

https://dspace.org/

A critical evaluation of developmental local government in the City of Johannesburg, 2001-2005

Seedat, Rashid Ahamed

2009-01-21T07:37:04Z
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/5954

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

A CRITICAL EVALUATION OF DEVELOPMENTAL LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN THE CITY OF JOHANNESBURG, 2001-2005

Rashid Ahamed Seedat

A research report submitted to the Faculty of Engineering and the Built Environment, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science (Development Planning)

Johannesburg, 2005

DECLARATION

I declare that this research report is my own, unaided work. It is being submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of Master of Science (Development Planning) in the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination in any other university.

_____

Rashid Ahamed Seedat
Student No.: 8118756
28 November 2005

ABSTRACT

A critical evaluation of developmental local government in the City of Johannesburg, 2001-2005 is a qualitative analysis drawn from participation in setting, interviews and primary and secondary sources. It notes that the notion of developmental local government is drawn from a wide range of discourses such as developmentalism, decentralised local government, public management, governance, urban fragmentation and integration and sustainable development. The study takes the view that the notion of developmental local government would be more concisely conceptualised in terms of and as a confluence of the concepts of good governance, urban integration and sustainable development. These concepts are used to frame and critically analyse the practise of developmental local government in the City of Johannesburg between 2001-2005. The overall conclusion of the study is that the City of Johannesburg has embraced developmental local government between 2001-2005, albeit with some deficiencies, mainly relating to the gap between policy and implementation.

CONTENTS

DECLARATION I

ABSTRACT II

CONTENTS III

LIST OF FIGURES V

LIST OF TABLES VI

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS VII

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION 1
- Rationale 4
- Research Method 6
- Chapter Outline 10

CHAPTER 2: BACKGROUND 12
- Development of Local Government Legislative and Policy Environment 12
- Local Government Transition in Johannesburg 19

CHAPTER 3: LITERATURE REVIEW 24
- Developmentalism 24
- Decentralised Local Government 26
- Public Management 28
- Governance 30
- Urban Fragmentation and Integration 34
- Sustainable Development 37
- Conclusion 39

CHAPTER 4: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK 41
- Good Governance 42
- Urban Integration 46
- Sustainable Development 46

CHAPTER 5: ANALYSIS OF GOOD GOVERNANCE IN JOHANNESBURG, 2001-2005 48
Overview and Context 48
Representative Role of Councillors 56
Separation of Powers 57
Ward Committees 59
Strategic Perspectives 62
Development Oriented Institutions 66
Overall Assessment of Good Governance 72

CHAPTER 6: ANALYSIS OF URBAN INTEGRATION IN JOHANNESBURG, 2001-2005 74
Spatial Structure of the City 74
Overview of Spatial Development Framework (SDF) 75
Overall Assessment of Urban Integration 82

CHAPTER 7: ANALYSIS OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN JOHANNESBURG, 2001-2005 84
Environmental Conservation 84
Social Equity 90
Economic Development 95
Overall Assessment of Sustainable Development 100

CHAPTER 8: CONCLUSION 102

REFERENCES 105
Interviews and Personal Communications 105
Books and Journals 105
Government Publications 110
Local Government Publications 111
Unpublished Documents 112
Internet 113

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1 Municipalities in South Africa that are part of Project Consolidate

Figure 5.1 Johannesburg in the context of South Africa

Figure 5.2 Map of the city and its eleven administrative regions

Figure 5.3 Overall political and administrative structure of the City of Johannesburg

Figure 5.4 Actual capital expenditure 1995/06-2004/05 and capital budget 2005/06-2007/08 for the City of Johannesburg

Figure 6.1 Conceptual development direction of the Spatial Development Framework

Figure 7.1 Sources of air pollution in Johannesburg

Figure 7.2 Sectoral contribution to GVA for 2004

LIST OF TABLES

Table 5.1 Population by population group for Johannesburg, 1996-2001

Table 5.2 Size of household, Johannesburg, 1996 and 2001

Table 5.3 Names of City of Johannesburg municipal entities and their functions

Table 7.1 Estimated distribution of water service levels, 2000

Table 6.3 Household access to water, Johannesburg, 1996 and 2001

Table 7.2 Estimate of sanitation service levels, 2000

Table 7.3 Social package of free basic services

Table 7.4 Key economic indicators for selected metros, 2004

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

ANC	African National Congress
CBD	Central Business District
CBO	Community-Based Organisation
CoJ	City of Johannesburg
DFA	Development Facilitation Act
DLG	Developmental Local Government
DPLG	Department of Provincial And Local Government
EMF	Environmental Management Framework
GEAR	Growth, Employment And Redistribution Strategy
GCR	Global City Region
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GVA	Gross Value Added
HDS	Human Development Strategy
IBP	Index of Buying Power
IDP	Integrated Development Plan/ning
JMOSS	Johannesburg Metropolitan Open Space System
LED	Local Economic Development
LGTA	Local Government Transition Act
LSM	Living Standards Measure
MFMA	Municipal Finance Management Act
MSDF	Metropolitan Spatial Development Framework
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NPM	New Public Management
PR	Proportional Representation
RDP	Reconstruction and Development Programme
RSA	Republic of South Africa

SA	South Africa
SABS	South African Bureau of Standards
SDF	Spatial Development Framework

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

> *Contemporary Johannesburg is the premier metropolis in Africa in terms of technology, wealth and racial complexity, as well as cultural practices and formal institutions – apparent through the sheer quantification of the world of goods, of production and consumption. It is a thoroughly polyglot urban formation whose influence, connections and identifications extend beyond its locality and well beyond South Africa* (Mbembe & Nuttall 2004: 365-6).

Johannesburg occupies a pivotal position on the South African landscape. It is the largest, by population, of the country's six metropolitan areas and continues to attract an unparalleled number of migrants. It is at the epicentre of the national economy by virtue of its role in the provision of corporate headquarters and business services. It plays a critical role in politics and political discourse and it profoundly influences the development of popular culture. Johannesburg is the seat of the Constitutional Court and thus the judicial capital of South Africa. It economically articulates with South Africa as a whole, Africa and the rest of world, as African continent's only truly globalised city.

Although some of the latter assertions maybe contested, using Saskia Sassen's concept of global networks and linked cities, it is argued that "Johannesburg is fully located within specialized global circuits of finance, labor, technology and capital … [whose resources are] old history of economic advantage (through mining); its dense business, capital exchange, and transport networks; its telematic and conventional infrastructures; its web of international firms; its highly competitive labor market for professionals (finance, accounting, law, advertising) and specialized service workers; its

capacity for global transmission and communication; and its increasingly digitised economy." (Mbembe & Nuttall 2004:360)

Johannesburg undoubtedly occupies a central position in the country's political economy, but it is also afflicted by the legacy of apartheid in terms of unequal and racially-defined access to urban infrastructure and services, high levels of poverty, unemployment and marginalisation, degrading urban environments and a hugely fragmented urban landscape. Indeed, some even contend that urban social equity has *worsened* since the end of apartheid (for example, Bond 2000).

It is against this backdrop that service delivery, development and governance in the City of Johannesburg[1] is crucial to the national development project and to the overall success of Nepad across the African continent. "How Johannesburg fares will also be seen, unfairly or not, as indicative of the success or failure of South Africa." (Tomlinson *et al*. 2003:xi)

Local government, in the South African context, has increasingly been called upon to assume a key role in driving urban development, change and transformation. "The historical burden on the shoulders of local government is colossal and mounting. Increasingly, politicians and civil society refer to the leading role local government must play in achieving the ambitious objectives of national transformation in South Africa." (Pieterse 2002:1) Therefore, sustainable socio-economic development in Johannesburg holds the promise of stimulating economic growth, addressing poverty and improving the quality of life of the city's citizens.

[1] The 'City of Johannesburg' or 'City' (upper case) or 'CoJ' are used interchangeably to refer to the legal municipal entity, while 'city' in lower case refers to the social, economic and spatial entity. In both cases, it refers to the wider metropolitan area not limited to the historical central business district (CBD).

The policies and structures of the City of Johannesburg have generated substantial public debate and scholarship during the late 1990s and the early years of the new century (see Bond 2000; Mbembe & Nuttall 2004; Tomlinson *et al.* 2003; and CoJ 2001). Given the strategic importance of the city, the debate was fuelled by policy shifts at the national government level, notably the adoption of the Growth, Employment and Redistribution (GEAR) strategy in 1996, the adoption of *iGoli 2002* in 1999 by the erstwhile Greater Johannesburg Metropolitan Council and the policies formulated and implemented after the December 2000 local government election.

Although a diverse range of opinions has been expressed on the 'Johannesburg model', three distinctive sets of stances are discernible. The progenitors of iGoli 2002 argue that their approach seeks to transform local government on a sustainable basis (CoJ 2001). Those who occupy the middle ground take a 'constructively critical' view of the Johannesburg model (Beall, Parnell & Crankshaw 2003). At the other extreme, the left opposition view the model as supplanting reconstruction and development and as a triumph of neo-liberalism (Bond 2000).

However, the notion of *developmental local government*, albeit with differing interpretations, is widely held as the foundation of a progressive and ameliorative approach to local government in South Africa (see Chipkin 2002; Mogale 2003; Parnell & Pieterse 2002; and Pieterse 2002). Therefore, this project explores the ways in which developmental local government has been conceptualised, defines a distinctive conceptual framework for developmental local government and examine the *praxis* of municipal governance in Johannesburg between 2001 and 2005.

RATIONALE

The research topic, 'A critical evaluation of developmental local government in the City of Johannesburg, 2001-2005', explores municipal governance in the City of Johannesburg in terms of the idea of developmental local government. The imperative for developmental local government is to "radically transform the apartheid system of segregated municipal government … [and to provide] an excellent opportunity to totally redefine the goals and operational procedures of local government in South Africa." (Parnell & Pieterse 2002: 79)

Although there has been intensive restructuring of government institutions, legislative and regulatory frameworks and systems of resource allocation, Harrison, Huchzermeyer & Mayekiso (2003:1) argue that serious deficiencies remain in terms of implementation. They point out that despite a clear commitment to urban integration and coordinated development, housing policies and practices, for example, lead to poor quality housing that is badly located in relation to urban opportunities.

Hence, this project seeks to address the primary research question, which is: *Can the contemporary model and practice of local government in Johannesburg be characterised as 'developmental'*?

There are three supplementary questions and issues that underpin the primary research question. Firstly, developmental local government is the subject of competing conceptions. The literature on developmental local government will be examined to determine and expatiate upon the different theoretical conceptions, which will be carefully analysed and critiqued.

Secondly, this project seeks to formulate its own conceptual framework that will enable a rigorous conceptualisation of developmental local government. The motivation for a distinctive approach is that existing conceptions are variously inadequate, ambiguous or unhelpful; and which should enable a framework for assessing the actual practice of developmental local government in a specific municipality over a defined period of time.

In other words, when can it be said that a municipality is acting developmentally? Has access to basic services improved significantly? Has the quality of services been improved? Have the principles of sustainable development been applied? How has the problem of fragmentation been addressed? Has the municipality acted in a manner that ameliorates poverty and improves the quality of life of its citizens?

Thirdly, the conceptual framework will be used to frame the case study of the City of Johannesburg between 2001 and 2005 in terms of its actual practice as a developmental municipality. Dewar (1998 quoted in Pieterse 2002:6) points out the gap between policy intent and outcome, experienced in the domain of urban planning between 1994 and 1998. Can the same be said for the policy intention of developmental local government and its practice in Johannesburg?

The period 2001 to 2005 has been chosen because it coincides with the municipal electoral term that commenced in December 2000 and is due to end in February 2006 and consequently, the formal implementation of the iGoli 2002 plan and the establishment of the new model of metropolitan governance. This allows for an analysis of events for most of the electoral term and takes account of the reality that service delivery and development processes take some years to comprehensively implement.

Thus, the praxis of municipal governance in Johannesburg, framed by the conceptual framework, will entail an examination of both the conception and the actual practice of service delivery and socio-economic development.

Given that the period of analysis is five years and considering that this is a focused research report means that a comprehensive account is not possible, which is also the key *limitation* of this study. This report will therefore not provide a detailed 'account' of developmental local government in Johannesburg, but will assess it on the basis of the criteria of good governance, urban integration and sustainable development.

RESEARCH METHOD

Research methods have broadly been categorised into quantitative and qualitative research. According to Creswell (1994), five fundamentally different assumptions separate these two types of research:

(a) *Ontological assumption*: Quantitative research assumes a single objective world and qualitative research assume that multiple subjectively derived realities can co-exist.
(b) *Epistemological assumption*: Quantitative research assumes its independence from the variables under study whereas qualitative research assumes interaction with subjects of its study.
(c) *Axiological assumption*: Quantitative research act in a value-free and unbiased manner, while qualitative research acts in a value laden and biased manner.
(d) *Rhetorical assumption*: Quantitative research uses impersonal, formal and rule-based text and language, while qualitative research use personalised, informal and context based language.

(e) *Methodological assumption*: Quantitative research applies deduction, limited cause-effect relationships and context free methods, while qualitative research tends to apply induction, multivariate and multi-process interactions and context specific methods.

The boundaries between 'pure' quantitative and qualitative research rarely exist in practice and in certain situations, the two types of research may indeed be complementary. Moreover, Ackroyd & Hughes (1992:30) argue that "… it is the nature of the research problem that should dictate the appropriate research method; sometimes quantification is required, sometimes not. There is no intrinsic virtue to either style of method."

Therefore, this research effort is considered to be qualitative in nature due to the assumptions that are shared with qualitative research that multiple subjectively derived realities co-exist, that interaction with the subjects of the research should occur and that values underpin both the researcher and the researched; and because quantification is not required.

Marshall & Rossman (1995), writing on the design of qualitative research, state that qualitative researchers rely on certain methods for gathering data: participation in the setting, in-depth interviewing and document review. This research project relied on all these methods, as is explained below.

Participation in setting

The researcher has been employed by the City of Johannesburg in various capacities since 1995 to the present. He has been involved, at a senior level, in all of the key transformative processes including the early local government transition processes, the development and implementation of the iGoli 2002 plan, the formulation of Joburg 2030 and the development of IDPs.

This enables the researcher to make informed observations of the complex and multifaceted processes that have unfolded between 2001 and 2005 based on innumerable discussions, debates, policy proposals and implementation plans. Although the researcher has not been immune to influences, he recognises that the nature of an academic exercise requires critical and independent judgement, especially for an evaluative exercise such as this assignment.

In-depth interviewing

Interviews were held with a number of officials of the City of Johannesburg who have been intimately involved in work that intersects with the subject matter of this research. This proved to be a very effective method to gather data and to clarify the views of CoJ officials.

Document review

Primary documentary sources emanating from the City of Johannesburg such as Council reports, the Integrated Development Plans, the Mid-term Report and Annual Reports; national legislation such as the Municipal Systems Act and the Municipal Finance Management Act; and national and provincial policies such as the White Paper on Local Government were immediately available to the researcher.

Other primary sources such as newspapers and magazine articles concerning developmental local government have been collected by the researcher over time were also readily available. These primary documents provided the main source of data and information for the analysis contained in this report.

Secondary sources in the form of local and international books and journal articles on local government, developmental local government, civil society, sustainable development, national government policy, public management and related topics were sourced and consulted. This provided the material for the background chapter, the literature review and formulation of the conceptual framework. Some of the secondary material was also used for the analysis that has been presented in the latter part of the document.

Electronic data

The researcher also had access to primary electronic databases or spreadsheets of the City of Johannesburg such as budgets, demographic data, socio-economic data, citizen satisfaction surveys and the like. These assisted on the analysis component of the report.

Internet

The Internet was utilised to source specific data or information from websites for government, local government, statistical agencies and international experience. Although the Internet was used, much of the data was ultimately not utilised in the final writing of the report.

CHAPTER OUTLINE

Chapter 1 is the **introduction**, which provides an overview of the research report, the rationale for the research, including the primary and supplementary research questions and then sets out the method by which the research was conducted. It therefore sets the scene for the entire document.

Chapter 2 provides the **background**, which traces the formulation of the concept of developmental local government within the emergent legislative and policy environment; and it briefly shows the genesis of Johannesburg's institutional, financial and governance difficulties and describes the iGoli 2002 plan that was formulated to address these difficulties.

Chapter 3 is the **literature review** that encompasses a number of discourses, which include developmentalism, decentralisation of local government, public management, governance, urban fragmentation and integration and sustainable development. These discourses are important because they provide some of the intellectual roots of developmental local government; they are closely related and are critical for formulating the conceptual framework for developmental local government used in this project.

Chapter 4 is the **conceptual framework**, which based on the conclusions reached in the literature review. It is made up of three core elements: good governance, urban integration and sustainable development. Each of these elements is unpacked, with a set of propositions that would be used as the basis of evaluation for the subsequent chapters.

Chapter 5 provides an **analysis of good governance in Johannesburg, 2001-2005**. It starts by providing an overview and context including the location of Johannesburg, demographic trends, political arrangements,

administrative structure and capital and operating budget. It then analyses a number of issues that have an important bearing on good governance: representative role of councillors, separation of powers, ward committees, mayoral road shows and strategic perspectives. The chapter concludes with an overall assessment of good governance.

