

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Section 1: Description of the Khayelitsha (T1 V2) neighbourhood	3
Section 2, part 1: Main Themes Emerging from Interviews Conducted in Khayelitsha	5
Broad, Khayelitsha-level themes.....	5
The economic.....	6
The social and political	7
Services and infrastructure.....	8
Khayelitsha Core and T1 V2 positioning in the Khayelitsha development landscape	9
Conclusion	10
Section 2, part 2: Overview of Literature available about Khayelitsha	11
Government Articles.....	11
City of Cape Town Census 2001 – 2006 Wards, Ward 94	11
City of Cape Town Census 2001. Khayelitsha.	11
Socio-Economic Profile for Ward 94. 2005 City of Cape Town.	12
Business Plan for Urban Renewal Programme: Khayelitsha and Mitchell’s Plain (document undated).....	12
Department of Provincial and Local Government & the Business Trust. ????. Khayelitsha Nodal Economic Development Profile.	14
QJS Consultants and Unit for Religion and Development Research, University of Stellenbosch. July 2006. Socio-Economic Profiling of Urban Renewal Nodes: Khayelitsha and Mitchell’s Plain. Compiled for Information and Knowledge Management Department, City of Cape Town.	15
MCA Africa. August 2006. Shared Learnings from the City of Cape Town's Urban Renewal Programme. Compiled for the City of Cape Town: Information and Knowledge Management Department.....	16
Karen Small. August 2007. A Comparison of Different Dwelling Types in Khayelitsha: Demographic and Socio-Economic Information. Strategic Development Information and GIS Department: City of Cape Town.....	17
18/02/03: In the heart of Cape Town's Khayelitsha township. <i>Financial mail</i>	18
31/07/03: R300m for Khayelitsha CBD. From http://www.southafrica.info/doing_business/economy/development/urban/khayelitsha-310703.htm	18
27/5/09: Ziyanda Sidumo. MEC hits back amid protest. <i>Cape Argus</i>	18
Dewar. D. and V. Watson. 1984. <i>Introduction</i> . The Concept of Khayelitsha: A Planning Perspective. Working Paper No. 31. Urban Processes Research Unit, University of Cape Town.....	18
Cook. G. 1992. Khayelitsha: New settlement forms in the Cape Peninsula in D. Smith (ed). <i>The Apartheid City and Beyond: Urbanisation and Social Change in South Africa</i> . Wits University Press: Johannesburg. pg. 125-135	19
T.M. Tuswa. (date unknown). Service Delivery in the City of Cape Town: A Case Study in the Water Service in Khayelitsha. MPA, UWC.	21
Huchzermeyer, M. 2003. Low income housing and commodified urban segregation in South Africa. In C. Haferburg and J. Oßenbrugge, Eds. <i>Ambiguous Restructurings of Post-Apartheid Cape Town: the Spatial Form of Socio-Political Change</i> . 115-135.	23

Unit for Religion and Development Research, Stellenbosch University and Transformation Africa. (Date unknown). Khayelitsha Transformation Research Project.....	23
Bidandi, F. 2007. The effects of poor implementation of housing policy in the Western Cape : a study case of Khayelitsha Site C. M. Public Administration, School of Government, University of the Western Cape.	24
Section 3: Photograph Album of Khayelitsha	25

Introduction

This project aimed to explore the social, economic and political changes which have occurred over the last fifteen years in several areas in Cape Town, including Khayelitsha. To do this, interviews were conducted over a three week period. The researchers were supplied with some initial contacts in the area by the research coordinator, and from there the snowballing technique was used to acquire more informants. The people interviewed by the researchers represented a diverse spectrum of interests and roles within the community. For Khayelitsha, the following informants provided the information on the area: members of the Ward 94 Development Forum; representatives of the Violence Prevention through Urban Upgrading (VPUU) initiative; a local real estate agent; a school representative; a social worker at a local Counselling Centre; a representative of Students Health and Welfare Centres Organisation (SHAWCO); the councillor of Ward 94; a representative of the municipal government; local shop owners; and a representative of the Khayelitsha Development Forum (KDF). This document is organised into three sections: first, a brief description of the area is given, through information from the informants as well as from the researchers' perceptions from their time spent in the area. Second, an analysis of the key issues in Khayelitsha is explored. This is organised into two parts; the first looks at the key themes which emerged in the interviews with the key informants, while the second part looks at the themes covered in the literature regarding the area. The second section is a photograph album of the area which the researchers took during their time spent in Khayelitsha. While this document is by no means supposed to represent all the issues that Khayelitsha faces, nor the many opinions present in the neighbourhood, the key informants show a diverse spectrum of interests and roles within the community, and thus provided useful insight into the key issues in Khayelitsha.

