



Promoting active citizenship and good governance

Land and Settlement Development Research Study

Report on:

Spatial Development Frameworks

2013

Prepared by:



Table of Contents

1. Purpose of the study	4
2. The Terms of Reference	4
3. Activities	5
4. Overview of the report	6
5. Background to Municipal Planning in South Africa.....	7
6. The concept of Spatial Development Frameworks.....	12
7. Participatory processes for communities	14
8. Kei Mouth Local Spatial Development Framework Case Study	16
9. Duncan Village Local Spatial Development Framework Case Study	20
10. Emerging Issues.....	24
11. Recommendations.....	26
12. Conclusion	30
13. References.....	31

Glossary of Terms

Communal Land	Communal Land means land which is, or is to be, occupied or used by members of a community subject to the rules or custom of that community.
Community	Community means a group of persons whose rights to land are derived from shared rules determining access to land held in common by such group
Corridors	Corridors are links between nodes, along which an increased intensity of development may be encouraged. Corridors provide efficient access to a higher level of economic opportunities than would generally be the case in less structured space. They typically include public transport routes.
Density	Density is the number of units (e.g. people, dwelling units, floor area) per unit of land area, e.g. dwelling units/ hectare.
Densification	Densification is the increased use of space both horizontally and vertically within existing areas/ properties and new developments, accompanied by an increased number of units and/or population threshold
Efficiency	Development that maximises development goals such as sustainability, integration, accessibility, affordability, and quality of living, relative to financial, environmental, and social costs, including ongoing and future costs
Environmental Management Framework	An Environmental Management Framework (EMF) provides a study of the biophysical and socio-cultural systems of a geographically defined area to reveal where specific land uses may best be practiced and to offer performance standards for maintaining appropriate use of such land.
Infill Development	Development of vacant or underutilised land within existing settlements in order to optimise the use of infrastructure, increase urban densities and promote integration.
Integrated Development Plan (IDP)	The strategic municipal development plan, reviewed on an annual basis, required by the MSA (Act 32 of 2000) which guides municipal decisions and budgets as well as the development programs of SoEs and the private sector.

Land Use Management	Establishing or implementing any measure to regulate the use or a change in the form or function of land, and includes land development
Land Use Management System	A system used to regulate land use in a municipality, including a town planning or zoning scheme, or policies related to how land is used on a plot by plot basis.
Nodes	Nodes are areas where a higher intensity of land uses and activities are supported and promoted. Typically any given municipal area would accommodate a hierarchy of nodes that indicates the relative intensity of development anticipated for the various nodes, their varying sizes, and their dominant nature.
Rural Areas and Rural Development	Can be defined as areas outside urban settlements where: - population densities are less than 150 people / km ² ; and - dwelling densities are less than 1du/ ha. Rural development generally includes primary economic activities; agriculture, agro-processing, mining, tourism, resource extraction, water, energy.
Scenario	A plausible and often simplified option of how the future may develop, based on a coherent and internally consistent set of assumptions about driving forces and key relationships Often a set of different scenarios are considered as part of the process of agreeing on a way forward.
Strategic Environmental Assessment	A Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) is a system of incorporating environmental considerations into policies, plans and programmes.
Sector Plans	Sector Plans are municipal plans for different functions such as biodiversity, conservation, housing, transport, local economic development and disaster management. They may also be geographically based, for example a sub-region, settlement within a local Municipality or a component of a settlement.
Settlement	A <i>settlement</i> is small community, village or a group of houses in a thinly populated area.
Spatial Planning	Spatial planning is a planning process that is inherently integrative and strategic, takes into account a wide range of factors and concerns and addresses how those aspects should be arranged on the land

Spatial Development Framework (SDF)	An SDF is a framework that seeks to guide, overall spatial distribution of current and desirable land uses within a municipality in order to give effect to the vision, goals and objectives of the municipal IDP. The aims of a Spatial Development Framework are to promote sustainable functional and integrated human settlements, maximise resource efficiency, and enhance regional identity and unique character of a place.
Stakeholders	Stakeholders are agencies, organisations, groups or individuals who have a direct or indirect interest in a development intervention or its evaluation
Sustainable Development	Sustainable Development requires the integration of social, economic and environmental factors in the planning, implementation and evaluation of decisions to ensure that development serves present and future generations
Town Planning Scheme or Zoning Scheme	A legal instrument for regulating the use of land in terms of provincial or national legislation, see Land Use Management System.
Urban Areas and Urban Development	Can be defined as places where: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - population densities are greater than 150 people / km² - dwelling unit densities greater than 1du/ha - settlement contained within an Urban Edge - services provided on a grid reticulation system - some primary; urban agriculture, building materials, resource extraction but mainly secondary and tertiary economic activity
Urban Edge	A demarcated line and interrelated policy that serves to manage, direct and limit urban expansion
Urban Sprawl	Urban Sprawl is the expansion of urban areas across the landscape and the conversion of forested, wetland and agricultural areas to urban areas.
Village	A village is a clustered human settlement, larger than a hamlet and usually smaller than a town, with the population ranging from a few hundred; often located in the rural areas.

1. Purpose of the study

Afesis-corporation has appointed CS Consulting to undertake a study that will achieve the following outcomes:

- 1.1. Afesis-corporation (and other civil society organisations- and others) get an understanding for:
 - a. How effective SDF planning exercises have been in leading to appropriate land being accessed and secured for low income households
 - b. To what extent spatial planning processes have taken into account the views of low income and other communities in developing these plans
- 1.2. Afesis-corporation (and other civil society organisations - and others) are better able to identify potential areas for where the spatial planning process and products can be improved and help identify what further actions and interventions can be undertaken by Afesis-corporation, other civil society organisations (and others) to improve the planning process.

2. The Terms of Reference

The consultant is expected to prepare a short basic case study report on experiences of two communities in participating in SDF's in relation to improving access to land for settlement purposes. Each report must include the following:

- 2.1 Case study description:
 - a. Broadly why and how was SDF planning done in the case study municipality
 - b. What type of land has been identified for settlement purposes (its location relative to other activities, its size, its development suitability, its ownership, cost, etc.)
 - c. How did the community participate in the various planning process
- 2.2 Case study analysis
 - a. What are case study communities experiences of participating in the process
 - b. What are communities views on the appropriateness of the spatial development plans that have been developed for their settlement development needs
 - c. Do case study communities feel they are able to influence what goes into spatial plans; and are they able to ensure the plans get implemented according to plan
- 2.3 Recommendations

- a. What broad recommendations can be made for communities and government for how to improve community participation in spatial planning broadly and in the case study areas particularly

2.4 Journal article

- a. A Transformer journal article summarizing case study findings

3. Activities

1. Data collection

- a. Data collection from municipality and other sources
 - i. Assist Afesis-Corplan identify communities where case studies will be conducted (this is likely to be 2 of the communities where Afesis-Corplan are already involved)
 - ii. Meet with government officials to collect copies of SDF's and other relevant information from that municipality and get their views on the SDF planning process and impact.
 - iii. Analyse the municipal plans to identify what the plans say about 1) where land should be for low income settlement, and 2) the participation of the community in developing the plan and implementing the plan.
 - iv. Read and comment on other research reports being developed by Afesis-Corplan on national municipal planning legislation.