Chapter 6 sets out an **analysis of urban integration in Johannesburg, 2001-2005**. It provides the context by describing the spatial structure of the city and then sets out the Spatial Development Framework, including its elements of nodal development, corridors, mobility, density and urban development boundary. It concludes with an assessment of urban integration in Johannesburg.

Chapter 7 provides an **analysis of sustainable development in Johannesburg, 2001-2005**. It unpacks each of the elements of sustainable development, namely, environmental conservation, social equity and urban economic growth. It then concludes with an overall assessment of sustainable development.

Chapter 8 shows the **conclusion**, which is that the City of Johannesburg has embraced developmental local government between 2001-2005, albeit with some deficiencies, mainly relating to the gap between policy and implementation.

CHAPTER 2: BACKGROUND

This background chapter is made up of two distinct sections: the local government legislative and policy environment and the specific dynamics of the Johannesburg local government transition. This chapter traces the formulation of the concept of developmental local government within the emergent legislative and policy environment; and it briefly shows the genesis of Johannesburg's institutional, financial and governance difficulties and describes the iGoli 2002 plan that was formulated to address these difficulties.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT LEGISLATIVE AND POLICY ENVIRONMENT

Historically, the approach to planning in local government in South Africa was informed by the idea of 'blueprint' planning, which posited the existing urban form against an imaginary ideal. Planning instruments such as municipal structure plans and planning guides detailed the precise interventions required to develop the actual towards the imagined. Furthermore, the realisation of the blueprint was seen as the technical manipulation of social, demographic and transport trends, where town planners were responsible for 'development control' (Chipkin 2002:63).

An international shift from blueprint planning to 'management' planning gradually became evident in the country. This approach de-emphasised the correlation between plan and execution and implied that the process should manage delays and interruptions to deal with pressing issues without losing

sight of long-term objectives (Chipkin 2002:63). The criticism of both these approaches are that they assume the urban form as given and do not entertain the idea that the urban form needs to be transformed to address the legacies of urban inequality and inefficiency.

Although local government planning in South Africa until 1994 had generally referred to planning in relation to land and land uses, there were two notable exceptions. Firstly, the thinking underlying the Urban Management Programme (UMP)[2] influenced some planners in the 1980s, albeit in the context of apartheid South Africa. The UMP advanced the view that the traditional role of local government in land management absorbed resources while critical strategic issues and budgetary and management resources were left unattended (Mabin 2002:43). Secondly, planning that was focused around the physical development of urban areas including infrastructure, housing, land use, transport emerged in the context of local negotiations between grassroots extra-parliamentary movements and local government in the late 1980s and early 1990s (Mabin 2002:44).

In both these cases, the impact was largely limited. The planning inspired by urban management mainly found resonance in the Urban Foundation, a private sector led initiative that sought to influence urban policy. Planning emanating from local negotiations only influenced a limited number of relatively enlightened municipalities during that period.

Developmental local government and integrated development planning owe their origins to a different idea for planning in local government, one which sought to inform decisions about resource allocation in a manner that was simultaneously political and an alternative to purely political allocation or

[2] The Urban Management Programme emerged from the first Habitat conference in Vancouver in 1976 as a joint initiative by the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (now called UN-Habitat), the United Nations Development Programme and the World Bank (Mabin 2002:43).

wholly technical processes (Mabin 2002:40). Planning encompasses both corporate (or internal) planning for municipal operations and planning for local governments' external environments (Lemon 2002:27).

The Local Government Transition Act, 203 of 1993 (LGTA), passed in tandem with the 1993 Interim Constitution, was negotiated at the National Local Government Negotiating Forum. This was the principal legislation governing the local government transition, which set out the process for the establishment of transitional councils, defined the mechanisms for boundary determination and determined the process for nationwide local government elections. Although the LGTA provided the basis for the deracialisation and democratisation of local government, it did not specifically seek to fashion local government as an agent for development.

The Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) (ANC 1994) set out five programmes for the transformation of South African society at the dawn of the post-apartheid period: meeting basic needs, developing human resources, building the economy, democratising state and society and implementing the RDP. The RDP sought to achieve formal and substantive democracy, a pluralistic and participatory form of governance and a developmentalist agenda (Mhone 2003:21). It also provided the basis for much policy that emanated from government in subsequent years. The adoption of the Growth, Employment and Redistribution strategy (GEAR) in 1996, however, was perceived by many commentators as a neo-liberal 'turn' away from the state's developmental agenda, which was reflected in the RDP (see for example, Mhone 2003 and Harrison, Huchzermeyer & Mayekiso 2003).

The first post-apartheid planning legislation was the Development Facilitation Act (DFA) 46 of 1995. It sought to speed up land development by removing

obstacles of the past and use local government to plan ahead for the physical development of its locality. Consequently, municipalities were required to prepare land development objectives (LDOs), which basically set local government policy for development of its area. As Mabin (2002:45-46) shows, the DFA was bedevilled by a series of problems relating to complexity, a still emerging role for local government and the lack of provincial regulations. Around 1996, a rapidly changing constitutional and legislative environment effectively supplanted the DFA[3].

In terms of section 152 of the (final) Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, Act 108 of 1996, the objects of local government are to:

(a) Provide democratic and accountable government for local communities;
(b) Ensure the provision of services to communities in a sustainable manner;
(c) Promote social and economic development;
(d) Promote a safe and healthy environment; and
(e) Encourage the involvement of communities and community organisations in the matters of local government.

Its significance is that local government is specifically enjoined to promote social and economic development, provide services and ensure participation. Since it is a rights-based constitution, it means that local government as an organ of the state is required to progressively address socio-economic rights of its citizens or what Mhone (2003:20) calls the realisation of 'emancipatory democracy'.

Local government was defined as a 'sphere' of government, along national and provincial government meaning that its position was entrenched as a separate entity within the overall intergovernmental system. In the first

[3] Since the DFA is still on the statute books, it is mainly used by developers to accelerate planning approval.

certification case in the Constitutional Court, the court observed that local government has been afforded more autonomy in the new Constitution than in the interim Constitution. However, the court added: “What the New Constitution seeks hereby to realise is a structure for Local Government that, on the one hand, reveals a concern for the autonomy and integrity of local government and, on the other, acknowledges the requirement that higher levels of government monitor local government functioning and intervene where such functioning is deficient or defective in a manner that compromises this autonomy.” (Re: Certification if the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996(10) BCLR 1253 [CC], quoted in Chipkin 2002:74)

Also in 1996, the Department of Constitutional Development piloted the Local Government Transition Act, Second Amendment Act, 97 of 1996 through Parliament, which introduced the new idea of ‘integrated development planning.’ Section 10(c) required municipalities to promote integrated economic development, equitable redistribution of municipal services and the equitable delivery of services that were to be defined within an IDP. In one sense, the notion of the IDP sought to supersede LDOs as the principal planning instrument for local government. But elaboration of the idea only occurred in the form of the Green Paper on Local Government in 1997 and particularly the White Paper on Local Government in 1998.

The White Paper expanded the functions of local government to include poverty eradication, local economic development and sustainable development. Thus, the notion of *developmental local government* was born. Parnell & Pieterse (2002) postulate that developmental local government represented the ‘second wave’ of the post-apartheid reconstruction. The first wave, by contrast, demonstrated vague reconstruction goals or promised too much or did not take into account fiscal constraints. They outline the four dimensions of developmental local government as follows: Firstly, changing

the spatial framework of apartheid. Secondly, local government finance encompassing GEAR-related fiscal restraint. Thirdly, integrated local government management where the municipality becomes the primary champion for development. Fourthly, there is a strong emphasis on local democracy and community participation.

The White Paper strengthened the idea of integrated development planning. It was conceived as the mechanism for coordinating and integrating the work of the municipality in terms of revenue raising, service delivery, community participation and institutional arrangements. It was also the tool for integration with adjacent municipalities and other spheres of government. IDPs were intellectually influenced by participatory development planning that emanated from the writings of theorists such as Mumford, Faludi and Habermas, who advanced notions such as diversity, collaboration, communication and integration (Mogale 2003:220).

In the mid to late 1990s, various national government departments initiated policy and legislation that required local government to plan for specific sectors such as housing, water services, the environment and disaster management. The difficulty that emerged was the integration of these myriad requirements into municipal planning frameworks. As a result, the polar approaches of ‘metaplanning’ and ‘mesoplanning’ was proposed, where the former referred to the attempt to integrate all planning within one approach and the latter to the linking of different parallel processes (Harrison *et al*:1998, quoted in Mabin 2002:47).

Mabin’s (2002:47) view is that this tension has its basis in the notion of ‘comprehensiveness’, which is the attempt to include all possible variables in planning. This strand of modernist planning evolved in a era in which both the territory of the state and the connections between the economic and

social were at least differently understood and differently articulated in practice (Rose 1996 quoted in Mabin 2002:47).

By the late 1990s, the Department of Provincial and Local Government set about the implementation of the White Paper on Local Government. It introduced a suite of legislation intended to complete the 'local government transition'. The Local Government: Municipal Structures Act, 117 of 1998 set out newly defined structures for municipalities including metropolitan, district and local municipalities, while the Municipal Demarcation Act, 27 of 1998 established the Municipal Demarcation Board for ward and municipal boundary determination. These laws provided the framework for the December 2000 local government elections.

Most pertinently, was the passing of the Municipal Systems Act, 32 of 2000. It sought to overhaul the systems underpinning municipal planning, monitoring and operations intended to strengthen the local government sphere. It specifically addressed financial and human resources, integrated development planning, municipal services partnerships and performance management.

Although the framework provided by this law intended the emergence of developmental local government, it is clear from recent experience that many emergent municipalities across the country have been wracked by instability, the lack of human resources and financial capacity and have struggled to improve service delivery and enhance development in their localities. These are mainly the 136 municipalities (out of a total of 284 municipalities) that have received attention from the Department of Provincial and Local Government's Project Consolidate, which seeks to enhance the capacity of municipalities to deliver services (see www.projectconsolidate.gov.za). Figure 2.1 shows the municipalities that are part of Project Consolidate.




Figure 2.1: Municipalities in South Africa that are part of Project Consolidate (source: www.projectconsolidate.gov.za/images/municipalities.gif)

Integrated development planning, on the other hand, "has brought about substantial changes in the planning actually practised in municipalities … [and] large numbers of citizens, councillors and officials have learnt significantly (about development) through public participation processes; and planning processes have significantly influenced municipal decision-making processes." Mabin (2002:49)

LOCAL GOVERNMENT TRANSITION IN JOHANNESBURG

Apartheid local government was characterised by racially based municipal government such as white municipal councils, black local authorities and coloured and Indian management committees and grossly inequitable access to local government revenue. The consequences were high levels of

infrastructure, services and facilities in white localities and negligible services in black townships, with coloured and Indian areas somewhere in between. Apartheid also bequeathed a distorted spatial structure for the city with racially based residential areas, urban sprawl, low-density development even in low-income areas and public transportation that increasingly favoured motorised commuting. Furthermore, the spatial structure reflected racial segregation as well as poverty, marginalisation and exclusion.

Popular resistance to apartheid local government emerged in the post-1976 period and reached unprecedented heights during the late 1980s. The focus of much of the resistance was on illegitimate local authorities, unaffordable service charges and the lack of adequate basic services and housing. In the South African context, the idea that the most effective solution for metropolitan areas was the creation of metropolitan municipalities was clearly articulated during the struggle against apartheid local government and was a key demand of the anti-apartheid opposition during the local government transition process.

The model that emerged out of the local government negotiations in the early 1990s sought to balance the tension between large municipal jurisdictions that permitted a unified tax base and spatial integration; and local government that was ‘close’ and to its citizenry. Consequently, the model of metropolitan local government that made its way into Local Government Transition Act was a two-tiered system of metropolitan government, comprising a ‘top-tier’ metropolitan municipality and constituent local municipalities.

However, the two-tier metropolitan government structure proved to be profoundly dysfunctional for Johannesburg. It resulted in a major governance and financial crisis between 1996 and 1999. The then Greater Johannesburg Metropolitan Council (GJMC 2000) argued that the two-tier system of political

governance (i.e. five independent municipalities) resulted in a situation where local interests served by a metropolitan local council often competed and even conflicted with the priorities of the city as a whole; and that political and institutional fragmentation and competition made it difficult to develop a cohesive political and redistributive agenda for the city. Furthermore, the financial difficulties were characterised by fragmented revenue and expenditure arrangements, consistent overspending, low payment levels, growing arrears and negligible capital expenditure.

The conclusion therefore, was that the city's problems were attributable to poor political governance structures, poor institutional arrangements, inadequate financial management, and the lack of management capacity – all of which resulted in an institutional, governance and financial crisis (GJMC 2000).

In partial response to the crisis confronting Johannesburg, the White Paper on Local Government recommended the establishment of 'unicity' metropolitan government to address the identified weaknesses, coupled with flexibility in each metro area for an optional form of political decentralisation through the establishment of 'sub-councils', administrative decentralisation as determined by the metropolitan council concerned and institutionalised civil society participation through 'ward committees'.

As a result of the legislative changes, the then GJMC approved its transformation plan, called *iGoli 2002*, whose salient features included the following (GJMC 2000 and CoJ 2001):

a) *New political governance arrangements*: After the 2000 local government election a unicity should be created for Johannesburg, the appointment of

an executive mayor and the establishment of ward committees to facilitate and institutionalise local community participation.

b) *Achieving financial sustainability*: This was to be achieved by reducing the operating deficit, improving payment levels, reducing wastage, improving efficiency and increasing capital expenditure to sustainable levels.

c) *New core city administration*: The new administration should comprise a central administration that delivers services directly to its citizenry such as metro police and emergency services along with eleven decentralised administrative regions that deliver localised services such as libraries, sport and recreation facilities and serve as a highly localised interface between the CoJ and its citizens.

d) *Creation of arm's length entities*: The creation of these entities was motivated by the need to enhance operational efficiencies. They were named *utilities* (water and sanitation, electricity and solid waste), *agencies* (roads and stormwater and parks and cemeteries) and *corporatised entities* (the Johannesburg Zoo, the Fresh Produce Market, Metrobus, the Civic Theatre and the Johannesburg Property Company).

The new institutional and governance model that the iGoli 2002 plan, proposed at the end of the local government transition period[4] and at the cusp of the new local government dispensation in December 2000, represented a bold and radical approach to local governance in South Africa.

[4] In terms of the Local Government Transition Act, the first set of post-apartheid councils were *appointed* in 1994 to oversee the so-called 'pre-interim' period while the second set of councils were *elected* in November 1995 to govern during the 'interim' period. The Municipal Structures Act finalised local government legislation to end the transition and initiate the 'final' and permanent arrangements. These elections were held in December 2000.

The years ahead would determine whether the new thinking would bring about good governance, improved service delivery and enhanced development for the citizens of Johannesburg.

CHAPTER 3: LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review encompasses a number of discourses. These include developmentalism, decentralisation of local government, public management, governance, urban fragmentation and integration and sustainable development. These discourses were chosen because they provided some of the original intellectual roots to developmental local government and are also closely related and interdependent. They are also critical for formulating a conceptual framework for developmental local government.

DEVELOPMENTALISM

The notion of 'developmentalism' is closely related to discussions and debates on globalisation, neo-liberalism and the role of the state. *Globalisation* refers to the growth and expansion of international flows related to goods and services, finance, information, individuals, technology and capital goods in a manner that considerably limits the ability of individual nation-states, or current multilateral and bilateral bodies, to control or regulate them adequately (Mhone & Edigheji 2003:4).

In the broadest sense, there are three views concerning globalisation. The first is that globalisation is an inevitable consequence of the development of human society and that its benefits are positive and need to be promoted. Specifically, supporters of globalisation make a number of important claims: globalisation leads to the liberalisation and global integration of markets; globalisation is inevitable and irreversible; nobody oversees globalisation; globalisation holds universal benefits; and globalisation promotes democracy

in the world (Steger 2003). Furthermore, that it will increase integration, prosperity, democracy and development provided that governments pursue market based growth paths and take advantage of international trade and attracting capital (World Bank 1995, quoted in Mhone 2003:27).

The second perspective takes the diametrically opposite view. It believes that globalisation is driven by the imperatives of major corporations and their home governments and are bolstered by the efforts of various bilateral and multilateral organisations; that its structural manifestations and underpinnings are found in market-driven economic processes and market fundamentalism; and that it is rationalised through the dogma of economic liberalism (also referred to as the Washington Consensus or neo-liberalism[5]) (Mhone and Edigheji 2003:4). The effects of globalisation are structural adjustment and stabilisation programmes and unequal benefits that tend to benefit developed countries (Mhone & Edigheji 2003:5).

The third view is similar to the second view in that it shares the criticisms of market fundamentalism and the effects of globalisation. Joseph Stiglitz (2002), in his seminal work *Globalization and its discontents*, states that abandoning globalisation is not the answer, since it has brought opportunities for trade and increased access to markets and technology. Stiglitz argues that globalisation should be reshaped to realise its 'potential for good' and that international economic institutions should similarly be reformed. These include the role of governments in mitigating the effects of market failure and ensuring social justice; and reforming global financial system, the World Bank

[5] Steger (2003:41) usefully lists 'concrete neo-liberal measures' as: privatisation of public enterprises; deregulation of the economy; liberalisation of trade and industry; massive tax cuts; 'monetarist' measures to keep inflation in check, even at the risk of increasing unemployment; strict control of organised labour; the reduction of public expenditures, particularly social spending; the down-sizing of government; the expansion of international markets; and the removal of controls on global financial flows.

and development assistance and the World Trade Organization. This is the view supported in this project.