Section 1: Description of the Khayelitsha (T1 V2) neighbourhood

Khayelitsha is an enormous area – you can enter at one part and see only one small facet; enter from another side and see something completely different. The area we were assigned to work in looked quite different from stereotypical images of Khayelitsha: T1 V2 had been built in the 1980s, and is defined by formal houses on relatively decent sized plots, with wide streets and some amenities. Along its outer borders, informal settlements along Pama Rd. and Lansdowne have grown, with lots of informal traders plying their trade along the main roads (including ready-to-go zinc shacks). Conversely, the 'Core' (those neighbourhoods which lie around T1 V2, had been built in the early to mid-1980s) are planned and established, with much less informality (either in trade or housing). However, informality is very present in the large permanent and 'temporary' backyard dwellings that have been established in almost every plot. Some people have formally (although not sure legally) extended their homes on every side, others have only a small 'hok', or backyard dwelling, set up at the back. However, the relatively large plots (compared to newer housing built in the nearby Greenpoint for example) lend themselves to this. Some home businesses are also observable: salons, taverns, spaza shops, dressmaking, meat sellers and braaiers, etc. These facilities are crucial in the lack of any retail or service facilities in the immediate neighbourhood.

The Eyethu Centre is the main public facility in the neighbourhood. This huge, red-roofed warehouse-like structure sits imposingly on Mongesi Rd, looking out across a wetland on the other side. A large belt of empty asphalt (a potential car park?) runs around the centre, punctuated by a bus stop. The centre has seen better days – there is little sign of life behind the metal and bolted gates which used to be the entrance. Outside, the Universal Kingdom of God Church has also erected a large banner across one section of the Centre's facade. Other than these few spaces of life and movement, the centre looks long forgotten, abandoned, and eerie.

However, other activities along Mongesi Rd. (the main road through the neighbourhood) are more vibrant: taxis and Golden Arrow buses tear down the street, connecting it up with the main arteries on Pama and Lwandle. On entering Mongesi from Lwandle, there is a large block high school at the corner of Mongesi and Lwandle. On rounding the bend in the road after the wetland, you pass a small nursery school, a riot of colour and noise from first thing in the morning. Opposite this on the pavement are stalls where people can buy meat, cooked and uncooked. Huge half-drums hold fires that are stoked all day long. Black grates packed with recently cleaned sheeps' heads sit atop these drums. The pavement is black with soot and ash from these all-day, everyday furnaces. Further on, a container with a spaza sits opposite another daycare facility and a community vegetable garden. On our first day in the area, we stopped at this garden to buy broccoli. We met some Zimbabwean women on their way to church also buying broccoli leaves there – similar to a favourite food difficult to come by in the Cape. They live in the area, renting a backyard structure. The cabbages in the garden are enormous -the soil seems to be quite clayey, not just sandy, because of the nearby wetland. Past the Eyethu Centre is the SHAWCO centre which houses a number of community projects, its drab grey exterior belying the exciting work that goes on inside. Adjacent to this is a low rise primary school, with some nicely tended gardens; and opposite a container with a salon, internet cafe and West African clothes shop. Suddenly, Mongesi ends in the busy Pama Rd. - one can look across to Site C, and more schools within spitting distance of these T1 V2 ones.

Schools are abundant in the neighbourhood – driving around we would often happen upon another concrete (1980s apartheid special) block with spacious, but hard to maintain, grounds. There are no clinics in this neighbourhood, or government offices or representatives such as the police, social services, etc. For these, one needs to move across Lwandle or Pama Rd. to Lingeletu and Sanlam Centre, or head down to the CBD which is about 1 km from T1 V2. Sanlam Centre, and now the CBD, are the main hubs for people to do their shopping, banking, and any other formal business, as well as meet representatives of the state.

Passing through the streets, there are a lot of men (and older men) on the street corners during the day – women are less visible, we are not sure if it because they are in the house or at work. It is wintry weather during the two weeks we are there, and so that perhaps explains why children are not outdoors, although we are also there during school hours mainly. One sees lots of school children walking home in their uniforms by the mid-afternoon. We do not walk around much, staying in the car largely, as unknown, unaccompanied pedestrians raise a lot of eyebrows – strangers are unusual here. People have generally been living in this area since its genesis in the 1980s, at least those in the formal houses. Young people and newcomers must fight over the backyards.