- b. Data collection from community

- I. Hold focus group meetings (to be organized by Afesis-Corplan) with identified community leaders to:
 - a. Find out from the community how they participated in the development of the municipalities plans; and
 - b. Present a summary of the plans to the community explaining what the plans says about what land should be developed and how the community should be involved in its development and whether their views on the plans reflect their expectations and needs.

2. Analysing and circulating research findings

- a. Write up a case study report summarizing the findings from the data collection and focus group meetings.
- b. Circulate copy of draft report to the municipalities and communities involved to get their feedback and comments.
- c. Produce a revised draft report.

- d. Hold meetings (organized by Afesis-Corplan) with representatives from case study municipalities, provincial government and others to present final draft research report.
- e. Produce final research report.
- f. Write a journal article based on research findings.

4. Overview of the report

The report is divided into three parts which deal with the question of whether the Spatial Development Framework process has been an effective planning instrument in ensuring that the planning outcomes such as that of providing land for subsidized housing has been realized. The first part of the report gives the theoretical background to the system of Municipal Planning in South Africa and explores its roots which were based on the New Public Management system of government favoured in the late 1980's and early 1990's by proponents in Britain and the United States. It also explores the relationship between the shifts in government policy from the more socialist friendly Reconstruction and Development Programme to the neo-liberal Growth Employment and Redistribution policy which caused a fracture in the ANC with its alliance partners. These changes as well as the transformation that the country was undergoing had a profound effect on the system of planning in South Africa.

The second part of the report examines two examples where the Spatial Development Framework planning processes were undertaken and documents these as case studies based on the experiences of selected individuals who were involved in these processes. The case studies selected were in the Great Kei Local Municipality where a Local Spatial Development Framework was undertaken for the Kei Mouth area and in the Buffalo City Metropolitan Municipality where the upgrading of the massive informal area of Duncan Village was chosen. The case studies were based on interviews and interactions with focus groups and the experiences of selected individuals who were involved in these planning processes at the respective Municipalities.

The third part of the report consolidates the theory with the experiences of communities involved in these planning processes and develops a set of recommendations towards ensuring that civil society and other organizations learn from the lessons of the community experiences in the planning processes and the outcomes of accessing land for the development of low income and subsidized housing for the poor.

5. Background to Municipal Planning in South Africa

The Integrated Development Plan (IDP) is the focus of South Africa's post-apartheid municipal planning system and is also now regarded as a key instrument in an evolving framework of intergovernmental planning and coordination. The 1998 White Paper on Local Government identified the IDP as a key tool of 'development local government' (meaning local government that is concerned with promoting the economic and social development of communities) and linked the IDP to a broader processes and service delivery partnerships.

In 2000, the Municipal System Act specified the minimum contents of the IDP as:

- A vision for long-term development of a municipality;
- An assessment of the current level of servicing, and of economic and social development, in a municipality;
- The municipal council's development priorities and objectives for its elected term;
- The local council's development strategies (which must be aligned with any national or provincial plans)
- *A Spatial Development Framework (which must include guidelines for a land use management system)*;
- Operational strategies;
- Sectoral plans required by other legislation (e.g. water plans, transport plans, waste management plans, disaster management plans and housing strategies);
- A financial plan; and
- A set of key performance indicators and performance targets.

Harrison (2006) contends that the IDP is one of the outcomes of policy convergence that happened internationally in the 1990's and in which South Africa became a key player.¹

More recently, spatial policy has re-emerged as an instrument of policy coordination (Healey 2004).² The European Spatial Development Perspective, which provides a broad framework for public and private investment across the continent, has been particularly important in shaping the new spatial vocabulary and practice but there were other important national, regional and local initiatives (Jensen & Richardson 2003).³ This new-style spatial planning involves what the doyen of planning theory, Patsy Healey, calls 'self-conscious collective efforts to re-imagine a city, urban region or wider territory and to translate the result into priorities for area investment, conservation measures, strategic infrastructure investments

¹ Democracy and Delivery: Urban Policy in South Africa (2006)

² ibid

³ ibid

and principles of land use regulation (Healey 2004:46) as quoted in Harrison (2006).⁴ It is a form of spatial policy making that has responded to a paradigmatic shift in geographical imagination (2004:48). It increasingly involves collaborative processes of dialogue and negotiation (Wolsink 2003).⁵

The idea of the Spatial Development Framework, a component of the South African IDP, is converging on this new international approach to spatial policy-making.⁶ By 1996 the need for a local planning instrument was obvious. The first post-apartheid planning instrument had been introduced in the Development Facilitation Act promulgated in October 1995, but these instruments – including the Land Development Objectives which local authorities were required to prepare, and Development Tribunals which were given power to override legal restrictions on land development – were intended primarily to be ‘extraordinary measures’ to facilitate and speed up the implementation of reconstruction and development programmes and projects in relation to land’. There was a need for a broader instrument to coordinate and direct the activities of local authorities.

The opportunity was provided in late 1996 by the preparation of piece of legislation to amend the Act which provided the legal basis for the system of transitional local government. The Local Government Transition Act, Second Amendment Act was drafted by the Department of Constitutional Development (DCD) and promulgated in November 1996.

The drafters of the 1996 Act may have had a coherent view of the purpose of the IDP but there was a high degree of confusion amongst other actors. In particular, there was uncertainty around the relationship between IDP and the Land Development Objectives, and between the IDP and the planning instruments that had recently been developed by provincial authorities (especially Kwazulu-Natal and the Western Cape). Newly established and still inexperienced municipal councils had little understanding of the planning process, and generally subcontracted the preparation of the IDP’s to professional planners, many of whom were still rooted in a strongly traditional and spatially oriented practice of planning.⁷ The change in focus from a purely spatial, area based form of planning to one of producing a management plan for the entire Municipality and all its operations was a huge adjustment to make for the planners in many Municipalities who were now entrusted with this task.