In a similar vein, is the notion of *developmentalism*, which holds that the state is not a passive recipient or respondent but an active player in shaping the processes of globalisation (Edigheji 2003:73). More clearly, it is the conscious and strategic position taken by the state to promote economic growth, structural transformation, social development and the repositioning of the economy in the international division of labour by consciously influencing the performance of the market (Mhone 2003:38). Developmentalism has since been refined to 'developmental democracy' to take into account good governance and state capacity as the major determinants of developmental performance (Mhone 2003:40).

DECENTRALISED LOCAL GOVERNMENT

The need for sub-national government (including local government), according to Lemon (2002:18), stems from three aspects of the modern state: the bureaucratic nature of the central state requires decentralisation of functions that can be better administered locally, the state's legitimacy may be assisted by acceptance of local autonomy and the need to address uneven development.

Mabin (2002:46) argues that the concept of decentralisation is "really a way of shifting development and management responsibility from national governments to local governments – perhaps based on the charitable concern that if national government could not do the job, then local governments provided the alternative." Khan (2004) also points to the central state's 'abdication' of its responsibilities and refers to a World Bank (1997

quoted in Khan 2004:12) study that found that decentralisation had sharpened inequality between localities, undermined economic stability and that institutions have been prone to capture by local groups leading to misuse of resources.

Lemon (2002:18) however argues, “there is a potentially important role for local government in development … both from its use by central government as a developmental tool, and from its own enterprise and initiative.” Another considered rationale for decentralisation is found in Oldified (2002:93) who basis her argument on the concept of ‘embedded autonomy’. She argues that to fulfil its developmental mandate within the context of resource constraints, the national state attempts to ‘embed’ the key constituents (other spheres of government and civil society) into the reconstruction project. Decentralisation is therefore understood as a process of ‘embedded autonomy’ where local government is afforded autonomy and responsibility to undertake local development.

Across the world, the extent of decentralised local government can differ quite markedly. On the one extreme, ‘deconcentration’ refers to the local administration of central government functions. In many countries, this is the only form of ‘local government’. In between, “are those councils that may lack power to initiate policy, but may nevertheless be given discretion to implement central policies flexibly in relation to local needs, which Clark (1984) describes as ‘top-down autonomy’.” (Lemon 2002:20) Decentralised sub-national government is thus characterised by ‘bottom-up autonomy’.

Decentralisation of local government is difficult to achieve in practice. A number of conditions need to be satisfied to ensure a decentralised system of local government (adapted from Lemon 2002:20; and Pieterse 2002:2): First, local government should be constitutionally entrenched. Second, national

government should not limit financial resources or transfer its functions without sufficient resources. Third, it should have sufficient financial resources to accomplish its tasks and adequate administrative capacity to administer those tasks.

Decentralised local government is important because it would enable municipalities to exert influence in their localities and provide the point of accountability for the service delivery and development of the locality.

PUBLIC MANAGEMENT

Public sector efficiency has its beginnings in changes in public management in the 1980s, acquiring the label 'new public management' (NPM) by the 1990s. Five 'megatrends' in public policy and administration for the 1990s were identified by Hood (1989:346-350, quoted in Thynne 1995:1): attempts to peg back the growth of government, the internationalisation of public administration, automation in public administration, the privatisation of public administration and the rise of the new public management.

The 'key values' underpinning a number of these developments, especially the NPM and privatisation, include individual choice, responsiveness to market forces, management responsibility for organisational outputs and resource frugality and avoidance of waste and inefficiency (Thynne 1995:2).

The critique of the NPM is that it is an attempt to 'roll back the state', cut back on services and 'marketise' service provision (Mackintosh 1993 in Pieterse 2002:8) in terms of its impact on the system of governance in society. It also reduces political risks because many state responsibilities are shifted to other actors; and its frameworks provide simple answers for complex issues and

define clear procedural steps to solve specific problems, thereby creating a false sense of achievement (Pieterse 2002:8).

Lowndes (1997) states that although the political significance of the NPM lies in its correspondence with a 'new right' policy agenda, the specific aspirations of the NPM hold a political significance of their own. The statements of intent and principle of the NPM amounts to a major challenge to traditional patterns of public-service management based on rule-following, specialism, hierarchy and line-management. Whereas traditional bureaucracies focused on inputs (rules, staff and budgets), the NPM focuses on performance, standards and customer satisfaction. New structures are designed to facilitate client-contractor splits, decentralisation of provider units, consumer choice and feedback and service monitoring. The NPM also undermines the traditional forms of accountability – such as elected representatives' democratic mandate, which is institutionalised through elections – with individual consumer style rights and choices.

Clarke (1994:20) advances the position that change in government should be driven by the need to find ways of making the public sector more efficient and responsive by emulating the results orientation of the private sector, but within the ethical framework of accountability and ethical commitments of the public sector.

Thus development-oriented public management should not simply reproduce the NPM and its prescriptions. It should use certain techniques, methods and structures of management that would enable effective management of resources, public accountability and enhanced capacity for service delivery and development.

GOVERNANCE

Good governance is usefully defined as "the achievement by a democratic government of the most appropriate developmental policy objectives to develop its society, by mobilising, applying and co-ordinating all available resources in the public, private and voluntary sectors, domestically and internationally, in the most effective, efficient and democratic way." (Cloete 2002:278)

A wide range of concerns have been raised on 'mainstream' views of governance[6]: that it has been appropriated to endorse the neo-liberal political project and a reduced role for the state; that is used to legitimate state actions and forge compliance; and that it tends to confine the role of the state to that of a 'night-watchman', providing a conducive environment for the market (Hassen 2003; Pieterse 2002; and Edigheji 2003:73).

The alternative 'radical' version makes the point that governance should imply a strong role for the state, which has a number of key features that distinguishes this conception of governance from the mainstream view. First, the bedrock of good governance is 'formal' democracy that entails representative government with periodic elections based on universal adult suffrage (Edigheji 2003). Second, it is focused on the interaction of a multiplicity of actors aimed at civil society empowerment and state democratisation (Pieterse 2002:8). Third, that it comprises institutional and political power that ensures effective management of resources for development and the means for legitimating allocation and distribution decisions (Hassen 2003:121).

[6] Examples of the mainstream approach can be found at the United Nations Development Programme's website www.undp.org, and the World Bank's website www.worldbank.org.

The following cornerstones constitute this approach to good governance in the local government sphere: strengthening formal democracy, facilitating deliberative development and building development-oriented institutions.

Strengthening formal democracy

Strengthening formal democracy encompasses constitutionally and legally entrenched protection of human rights. Stoker (2002:32) believes that democracy triumphed as an ideology in the twentieth century precisely because its arrangements treat all as free and equal and protects the basic rights of citizens by insisting on the popular authorisation of public power.

It is assumed in the South African context that certain mechanisms of formal democracy such as regular elections and basic human rights are constitutionally guaranteed and are essentially in place. However, formal democracy can be strengthened by the nature of the democratic arrangements and in terms of openness, accountability and transparency, so that democracy goes beyond the periodic, ritual exercise of the franchise.

Democratic arrangements encompass the mechanisms that deepen representation of the electorate and ensure that the exercise of power is subject to the appropriate checks and balances. Key among these is the electoral system and separation of powers between the legislature and executive.

Openness refers to an open society in which citizens are able to express themselves freely; especially when they believe that representative politics or other forms of political engagement are not serving their interests. The key is to prevent barriers for the expression of interests by poor and marginalised

communities and their representative organisations. Indeed, community-based organisations should be provided with information and accorded adequate resources to participate in the open democracy.

Political representatives exercising political power in public office must *hold* themselves accountable and be *held* to account for their policies, development trajectories and use of public resources on an ongoing basis, since *accountability* strengthens legitimacy of leadership and legitimacy is required if leadership is to have any capacity (Stoker 2002:38).

The closely related idea of *transparency* means that the actions and processes of public representatives and their institutions should be visible and that information on their activities should be reasonably accessible.

Facilitating deliberative development

Khan (2004:24) argues that participation based on the neo-liberal model involves a group of empowered individuals who voice their opinions and offer their expertise, which results in the poor being excluded and marginalised. An alternative approach to participation, which is used here, is called *deliberative development*[7].

Deliberative development endeavours to facilitate development through vibrant politics involving a wide range of social actors in the locality. It defines shared objectives to address key social and economic challenges and strives to consolidate resources and capacities through political interaction.

[7] It is termed 'deliberative development' by Khan (2004:24). It also has a variety of other nomenclature including 'experimental democracy' by Brazilian intellectual Roberto Unger (quoted in Pieterse 2002:11), 'social learning' by Pieterse (2002), 'embedded autonomy' by Oldfield (2002) and 'community leadership' by Stoker (2002).

In this approach, politics becomes a mechanism for achieving social co-ordination, and the locality provides the space for political interface. Although politics is a complex process that involves competing discourses of development and notions of governance (Oldfied 2002:98), deliberative development enables cooperation through flexible decision-making and the achievement of a common purpose (Stoker 2002:33).

Formulating an inclusive, integrated and progressive development vision, strategy and programme

Closely tied in to deliberative development is the need to formulate a development vision, strategy and programme. The key issues here include the *process* of formulation, multifaceted needs and priorities that encompass the wide range of societal stakeholders and a distinctively progressive or pro-poor orientation.

Building development oriented institutions

In the earlier sub-section on public management of this literature review, it was shown that knee-jerk opposition to the new public management due to its neo-liberal roots is unhelpful. At the same time, a uniform dose of NPM prescriptions is unlikely to solve the complex problems that confront the public sector. Instead, the public sector should shed its old public administration roots in favour of new approaches, methodologies and institutional forms that are capable of responding to the specific challenges of a particular organisation, which would enable it to provide enhanced services to society as a whole.

URBAN FRAGMENTATION AND INTEGRATION

Urban fragmentation and integration are key concepts underlying spatial development planning theory and practice, which will be examined here.

Urban fragmentation

Harrison (2003) observes that *urban fragmentation* is a 'slippery' concept that is widely recognised but which is not defined with any precision. He points to three evident forms of fragmentation: intensified socio-economic inequalities, institutional fragmentation and fragmented spatial arrangements.

Fragmentation due to *socio-economic inequality* arises not merely because of differentiation in income but "when material inequality among groups reaches unsustainable levels, in the sense of threatening moral order and social reproduction." (Smith 2003:38)

Institutional fragmentation arises because power has been diffused from traditional centres of authority into multiple points of influence as an outcome of globalisation; while the neo-liberal ideology hastens institutional fragmentation in its eagerness to diminish the role of the state (Harrison 2003:16).

Fragmented spatial arrangements are usually a reflection of increasing socio-economic inequalities and institutional fragmentation and are manifested in physical concentrations of wealth and poverty (Harrison 2003:16). But fragmented spatial arrangements do not necessarily emanate from socio-economic or institutional differences. As Smith (2003) points out, in the 'multicultural city', populations with equal rights but different traditions and ways of life coexist with varying degrees of comfort or discomfort.

Urban fragmentation in South Africa is widely viewed as having emanated from apartheid urban policy, which created large dormitory townships on the urban periphery and imposed increased commuting time costs and time, marginalised the poor from accessing jobs and other urban opportunities and social facilities (Dewar 1984, quoted in Todes 2003:111; and Chipkin 2002:69). This resulted in degraded environments with poor services and facilities, reduced the cost effectiveness of public transport and the high cost of urban infrastructure and services per property.

Compact city

The approach to urban integration focused upon here may also be termed the *compact city* approach. The basis of this approach is the reorganisation of the urban system through the prevention of sprawl that would enable low-income groups access to job opportunities and housing on well-located land. It seeks to contain urban sprawl, increase densification, promote mixed-use development, integrate diverse social groups and activities and optimise infrastructure utilisation and public transportation.

A number of instruments are used to achieve urban compaction, including strong planning interventions such as urban growth boundaries, infill development and designation of urban corridors, road pricing and strategic infrastructural investments. In practice, this could include the location of subsidised low income housing developments within the urban core, possibly located adjacent to wealthy areas.

Although the compact city gained widespread academic and progressive political acceptance in the 1980s through to the 1990s, a number of writers began expressing their misgivings from the late 1990s. The eminent academic Peter Marcuse (2003:xiii) recently asserted that the concept might

be more likely to lead to further exclusion from the city than inclusion within it, thereby enlarging the scale of fragmentation to the region.

Oelofse (2003) is more specific when he points out that the compact city approach results in insufficient attention being paid to social justice. He argues that the empirical evidence is not conclusive and points to a study by Burton (2001:4 quoted in Oelofse 2003:89) of 26 British towns and cities where compact development led to improved use of public transportation, greater scope for walking and cycling, better job opportunities for the lower skilled and better access to facilities. However, it led to less domestic living space, a lack of affordable housing, poor access to green space and increased levels of crime.

This is echoed by Schoonraad (2000 quoted in Todes 2003:112), who shows that communities on the periphery of Pretoria have the flexibility to accommodate lifestyle changes, maintain social networks and to diversify income sources through sub-letting and urban agriculture.

Burton's conclusion was that the compact may promote social *equality* rather than social *equity*: the position of the poor relative to the affluent is better, but not that the poor are better off in absolute terms or compared with the poor in other cities. Moreover, as Todes (2003) argues, urban compaction should not necessarily preclude the need for larger and peripherally located sites for housing.

The compact city approach is not fundamentally unsound and it remains the principal instrument for addressing spatial fragmentation generally and for specifically ameliorating the spatial legacy of apartheid. At the same time, it is recognised that social equity is not necessarily an outcome of compaction and that a completely inflexible approach may be counterproductive.

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Sustainable development is a key concept for understanding the content of the South African development project and the interrelationships between economic development, social equity and the natural environment.

The term sustainable development has been the subject of much debate at international forums and in scholarly journals, but the widely accepted definition provided by the World Commission on Environment and Development[8] in 1984 provides a useful starting point: "Development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs." (Irurah & Boshoff 2003:244)

The importance of the Brundtland Report was that it asserted that equity, growth and the maintenance of environmental integrity are simultaneously possible as long as the key principles are applied, namely, satisfaction of basic human needs for food, shelter, water and energy; conservation of biodiversity and maintenance of ecological integrity, including ecological carrying capacity; social justice and equity, including inter- and intra-generational equity; and participation of individuals and communities in activities and decisions that affect them (Sowman 2002:184).

Implicit in this notion of sustainable development are the rejection of an ecology-oriented paradigm and the acceptance of a human-centred path. Thus, sustainable urban development in South Africa should strive to balance social equity, urban economic growth and environmental conservation.

[8] The final report of World Commission on Environment and Development, *Our Common Future,* released in 1987 is also known as the Brundtland Report, after its chairperson Gro Harlem Brundtland.

Environmental conservation

Environmental conservation sits at the centre of the sustainable development agenda. Two key concepts need to be applied in the context of sustainable cities and human settlements, namely, resource limits and sink limits. *Resource limits* entail the finite resource base for key inputs to maintaining cities and buildings such as land, natural habitats, energy, water, construction materials and raw materials for economic purposes; while *sink limits* refer to the finite capacity of air, land and water to process waste generated from production and consumption (Irurah & Boshoff 2003:247).

In the case of urban environmental conservation, cities should seek to address dependence on motorised transport, grid electricity and virgin raw materials. Conversely, the specific measures that cities need to take to ensure conservation include renewable energy sources and minimising resource and waste throughput in their metabolism through conservation interventions and/or re-use/recycling (Irurah & Boshoff 2003:250).

Swilling (2004:224) goes further when he argues that a sustainable city should reduce its total consumption of inputs, increase the efficiency of throughputs and transform all its waste outputs into productive outputs, that is, making the transition from 'linear' to 'circular metabolism'.

Social equity

Social equity is a key element of the sustainable development agenda. It focuses on meeting basic needs, reducing poverty and ensuring the rights of vulnerable groups such as women, children, the aged and the disabled.

Urban economic growth

On opposite ends of the spectrum, ‘deep ecologists’ believe that economic growth can never be sustainable, while the ‘mainstream’ view believes that the diversity of nature, the ingenuity of people and new technologies will be able to address emerging problems (Sowman 2002:184).

The view taken here is that economic sustainability is not only desirable, but also possible, provided that economic growth is accompanied by employment creation and social equity and the mitigation of negative environmental externalities resulting from production.

CONCLUSION

The literature review reaches a number of important conclusions:

First, through the notion of developmentalism, it has been shown that the state has an active role to play in mitigating the processes of globalisation, intervening in the economy and interceding in favour of social equity.

Second, that decentralised local government is important because it enables municipalities to exert influence in their localities and provides the point of accountability for the service delivery and development of the locality.

Third, that the public sector should use certain techniques, methods and structures of management that would enable effective management of resources, public accountability and enhanced capacity for service delivery and development.

Fourth, that the concept of good governance enables the strengthening of formal mechanisms of democracy, promotes deliberative development, ensures formulation of an inclusive and progressive development programme and builds appropriate development institutions.

Fifth, that urban integration advanced through the notion of the compact city advances social equity and improves urban efficiency.