Also interesting is the naming of the neighbourhood: the community of T1 V2 does not exist on the ground or on any signage of map, despite this census subplace definition. Within this area

are sections, mainly I, H and J, which are more commonly used by people to denote where they come from: “I stay in H” or “Here in I Section”. The units are smaller, but also bigger: there is reference to “Core Khayelitsha” or “Khayelitsha Core” or Sections A-J which talk of the wider area developed here in 1983 – the ‘original Khayelitsha’. These are more powerful discursive boundaries than Ward borders: for example, Ward 94, in which T1 V2 is situated, is so enormous that people do not see their neighbourhood as a ward. It is too multi-faceted, differentiated, etc. We had to learn the relevant section names quickly as our “T1 V2” elicited little response.

Ultimately, T1 V2 appears to be a ‘normalised’ township neighbourhood in a superficial sense: it has formal houses, planned streets, plotted yards, piped water, bulk sanitation, electricity, schools, shops (debatable), churches, playgrounds and parks, some street lights, etc. It has all the basics and is established, with 25 years of history. However, there is also a stasis of some sort – few new developments, other than the Family Counselling Centre and the community hall, have been built in the last few years. There has been no new housing development, other than private extensions, or school development. Facilities like libraries, good retail areas, clinics and police stations have gone to other, more popular nodes of development, like Ilitha Park, the CBD and Lingeletu. There is a sense, which is confirmed by the people living there, that this area is no longer on the development agenda of Khayelitsha: it was a primary focus in the 1980s, it is now ‘established’ and ‘developed’, there are other newer neighbourhoods of much greater need, such as Indlovini, Kuyasa, and the constant bugbears of Site C and Nqkubela. Current T1 V2 life is the responsibility and product of its private residents and their attempts to continue any ‘development’ of the neighbourhood.

Section 2, part 1: Main Themes Emerging from Interviews Conducted in Khayelitsha

Broad, Khayelitsha-level themes

Khayelitsha is a huge area, made of some 12 wards and within that, multiple neighbourhoods of various characters. It is a very heterogeneous place in terms of income, housing type, service level and employment statuses, but is less heterogeneous in terms of race and language. Its history and legacy of apartheid planning as a “dormitory town” continue to haunt it and define its development needs – there are few formal local job opportunities, a huge reliance on transport because of its distance from economic nodes, little retail and lifestyle provision, etc. There is definitely a sense in all the interviews of not being integrated into the wider Cape Town city: of a history on the periphery, and the difficulties in the present of responding to such intractable issues as geography, land availability and distance.

However, there is also an understanding that Khayelitsha is here to stay: it is a permanent site of African urbanity in Cape Town. “Khayelitsha is no longer a temporary structure! These people belong in Cape Town. There is no more going back!” noted a representative of the KDF (4 June 2009). With its history of 25 years of settlement, this area and its residents are not going anywhere, despite their initial temporal claims to the city. It is becoming a normalised place, where schools can compete over learners, as noted by a local school representative (5 June 2009), structures for grievance-airing are established, people don't think in terms of their street

but their wider 'sub-city'. A real estate agent commented that in 10 years time, Khayelitsha “will look a lot like traditional real estate markets” (1 June 2009).

However, Khayelitsha as a growing area is also very important in the interviews conducted: not only is it the biggest township in Cape Town, with the political power behind that; but most of the new migrants to the city (some 50% it is estimated) choose to settle in this area. Estimates from our participants state some 10,000 new arrivals set up house in Khayelitsha every year. This influx has very real ramifications for development planning and service delivery - the “weight is heavy” said a representative of Ward 94's Development Forum (5 June 2009). Such growth exacerbates tensions over resource allocation, as well as other fractures (class, place of birth, 'cityness', political party affiliations). Bad statistics over the actual population of Khayelitsha, which range from the Census' 329,000 to the KDF's 1,000,000 also affect planning and budgeting.