⁴ ibid

⁵ ibid

⁶ ibid

⁷ Democracy and Delivery: Urban Policy in South Africa (2006)

There was an urgent need for further clarification of policy and for greater detail in terms of requirements, and also for support, training and capacity development for local authorities. A process of policy elaboration unfolded after 1996 that connected with a series of international influences. The most important initial development was the release of the White Paper on Local Government in 1998, which set out the principles and proposed arrangements for the new system of local government that would end the transitional period. The White Paper confirmed the IDP as a crucial instrument of developmental local government, and emphasized the links between the IDP and performance management.⁸

The IDP, which began its life as a precarious and misunderstood instrument, in competition with other forms of planning such as spatial planning and land use planning, was now well entrenched within the post-apartheid system of local government. To a large extent the IDP, as an institutional plan, had eclipsed the previously dominant spatial planning approach although, by about 2000, a new form of integrative spatial planning was resurfacing within the framework provided by the IDP (Harrison & Todes 2001: Watson 2002,2003).⁹ In 1998, despite the clarity brought by the White Paper, there was still great need to provide municipal authorities with substantive guidance and support in the preparation of IDP's and to provide a more adequate legislative basis for IDPs.

By 2000, most of the building blocks for the new (post-transitional) system of local government were in place. Local government boundaries had been redrawn and new local government legislation was in place. For the IDP, the key legislation was the Municipal Systems Act (2000) which specified the minimum contents of an IDP and set out principles for the process to be followed in preparing an IDP (although it did not prescribe the process). In December 2000 the municipal elections were held and the new system of local government came into effect. Municipalities were then required to produce interim IDPs by March 2001 so that budgeting processes would be informed by some version of integrated development planning (with full IDPs being prepared by March 2002).

The new planning system in South Africa has continued to evolve through a learning process and in response to broader shifts in governance and macro-policy approaches. Until very recently, the IDP was seen almost entirely as an instrument of local planning and coordination (although there was requirement that the IDP be aligned to national and provincial policies and programmes). However, from 1999, when Thabo Mbeki became president, a new emphasis was working its way through government. It was an emphasis on

⁸ *ibid*

⁹ Democracy and Delivery: Urban Policy in South Africa (2006)

integrated (or joined-up) multi-level governance. As senior ANC official Fraser-Moleketi put it, 'issues of integration have been a cornerstone of the second term of democratic governance under President Thabo Mbeki' (2003b:2) as quoted in Harrison (2006).¹⁰

Since the IDP was an established mechanism of coordination within the local sphere, it became an obvious instrument to connect with the national Medium Term Strategic Framework and the respective Provincial Growth and Development Strategy's of the Province's. In December 2001 the Presidential Co-ordinating Council called for the 'implementation of a state-wide planning system wherein Integrated Development Planning serves as the basis for aligning policy, planning and budgeting processes across all spheres' and in May 2003, the Cabinet charged The Department of Provincial and Local Government (DPLG) with preparing an Intergovernmental Planning Framework and putting together an Intergovernmental Relations Framework Bill that would strengthen the role of planning across the spheres of government. Recent reports from the Office of the President have mentioned the key role of the IDP within an unfolding system of intergovernmental planning. The IDP had now taken on a new meaning within a much broader context of a national and provincial integrated planning system. The new National Planning Commission has completed its work on the National Development Plan which sets the framework for both Provincial and local planning.

Whilst national government was putting together a system of multi-level integrated planning and coordination, a more bottom-up and voluntary form of networking was coming together. This was the inter-locality networking that was formalized in 2002 as the South African Cities Network, which brings together South Africa's nine largest cities in a strategic partnership. This network is, in turn, linked to the international Cities Alliance Network, which is closely connected to the major global development agencies. A new approach to city planning – which both connects with and challenges the IDP – is being promoted through this extended network. This is the City Development Strategy (CDS) approach which has been implemented through the network in over 80 cities worldwide over the past few years, including in Johannesburg. The CDS approach allows for considerable innovation and variation in local methodology, and can be related fairly easily to the IDP. However, there are some potentially important differences in emphasis. The CDS for example has a longer-term perspective, is more strongly focused on economic development, and is directed mainly at managing the growth of large cities, whereas the IDP has largely been developed with medium-level local authorities in mind.

¹⁰ *ibid*

The IDP-related system was developed almost entirely under the direction of national government (with strategic support from agencies such as GTZ). In the future, however, metropolitan authorities (with their large resources and planning capacity), supported and informed by wider networks such as Cities Alliance, are likely to be an important source of innovation in planning.

According to Harrison et al (2008)¹¹, by 2005, local government seemed to be floundering with the most visible evidence in the protests that erupted in local authorities from Harrismith in the Free State to Khutsong on the Gauteng/North West border. Although some of the unrest had to do with the re-demarcation of provincial boundaries, the lack of service delivery appeared to underlie most of the agitation, although a fair amount of the unrest may have been about political contestation around positions on municipal councils.

Harrison et al (2008) contend that the irony of the Mbeki era was that despite the emphasis given to good governance, the everyday reality in many municipalities was of patronage in appointments and tendering, institutional conflict, poor delivery records and financial crisis. The state of crisis was acknowledged in government audit of municipalities which revealed that 136 of South Africa's 284 municipalities did not have the capacity to fulfill their basic functions; a sobering finding that led to the April 2005 launch of Project Consolidate, a national government programme designed to fill the capacity gaps within local government.¹²

In the better-capacitated municipalities, the strategic and longer-term perspectives provided by a Growth and Development Strategy GDS or City Development Strategy (CDS) are beginning to inform an increasingly sophisticated array of short and medium-term plans. In the City of Johannesburg for example, the GDS informs the five-year IDP, the Spatial Development Framework (SDF), 7 Regional Spatial Development Frameworks (RSDFs), Regional Urban Management Plans (RUMPs), Sector Plans, and may, in the future, also provide guidance to Ward-Based Plans. Many other municipalities continue to struggle with the preparation of an IDP, which suggests that planning will become increasingly differentiated across the country, with a growing variance in the level and scale of planning that happens.

¹¹ Planning and Transformation: Learning from the Post Apartheid Experience (2008)

¹² ibid

6. The concept of Spatial Development Frameworks

According to the Guidelines for Spatial Development Frameworks (SDF's) published by the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform in 2010, a Spatial Development Framework is a core component of a Municipality's economic, sectoral, spatial, social, institutional, environmental vision. In other words, it is a tool to achieve the desired spatial form of the Municipality. The guidelines also offer advice to a range of stakeholders on how to:

- ensure that the SDF is accessible to a wide audience;
- achieve support for the SDF from all stakeholders;
- write and illustrate SDF reports;
- propose spatial interventions that will effectively address common spatial issues facing municipalities and assist with achieving the desired spatial form.