Sixthly, sustainable development comprising environmental conservation, social equity and urban economic growth needs to be balanced to ensure a development trajectory that provides for improved economic performance, improved incomes and access to urban services without compromising the natural environment.

CHAPTER 4: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The literature review above concludes that the ideas of developmentalism, decentralised local government, public management, governance, urban integration and sustainable development can provide the basis for an alternate conceptual framework for developmental local government. It is specifically advocated that the underlying ideas be brought together in terms of three core elements of the alternate conceptual framework, viz. good governance, urban integration and sustainable development.

The notion of *good governance* would be able to simultaneously capture the essence of an active role for the state (developmentalism), the ability of local government to be held accountable for development (decentralised local government) and ensure effective management of resources and enhanced capacity for delivery (public management). This brought together through the notions of strengthening formal democracy, deliberative development, formulating a developmental vision and establishing appropriate institutions.

Urban integration would enable a focus on the spatial dimension and its role in advancing social equity and urban efficiency.

Sustainable development, as has already been stated, comprises environmental conservation, social equity and sustainable economic development, which need to be balanced to ensure a development path that provides for improved economic performance and access to urban services without undermining the environment.

GOOD GOVERNANCE

Good governance, in this framework, comprises three related components: strengthening formal democracy, facilitating deliberative development and building development-oriented institutions, which are explored below.

Strengthening formal democracy

Strengthening formal democracy entails the regular exercise of the vote along with ensuring openness, accountability and transparency. The propositions for strengthening formal democracy are set out as follows:

(a) *Democratic arrangements*: Mechanisms that deepen representation of the electorate and ensure that the exercise of power is subject to the appropriate checks and balances such as the electoral system and separation of powers between the legislature and executive.

(b) *Accountability*: Elected representatives should hold themselves to account and be held to account for policies, development paths and use of public resources on an ongoing basis.

(c) *Transparency*: Actions and processes of elected public representatives and their institutions should be visible and information should be readily accessible.

Deliberative development

Deliberative development seeks to facilitate development through vibrant politics involving a wide range of social actors in the locality. The propositions for deliberative development are set out follows:

(a) *Centrality of local government*: Elected representatives and their institutions (such as the mayor, councillors and the municipality) by are central to the development process due to the constitutional duty to facilitate development, legitimacy of democratically elected leadership and their stewardship of the institutional and resource bases for implementation of development programmes.

(b) *Collaboration for the common good*: The purpose of bringing together local interests is to work towards the equitable allocation of resources, formulation and buy-in of a vision, drive socio-economic transformation for the common good.

(c) *Participation of diverse local interests*: The participants of deliberative development comprise the diverse social interests in the locality including local government, labour, business, community-based organisations and non-governmental organisations. However, this implies equitable (not equal) representation of the variety of interests, based on the centrality of local government and the relative weight of different constituencies (e.g. trade union with mass membership versus a small NGO).

(d) *Dynamic and interactive discourse*: The nature of interaction entails the sharing of information, give and take approach and enabling participants to relate to each other as deliberators and reason-givers. Strategies that emerge through a process of political arguments are more likely to provide an effective basis for action than strategies that are arrived at through the abstract reasoning of a planner or imposed by a dominant actor in a partnership[9].

[9] This idea is directly attributed to Patsy Healy (1995 quoted in Harrison 2003:21).

(e) *Developmental and good governance outcomes*: The outcomes of such processes should enable all parties to reach consensus and concentrate and synergise their efforts on shared priorities; ensure effective coordination and management of development and service delivery; and enable local government to judiciously manage public resources and be held accountable for its initiatives.

Formulating a developmental vision, strategy and programme

The formulation of a development vision, strategy and programme is closely tied into deliberative development, covering the following propositions:

(a) *Inclusive formulation process*: This element is closely linked to the deliberative development, where the development programme needs to be formulated.

(b) *Integration*: It needs to be integrated in the broad sense of the word, including intra-municipal integration (challenge 'silo' department-based approach to development), inter-municipal integration (in conjunction with adjacent municipalities), intergovernmental integration (integration with other spheres of government), inter-stakeholder integration (integration with the relative needs and priorities of different interest groups e.g. business and the unemployed).

(c) *Progressive*: The developmental vision, strategy and programme needs to be progressive, meaning that it should prioritise the needs of poor, vulnerable marginalised groups.

Building development-oriented institutions

The challenge in the South African local government context is to build development-oriented institutions that are capable of facilitating development (overcoming the legacy of apartheid) as well as delivering quality public services. The specific propositions for these institutions are set out as follows:

(a) *Economy, efficiency and effectiveness*: Ensure that local government institutions are not only focused on optimising the use of resources (inputs and outputs), but also concerned with the results and outcomes.

(b) *Development orientation*: Transform institutions towards a development orientation such that it is clearly reflected in strategic plans, values and impact, which is reflected in development focused on excluded, vulnerable and poor people and marginalised localities.

(c) *Citizen and customer orientation*: Segmentation of the diverse interests served needs to be taken into account to improve delivery. Municipalities serve *citizens* who are entitled to constitutionally entrenched socio-economic rights such as housing, water and sanitation. But municipalities also deliver services to specific *customers* such as business customers that use the municipal solid waste in preference to private providers.

(d) *Internal, horizontal and vertically integrated government*: This refers to the *practice* of integrated government to improve overall delivery of services.

URBAN INTEGRATION

Urban integration is critically important for addressing the fragmentation wrought by apartheid, comprising the following propositions:

(a) *Adopt the compact city approach*: Reorganisation of the urban system through containing urban sprawl, increasing densification, promoting mixed-use development, integrating diverse social groups and activities and optimising infrastructure utilisation and public transportation.

(b) *Appropriate use of compact city instruments*: The appropriate use of compaction instruments includes urban growth boundaries, infill development, designation of urban corridors, road pricing and strategic infrastructural investments.

(c) *Outcomes of efficiency and equity*: Outcome of the compact city should be the improvement of urban efficiency and enabling low-income groups access to job opportunities and housing on well-located land.

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Sustainable development constitutes a distinctive development paradigm that eschews fragmented, polluting, resource intensive and iniquitous growth. The propositions for sustainable development are thus as follows:

(a) *Adopt the sustainable development paradigm*: Development that simultaneously addresses equity, growth and the maintenance of environmental integrity.

(b) *Environmental conservation*: General conservation of biodiversity and maintenance of ecological integrity, where the city should reduce its total consumption of inputs, increase the efficiency of throughputs and transform all its waste outputs into productive outputs.

(c) *Social equity*: Satisfaction of basic human needs, reducing poverty and ensuring the rights of vulnerable groups such as women, children, the aged and the disabled.

(d) *Urban economic growth*: Economic growth that balances employment creation, social equity and negative environmental externalities resulting from production.

CHAPTER 5: ANALYSIS OF GOOD GOVERNANCE IN JOHANNESBURG, 2001-2005

This chapter will analyse good governance in Johannesburg between 2005-2005. It starts by providing an overview and context including the location of Johannesburg, demographic trends, political arrangements, administrative structure and capital and operating budget. It then analyses a number of important issues that have an important bearing on good governance: representative role of councillors, separation of powers, ward committees, mayoral road shows and strategic perspectives. The chapter concludes with an overall assessment of good governance.

OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

Johannesburg is situated towards the northern end of South Africa's highveld plateau which has an average altitude of 1 500 metres above sea level (see Figure 5.1). The city has an average annual rainfall of between 700-800 mm per annum. The city is placed in the middle of the Witwatersrand, which is a 1 800 metre-high continental divide. The streams to its north flow through the



Figure 5.1: Johannesburg in the context of SA

high inland plateau into the Limpopo River and then to the Indian Ocean. To its south, the streams enter the Vaal River, which joins the Orange River flowing to the Atlantic.

The City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality is situated in the centre of the Gauteng province of the Republic of South Africa. It is located south of the City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality and west of the Ekurhuleni Metropolitan Municipality. To its east lie the local municipalities of Mogale City (formerly Krugersdorp), Randfontein and Westonaria. To its south and southwest are the local municipalities of Emfuleni and Midvaal.

Johannesburg, along with Tshwane and Ekurhuleni, constitute the core of a major urban conurbation with a population is excess of 8 million people that contributes almost 35% of South Africa's GDP (CoJ 2005a:6). These three metro municipalities constitute the hub of the global city region (GCR) that was first highlighted in the South African Cities Network's *State of the Cities Report 2004* (SACN 2004), which has been taken up by the Gauteng Provincial Government as one of its strategic priorities.



Figure 5.2: Map of City of Johannesburg and its eleven administrative regions

Johannesburg's municipal area covers 1 644 km^2. As shown in Figure 5.2, the metropolitan area comprises the relatively new commercial and industrial node of Midrand in the north, through to the sprawling formal and informal settlement area of Orange Farm in the south. Regions 6 and 10 in the southwest make up the greater Soweto area, which

contains over 40% of the city's residents. The historic central business district that was founded in 1886 sits at the heart of the metropolitan area. To its north is Sandton, which is the new premier business node of the city, indeed the country as a whole. The municipal area also comprises Roodepoort, Randburg and Alexandra.

Demographic trends

The population of Johannesburg was 3,2 million people living in 1 006 930 households on Census day in October 2001 making it the largest city by population and the most densely populated municipality in South Africa at 1 946 persons per km^2 (CoJ 2005a:12) with 3,2 million people representing 7,2% of the country's population. Between 1996 and 2001, the population grew at an average of 4,1% per annum, significantly higher than the national average. Table 5.1 shows the increase in population between 1996-2001 by population group. Africans recorded almost 28% growth, while whites showed a negligible growth of 4,6% over the five year period.

Table 5.1 also shows, in spite of an aggregate growth of 22,2%, the decline in the number of persons per households from 3,77 to 3,2. This suggests significant growth in migration coupled with rapid household formation over the 1996 to 2001 period.

Description	1996	2001	% change
African	1 853 220	2 370 288	27,9%
Coloured	171 614	206 166	20,1%
Indian	96 835	134 097	38,5%
White	492 303	515 176	4,6%
Total population	2 639 110	3 225 608	22,2%
Persons per hh	3,77	3,20	

Table 5.1: Population by population group for Johannesburg, 1996-2001[10]

[10] Derived from the City of Johannesburg website at: http://www.joburg.org.za/facts/index_statistics.stm and are based on the results of the 1996 and 2001 Censuses, which are available at http://www.statssa.gov.za.

The population is relatively young, with 42% under the age of 24 and 49% under the age of 34, while the birth rate is around 19 persons per 1000 of the population, which is among the highest in the country (CoJ 2005a:3).

Table 5.2 shows the growth in the number of households from about 700 000 to over 1 million in the space of five years. What is notable is that the number of smaller households has increased significantly over the five-year period. This suggests a preference for smaller household units in both the formal and informal housing sectors. The number of households without formal shelter (2001) is estimated at 22,2% (SACN 2004:29).

Size of household	1996	2001
1	158 227	264 141
2	160 290	250 686
3	113 365	174 498
4	100 399	148 776
5	66 332	89 373
6	38 972	51 447
7	22 853	28 530
8	14 303	16 065
9	14 308	9 525
10 and over	10 757	16 134
Total	699 806	1 049 175

Table 5.2: Size of household, Johannesburg, 1996 and 2001 (source: see footnote 5)

The relationship between the rate at which households are growing and the rate at which the population is growing is calculated by dividing the population growth by household growth. This ratio for Johannesburg is 22,2/39 that equals 0,57. This suggests that household formation is increasing at about double the pace at which the population is growing (CoJ 2005a:42). The implication of this is that the backlog of service provision increases significantly for local government.

Political arrangements

Following the local government elections of December 2000, the new City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality[11] was established. Its Council comprises 217 councillors, made up of 109 ward councillors and 108 councillors elected in terms of a party list system (also known as PR councillors). The political head of the council is the Executive Mayor, who presides over a ten-person mayoral committee. Each member of the mayoral committee is allocated an executive portfolio and chairs a portfolio committee, made up of councillors drawn proportionally from parties represented on the Council. Individual ward councillors are responsible for setting up and chairing a ten-person ward committee, made up of representatives of local civil society.

Administrative structure and staffing

A City Manager, along with a Chief Operations Officer and heads of department for development planning, finance, housing, corporate services, contract management, metro police and emergency services heads the city's central administration. The administration has been decentralised into eleven administrative regions, which are operationally responsible for the delivery of health, sport and recreation, libraries, social development and other local community-based services.

The lists of arms length municipal entities (also known as utilities, agencies and corporatised entities) are shown in Table 5.3.

[11] The formal name of the entity is City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality, but the shortened version of 'City of Johannesburg' is used on a day-to-day basis.

Name of municipal entity	Functions
City Power	Electricity and street lighting
Johannesburg Water	Water and sanitation services
Pikitup	Solid waste management
Johannesburg Roads Agency	Roads, storm water and traffic lights
City Parks	Parks, cemeteries and grass cutting
Johannesburg Development Agency	Economic development agency
Johannesburg Zoo	Zoological gardens
Metrobus	Bus commuter services
Johannesburg Property Company	Management of property portfolio
Civic Theatre	Staging of live performances
Metro Trading Company	Informal traders markets
Johannesburg Tourism Company	Tourism promotion
Johannesburg Social Housing Company	Social housing development and provision
Johannesburg Fresh Produce Market	Wholesale fresh produce market

Table 5.3: Names of City of Johannesburg municipal entities and their functions (source: derived from CoJ 2005c)

In total, the City of Johannesburg employed 10 454 staff members in its core administration and 14 155 staff members in its municipal entities, totalling 24 609 staff members as at 30 June 2004. The largest components of the core administration were the Johannesburg Metropolitan Police Department with over 2 500 staff members (officers and civilian staff), Emergency Management Services with about 1000 staff members and Corporate Services Department and the Finance and Economic Development Department with over 1 000 staff members each.

The single largest employer in the CoJ is Pikitup with about 3 500 staff members due to its labour intensive services; followed by Johannesburg Water with approximately 2 500 staff members. The third largest entity is City Parks with about 2 300 staff members. City Power, which has the largest budget, employs about 2 000 staff members, as does the Johannesburg Roads Agency. Metrobus employs about 1 000 staff members (Gotz 2005, personal communication). The overall political and administrative structure of the CoJ is shown in Figure 5.3.




Figure 5.3: Overall political and administrative structure of the City of Johannesburg (source CoJ 2005c:125)

Capital and operating budget

The total budget for the City of Johannesburg for the 2005/06 financial year was R18,9bn, comprising a capital budget of R2,8bn and an operating budget of R16,1bn[12]. The capital budget increased by 31,5% over the previous year and the operating budget increased by 6,8% over the same period.

[12] Data for the rest of this section was derived from the Executive Mayor's 2005/06 budget speech 2005/06 (CoJ 2005d:13-15) and the medium-term budget 2005/06-2007/08 (CoJ 2005e).

Operating income of R16,2bn was made up, *inter alia*, as follows: electricity charges of R3,5bn (21,6%), property rates of R2,9bn (17,9%), water and sewer charges of R2,8bn (17,2%), business levies of R1,6bn (9,8%), refuse charges of R382m (2,3%), subsidies of R1bn (6.1%), fines and licence fees of R332m (2%) and minor tariffs and other.

Operating expenditure for 2005/06 was estimated at R16,1bn, which is composed of a surplus of 27,2% for bulk purchases of water and electricity, 26% for salaries, 10,6% for contracted services such as IT and fleet and 7% provision for depreciation. Allocation of operating expenditure includes City Power at R3,6bn, Johannesburg Water at R3,1bn, Pikitup at R621,9m, Johannesburg Roads Agency at R391m, City Parks at R334,8m and Metrobus at R315m.

The core administration makes up 46% of the total budget and is allocated to finance at R1,9bn (includes bad debts, depreciation and debt servicing costs), subsidies at R2bn, metro police at R719m, emergency services at R364m, housing at R447m, corporate services at R342m, social development at R310m and health at R225m.

The capital budget has increased by 31,5% over the previous financial year. The lion's share of the capital budget was allocated to City Power for electricity network refurbishment and extension of access at R675m. Johannesburg Water was allocated R556m, roads allocated R261m, housing was allocated R234m, development planning and transportation (including Cosmo City) was allocated R253,5m and social development was allocated R123m.

REPRESENTATIVE ROLE OF COUNCILLORS

The electoral system for local government is a combination of ward based representation and proportional representation on the basis of party lists. In terms of the Municipal Structures Act, the formula for the number of seats for Johannesburg computes to 109 ward councillors and 108 PR councillors, which totals to 217 councillors.

The strength of this system is that it ensures the representation of grassroots communities through ward councillors, while maintaining equitable party political representation effected through the system of proportional representation. The distortion introduced by the electoral legislation, however, is that it results in an inordinately large council for Johannesburg[13].

The primary role of councillors is to represent the needs and interests of their constituents within the council. In practice, they play a wide variety of roles both within the council and in the broader society. In the council, non-executive councillors[14] participate in a variety of section 80 policy committees that mirror the portfolios of members of the Mayoral Committee as well as participating in the debates at monthly council meetings. The multi-faceted role of councillors in the community include facilitation of public participation processes, involvement in local development processes, addressing community service delivery concerns with the administration and interacting and networking with local interests and stakeholders. Councillors also have a range of party-political responsibilities with respect to branch meetings, grassroots campaigning, policy processes and caucus.