The Department of Rural Development and Land Reform (DRDLR) has recently investigated the quality and status of SDFs throughout the country. (DRDLR, SDF, LUMS and GIS Audit, 2010) In addition, specific research focusing on the strength and weaknesses of municipal SDFs was undertaken. This research has shown that compilers of SDFs struggle with the following aspects:

- a) Applying national and provincial spatial policies and principles and related planning concepts to the reality at the municipal level.
- b) Formulating practical and implementable SDFs, with measurable targets that will allow for assessing the success of an SDF.
- c) Aligning SDFs with other sector planning in municipalities and with the planning of neighbouring municipalities.
- d) Achieving buy-in of SDFs, thus improving their status and role in guiding decisions made by municipalities. A SDF is an important municipal policy instrument provided for in legislation but it has been shown that merely fulfilling the requirements of the law will not result in an effective SDF.

Although the scope and contents of SDFs will vary for different municipalities, a credible SDF:

- a) is based on an agreed vision and planning principles that promote equity and sustainability; for example:
 - assisting with restructuring spatially inefficient settlements;
 - promoting sustainable use of land resources;
 - channelling resources to areas of greatest need (social investment) and development potential (economic investment); and,

- o stimulating economic opportunities in rural and urban areas (White Paper 2001)
- b) is aligned with relevant national and provincial policy;
- c) reflects a clear understanding of the reality of the municipal spatial environmental, social and economic systems, particularly with regard to urban infrastructure needs and capacity;
- d) provides sufficient detail to inform Council decisions that have a spatial dimension;
- e) includes an implementation plan, with measurable targets;
- f) is realistic in terms of growth prospects and the financial and institutional capacity of the municipality to implement the proposals;
- g) is aligned with the municipal Environmental Management Framework (EMF), where applicable;
- h) provides guidance for sector plans and development initiatives from all government agencies, e.g. land reform programmes, and private sector projects that will contribute towards the municipality's vision;
- i) enjoys a high level of buy-in from all stakeholders (i.e. the process of formulation is as important as the product);
- j) provides guidance for the Municipality's Land Use Management System (LUMS); and,
- k) is clear, succinct and accessible to a wide audience¹³

6.1. The Spatial Development Framework process

The detailed process of compiling an SDF comprises seven phases as outlined below which are designed to flow from one to the next following a logical sequence that clarifies the brief as soon as possible, has a public engagement element to identify strategic issues, creates awareness of the process, and stimulates future thinking, and then analyses the status quo. The output of these first three phases informs, firstly, the conceptual framework that sets down the key ideas and focus areas, and secondly, the draft SDF. This phase may include an intermediate round of public participation if scenarios need to be considered. Support for the SDF must then be achieved after which formal approval, implementation and monitoring follow. The summary of the process is as follows:

- **Phase 1: Start-up**

Set up of institutional and political support structures, understanding of the role, agreement on the scope of work for the SDF, and completion of the project plan and inception report..

- **Phase 2: Issues & Vision**

Agree with stakeholders on the spatial vision and issues. This phase precedes the status quo investigation, so as to avoid influencing the public by presenting "leading" information

¹³ Guidelines for Spatial Development Frameworks (2010)

and to ensure that the subsequent work also considers issues of public concern, rather than solely academic approach that attempts to address a myriad of issues equally.

- **Phase 3: Spatial analysis and synthesis**

Investigation and analysis of the status quo of spatial issues.

- **Phase 4: Draft SDF**

Preparation of draft SDF proposals (first draft document on the table for comment)

- **Phase 5: Achieving support**

Discussion of the SDF proposals with stakeholders.

- **Phase 6: Finalization and approval of the SDF**

Analysis of the comments/ proposals for amendments, finalization of the SDF and approval of the SDF by relevant authorities.

- **Phase 7: Implementation and monitoring**

Implementation and monitoring of the SDF, and revision of the SDF, which should be coordinated with the IDP cycles.

7. Participatory processes for communities

At local government level, the Municipal Systems Act (Act 32 of 2000) puts emphasis on the need to develop a culture of community participation. According to section 16 (1) (a) of the Municipal Systems Act, a municipality must develop a culture of municipal governance that complements formal representative government with a system of participatory governance and must for this purpose do the following:

- Encourage and create conditions for, the local community to participate in the affairs of the municipality, including in the preparation and implementation and review of its integrated development plan.
- Contribute to building the capacity of the local community to enable it to participate in the affairs of the municipality.

To facilitate practical implementation of public participation, the government has since 1994 implemented various initiatives. These include the following:

- ***izimbizo***: The political leadership of government, including the President, the Deputy President, members of the cabinet, Premiers, members of the Executive Councils, Mayors, councilors accompanied by senior government officials hold public meetings to engage with communities on issues of government policies and service delivery. Municipal councils also conduct their own Integrated Development Plan *izimbizo* wherein the Executive Mayor, Councilors and officials embark on public meetings to engage citizens on matters affecting their wards and to prioritize their future projects.

- **EXCO Meets the People:** This is the provincial initiative undertaken by the Premier and Members of the Executive Council in a province to engage with communities on government policy and service delivery issues.
- **Public Hearings:** Public hearings of different types are organised by different organs of the state, including Parliament and National Council of Provinces (NCOP) to engage with the general public on policy and service delivery issues.
- **Ward Committees:** Ward committees are statutory bodies created in terms of the Municipal Structures Act (Act No. 117 of 1998). The purpose of ward committees is to assist the democratically elected representative of a ward (the councilor) to carry out his or her mandate. Ward committee members are members of the community representing the needs of the people in areas where they live. Chapter 4 (part 4) of the Act requires that municipalities must establish ward committees, with the objective of enhancing participatory democracy in the local government.
- **Community Development Workers (CDWs):** CDWs are community-based resource persons appointed by Municipalities who collaborate with other community workers to help fellow community members to obtain information and resources from government departments. The aim of CDWs is to facilitate community participation in government initiatives.
- **Citizen Satisfaction Surveys:** Citizen Satisfaction Survey is a methodology used to engage with citizens and to establish their views and expectations on service delivery. It is a means of collecting citizens' feedback on the quality and adequacy of public services directly from the service users of government services. Furthermore, Citizen Satisfaction Surveys provide a thorough basis and sets a proactive agenda for citizens and government to engage in dialogue to improve the delivery of services to the public. Most departments apply Citizen Satisfaction Surveys to solicit feedback from the citizens on the quality of the services they render.
- **Citizens Forums:** The Citizens Forums model is a mechanism to facilitate public participation in the Public Service. The overall purpose of Citizens Forums is to evaluate the delivery of particular services throughout the country, and to enable active involvement of people affected by government programmes in service delivery improvement.