[13] The City of Johannesburg is the largest municipal council in the country with 217 councillors. The Cape Town and eThekwini metros follow it with 200 councillors each. In contrast, the Gauteng Provincial Legislature has just 90 members.

[14] Non-executive councillors refer to all councillors except the Executive Mayor, the Speaker, members of the Mayoral Committee and the Chief Whip.

Since non-executive councillors have wide ranging responsibilities, their *representative* role has been undermined or diluted for a number of reasons. The current structure of council does not easily lend itself to the representative role of councillors. Council, in its plenary session, is structured according to a defined agenda that does not allow councillors to systematically reflect the needs of their constituents. Similarly, section 80 committees are structured on a thematic and not a geographic basis, which also do not provide avenues for the comprehensive consideration of local interests. There are also inadequate mechanisms or use of mechanisms such as petitioning that enable the serious consideration of community concerns. Conversely, "councillors see themselves representing the council in the community as opposed to representing the community in council."[15]

There is thus a need to clearly define the role of councillors as representative of the wider citizenry and the need to restructure the manner in which councils and its committees function and the creation of mechanisms that would facilitate this role.

SEPARATION OF POWERS

Another key issue is the *separation of powers* between the legislature and the executive. Municipal councils in South Africa, unlike their national and provincial counterparts, are empowered by the Constitution and legislation to perform both legislative and executive role.

[15] This remark is attributed to Firoz Cachalia (Gauteng MEC for Safety) at an ANC Gauteng Provincial seminar on local government, which was held on 5 October 2005 at the Graduate School of Public and Development Management, University of the Witwatersrand.

Although legislation enables councils to delegate their executive functions, this has not been done comprehensively, even in the context of the executive mayoral system in Johannesburg. This situation undermines the absolute exercise of executive powers by the Executive Mayor and the Mayoral Committee thereby diluting the accountability for executive functions. This also means that Council's oversight role of the executive is reduced.

The remedy to this situation is to apply the doctrine of separation of powers within the confines of current constitutional and legal provisions in a manner that defines the role of the council as a legislative, representative and oversight body.

The executive function should be totally delegated to the Executive Mayor and Mayoral Committee along with being held accountable for financial performance and service delivery by the council. Although the party-political system sometimes reduces the efficacy of executive accountability, the restructuring of the arrangements will go some way to enhance the overall system of governance.

WARD COMMITTEES

In a large and complex metropolitan municipality such as Johannesburg, it is unlikely that a single 'deliberative development' forum would be sufficient for the multiplicity of needs, locales and foci that exist in the locality. Consequently, there are a wide variety of mechanisms that seek to engage with specific stakeholders, either on a thematic basis (such as the Joburg AIDS Council and the Joburg Business Forum) or on a geographic basis (such as the Alexandra Development Forum).

The focus of evaluation will be on the efficacy of *ward committees* that have been established in terms of the local government legislation[16]. Each ward committee is chaired by the ward councillor and comprises ten representatives of civil society that are 'elected' by the local community. Ward committees are the best approximation of a deliberative development forum because they provide, according to the city's Executive Mayor, "… an important mechanism through which government can forge a strong and dynamic link with civil society. This link is vital not just for its own sake, but also to provide a direct channel of implementation of government programmes and ensure greater legitimacy for such programmes." (CoJ 2005:38)

Ward committees, which are expected to meet monthly, have an equal number of men and women and typically comprise representatives of women, youth, religious, sports, culture, health, welfare, civic and education organisations (CoJ 2003:27). Their functions include assistance to the ward councillor to carry out his/her mandate, make recommendations on issues

[16] The City of Johannesburg has been established in terms of Section 8(g) of the Municipal Structures Act, which is a single tier, metropolitan municipality combined with a mayoral executive system and ward participatory system, i.e. ward committees.

affecting the ward to the councillor or through the ward councillor to the Council, input into the formulation of the IDP and budget, participation in the formulation of regional spatial development frameworks and communicating the work of Council (CoJ 2005:38; and CoJ 2003:28).

Ward committees are structured around elected representatives. The formal and legislatively based structure avoids the problems of instability and discontinuity that have characterised development forums in the past. On the other hand, it treats all localities as the same and provides no room for flexibility.

Ward committees based on their stated purposed, are a combination of the system of representative democracy and a development forum. Although there are advantages to having a wide remit, ward committees do not really succeed in either of these roles. Even though they are empowered to make recommendations to Council via their ward councillor, the structures and mechanisms of Council do not easily lend themselves to formal representation from local communities. On the other hand, while ward committees contribute to the IDP and play a role in determining local development priorities, they are disconnected from the final decision-making and subsequent implementation.

Members of ward committees generally comprise a diverse range of social interests in the locality and are elected by the community at public meetings. Initially, ward committees were elected for a maximum of one year, which sought to avoid entrenching particular individuals or interests and the idea of regular recall of representatives. In practice, this proved to be too short a period for logistical and continuity reasons. As a result, the term of ward committees have been extended to two and a half years. It is difficult to assess whether different local interests are ‘equitably’ represented since local

areas differ substantially, but the mechanism of public elections would allow a reflection of local interests.

The nature of interaction generally involves intensive political interaction that entails the sharing of information, give and take approach and enables participants to relate to each other as ‘deliberators and reason-givers’.

MAYORAL ROADSHOWS AND OTHER OUTREACH INITIATIVES

Early in his term of office, the Executive Mayor of Johannesburg instituted the idea of the ‘Mayoral Roadshow’ to promote accountability and transparency. It was partly modelled on the imbizo that had become a regular practice for national government and various provincial governments, including the Gauteng Provincial Government.

A Mayoral Roadshow is held in a different part of the city once every six to eight weeks and comprises two parts that are held over two separate days. On the first day, the Mayoral Committee accompanied by senior management visit the area to examine the state of service delivery, launch development projects and meet local stakeholder representatives. It provides the opportunity for an ‘inspection in loco’ and gives a sense of the socio-economic conditions in the locality.

On the second day, the CoJ hosts a public meeting. The objectives of the meeting are to listen and respond to issues raised by the local community. The format of the meeting provides for members of the community to raise any concerns and grievances in relation to development and service delivery. Thereafter, the Executive Mayor and members of the Mayoral Committee

respond to these concerns or undertake to follow up outstanding issues or make commitments on specific service delivery issues.

The roadshows have a number of benefits viz. understanding the diversity of needs that exist across different communities and localities in the city; carefully recording the proceedings; and systematically following up on the issues that are raised by the communities.

STRATEGIC PERSPECTIVES

The strategic development perspectives that have underpinned the work of the City of Johannesburg over the period 2001 to 2005 have evolved from a simple set of priorities to a wide array of sector based strategies and plans.

Six Mayoral Priorities

In early 2001, soon after the December 2000 local government election, the Executive Mayor and the Mayoral Committee set out six priorities for their term of office. These 'Mayoral Priorities' were defined as economic development and job creation; by-law enforcement and crime prevention; good governance; service delivery excellence, customer care and *batho pele*; inner city regeneration; and HIV/AIDS.

The Mayoral Priorities contain an interesting blend of issues, reflecting different provenance. Firstly, priorities such as 'economic development' and 'service delivery excellence' emanated from the ANC's local government manifesto. Since it was a single manifesto for local government nationally, it set out very broad objectives for the party to achieve in individual municipalities countrywide. Secondly, crime prevention and inner city

regeneration reflected the specific difficulties that confronted the city at the time (and continue to confront the city). Thirdly, HIV/AIDS was a single-issue priority, which reflected the need for dedicated attention and concern about its demographic, political, social and economic consequences.

The significance of the priorities was that they provided a sense of direction very early in the term of office. In making 'service delivery excellence, customer care and *bath pele*' a priority the political leadership signalled to the administration that they expected the highest levels of commitment and effort to provide good quality yet cost effective services to the city's residents and ratepayers (Gotz 2005: personal communication).

Joburg 2030

Joburg 2030 (CoJ 2002) was approved as the City of Johannesburg's long-term development strategy at the end of 2001 and publicly released in early 2002. Its basic thesis was that certain microeconomic constraints should be addressed in order to generate additional investment, which would create growth and jobs thereby improving the quality of life of the city's people.

The adoption of Joburg 2030 was significant because it represented a well-researched and argued case for 're-dimensioning' the long-term, strategic focus of the CoJ to economic development. Indeed, it was the first coherent conception on economic development for a metropolitan municipality at the time. More importantly, it provided a focus to a wide range of the CoJ's departments and municipal entities for their strategic perspectives and operational activities.

Human Development Strategy

The City of Johannesburg's Council approved the Human Development Strategy (HDS) in 2004 (CoJ 2005). It was formulated on the recognition that the job creation that was envisaged in Joburg 2030 would not address the immediate problems of poverty, vulnerability and exclusion that confronted the residents of the city.

The HDS is a medium term strategy that comprises three interrelated elements:

(a) *Safeguarding and supporting poor and vulnerable household*s: This is aimed at enhancing social safety nets based on a 'social package' of core municipal services and subsidies that are provided to the poor; as well as seeking to enhance coverage and access to provincial social security grants.

(b) *Championing rights and opportunities*: Targets issues of inequality in the city through addressing access to housing and services.

(c) *Building prospects for social inclusion*: This is a long-term objective that focuses on building social relationships and partnerships among city residents and between the CoJ and its residents.

The programmes that have been proposed to implement the HDS include: Early Childhood Development, New Social Package Policy and Social Grants Initiative, Building Social Cohesion, Women's Health, Women's Safety, Sustainable Human Settlements, Expanded Public Works Programme and Labour Market Intelligence Database, Women's Entrepreneurs and Targeting Vulnerable Groups (CoJ 2005f).

Other strategies and plans

As the term of office proceeded, the administration produced a wide range of strategies and plans to address the needs of specific sectors such as the Integrated Transport Plan, Spatial Development Framework, Water Services Development Plan, Housing Master Plan and Environmental Management Framework.

Integrated Development Plan

The CoJ has developed an Integrated Development Plan (IDP) annually since 2001. It evolved from the first, basic unicity IDP[17] for 2001/02 to a well crafted and highly regarded IDP for 2005/06[18]. IDPs for the City of Johannesburg sought to address the complex and extensive requirements of the Municipal Systems Act, which requires municipalities to develop a single, inclusive and strategic plan that includes a vision for long term development, critical development and internal transformation needs, assessment of the existing level of development, development priorities and needs, spatial development framework, operational strategies, financial plan and key performance indicators and targets.

An examination of the 2005/06 IDP (CoJ 2005c) reveals that the CoJ has been able to formulate a document that addresses the diverse requirements of the legislation. It incorporates the vision and strategy set out in Joburg 2030 as well as aligning other CoJ plans such as the Integrated Transport

[17] The IDP for the 2001/02 was incorrectly named 'City Development Plan'. Thereafter, it was called IDP to avoid confusion and ensure legislative compliance.

[18] Evidence for this are the positive assessments that have been received from the Gauteng MEC for Local Government for the 2004/05 and 2005/06 IDPs and which are available to the author.

Plan and the Water Services Development Plan. Intergovernmental alignment, with national and provincial government, is included in the IDP for the first time. It details the community outreach process and the spatial development framework. At the centre of the IDP are a number of strategic programmes and projects. It finally sets out the institutional framework, performance management system and the financial plan.

DEVELOPMENT ORIENTED INSTITUTIONS

Johannesburg: An African city in change (CoJ 2001) is the most comprehensive and systematic official account of the iGoli 2002 plan. It outlines the rationale for the plan as the local government legacy, institutions in transition and a failure of management. It posits a growth with sustainability model and outlines the management of implementation.

In contrast, there has been a major intellectual interest in Johannesburg. Tomlinson *et al* (eds) (2003) edited volume *Emerging Johannesburg: Perspectives on the postapartheid city* emanated from contributions to the 2000 Urban Futures conference. The editors (2003: 18) argue, "both iGoli 2030 and Blue IQ are likely to reinforce economic, social, and spatial separation and disparities in and around Johannesburg. If such plans are any indication, post apartheid Johannesburg is likely to be no more integrated than its apartheid predecessor."

An important but different contribution in the same volume is Robinson's (2003) article "Johannesburg's futures: Beyond developmentalism and global success". Her view is that Johannesburg should be thought of as 'ordinary', meaning that attention should be focused on the needs of residents and on how the CoJ functions internally.

Beall, Crankshaw and Parnell's (2002: 205) book titled *Uniting a divided city: Governance and social exclusion in Johannesburg* is an expansive account of "social differentiation, social polarization and social exclusion … (which) operate along a number of different axes of inequality." The book also takes specific issue with iGoli 2002, which it argued was more concerned with *efficiency* than *equity*. However, it states that the city has maintained its commitment to alternative city development and its policy of prioritising the needs of its citizens (2002: 105).

McKinley's (2004) review of Beall, Crankshaw & Parnell's book revolves around the idea that their account sees structural problems (such as macroeconomic policy) as 'constraints' and 'difficulties'. This structuralist view permeates the literature or the view that the neo-liberal GEAR dominates local government practice. This is best exemplified by Bond (2000).

A short case study of Joburg Water

It is clear that the iGoli 2002 plan elicited major debates about the *developmental nature* of the institutional form that it proposed. The limited scope of this paper does not permit a detailed appraisal of iGoli 2002, but an examination of its efficacy is essential. To achieve this, a short case study of Johannesburg Water will be sketched.

Johannesburg Water was the *leitmotif* of the iGoli 2002 plan. This was due to the social and economic importance of water and sanitation services, its impact on the natural environment and the relative scarcity of water in the commercial and industrial heartland of the country.

Institutional set-up

Water and sanitation services prior to the establishment of Johannesburg Water were fragmented across five different municipalities at both the metro and local levels. To address this institutional fragmentation, Johannesburg Water was established as an arm's length, wholly owned municipal entity by the City of Johannesburg in 2001.

Johannesburg Water also unique amongst the municipal entities in that it had entered into a management contract to assist the then newly-established entity to set up, consolidate its financial and institutional position and address its key service delivery challenges.

In 2001, water and sanitation services had a total of 2 546 employees (Seedat 2001:63), which interestingly has remained constant at about 2 500 in 2005 ((Gotz 2005, personal communication).

Finance

In the 1999/2000 financial year, the total cost of the water and sanitation service was R1,142bn and comprised operating costs of R430m and bulk water purchases of R712m (Seedat 2001:66; and CoJ 2003:126).

After Johannesburg Water was established in 2001, its financial position was relatively healthy until it confronted financial difficulties in 2003/04 that was attributed principally to revenue under collection. The CoJ then agreed to provide it with a subsidy provided that it adhered strictly to a turnaround strategy. At the end of the financial year, it more of less broke even with revenue of R2,646bn and expenditure of R2,641bn (CoJ 2005e:25).

At the beginning of the 2005/06 financial year, the CoJ provided the entity with a grant of R240m to cover its budgeted loss of R127,6m for the 2004/05

financial year and allow it space to improve its revenue position for the forthcoming year (CoJ 2005e:3). Johannesburg Water had thus budgeted for R3,159bn for revenue and R3,130bn for expenditure for the 2005/06 financial year. This reflected an increase of 11,3% for revenue and 5,5% for expenditure over the previous year meaning that its turnaround strategy involved the generation of additional revenue and keeping expenditure within the prevailing inflation rate.

Indications at this point in time, halfway in the 2005/06 financial year, are that Johannesburg Water's financial turnaround strategy is succeeding and is on its way to becoming a sustainable entity in the future (Prem Govender, personal communication).

Capital expenditure and infrastructure investment

Infrastructure investment is financed through capital expenditure and in 1999/2000, the capital budget totalled just R6m (CoJ 2003:124). This was due to the severe financial crisis that afflicted the Johannesburg metro from 1997 to around 2001. Budgeted capital expenditure for the 2000/01 financial year was R70m for water and R87m for sanitation, totalling R157m (Seedat 2001:63). The apparent increase was due to a grant from the National Treasury that sought to stabilise the financial position of the City and not a result of a dramatic turnaround.

Between 2001-2005, the City of Johannesburg's *overall* financial health had not only stabilised, it had improved dramatically. In 2005/06, the CoJ reported that its short-term ratings were upgraded by both Fitch Ratings and CA Ratings, from F2+ to F1 and A2 to A1 respectively (CoJ 2005e:4). During that period, it also successfully raised municipal bonds on the capital markets

to fund infrastructure investment. The substantially improved capital expenditure over the last few years is shown in Figure 5.4.




Figure 5.4: Actual capital expenditure 1995/06-2004/05 and capital budget 2005/06-2007/08 for the City of Johannesburg (source: Roland Hunter, personal communication)

The capital budget for Johannesburg Water is R556m for the 2005/06 financial year to be spent on unaccounted for water and extension of water services, representing about one fifth of the total capital budget of the City.

Unaccounted for water

In 2000, it was estimated that unaccounted for water was 41,6%, which was made up of physical losses (17%), commercial losses (24,1%) and miscellaneous use (0,5%)[19] (Seedat 2001:70-71). By 2003, it was estimated that unaccounted for water losses also stood at 37% (CoJ 2003:126).

[19] 'Physical losses' refer to the losses that occur due to state of the network such as leakages, while 'commercial losses' occur due to unmetered households, non-payment and billing errors.