Communities have been encouraged to participate in the various platforms for consultation created by all three spheres of government to put forward their needs and request assistance from the various government departments.

8. Kei Mouth Local Spatial Development Framework Case Study

8.1. Background to the Kei Mouth Local Spatial Development Framework (KMLSDF)

Acting as fund administrator on behalf of the Department of Local Government and Traditional Affairs, the Amathole District Municipality appointed Umhlaba Consulting Group to undertake a Local Spatial Development Framework for the coastal town of Kei Mouth situated within the Great Kei Local Municipality in 2008. The Great Kei Local Municipality itself compiled its' first generation Spatial Development framework (SDF) between 2004 and 2006 for the whole municipal area. The purpose of the Kei Mouth Local Spatial Development Framework (KMLSDF) was to set out a broad framework for guiding spatial development across the whole of the Kei Mouth and Morgan Bay area as well as setting in place clear land use management guidelines for application by the local Municipality.¹⁴

The decision to implement a Local Spatial Development Framework for the town of Kei Mouth arose from the dynamics of the coastal property recognition of the market with more people looking to buy property along the coast coupled with the improved accessibility of the town after the tarring of the main access road. These factors, together with the growing tourism potential of the town resulted in an increased need to plan for land development in Kei Mouth. According to Section 35 (2) of the Municipal Systems Act, the KMLSDF had statutory status and overrode all other plans for the area or a portion of Kei Mouth that may have been completed previously.¹⁵

The terms of reference for the formulation of the KMLSDF are outlined below:

- Identify the key spatial development features (characteristic land use patterns, development trends and related land use dynamics) applicable in the study area
- On the basis of work completed for the Great Kei Spatial Development Framework, incorporate the relevant elements of the Great Kei Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) as these have a bearing on Kei Mouth
- Establish the objectives of the Great Kei Municipality in relation to spatial development in Kei Mouth, with particular emphasis on clarifying the principles to be followed in the management of spatial development in the study area
- Identify the Municipality's strategies and policies that are adopted to achieve its spatial development objectives on the basis of the above and consideration of the spatial implications of the various proposals made by the Sector Plans completed or being undertaken

¹⁴ Kei Mouth Local Spatial Development Framework (2011)

¹⁵ *ibid*

- Illustrate the spatial features and objectives (proposed directions of growth and indicative preferred land use zones) in a conceptual Spatial Development Framework
- Formulate a clear overall plan of the desired spatial form of the study area and accompanying land use patterns
- Identify key projects required to be implemented to enable further spatial development in Kei Mouth
- Clarify the guidelines for land use management in the Kei Mouth area
In accordance with the terms of reference for the project, the KMLSDF was formulated over a three phase process as outlined below:
 - Phase One – Analysis
 - Phase Two – Objectives, strategies and proposals
 - Phase Three – Operational plan

According to Umhlaba Consulting Group, the following meetings were held with interested and affected parties in the Kei Mouth area:

- Steering Committee meeting held on the 17th September 2008
- 1st Primary Working Group meeting held on the 25th of September 2008
- 2nd Primary Working Group meeting held on the 16th of October 2008
- 3rd Primary Working Group meeting held on the 30th of October 2008
- 4th Primary Working Group meeting held on the 27th of November 2008

8.2 Interview with key stakeholders

As part of this SDF case study, a focus group session was held with selected members of the Kei Mouth Cwili community and the Chairperson of the Kei Mouth Ratepayers Association in late 2012. According to all the members present, the Kei Mouth Local Spatial Development Framework (KMLSDF) undertaken by Umhlaba Consulting Group was a comprehensive plan which took into account all the aspirations of the local community. It was stated that all the planning proposals were supported by the Kei Mouth community and that the contents of the documents and maps were accepted.

According to the focus group, the Great Kei Municipality attended a few meetings although according to them they had no real grasp of the issues outlined in the KMLSDF. As will be elaborated on below, the Great Kei Municipality has to date still not finalized the KMLSDF document and therefore it is still not approved.

The main issue that sparked the development of the KMLSDF related to the issue of the municipal commonage which the community wanted as communal land for cattle owners. It was felt that there were private developers who were interested in the commonage and the community did not want to see the developers misuse the land for their own profits. The community then started a Development Forum comprising of Kei Mouth residents, Cwili residents, the stockowners, SANCO, churches, business and tourism owners. The Development Forum then demanded to know what the development plans for the Kei Mouth area were from the Municipality. A number of adversarial meetings were held between the Development Forum and the Great Kei Municipality.

The Kei Mouth Municipality then realized that they had to follow the proper procedures and appoint professional service providers to undertake the spatial planning for the Kei Mouth area. Umhlaba Town and Regional Planners were appointed with funds by the Department of Housing and Local Government and through the Amathole District Municipality. The entire planning process took about two and a half years to complete. The consultants ensured that the community participated and took into account all their needs. They even did a feasibility study on certain proposals and incorporated suggestions from the community. The community was happy with the document.

At a meeting at the Kei Mouth Country Club in February 2009, the implementation plan was discussed, where the Great Kei Municipality was given responsibility to implementing many of the projects identified in the SDF (e.g. tourism development and infrastructure upgrades). From previous experiences with the Great Kei Municipality, the community felt it was not possible to leave them solely responsible for the implementation of the plan and the community, through the Development Forum wanted to be more involved in the implementation stage.

The community wanted a greater say over the implementation process as they felt that capacity within the Municipality was a problem. The perception was that there was actually no trust between the community and the Municipality. The community felt that administrators were not accountable and had no will to make a difference. They also felt that it was difficult for the Municipality to raise revenue as resources were split to a greater degree to the rural areas in the Municipal area because of greater representation of these rural areas in council. The community also felt that Councilors had no interest in the coastal villages like Kei Mouth and Haga Haga and channeled resources to the rural areas where their constituencies were. According to the focus group we met for this case study, the KMLSDF was still valid and met all the communities' aspirations.

An interview was also held with the main consultant in the Umhlaba Consulting Group who was responsible for the formulation of the KMLSDF. He pointed out that they were appointed in 2008 but they had to cut out an important component of the work dealing with the engineering and infrastructure services due to budget constraints. They contacted the main official from the Department of Local Government and Traditional Affairs who initiated the introductory meeting with the Kei Mouth community which was well attended by the Municipality, the Kei Mouth and Cwili community and included the Mayor and Municipal Manager.

A local working group or Development Forum was established which included members from the ratepayers association and representatives from Cwili and Kei Mouth. A series of working sessions were held with the attendance being fairly consistent throughout. By December 2008, a draft document was circulated to the stakeholders for their comments and input over the December/January period. A final meeting was held at the Kei Mouth Golf Club in February 2009 and this is where the dispute arose.

The draft document had identified projects for implementation by the Municipality. However, the Kei Mouth community were not happy with this task being given to the Municipality and declared a dispute. The reason why this had resulted was because of mistrust between the community and the Municipality. The underlying issues are complex but revolve around two main matters. Firstly, the community had a history of attending to their own maintenance from funds which they had raised and due to the fact that the Great Kei Municipality were not attending to the maintenance issues in Kei Mouth, they felt that the Municipality could not be held responsible for this major issue. The second issue was the matter of land which the Kei Mouth community had purchased and was used as commonage and under the new Council, it appeared that the Mayor wanted to sell it off to developers. This had the effect of bringing the community together to oppose the exploitation of what they felt was a community asset. The Cwili community also felt that their interests in Kei Mouth were not being attended to as they were represented by Councilors who had a largely rural constituency.

After the dispute was declared, the community wrote to Umhlaba Consulting Group to stop work on the project as they did not want it to be approved until matters were resolved between the community and the Great Kei Municipality. The KMLSDF process was halted after that and although the consultants engaged with the Department Of Local Government and Housing and the Amathole District Municipality, the planning process never resumed and the document still remains in draft format.

9. Duncan Village Local Spatial Development Framework Case Study

9.1. Background to the Duncan Village Local Spatial Development Framework

In late 2003, the Buffalo City Municipality embarked on an ambitious programme to redevelop the area known as Duncan Village and, in the process, uplift the Duncan Village community. This programme, which was named the Duncan Village Redevelopment Initiative (DVRI), was a complex, multi-faceted and multi-disciplinary initiative, and the National Department of Housing and the Eastern Cape Provincial Department of Housing; Local Government & Traditional Affairs joined the Buffalo City Municipality in this venture.

Within the context of the DVRI Programme, the Duncan Village Local Spatial Development Framework (or DVLSDF), was formulated which described, from a broad perspective, the spatial proposals and associated infrastructure development necessary to enable the implementation of the DVRI target of developing over time some 20,000 dwellings at various localities within Duncan Village itself and, beyond this area, within an identified Urban Renewal Zone, which extended eastward and north/north-west of Duncan Village.

It was intended that the 20,000 dwellings be developed in an integrated manner with appropriate levels of access to supportive social facilities and adequate public transport to ensure the mobility of the beneficiary population to be able to reach all areas of social and economic opportunity.

Focused investment in the Urban Renewal Zone to permit the scale of DVRI as envisaged would also unlock development space for other initiatives and could see the development of an additional 10,000 dwellings or more in the area over an extended period of time. This was equivalent to the development of the scale of Mdantsane and would represent a major restructuring of the urban environment of East London. This would result in enhanced thresholds for the delivery of services on a sustainable basis as well as a more concentrated urban market relating to massive economic growth potential over the next 20 to 30 year period.

Aside from the focus on the residential developments over time, it was intended to redevelop specific areas or elements of the urban environment in Duncan Village to improve the area

for residents, and to provide spaces for the development of local economic opportunities. The principal proposals in this regard are:

- To redesign and redevelop a significant stretch of Douglas Smit Highway into a Main Street type of environment, thereby providing spaces for a higher intensity of land use, including commercial and residential uses, to be developed alongside its alignment;
- The planning and development of a Mixed Land Use node and Central Market at the intersection of Douglas Smit Highway and Jabavu Street; and
- The packaging of a call for development proposals in regard to a proposed Gateway development at the Fitchet Road entrance to Duncan Village.

From a broader socio-economic perspective, the Local Spatial Development Framework proposed that it would be necessary to plan and implement several key activities and development programmes to ensure a balanced and integrated approach is maintained over an extended period of time to achieving sustainable developmental outcomes for DVRI.

These are highlighted in the report as follows: -

- A targeted Public Transport Plan for DVRI was an important requirement to ensure that appropriate strategies and operational measures are put in place to facilitate the improvement in mobility of people residing in Duncan Village and beyond in the Urban Renewal Zone. Mobility has become a central need for people, the majority of whom do not have access to private means of transport, to better enable them to access social and economic opportunities, and to exercise choice over where to access such opportunities.
- A multilateral Social Facilities Development Programme, which would aim at developing the necessary relationships between the responsible departments in Buffalo City Municipality with other spheres of government and other agencies responsible for the planning and development of “social goods” facilities such as schools, clinics, sports facilities, libraries and community centres. The objective of this Programme would be to ensure that residents in the Urban Renewal Zone have improved levels of access to such “social goods” facilities over time, either by ensuring adequate transport to such facilities or by developing the facilities in well-planned localities within the Zone.
- A DVRI Local Economic Development & Training programme, which entailed detailing the requirements for elements such as: (a) Small enterprises training and management support; (b) Training in construction and related skills; (c) Planning of sites for local economic enterprises (formal and informal); (d) An urban agriculture and food security programme; and (e) IT Skills Training.¹⁶

¹⁶ Duncan Village Local Spatial Development Framework (2008)

9.2. Interviews with key stakeholders

Interviews on the outcomes of the DVLSDf were held with a number of stakeholders. The first interview conducted was with an official of Buffalo City Metropolitan Municipality who was responsible for the development of the DVLSDf. The official stressed the point that the DVLSDf was the most time extensive forward planning process that the Municipality had ever embarked on. The process of formulating the DVLSDf started in October 2004 and was approved by Council almost four years later in October 2008.

The DVLSDf process started with intensive community research undertaken by the Fort Hare Institute of Social and Economic Research in analyzing a whole range of demographic and socio-economic information. This was coupled with a comprehensive shack and population survey undertaken by a well established engineering company. This research formed the basis of the planning process.

The engagement process with the community started on the basis of interacting with them and agreeing on the best way for the community participation process to unfold. The mass meetings were held in the Gompo Hall, a central community hall in Duncan Village with the average attendance of about 200 people who represented the community structures in Duncan Village. It was further agreed that additional public participation meetings would be held at a Ward level due to the huge population numbers and the need to spread the coverage about the aims and objectives of the DVLSDf. These meetings were held where presentations were done in English and then translated into Xhosa so that as many people would be able to participate on a meaningful level. Separate meetings were also held with the political structures in Duncan Village to ensure the widest possible buy in to the DVLSDf process. All of the meetings reportedly took place with a high level of enthusiasm and interaction from the community representatives bearing in mind that the proposals were to be implemented over both the short and long term. The major issues raised by the Municipality and responded to by the community were the issues of densification/de-densification of informal settlements and housing, people living within floodplain prone areas and the constant threat of shack fires within Duncan Village.