The relative improvement in accounted for water was ascribed to the initiation of Operation Gcina'manzi. The programme aimed to address both physical and commercial losses by targeting areas where the network is a poor state and consumption is essentially unmetered for individual properties.

By 2004/05, Johannesburg Water was able to bring down unaccounted for water to 34% and it is expected that it would be further reduced to 28% for 2005/06 (CoJ 2005c:86-87).

Customer service

A major challenge that confronts the City of Johannesburg is 'customer service', which is made up of a related set of issues related to billing, metering, payment and customer service for water and sanitation, electricity, solid waste and property rates. These difficulties started soon after the amalgamation of local authorities in the post-apartheid period and were characterised by high levels of non-payment, inaccurate municipal bills, and incorrect or inconsistent meter reading and poor customer service when responding to these problems.

By 2003, the CoJ reported that there had been improvements in payments to Johannesburg Water from its top 13 500 customers that make up one third of its revenue base. Between 2001 and 2003, billing to these customers had increased by 10% and the average collection rate was 95% (CoJ 2003:126-127). However, payment from the rest of the customer base had not improved over the same period.

Water quality and environmental impact

At the inception of Johannesburg Water in 2001, the quality of water was not seen as a problem "… although actual testing is not always comprehensive." (GJMC 2000c:7 quoted in Seedat 2001:61). By 2003, it was reported that tests were being done on more than 400 water samples per month, significantly higher than the approximately 100 samples that were tested in the past (CoJ 2003:127). This enabled Johannesburg Water to comply with the standards set for the chemical quality of drinking water (CoJ 2003:127).

With respect to the standards set for wastewater treatment works and final effluent, Johannesburg Water achieved 88% by 2002. Since compliance of 90% is considered 'excellent', Johannesburg Water was not fully compliant by that date.

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF GOOD GOVERNANCE

Formal democracy is generally robust in the City of Johannesburg in terms of the mechanisms of formal democracy, accountability and transparency. The democratic arrangements are broadly in place, but there is a need to clearly define the role of councillors as representative of the wider citizenry; and there is a need to reorganise the manner in which councils and its committees function to enhance the representative role of the councillors and the council.

The separation of powers between the council as the legislative, representative and oversight body on the one hand and the Mayoral Committee as the executive on the other needs to strengthened.
Ward committees are important instruments for deliberative development. They ensure the centrality of local government to the deliberative process and

encourage local collaboration for the common good with fairly dynamic discourse and interaction. However, participation of diverse local interests is not always consistent resulting in under representation of certain sectors of society. In addition, development and good governance are not very often the outcome of the deliberation of ward committees.

The formulation of a development vision, strategy and programme has generally been integrated and pro-poor, but not always inclusive in terms of wide stakeholder participation.

The key challenge building development-oriented institutions was assessed in terms of the Johannesburg Water case study. Although there have been significant difficulties soon after establishment, orientation has been towards greater efficiency and effectiveness, customer orientation and pro-poor orientation.

CHAPTER 6: ANALYSIS OF URBAN INTEGRATION IN JOHANNESBURG, 2001-2005

Chapter 6 sets out an analysis of urban integration in Johannesburg between 2001-2005. It provides the context by describing the spatial structure of the city and then sets out the Spatial Development Framework, including its elements of nodal development, corridors, mobility, density and urban development boundary. It concludes with an assessment of urban integration in Johannesburg.

SPATIAL STRUCTURE OF THE CITY

The spatial structure of the city, according to the City of Johannesburg's 2004/05 IDP (CoJ 2004:288-290) is a result of its unique geology, apartheid policies and natural city growth. The structuring elements of the city are the central business district (CBD), the mining belt, roads and commercial nodes along major arterials.

The economic role of the CBD has declined, but remains the core of the metropolitan area and remains an important structuring element. The mining belt divides the northern and southern parts of the city and is characterised by unstable geological conditions, mine dumps and slimes dams. Key national, provincial and metropolitan roads structure the metropolitan area and provide regional linkages. New commercial nodes have been established along major arterials, especially to the north of city.

Three types of settlement patterns, according to the CoJ (2004:289), are to be found. First, 'primary' residential areas (mainly former white suburbs) are characterised by mixed densities. Second, farm portions or agricultural holdings are characterised by undeveloped land or gated housing estates. These developments are focused on private vehicle usage, with little provision of public transport. Third, township areas and new low-income settlements such as Orange Farm are characterised by relatively high densities, although sprawl has been promoted through inefficient utilisation of land. These locations remain primarily 'dormitory' areas, with few employment opportunities and urban facilities.

OVERVIEW OF SPATIAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK (SDF)

The former Greater Johannesburg Metropolitan Council developed its Metropolitan Spatial Development Framework (MSDF) in 1998. The MSDF was long in the making and took a number of years before it was finally approved. In the process, it did not make a significant impact on re-ordering space in the city.

The Municipal Systems Act subsequently required all municipalities to produce a Spatial Development Framework (SDF), which would define the spatial structure of the municipal area. The SDF "… is not a one-dimensional map or plan. It seeks to arrange development activities and the built form – in such a manner that they can accommodate the ideas and desires of people – without compromising the natural environment and how services are delivered. If not done properly, the system will be very costly, inefficient and can even collapse. It is a fine balance that must be maintained at all times: too much emphasis on one element can harm the system; if development happens too quickly, infrastructure provision cannot keep up." (CoJ 2004:287)

The CoJ's SDF has been through annual revisions since July 2001. The latest version of the SDF is contained within the CoJ's 2005/06 IDP (CoJ 2005c:55-81).

The SDF is based on a 'growth management framework' that encompasses the following principles (CoJ 2005c:55-56):

(a) *Adopt a growth management approach*: Seeks to strike a balance between growth and development on the one hand and social responsibility and upliftment on the other.

(b) *Understand the city's development context*: This is based on a thorough assessment of the nature and level of development.

(c) *Utilise a citywide approach to development*: This points to a comprehensive, integrated and holistic approach to development.

(d) *Implement area-based development initiatives and interventions*: Within the framework of a holistic approach, some local areas must be targeted for intensive development, while others should be sustained.

(e) *Identify marketable opportunities*: Development opportunities should be identified at all levels, including opportunities for infill, reinvestment in existing developed areas, investment in underdeveloped areas and strategic densification.

(f) *Provide development guidelines*: Development rights should not be viewed separately from the actual functioning of the development and should contribute to city's overall development.

Based on these principles, the CoJ developed a high-level, conceptual framework for development that is shown in Figure 6.1. Each of the key elements of the SDF shown in Figure 6.1 will explored below, viz. nodal development, corridors, mobility, density, urban development boundary and neighbourhood design and layout (derived mainly from CoJ 2003c:59-63).




Figure 6.1: Conceptual development direction of the Spatial Development framework (source CoJ 2003c:57)

Nodal development

The emergence of a multi-nodal city has underlined the importance of nodal development for the City of Johannesburg. Nodes are characterised by clustering of activity on the basis of convenience and accessibility; high levels of accessibility to public and private transport facilities and transport routes; activity mix and a diversity of public facilities; density of development; and a recognisable centre or core, which supports a pedestrian environment and public spaces, but does not necessarily exclude vehicular traffic (CoJ 2005c:59).

The CoJ's approach to the formalisation of nodes is based on an existing mix of transport and business uses and high pedestrian volumes. Public investment in the form of infrastructure and public facilities is basis for attraction of private sector economic activity into nodes (CoJ 2005:59).

Corridors

Corridor development is dependent on strong and viable nodes, connected by linking roads with a transportation and mobility function as well as availability of adequate infrastructure and development take-up rate. In the CoJ, two key corridors have been identified, viz. the East-West Corridor and the North-South Corridor (CoJ 2005c:59).

The mining belt principally shapes the East-West Corridor. It accommodates an existing railway line with a number of stations, good east-west linkages but few north-south roads; and the current residential and commercial activity does not operate optimally. The objective is harness the opportunities and re-define it into a mixed-use urban environment.

The North-South Corridor runs from Soweto in the south, through the central business district of Johannesburg and continues through the new commercial nodes of Sandton and Midrand in the north. It traces the path of the Gautrain and contains the important M1/N1 motorway. The objective for this corridor is to optimise the vibrant developments already underway and integrate existing well-established land uses in a sustainable manner.

Mobility

Movement is a key element of the urban system. The CoJ's current mobility strategy is aimed at changing a predominantly private vehicle transport system to an appropriate public transport system over the long-term; ensuring that the mobility function of major roads is retained and enhanced; and ensuring that the movement system directly links with high intensity, mixed-use nodes and higher residential densities (CoJ 2005c:60).

The approach to achieving these objectives starts with integration between road, rail and air transport, as well as between private and public transport options. A feeder system linking nodes and railway stations needs to be developed, which will provide passengers with greater choice between different modes of transport and achieve greater economies of scale. It will also be necessary to provide linkages between road-based transport, the rail network and the envisaged Gautrain project (CoJ 2005c:60).

Density

The CoJ's view is that densification holds a number of benefits such as the viability of existing and proposed public transportation infrastructure and services increases in areas of higher density given the increased potential number of uses. Moreover, higher density development optimises the use of

land and provides accommodation in close proximity to urban opportunities (CoJ 2005c:61).

A number of caveats have been made about densification by the City of Johannesburg: significant capital funding is needed for an integrated mobility system and an efficient public transport system; that densification and the rate of development are dependent on market demand; that there are significant difficulties related to land acquisition for well-located land for low income housing; and that residents have diverse requirements and need areas of both low and high densities (CoJ 2005c:61).

The SDF promotes strategic densification in specific areas such as nodes, mobility roads in support of public transportation, on the periphery of open spaces, within areas of focused public sector investment and in particular areas of high private sector investment (CoJ 2005c:61).

Urban development boundary

The urban development boundary has been in place since 2001. Its benefits, according to the CoJ include curbing urban sprawl and further public investment, focusing public and private investment into core areas, promoting infill and redevelopment, protecting the city's natural environment and directing capital investment towards efficient infrastructure provision (CoJ 2005c:62).

The approach to development within the boundary is not that 'anything goes' and beyond the boundary that no development will be allowed. In both cases, the individual merits of the case would be assessed (CoJ 2005c:62).

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF URBAN INTEGRATION

The City of Johannesburg has embraced the idea of the compact city and have sought to reorganise the urban system through containing urban sprawl, increasing densification, promoting mixed-use development, integrating diverse social groups and activities and optimising infrastructure utilisation and public transportation.

It has also made extensive use of compact city instruments including growth boundaries, infill development, designation of urban corridors and strategic infrastructural investments.

However, the outcomes of urban efficiency and equity are far from clear. The location of low-income housing development projects initiated by the City of Johannesburg and its predecessors since 1994 have essentially been located on the edges of townships and in far flung locations such as Orange Farm and Diepsloot. Tomlinson *et al.* (2003:11) go further and argue that residential development has become increasingly 'balkanised' into people living in the south of the city, the inner city or the generally high-income population living to the north. These arise due to the shift of race to class in the north, perpetuation of exclusion in the south and the racial change in the inner city.

The pace of *de-racialisation* is at least negligible, if not moving in the opposite direction. Between only 1% and 2% of houses in former white suburbs are being sold to blacks (Beavon 2000, quoted in Tomlinson *et al.* 2003:13), but that a much higher percentage of blacks are moving into new gated communities at the urban periphery (Jurgens, Gnad & Bahr 2003). In the inner city, an opposite trend has been discernible.

Czegledy (2003) points to the increasing *fortification* of the northern suburbs of Johannesburg over the last fifteen years epitomised by high walls and electrified fences, the lack of social interaction at neighbourhood level and the proliferation of 'gated communities' in the form of townhouse complexes, enclosed suburbs and golf estates.

Three key factors have undermined the efficacy of the SDF. Firstly, the application of the principles by officials and councillors[20] was inconsistent. Secondly, adjacent municipalities such as Mogale City have spatial policies that contradict Johannesburg's. Thirdly, a relatively short period of time has elapsed since the formal adoption of the policy.

[20] The Town Planning Tribunal, established in terms of the Local Governance Ordinance, adjudicated in cases where there were disputes. The tribunal was composed of councillors until 2004. Planning Committees that only comprised of municipal officials thereafter replaced it.

CHAPTER 7: ANALYSIS OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN JOHANNESBURG, 2001-2005

Chapter 7 examines sustainable development in Johannesburg for the period 2001-2005. It unpacks each of the elements of sustainable development, namely, environmental conservation, social equity and urban economic growth. It then concludes with an overall assessment of sustainable development.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION

Johannesburg's biophysical environment, encompassing air, water, waste and land and open spaces is a product of the city's original environment, gold mining and industrial development and the imposition of the divided apartheid city on the landscape.

The city owes its origins to gold mining and is structured on an east-west axis comprising operational mines, mine dumps, slimes dams and derelict mining land. The consequences of this are dust pollution and heavy metal contamination of watercourses due surface water run-off (CoJ 2003:119).

The apartheid city has generated a number of environmentally related concerns. Backyard shacks, informal settlements and overcrowded township households result in strain on the water and sanitation infrastructure and leads to dumping of solid waste. Low-income settlements also tend to have energy inefficient houses and the propensity to use fossil fuels for heating during winter, even when electricity is available (CoJ 2003:119). Urban

sprawl coupled with poor public transport results in high levels of levels of private vehicle use for commuting.

Thus air quality is threatened by high levels of carbon dioxide, NOx and PM10 emissions; watercourses show evidence of sewage contamination and mining pollution; storm water is polluted through poor management of urbanisation; and waste disposal is unable to cope with the current rate of generation (CoJ 2005c:14). Figure 7.1 illustrates the sources of air pollution in Johannesburg.




Figure 7.1: Sources of air pollution in Johannesburg (source: CoJ 2003a)

Environmental conservation in the City of Johannesburg, during the period under review, has been firmly located within the sustainable development paradigm. "The city believes that for long-term sustainability, development must be socially, economically and environmentally sustainable. Economic growth and improved levels of production and consumption should be accompanied by the responsible use of environmental resources and the promotion of environmental best practices." (CoJ 2003:119)

The CoJ approved an Environmental Management Framework (EMF), which recognised that there is a wide range of environmental challenges including energy provision, noise pollution, water conservation and biodiversity

protection. However, it specifically focused on the problems of poor air quality, poor water quality, waste management and land and open space management.

Air quality

Air quality in many parts of the city is within acceptable levels, but in about 20% of the city (especially informal settlements), ambient air pollution exceed acceptable guidelines by between 20-30% (CoJ 2003:120).

The EMF contains an Air Quality Management Plan, which aims at acceptable air quality throughout the city, minimises the negative impacts of air pollution and promotes a clean and healthy environment (CoJ 2003:120).

The CoJ's 2005/06 IDP (CoJ 2005c:26) states that five monitoring stations would be commissioned to quantify problem areas and identify trends and would implement a low smoke *imbawula* (brazier) project in the CoJ's Region 10.

Water quality

The quality of water affects consumption by people of the city and the city's watercourses. The quality of drinking water is high, but the quality of water in the river systems is challenging since the Klip River in the south and the Jukskei River in the north show high levels of mining pollution, contaminated storm water run-off, littering and illegal effluent discharges. The costs of water pollution include public health deterioration, loss of aquatic life and declining aesthetic appeal. (CoJ 2003:121-122).

The main initiatives on water quality for the 2005/06 financial year are a surface water quality-monitoring programme that identifies areas that require intervention and the Upper Jukskei catchment rehabilitation (CoJ 2005:26).

Waste management

Solid waste has a major impact on the city's land, water and health. The CoJ's waste management utility, Pikitup, disposes 1,4 million tonnes of waste per annum from about 800 000 formal and informal properties which are serviced weekly. Commercial activities account for 23% of solid waste produced, 10% comprises industrial waste and the remainder is collected from households (CoJ 2003:134). High-income individuals generate between 1,3-1,6 kg of waste a day, compared with 0,7-1 kg for middle-income individuals and 0,35-0,6 kg for low-income individuals (CoJ 2003:134).

A number of other challenges confront waste management including increasing domestic waste volumes in the future, declining landfill space at landfill sites, the illegal dumping of hazardous waste, litter and illegal dumping of household waste (CoJ 2003:134-135).

Recycling levels are low in comparison with international benchmarks and fall short of the National Waste Management Strategy target (CoJ 2003:121).

The waste management initiatives between 2001-2005 include the reduction of waste disposed in landfill sites to 5% of all waste generated by 2020, increasing recycling and minimising the amount of waste generated. Pikitup has entered into partnerships with other role-players in the recycling industry to establish buy-back centres, where recyclable materials is removed before the waste is sent to landfill sites. It has also rolled out the provision of garden

refuse sites to reduce the amount of organic material (up to 30% of waste) through recycling and composting (CoJ 2003:137).

Reduction of littering and illegal dumping is also an important priority for the CoJ's waste management utility. This is done through a combination of education and enforcement campaigns and targeting particular areas that have a history of dumping (CoJ 2003:137).

The 2005/06 IDP states that the CoJ's main waste management initiative for the year would be the identification of waste recycling buy-back centres close to communities (CoJ 2005c:26).

Open space management

Open space management is based on the Johannesburg Metropolitan Open Space System (JMOSS). It is an interconnected and managed network of open space that supports interaction between social, economic and ecological activities.

The 2005/06 IDP (CoJ 2005c:62) states that these open spaces should perform an ecological, social and institutional function and contributes to the preservation of the city's heritage. As densities increase (in line with the SDF), the need to preserve finite open spaces becomes important; and may require the rehabilitation of degraded vacant land.

Open spaces such as roads, pedestrian paths and linear parks will provide a network connecting public transportation routes and community facilities such as libraries, schools and sports facilities; open spaces also improve ecological diversity by providing habitats for the city's fauna and flora; and a connected

system of open spaces is required to minimise storm water run-off and thus help protect the city's watercourses (CoJ 2005c:62).

Environment management tools

The EMF identified a number of environmental management tools that give practical effect to environmental management (CoJ 2005c:25):

(a) *Guidelines for implementation of an environmental management system*: This is a set of management procedures and processes that allow an organisation to analyse, control and reduce the environmental impact of its services, products and activities, while operating with greater efficiency and control.

(b) *Compliance monitoring framework*: It assists the CoJ in quantifying its environmental risks and liabilities and in developing and implementing appropriate actions to address these.

(c) *Environmental performance indicators*: Environmental indicators are measurements that track environmental conditions and progress towards environmental sustainability. Such information on the environment is necessary to assist policy-makers in proactively identifying danger signals.

(d) *Environmental impact assessment guidelines*: Guidelines have been prepared to assist CoJ departments in preparing comments for development applications.

SOCIAL EQUITY

Municipalities in South Africa perform a wide variety of roles in South Africa including spatial planning, taxation, regulation, facilitation of economic development, policing and by-law enforcement. However, local government's role in service delivery is its most significant function, given the relative use of financial and human resources and the scale of its impact. Thus, municipal service delivery is local government's principal instrument to address poverty and inequality and to progressively achieve social equity.

Basic service provision: focus on water and sanitation

Services that are 'basic' are generally those that are essential for survival, maintaining public health and environmental sustainability. This includes, from a municipal point of view the following set of services: water, sanitation, electricity, solid waste management, storm water management and primary health care. Due to the limited scope of this study, this report elects to limit its evaluation to water and sanitation only. Although water and sanitation are 'separate' services they are part of the same water-wastewater cycle that is delivered by the same service provider and are emblematic of basic service delivery for local government.

Access to basic water services

In 2000, it was estimated that 85% of formal households had in-house water supply and 14% had yard taps, with only a small number using communal standpipes. In informal settlements on the other hand, 92% of households had less than a level 4 service. A total of 14% of all households, at best, had access to a communal standpipe (level 2). This is outlined in Table 7.1:

Level of service		Formal settlements	Informal settlements	Total
L0	None/inadequate	0	9 693	9 693
L1	Tanker/communal tank	0	18 500	18 500
L2	Communal standpipes	8 306	55 755	64 061
L3	Yard taps with on-site sanitation	16 665	23 116	39 781
L4	Yard taps with waterborne sanitation	51 293	0	51 293
L5	In-house supply	424 335	9 838	434 173
	Total	**500 600**	**116 901**	**617 501**

Table 7.1: Estimated distribution of water service levels, 2000 (source: GJMC 2000c:63 quoted in Seedat 2001:64)

In 2003, the CoJ reported that infrastructure would only be installed in informal settlements that have been earmarked for permanence; otherwise water tankers would provide water. An 'intermediate' level of service would be provided to informal settlements consisting of an individual water connection and yard standpipe (CoJ 2003:128-129).

Access to water increased dramatically over the five-year period, 1996-2001[21]. Table 7.2 shows that household access to water in the dwelling increased by 10% and inside the yard by 143%. Although it records a net reduction of 21% for households that use community standpipes, it shows an almost identical increase in the new category of community standpipes over 200m. This suggests that households using standpipes has remained constant. Therefore, access to water at higher standards has increased substantially over the same period. Households without on-site water is estimated at 15,52% (SACN 2004:29).

[21] Data derived from the City of Johannesburg website at: http://www.joburg.org.za/facts/index_statistics.stm and are based on the results of the 1996 and 2001 Censuses, which are available at http://www.statssa.gov.za.

Household access to water	1996	2001	% change
Dwelling	479 927	525 876	10%
Inside yard	149 935	364 194	143%
Community stand	85 443	67 689	-21%
Community stand over 200m	0	61 998	
Borehole	3 643	1 233	-66%
Spring	335	513	53%
Rain tank	2 221	279	-87%
Dam/Pool/Stagnant water	0	2 055	
River/Stream	0	942	
Water vendor	6 800	3 960	-42%
Other	0	20 955	

Table 7.2: Household access to water, Johannesburg, 1996 and 2001 (source: see footnote 21)

The CoJ's IDP stated that 98,4% or 965 296 households would have access to basic water by the end of 2004/05 financial year and that an additional 981 will be serviced by the end of 2005/06, bringing the total to 98,5% or 966 277 households (CoJ 2005c:96).

Access to basic sanitation services

In the case of sanitation in 2000, 73% of all formal households had access to full waterborne sanitation, while about 12,5% had no or inadequate access to sanitation. About 58% of households in informal settlements had no or inadequate access to sanitation, while the rest (42%) were dependent on chemical toilets, which are detailed in the Table 7.3:

Level of service		Formal	Informal	Total
L0	None/inadequate/pit latrines	8 930	68 248	77 178
L1	Chemical toilet	0	48 653	48 653
L2	Ventilated improved pit latrine	16 665	0	16 665
L3	Septic tank	1 000	0	1 000
L4	Aqua privies	21 479	0	21 479
L5	Full waterborne	452 526	0	452 526
	Total	**500 600**	**116 901**	**617 501**

Table 7.3: Estimate of sanitation service levels, 2000 (source: GJMC 2000c:66 quoted in Seedat 2001:64)

By 2003, it was estimated that 16% of households did not have access to adequate sanitation. It was also estimated that 67% of residents of informal settlements had no or inadequate access to sanitation, made up of unimproved pit latrines at 52% and 15% with no facilities; the balance of 33% relied on chemical toilets (CoJ 2003:125-126). The position by 2003 had actually worsened meaning that the service provider had neglected to address the backlog and was unable to cope with rapid urbanisation.

At the time in 2003, the CoJ stated that temporary settlements would replace chemical toilets and unimproved pit latrines with ventilated improved pit latrines. The intermediate service for settlements marked for *in situ* upgrading would be a shallow waterborne system with pour flush facility.

Similarly, access to flush toilets increased by 36%, from 633 322 households to 864 432 households. However, some 155 000 households had inadequate sanitation in the form of chemical toilets, ventilated improved pit latrines and pit latrines or no sanitation in 2001 (see footnote 21).

The City's IDP states that of the total of 980 992 households, 93,9% or 921 115 households would receive basic sanitation by 2004/05 and an additional 4 941 would be serviced by 2005/06, bringing the total to 94,4% or 926 056 households. The backlog will be 54 936 households for basic sanitation.

Free basic services

In 2000/01, Johannesburg applied a progressive block tariff for metered water consumption, meaning that the charge per kilolitre increased by 'blocks' as more water was consumed. Thus, less than 10kl cost R2,16, 10-20kl cost R3,27, 20-40kl cost R4,50 and more than 40kl cost R5,28 (Seedat 2001:68). In areas of 'deemed consumption' where there were no water meters or

communal standpipes, the tariff in 2000/01 was R54,32 per month in Soweto, R21,64 in Alexandra and R10,82 in informal areas (Seedat 2001:69)

At the beginning of the 2001/02 financial year, the City of Johannesburg introduced a 'social package' of free basic services comprising a rebate for property rates and free basic water. Over the course of the next few years, the package had progressively included more services, so that by the 2005/06 financial year, the package of free basic services included a wide range of services. The cost of the social package to the CoJ increased over the years: R116,610m (2001/02), R296,793m (2002/03) and R433,601m (2003/04) (CoJ 2005d:12). Table 7.4 sets out the social package of free basic services.

ITEM	DETAILS
Property rates	100% rebate on properties where land value is less than R20 001
Water	First 6kl of water free per household per month
Electricity	First 50kWh of electricity free per household per month (includes Eskom supply area, where the CoJ pays the utility for the free portion of the electricity)
Refuse and sanitation	Additional subsidies where for households whose total monthly income is less than R1480
Other	Unemployed, pensioners, HIV and AIDS patients, orphans and persons with disability grants are also eligible for the social package

Table 7.4: Social package of free basic services (source: compiled from CoJ 2005d:12)

Although the current policy is very generous, certain deficiencies have become evident. Since only account holders are targeted, tenants of backyard shacks, tenants in flats and residents of informal settlements that have not been formalised do not 'qualify' for the subsidy. A new social package is currently being developed to address the deficiencies through an approach that combines a universal (via a mechanism such as the tariff) and a targeted approach (Jan Erasmus, personal communication).

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Joburg 2030 argued that the City should become an 'agent of economic development' through three key interventions (CoJ 2002):

(a) *Create an environment conducive to economic growth*: The focus is on addressing the factors that inhibit investment, specifically, the skills mismatch and the high level of crime in the city.

(b) *Increase the efficiency of investment*: The increase in the efficiency of investment should be addressed through spatial planning, utilities, telecommunications and transportation.

(c) *Accelerate growth*: This is to be achieved by focusing on information systems, small business development, sector development and catalytic projects.

The notions of 'higher' and 'shared' growth have gained currency in South Africa over the course of the last year[22], pointing to the need for both increased economic growth and the simultaneous reduction of unemployment, poverty and inequality.

Economic trends

Johannesburg is undoubtedly South Africa's premier business location as it generates 16,5% of the country's wealth, more than 70% of South Africa's companies' headquarters are located there, the JSE Securities Exchange is

[22] The Deputy President, Phumzile Mlambo-Ngucka, is currently leading a process to develop the 'Accelerated and Shared Growth Initiative', which had not been released at the time of writing.

based in the city and the City Deep container terminal handles 30% of the country's exports (2005a:3).

However, key comparative indicators shown in Table 7.5 show a mixed socio-economic performance for the city.

Indicator	Joburg	Ekurhuleni	Tshwane	Cape Town	eThekwini
Per capita income	R53 159	R32 780	R44 051	R31 627	R29 940
Unemployment rate	32,0%	38,7%	31,1%	26,0%	39,4%
Gross value added	R204bn			R150bn	R123bn
Share of GVA	16,5%	8,2%	9,7%	12,2%	10,3%
GVA growth: 2004	3,1%	5,0%	3,8%	2,2%	4,9%
GVA growth: average 1997-2004	4,5%	3,7%	4,7%	1,8%	3,4%

Table 7.5: Key economic indicators for selected metros, 2004 (source: CoJ 2005a: 6)

Johannesburg is the single largest local economy in South Africa, with R204 billion or 16,5% share of gross value added (GVA). The Johannesburg economy has consistently outperformed both the national and Gauteng economies. Between 1996 and 2004, it grew at a real annual average rate of 4,5%. Gauteng expanded at a rate of 3,9%, while the national economy grew at 2,9% per annum (CoJ 2005a:8).

As shown in Table 7.5, it produces at least 4% more than Cape Town, the second largest economy. Between 1997 and 2004, its average growth was 4,5% and was significantly ahead of its counterparts, except Tshwane which grew at 4,7%. During 2004, however, it recorded the second lowest growth (3,1%), while Ekurhuleni grew at 5% and eThekwini at 4,9%.




Figure 7.2 Sectoral contribution to GVA for 2004 (source: CoJ 2005a:12)

Figure 7.2 shows sectoral contribution to the city's GVA. It is clear that financial and business services dominate the city's economy in terms of value added at almost 33%. Trade and government and community services each contribute over 17% and transport and telecommunications at around 10%. Manufacturing's share of the local economy is 16,3%. Agriculture, mining, electricity and construction make negligible contributions to the city's economy.

Employment, poverty and inequality

In spite of its stellar economic performance in aggregate terms, the city still experiences very high levels of unemployment compared to its peers at 32% (expanded definition of unemployment) and is only exceeded by Ekurhuleni, which recorded 38,7% and eThekwini that recorded just under 40% (see Table 7.5). It compares favourably with Gauteng at 34% and the national rate of 40,4% (CoJ 2005a:28). The South African Cities Network suggests that migration is keeping unemployment high since the number of people in

the migrating age bracket of 15-34 grew 27,8% between 1996 and 2001 (SACN 2004:29).

Almost half of all formal sector employment is in just two sectors: financial and business services (23,5%) and wholesale and retail trade (23,5%). Government, community and personal services make up 17,8% of employment and manufacturing about 13% (CoJ 2005a:25). This translates into 1 333 491 jobs in 2004 in the formal sector, while it is estimated that the informal sector employs about 140 000 people.

The city's per capita income is the highest at R53 159, compared to just R29 940 for eThekwini. However, these figures must be viewed with caution due to extensive commuting across municipal boundaries, especially within Gauteng's urban conurbation. It is estimated that 16,7% of Johannesburg's population are within LSM[23] 1-4, meaning that almost a quarter of the population subsist on low incomes (SACN 2004:29).

The Index of Buying Power (IBP) weights data on population, income and retail sales to indicate the buying power attributable to an as a percentage of the national total. Johannesburg's IBP of 0,14 indicated that 14% of demand for goods and services emanate from the city, compared with Cape Town at 11% and eThekwini at 9% (CoJ 2005a:9). Johannesburg is a hub for wholesale and retail trade not only for its residents, but also for buyers from a wider hinterland and cross-border shoppers that emanate from Sub-Saharan African countries.

[23] LSM or living standards measure is a measure of living standards devised by the South Africa Advertising Research Foundation. The scale is between 1-10, where 1 represent low incomes and 10 high incomes.

A good measure of income in/equality is the Gini Coefficient, where 0 represents absolute equality and 1 absolute inequality. Although South Africa, including Johannesburg, has had historically high levels of income inequality, indications are that this is beginning to improve for Johannesburg. While the Gini Coefficient worsened for the country as whole between 2000 and 2004 from 0,63 to 0,64, it improved in the same period for the city from 0,61 to 0,57. In contrast, Mexico is 0,55 and Denmark is at 0,25 (CoJ 2005a:23).

The City of Johannesburg's Human Development Strategy (HDS) (CoJ 2005b) makes the crucial point that in addition to economic inequalities such as those described above, gender and generational inequalities and spatial inequalities completes the picture of inequality in the city.

With respect to gender and generational inequalities, the HDS found that women and children are the most directly affected by poor services and women experience health and security burdens as a result of inadequate services. Also, young women in particular are more susceptible to HIV infection and women are primary caregivers of the HIV infected (CoJ 2005b:45).

It is estimated that HIV/AIDS prevalence in Johannesburg's urban formal settlements is 12,1%, while it is almost double in informal settlements, at 23,1% (CoJ 2005c:15) The HDS (CoJ 2005b:48) examined the household impact of HIV/AIDS in Johannesburg and found that it negatively affects household income and expenditure, that it undermines household composition and family structure, that it is found to have a psycho-social impact on communities in the city and that there are growing numbers of AIDS orphans in the city.

The spatial inequalities, according to the HDS (2005:53) engendered by the apartheid city has resulted in population growth being concentrated on the periphery and that there is a strong correlation between population growth and growth in unemployment. Furthermore, the lack of facilities is particularly onerous on the poor and commuting costs increases the overall burden on the poor.

Social exclusion refers to the impoverishment or exclusion from adequate income and resources, labour market exclusion, service exclusion and exclusion from social relations (CoJ 2005b:54). The HDS argues that social exclusion is experienced in Johannesburg through low levels of social capital, which is the ability of people to work together for common purposes in groups and organisations, high levels of crime and violence as well as the exclusion of migrants, youth and people with disabilities (CoJ 2005:54-61).

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

The City of Johannesburg, in its policies, has made a clear commitment to the sustainable development paradigm that encompasses equity, growth and the maintenance of environmental integrity

On environmental conservation, its policies seek to conserve biodiversity and ecological integrity. However, effective implementation of these policies is still a long way off, since adequate resources for monitoring and enforcement have not been made available.

With respect to social equity, the implementation of pro-poor policies and practices are very much in evidence, especially with respect to access to basic services and the initiation of the Human Development Strategy.

Although economic growth has been in evidence, it is not clear whether these are specifically attributable to the efforts of the City. It appears that there no major negative externalities of increased production, since the trajectory of economic development in the city has focused on non-polluting industries. However, growth does not appear to be ‘shared’ by the poor and there is evidence of growing inequality in the city.

CHAPTER 8: CONCLUSION

The overall conclusion of the study is that the City of Johannesburg has embraced developmental local government between 2001-2005, albeit with some deficiencies, mainly relating to the gap between policy and implementation.

There is ample evidence to suggest that the essential components of developmental local government, viz. good governance, urban integration and sustainable development, have been enhanced since the beginning of the 'new' local government system that began in December 2000.

The examination of **good governance** has drawn the following conclusions:

(a) Formal democracy is generally robust in the City of Johannesburg in terms of the mechanisms of formal democracy, accountability and transparency. The democratic arrangements are broadly in place, but there is a need to clearly define the role of councillors as representative of the wider citizenry; and there is a need to reorganise the manner in which councils and its committees function to enhance the representative role of the councillors and the council.