This intensive first phase of community participation was followed by a more inward approach by the newly elected Ward and Proportional Representative Councilors of Duncan Village following the local government elections in 2006. This phase was where the newly

elected Councilors wanted to be taken through all aspects of the project and a series of workshops and meetings were held to bring them up to speed on the DVLSDF. At the same time the Project Steering Committee was set up to oversee the implementation of the project consisting of all the Ward and Proportional Representative Councilors from Duncan Village together with officials from the various Directorates in the Municipality. This new inward focused consultation process caused massive delays in finalizing the DVLSDF project.

In analyzing the positives and negatives with the finalization and approval of the DVLSDF, it was pointed out that the project went from being a consultative driven process to one of more political interference by Councilors and eventually distrust between the Councilors and the officials. Political factionalism or support for different political leaders also reared its head in Duncan Village over this time. There were many positive aspects to the DVLSDF project, one of them being that it was eventually approved by full Council in late 2009. Some of the major infrastructure proposals have very recently begun implementation such as the major diversion of the wastewater from Central treatment works to the Reeston works. The relocation of hundreds of Duncan Village residents to the newly built subsidized housing projects in Reeston was also a positive signal that the de-densification process was actually happening.

However, it was pointed out that a lot went wrong with the project especially after the DVLSDF was approved by Council.

- There was no concerted programme and budget to drive the implementation process within the Municipality.
- The DVRI Unit was established but lacked the capacity and will to actually take on the complex task of implementation.
- The Municipality also lost critical skills which inhibited its ability to negotiate with external partners to assist in implementation.
- Another factor was the inability of the Municipality to enforce its own land management strategy to achieve its block movement and redevelopment strategy. This resulted in the process not gaining any traction at all.

Institutional capacity was critical to give people access to land and the Municipality were lacking in this regard. No matter how good or bad the planning process was, institutional capacity was needed for implementation and to achieve the success of the plan. In his view, the Municipality lost major credibility by raising expectations through the DVLSDF process

but were then unable to deliver tangible service delivery results as spelt out in the implementation plan.

Of the three pilot housing projects identified, only two were implemented in Meken Street and Haven Hills but these were also beset by problems with the contractors abandoning the sites and some of the newly constructed housing units becoming vandalized.

10. Emerging Issues

The following issues emerge from an analysis of the two case studies:

- Importance of participation

Both case studies show that by following thorough community participation processes, broad acceptance of the proposals in an SDF can be achieved.

- Importance of local planning

In both case studies, it is evident that the level and scale of planning is also important. It is much easier to achieve participation and reach consensus when planning is undertaken at a local or community level as opposed to planning at a regional or provincial level.

- Capacity to implement plans

While national leaders have fingered local government for the crisis of service delivery failures, observers have suggested that South Africa's programme of decentralization has simply overwhelmed the capacities of new and fragile local governments. According to Kulipossa (2004), as quoted in Harrison et al (2008),¹⁷ for example, South Africa tried too much too quickly – there should have been a more gradual strengthening of the fragile institutional forms at local level through a careful, pragmatic and gradual process of decentralization, rather than lumbering local government so suddenly with such onerous responsibilities. Atkinson (2003:2) asks the critical question, 'are local governments and their administrations actually capable of fulfilling their developmental mandate (as enshrined in the Constitution, the Municipal Structures Act, and the Municipal Systems Act)?'

For planners, the question must be extended: to what extent have IDPs and SDFs alleviated or even contributed to the apparent crisis in local government? It is possible that the preparation of IDPs (and the preparation of other plans and strategies required by national legislation) has been a considerable short-term burden for authorities where high-level skills

¹⁷ ibid

are scarce, and has absorbed energies that may have been placed productively elsewhere. In this sense, planning may be complicit in the current crisis. The critical question, however, is whether, from a longer-term perspective, integrated development planning is building local capacity for the strategic and integrated decision-making and action that will eventually lead to better outcomes.

The critical issue is the relationship between the planning system and the differential capacity of municipal government. Arguably, one of the key problems with the development of post-apartheid planning was the lack of attention that was given to the huge diversity among municipalities and, as a result, the one-size-fits-all system was too sophisticated for many weaker authorities, and too limited for the larger and better-capacitated authorities. Also, the uniform nature, and national determination, of the system meant that local planning in post-apartheid South Africa lacked the open, experimental nature of planning in countries such as Brazil and the United States, for example.

- Need for proactive planning

Access to land by communities has been a priority since the dawn of democracy in South Africa in 1994 and it appears to be an ongoing call. The need from communities to access land for social and economic purposes has come from both urban and rural areas. Where planning systems are strong and there is capacity at the governmental level, communities have received assistance when it comes to accessing public land. However, when the policy and planning systems are weak, government departments have not been able to respond to the request from communities and this has had different outcomes. One can argue that part of the reason for the widespread service delivery protests in our country is because of the failure of the policy and planning systems to respond proactively to community needs

- Relationship of SDF to IDP and housing plans

Part of the current complexity of the Municipal planning system has to do with the integration of various sector plans. Under the umbrella of the IDP are a number of sector plans which have to be developed including the housing sector plan, environmental management plan, waste management plan, water services plan, etc. The inability in many instances to integrate the work of the various sector plans creates problems for the municipal planning and budgeting system. Where the SDF's are well developed, they have the ability to spatially plan where new investments and projects should go. The converse is also true that when SDF's are not well developed, the investments and projects have a low level of integration.

11. Recommendations

The purpose of this case study is to draw broad reasons and recommendations for SDF planning, but a few more specific recommendations are made for each of the case studies. These recommendations should not replace the need for a more detailed evaluation and review of each SDF plan.

A. Kei Mouth

- Include as part of the LSDF, the establishment of a local development forum. Task this forum with monitoring the implementation of the SDF after its adoption and approval and require the municipality to report on a regular basis to this structure. It should be treated as an advisory structure,
- Conduct a rapid review of the SDF to update and modify it based on new developments

B. Duncan Village

- Due to the size and scale of Duncan Village, it is much more complex as it affects the broader municipality. (See many of the broader recommendations below)
- Conduct a review of the plan (and its implementation) and make recommendations to augment the Project Steering Committee. to monitor and steer the implementation of the plan
- Capacitate and restructure the DVRI unit so that technical capacity is brought in to assist with the implementation and monitoring of projects

C. Broad recommendations

Restructure the planning processes

1. Promote local SDF's as opposed to District or Regional (or even municipal) wide plans and link SDF's to ward based planning.
2. Split Municipal and even local SDFs into more local area based plans (e.g. Duncan Village was divided into three planning areas and the community participation went down to branch level)