(b) The separation of powers between the council as the legislative, representative and oversight body on the one hand and the Mayoral Committee as the executive on the other needs to strengthened.

(c) Ward committees are important instruments for deliberative development. They ensure the centrality of local government to the deliberative process

and encourage local collaboration for the common good with fairly dynamic discourse and interaction. However, participation of diverse local interest is not always consistent resulting in under representation of certain sectors of society. In addition, development and good governance are not very often the outcome of the deliberation of ward committees.

(d) The formulation of a development vision, strategy and programme has generally been integrated and pro-poor, but not always inclusive in terms of wide stakeholder participation.

(e) The key challenge building development-oriented institutions was assessed in terms of the Johannesburg Water case study. Although there have been significant difficulties soon after establishment, orientation has been towards greater efficiency and effectiveness, customer orientation and pro-poor orientation.

The analysis of **urban integration** revealed that:

(a) The City of Johannesburg has embraced the idea of the compact city and have sought to reorganise the urban system through containing urban sprawl, increasing densification, promoting mixed-use development, integrating diverse social groups and activities and optimising infrastructure utilisation and public transportation.

(b) It has also made extensive use of compact city instruments including growth boundaries, infill development, designation of urban corridors and strategic infrastructural investments.

(c) The outcomes of urban efficiency and equity have not materialised, evidenced by the location of low-income housing development projects on the edges of townships and in far flung locations; the pace of *de-racialisation* is at least negligible; and there is increasing *fortification* of the suburbs.

The study shows the following on **sustainable development:**

(a) The City of Johannesburg, in its policies, has made a clear commitment to the sustainable development paradigm that encompasses equity, growth and the maintenance of environmental integrity

(b) On environmental conservation, its policies seek to conserve biodiversity and ecological integrity. However, effective implementation of these policies is still a long way off, since adequate resources for monitoring and enforcement have not been made available.

(c) With respect to social equity, the implementation of pro-poor policies and practices are very much in evidence, especially with respect to access to basic services and the initiation of the Human Development Strategy.

(d) Although economic growth has been in evidence, it is not clear whether these are specifically attributable to the efforts of the City. It appears that there no major negative externalities of increased production, since the trajectory of economic development in the city has focused on non-polluting industries. However, growth does not appear to be ‘shared’ by the poor and there is evidence of growing inequality in the city.

REFERENCES

INTERVIEWS AND PERSONAL COMMUNICATIONS

Erasmus, Jan (3 November 2005) Deputy Director: Policy and Strategy, Corporate Planning Unit, City of Johannesburg

Gotz, Graeme (25 October 2005) Specialist: Policy and Strategy, Corporate Planning Unit, City of Johannesburg

Govender, Prem (24 October 2005) Director of the Contract Management Unit, City of Johannesburg

Hunter, Roland (3 November 2005) Head: Programme Phakama, City of Johannesburg

Nhlapo, Pat (26 October 2005) Public Participation Officer, Office of the Speaker, City of Johannesburg

BOOKS AND JOURNALS

Ackroyd, S. & Hughes, J. (1992) *Data collection in context* (2nd ed.). London: Longman

African National Congress (ANC). (1994) *The reconstruction and development programme*. Johannesburg: Umanyano.

Auriacombe, C. (1999) “Reflections on the New Public Management” in *Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. 34, No. 2, pp 124-136

Beall, J., Crankshaw, O. & Parnell, S. (2003) *Uniting a divided city: Governance and social exclusion in Johannesburg*. London and Sterling, VA: Earthscan

Bond, P. (2000) *Cities of gold, townships of coal: Essays on South Africa’s new urban crisis.* Trenton: Africa World Press

Bond, P. (2004) “People, planet, prosperity or poverty, pollution, profits” in *Development Update*, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp 243-265

Cashdan, B. (2002) “Local government poverty in South Africa” in Parnell, S., Pieterse, E., Swilling, M. & Wooldridge, D. (eds.) *Democratising local government: the South African experiment*. Lansdowne: University of Cape Town Press

Chipkin, I. (2002) “A developmental role for local government” in Parnell, S., Pieterse, E., Swilling, M. and Wooldridge, D. (eds.) *Democratising local government: the South African experiment*. Lansdowne: University of Cape Town Press

Clarke, T. (1994) “Introduction: privatising the world?” in T. Clarke (ed.). *International privatisation: strategies and practices*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter

Cloete, F. (2002) “‘Capacity-building for sustainable local governance in South Africa” in Parnell, S., Pieterse, E., Swilling, M. & Wooldridge, D. (eds.) *Democratising local government: the South African experiment*. Lansdowne: University of Cape Town Press

Creswell, J.W. (1994) *Research design*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage

Czeledy, A.P. (2003) “Villas on the Highveld: A cultural perspective on Johannesburg and its ‘northern suburbs’” in *Emerging Johannesburg: Perspectives on the postapartheid city*. London and New York: Routledge

Fakir, E. (2004) “Institutional restructuring, state-civil society relationships and social movements” in *Development Update*, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp 123-150

Harrison, P. (2003) “Fragmentation and globalisation as the new meta-narrative” in Harrison, P., Huchzermeyer, M. & Mayekiso, M. (eds) *Confronting fragmentation: Housing and urban development in a democratising society*. Lansdowne: University of Cape Town Press

Harrison, P., Huchzermeyer, M. & Mayekiso, M. (2003) “Introduction: Confronting fragmentation” in Harrison, P., Huchzermeyer, M. & Mayekiso, M. (eds) *Confronting fragmentation: Housing and urban development in a democratising society*. Lansdowne: University of Cape Town Press

Hassen, E.K. (2003) “The power behind the desk: Democracy, collective bargaining and the public service in South Africa” in Mhone, G. & Edigheji, O.

(eds.) *Governance in the new South Africa: The challenges of globalisation.* Landsdowne: University of Cape Town Press and University of the Witwatersrand

Irurah, D.K. & Boshoff, B. (2003) "An interpretation of sustainable development and urban sustainability in low-cost housing and settlements in South Africa" (2003) in Harrison, P., Huchzermeyer, M. & Mayekiso, M. (eds) *Confronting fragmentation: Housing and urban development in a democratising society*. Lansdowne: University of Cape Town Press

Jurgens, U., Gnad, M. & Bahr, J. (2003) "New forms of class and racial segregation: Ghettos or ethnic enclaves" in *Emerging Johannesburg: Perspectives on the postapartheid city*. London and New York: Routledge

Khan, F. (2004) "The city and its future? The eternal question" in *Development Update*, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp 5-51

Lowndes, V. (1997) "Change in public service management: New institutions and new managerial regimes" in *Local Government Studies*, Vol. 23, No. 2, Summer, pp 42-66

Marcuse, P. (2003) "Foreword" in Harrison, P., Huchzermeyer, M. and Mayekiso, M. (eds) *Confronting fragmentation: Housing and urban development in a democratising society*. Lansdowne: University of Cape Town Press

Lemon, A. (2002) "The role of local government" in Parnell, S., Pieterse, E., Swilling, M. & Wooldridge, D. (eds.) *Democratising local government: the South African experiment*. Lansdowne: University of Cape Town Press

Mabin, A. (2002) "Local government in the emerging national planning context" in Parnell, S., Pieterse, E., Swilling, M. & Wooldridge, D. (eds.) *Democratising local government: the South African experiment*. Lansdowne: University of Cape Town Press

Marshall, C. & Rossman, G.B. (1995) *Designing qualitative research* (2nd ed.) London: Sage

Mhone, G. (2003) "Democratisation, economic liberalisation and the quest for sustainable development in South Africa" in Mhone, G. & Edigheji, O. (eds.) *Governance in the new South Africa: The challenges of globalisation.* Landsdowne: University of Cape Town Press and University of the Witwatersrand

Mhone, G. & Edigheji, O. (2003) “Globalisation and the challenges of governance in the new South Africa: Introduction” in Mhone, G. & Edigheji, O. (eds.) *Governance in the new South Africa: The challenges of globalisation.* Landsdowne: University of Cape Town Press and University of the Witwatersrand

Mogale, T.M. (2003) “Developmental local government and decentralised service delivery in the democratic South Africa” in Mhone, G. & Edigheji, O. (eds.) *Governance in the new South Africa: The challenges of globalisation.* Landsdowne: University of Cape Town Press and University of the Witwatersrand

Mbembe, A. & Nuttall, S. (2004) “Writing the world from an African metropolis” in *Public Culture*, No. 44, pp 347-372.

Oelofse, M. (2003) “Social justice, social integration and the compact city: Lessons from the inner city of Johannesburg” in Harrison, P., Huchzermeyer, M. & Mayekiso, M. (eds) *Confronting fragmentation: Housing and urban development in a democratising society*. Lansdowne: University of Cape Town Press

Oldfield, S. (2002) “‘Embedded’ autonomy and the challenges of developmental local government” in Parnell, S., Pieterse, E., Swilling, M. & Wooldridge, D. (eds.) *Democratising local government: the South African experiment*. Lansdowne: University of Cape Town Press

Osborne, D. & Gaebler, T. (1992) *Reinventing government: How the entrepreneurial spirit is transforming the public sector*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Parnell, S. & Pieterse, E. (2002) “Developmental local government” in Parnell, S., Pieterse, E., Swilling, M. & Wooldridge, D. (eds.) *Democratising local government: the South African experiment*. Lansdowne: University of Cape Town Press

Parnell, S. & Poyser, M. (2002) “‘The value of indicators as a tool for local government” in Parnell, S., Pieterse, E., Swilling, M. & Wooldridge, D. (eds.) *Democratising local government: the South African experiment*. Lansdowne: University of Cape Town Press

Pieterse, E. (2002) “Participatory local governance in the making: Opportunities, constraints and prospects” in Parnell, S., Pieterse, E., Swilling, M. & Wooldridge, D. (eds.) *Democratising local government: the South African experiment*. Lansdowne: University of Cape Town Press

Pieterse, E. (2004) “Recasting urban integration and fragmentation in post-apartheid South Africa” in *Development Update*, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp 81-104

Robinson, J. (2003) “Johannesburg’s futures: Beyond developmentalism and global success” in Tomlinson, R., Beauregard, R.A., Bremner, L. and Mangcu, X. (eds) (2003) in *Emerging Johannesburg: Perspectives on the postapartheid city*. London and New York: Routledge

Smit, W. (2004) “The urban development imagination and *realpolitik*” in *Development Update*, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp 53-80

Smith, D.M. (2003) “Urban fragmentation, inequality and social justice: Ethical perspectives” in Harrison, P., Huchzermeyer, M. & Mayekiso, M. (eds) *Confronting fragmentation: Housing and urban development in a democratising society*. Lansdowne: University of Cape Town Press

Sowman, M. (2002) “Integrating environmental sustainability issues into local government planning and decision-making processes” in Parnell, S., Pieterse, E., Swilling, M. & Wooldridge, D. (eds.) *Democratising local government: the South African experiment*. Lansdowne: University of Cape Town Press

Steger, M.B. (2003) *Globalization: A very short introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Stiglitz, J. (2002) *Globalization and its discontents*. London: Penguin

Stoker, G. (2002) “International trends in local government transformation” in Parnell, S., Pieterse, E., Swilling, M. & Wooldridge, D. (eds.) *Democratising local government: the South African experiment*. Lansdowne: University of Cape Town Press

Swilling, M. (2004) “Rethinking the sustainability of the South African city” *Development Update*, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp 215-242

Thynne, I. (1995) “Basic concepts and issues” in I. Thynne (ed.) *Corporatization, divestment and the public-private mix: selected country studies*. Hong Kong: Asian Journal of Public Administration in collaboration with International Association of Schools and Institutes of Administration.

Todes, A. (2003) “Housing, integrated urban development and the compact city debate” in Harrison, P., Huchzermeyer, M. & Mayekiso, M. (eds) *Confronting fragmentation: Housing and urban development in a democratising society*. Lansdowne: University of Cape Town Press

Tomlinson, R., Beauregard, R.A., Bremner, L. & Mangcu, X. (eds) (2003) "Introduction" in *Emerging Johannesburg: Perspectives on the postapartheid city*. London and New York: Routledge

Tomlinson, R. & Larsen, P. "The race, class and space of shopping" in Tomlinson, R., Beauregard, R.A., Bremner, L. & Mangcu, X. (eds) (2003) "Introduction" in *Emerging Johannesburg: Perspectives on the postapartheid city*. London and New York: Routledge

Tomlinson, R., Beauregard, R.A., Bremner, L. & Mangcu, X. (eds) (2003a) "The postapartheid struggle for an integrated Johannesburg" in *Emerging Johannesburg: Perspectives on the postapartheid city*. London and New York: Routledge

Van Donk, M. (2002) "'Local government's role in realising gender equality: from policy to practice" in Parnell, S., Pieterse, E., Swilling, M. & Wooldridge, D. (eds.) *Democratising local government: the South African experiment*. Lansdowne: University of Cape Town Press

Watson, V. (2003) "Planning for integration: The case of metropolitan Cape Town" in Harrison, P., Huchzermeyer, M. & Mayekiso, M. (eds) *Confronting fragmentation: Housing and urban development in a democratising society*. Lansdowne: University of Cape Town Press

Wooldridge, D. (2002) "'Introducing metropolitan government in South Africa" in Parnell, S., Pieterse, E., Swilling, M. & Wooldridge, D. (eds.) *Democratising local government: the South African experiment*. Lansdowne: University of Cape Town Press

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

Department of Constitutional Development and Provincial Affairs (DCD) (1998) White Paper on Local Government. Pretoria: DCD

Department of Finance (1996) Growth, Employment and Redistribution: A Macroeconomic Strategy (GEAR). Pretoria: Department of Finance.

Republic of South Africa (1993) Local Government Transition Act, 203 of 1993. Pretoria: Government Printer

Republic of South Africa (1995) Development Facilitation Act, 46 of 1995. Pretoria: Government Printer

Republic of South Africa (1996a) Constitution of the Republic of South Africa Act, 108 of 1996. Pretoria: Government Printer

Republic of South Africa (1996b) Local Government Transition Act, Second Amendment Act, 97 of 1996. Pretoria: Government Printer

Republic of South Africa (1996c) Growth, Employment and Redistribution Strategy of the Government of National Unity. Pretoria: Government Printer

Republic of South Africa (1998a) Municipal Demarcation Act, 27 of 1998. Pretoria: Government Printer

Republic of South Africa (1998b) Local Government: Municipal Structures Act, 117 of 1998. Pretoria: Government Printer

Republic of South Africa (2000) Local Government: Municipal Systems Act, 32 of 2000. Pretoria: Government Printer

Republic of South Africa (2003). Local Government: Municipal Finance Management Act, 56 of 2003. Pretoria: Government Printer

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

City of Johannesburg (CoJ) (2001) *Johannesburg: An African city in change*. Cape Town: Zebra

City of Johannesburg (CoJ) (2002) *Joburg 2030*. Johannesburg: CoJ

City of Johannesburg (CoJ) (2003) *Executive Mayor's mid-term report: Good governance, development and delivery.* Johannesburg: CoJ.

City of Johannesburg (CoJ) (2003a) State of the Environment Report 2003. Unpublished document.

City of Johannesburg (CoJ) (2004) *Integrated development plan 2004/05*. Johannesburg: CoJ

City of Johannesburg (CoJ) (2005) *Annual report 2003/04*. Johannesburg: CoJ

City of Johannesburg (CoJ) (2005a) *City of Joburg: Annual economic review*. Johannesburg: CoJ

City of Johannesburg (CoJ) (2005b) *Human development strategy: Joburg's commitment to the poor.* Johannesburg: CoJ.

City of Johannesburg (CoJ) (2005c) *Integrated development plan 2005/06*. Johannesburg: CoJ
City of Johannesburg (CoJ) (2005d) *Mayoral budget speech 2005/06*. Johannesburg: CoJ

City of Johannesburg (CoJ) (2005e) *Medium-term budget 2005/06-2007/08*. Johannesburg: CoJ

City of Johannesburg (CoJ) (2005f) "Human development implementation plan for the City of Johannesburg: 2005/06 to 2010/10". Report submitted by the Corporate Planning Unit, Office of the City Manager to the Council.

Greater Johannesburg Metropolitan Council (GJMC) (1999) *iGoli 2002: making the city work*. Johannesburg: Greater Johannesburg Metropolitan Council

Greater Johannesburg Metropolitan Council (GJMC) (2000) *iGoli 2002: making Greater Johannesburg work*. Johannesburg: Greater Johannesburg Metropolitan Council

South African Cities Network (SACN) (2004) *State of the cities report 2004*. Johannesburg: SACN

UNPUBLISHED DOCUMENTS

Seedat, R.A. (2001) "Regulation of the Johannesburg water and sanitation utility", a research report submitted to the Faculty of Management, University of the Witwatersrand, in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Management (in the field of Public and Development Management)

INTERNET

McKinley, D.T. (2004) “Mistaking symptoms for cause”, H-Safrica@h-net.msu.edu

City of Johannesburg (2005) “City statistics”, http://www.joburg.org.za/facts/index_statistics.stm

Department of Provincial and Local Government (2005) http://www.dplg.gov.za

Project Consolidate (2005) http://www.projectconsolidate.gov.za

South African Cities Network (2005) http://www.sacn.net

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (2005) http://www.undp.org

World Bank (2005) http://www.worldbank.org