3. Differentiate planning requirements in different types of municipalities. This requires that municipal planning capacity assessments are undertaken and that Municipalities are categorized where the low capacity municipalities can undertake simpler forms of planning to meet their needs.
4. Co-ordinate, simplify and align funding streams so that it becomes less difficult to secure funding for different phases and stages of development projects. This will encourage more multi-year project planning.
5. Conceptualize and arrange development of an SDF as a long term incremental process. For example, in the first year or first round of SDF development, just do basic planning (especially in low capacity Municipalities). Over time, as the municipality gains experience and confidence, require them to formulate more detailed SDF's. This approach may require more investigation.
6. Establish District/ provincial structures (like in the Great Kei Municipality where the Amathole District Municipality got involved) to do the planning. This must be done where there are a limited number of planners in order to centralize planning capacity. The Municipalities should also consider mentorship programmes where planners on the ground are supported by more experienced counterparts.
7. The same centralizing concept should apply for capacity to implement projects .
8. Ensure that the SDF and housing sector plans are properly co-ordinated and that the SDF sets out the framework for the new housing developments to occur.
9. Ensure that plans include both short term and long term proposals so that people can see the results of their participation in planning from the start.
10. Spatial planning in communal areas needs to be further investigated especially in rural areas with no clear planning legislation. Pilot projects should be undertaken to deal with these challenges.
11. Conduct socio economic studies as early in the planning process as possible. This should not however delay the planning process, Plans can always be modified when new data becomes available. It is also useful to involve the community in this data gathering phase of the SDF where possible.

12. Make use of technology to make plans easier to explain and understand. For example use graphic design techniques to help explain density implications of various options in terms of land use. Digital aerial mapping also can be used to show people exactly where different land use proposals would be located. This might increase capacity requirements for planners involved so a period of training would be recommended.
13. Keep politics out of the administration. The Duncan Village case study shows that where there is an imbalance between the politicians and the administration, the SDF process together with the intended outcomes usually suffers. Politicians and administrators need to understand their respective roles and responsibilities and adhere to these.

Capacity building and awareness raising

14. Build the capacity of officials to do planning. Use initiatives like courses on “Planning for non- planners” being developed by Free State university to enhance the capacity of officials.
15. Build the capacity of councilors to understand their role in planning and implementation.
16. Build project management capacity to manage and implement projects. This is an urgent requirement especially at a local level so that plans can be implemented on the ground.
17. Establish a provincial planning forum or a provincial wide community of practice – that includes planners and non planners to share experiences and lessons learnt.
18. The communities expectations of what planning can achieve should be managed by indicating what is realistic and achievable in the planning process.

Monitoring and evaluation

19. Initiate a project checklist/ pipeline approach to monitor progress of projects from planning to implementation.
20. Include the concept of a Project Steering Committee in any approved SDF that will be able to monitor and ensure that plans get implemented and that this structure is empowered to report to Council if there are problems with implementation.

21. Establish steering committees for projects that get identified in the planning process to monitor the implementation of these specific projects.
22. Evaluate past planning efforts before formulating new plans. Learn from past lessons as to what was successful and what posed problems.
23. Require regular evaluations of planning methodologies. The process of formulating an SDF should be reviewed every five years.
24. Planners should reconsider the whole planning approach, which would imply a shift from the present planning approach to a possible modified future planning approach as outlined below:
 - a) The present approach (plan - action), the following process is followed:
 - Planning specifies a desired future outcome by showing corridors, land use zones, location of future projects/ initiatives, etc.
 - The plan then lists all the steps to reach this outcome. For example, to achieve this outcome, responsibilities and resources must be allocated and this should be monitored over a time period.
 - b) In the possible new approach (plan - action – review – re-plan), planning would be about:
 - Providing a broad vision
 - identifying only the basic/ first initial steps to move towards this broad vision:
 - Monitoring and evaluation of success of implementing these initial steps in moving towards the broader vision, and identification of the next follow up steps to keep one moving towards this broader long term vision.
25. What is lacking in the present planning system is a strong feedback loop. Plans are there but they are not being implemented and people don't know what to do to steer the plan and hold those responsible for implementing the plan to account.
26. National government through the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform who is presently responsible for the planning function should establish a planning innovation fund and or programme (an innovation unit) This unit/ fund must make money available to municipalities (and others) to experiment with how they do planning. In some instances this programme/ unit must be able to override certain planning

requirements and procedures that existing legislation imposes so that people can do things differently and learn from these experiences.

27. This unit or programme should have the necessary capacity with a strong monitoring and evaluation section so that serious evaluations can be done on which planning systems work in which contexts, to inform and provide lessons for further planning. .

Recommendations for Civil society

The following are specific recommendations for what civil society can do in relation to these broad recommendations:

1. Use whatever opportunities they have to promote these broad recommendations.
2. Lobby for a community of practice around planning at provincial level
3. become familiar with and engage in the provincial planning review process
4. Initiate programmes and projects to build the capacity of communities to participate in the whole planning and delivery process so that they can both influence planning decisions and monitor implementation of agreed plans
5. Conduct research into and implement pilot projects where communities are involved in collecting and analyzing data (e.g. existing land use, socio economic surveys, etc.) that can be used for planning purposes.
6. Undertake pilot projects of local SDF's at ward level linked to community based or ward based plans,. Insights from the Asset Based Community Development approach can be incorporated.
7. Research and explore incremental processes of developing SDF's by identifying what is the least that needs to be part of a SDF at the start and how the content and process of developing the plan can be 'expanded' over time.

12. Conclusion

The findings of this research report including the two case studies that were conducted has found that although Spatial Development Framework plans are being developed and communities are involved, these plans and their outcomes are not being implemented. What is an important finding though is that local planning is absolutely critical to ensure community involvement in the planning process. Participation in the planning processes by communities is essential to achieve maximum buy-in to the plan and the desired outcomes.

However, what is clear is that the capacity of the Municipalities to implement the proposals and projects emanating from the plans is extremely weak. This gives rise to issues of credibility from the planners formulating the plans. The blurring of the lines between Councilors and officials as was highlighted in the Duncan Village case study also has the ability to prolong the planning process and to derail the plans. There is a clear need to develop an initiative to separate the roles and responsibilities between Councilors and officials when developing SDF's. Community support organizations can also play a critical role in the monitoring of the implementation of SDF's.

13. References

- Democracy and Delivery- Urban Policy in South Africa: U. Pillay, R. Tomlinson and J. Du Toit (2006)
- Guidelines for the Development of Spatial Development Frameworks: Department of Rural Development and Land Reform (2010)
- Planning and Transformation- Learning from the Post-Apartheid Experience: P. Harrison, A. Todes and V. Watson (2008)
- Jensen & Richardson 2003
- Healey 2004:46