But, despite these huge demands on resources, the interviews do display a sense that Khayelitsha is on the up: “developing is happening here slowly” noted a representative of the Khayelitsha Youth Development Council (27 May 2009). Of course, this may be a dominant theme because of the type of people we interviewed (city managers, councillors, community structure leaders, etc.). But whatever the perceptions, the area has received and is receiving a lot of infrastructure, both hard and soft, through the Urban Renewal Programme since 2001, which involves multiple tiers of government and a wide conglomeration of local structures with a heavy dose of private funding. At a Ward Level, such as in Ward 94 where our focal area was – which included the Khayelitsha Business District (KBD) – these physical, infrastructural interventions are obvious (although maybe even more so in other wards like where Harare and Kuyasa are). However, at a neighbourhood level (even in the Core neighbourhoods in a site like T1 V2), these interventions appear more limited: there are still very real challenges particularly around land, housing, safety and employment.

The economic

Unemployment was mentioned by all whom we interviewed, as well as various programmes that are being undertaken to respond to this crisis, such as skills development programme at SHAWCO, a local church and Khayelitsha Training Centre. Unemployment is linked by some respondents to crime. There is lots of crime in T1 V2; crime affects business particularly. There is also gendered formal employment – women leave the house to go and work, as noted by a representative of SHAWCO in Khayelitsha (27 May 2009). There is also a generational dimension to unemployment: the youth are particularly unemployed, as explain by a member of the Khayelitsha Youth Development Council (27 May 2009).

In such a context, small 'informal' businesses are key to survival. In T1 V2, and Khayelitsha more broadly, there are lots of informal activities going on, which have expanded over the decade. But these home businesses are quite difficult to set up and succeed, as some young entrepreneurs shared with us, especially in regards to crime. In T1 V2, even big businesses at the Eyethu centre closed down because of safety concerns. Also, apparently people do not want to support local businesses, as explained by a local young entrepreneur (1 June 2009). Renting formal premises is too expensive for most. There is also a lot of duplication – people offering the same services or products, which means it is harder to make a living out of this. Little value-adding activity is going on – it is all retail. There is also a high turnover in business.

The social and political

The interviews also spoke to a number of interesting social trends. Multiple classes exist in Khayelitsha: there are richer neighbourhoods like Graceland and Ilitha Park next door to very poor ones like Indlovini and Site C. There are also some more middle of the road neighbourhoods, such as T1 V2, where people are doing a bit better economically than those in the informal settlements, but who have accessed formal housing through a particular historical juncture in the 1980s rather than through the private market (like the real estate agency caters to) or the civil service. There is a lot of movement within Khayelitsha – people moving from one neighbourhood to another as their prospects improve or decline, going from informal to formal housing, and some vice versa. There has also been a movement out of the area by professionals to neighbourhoods like Kuils River, Eerste Rivier and Mandalay which are close by, but safer, and have better commercial and public facilities and transport infrastructure.

Class differences are made visible here by housing types: formal vs. informal, but more subtly through other categories such as “location folks” and “rural folks”, where people are defined by their place of birth and their level of 'cityness'. Young people are particularly under pressure to ascribe to middle class norms of urbanity, as a representative of the local SHAWCO initiative and a representative of the Khayelitsha Youth Development Forum explained (27 May 2009; 27 May 2009). However, the middle class in Khayelitsha is also key to understanding the level of organisation and presence of structures such as the Khayelitsha Development Forum (KDF), which has been able to mobilise and market the area as it has because of people's skills and some level of resources (like cars, petty cash, internet access, etc.) behind it.

Leading on from this is a major theme that came up across many of the interviews: that Khayelitsha is a very organised and active constituency, from the street level to the ward level to cross-ward suburb level. There are street committees, ward development forums, KDF structures, Khayelitsha Business Forum, etc. Development processes have to work through these structures.

Furthermore, these structures do not seem politically dependent. Government seems somewhat more peripheral to what happens, maybe because there are other channels of making things happen, like the KDF, who is the intermediary on all these issues. The lack of local government visibility and involvement may have something to do with this ambivalence about the role of councillors, who often don't pitch, as noted by several respondents or “get lost along the way”, as the members of the WDF explained (5 June 2009). People don't know what they are doing to help residents either. Councillors are also considered to be biased, only working for their own party members, although this does not stop things moving as it does in some areas. Only one respondent mentioned community structures' gate-keeping as a problem: he said, “people want to keep information to themselves especially where opportunities for money are involved” (29 May 2009). Generally people work hand in hand with these structures to get things done, not protest (although in informal areas this happens more). There is some sense though that, like the ANC nationally, the KDF has become a 'broad church' which has absorbed many of the other structures, or at least neutralised them.

However, this is not to say that these structures and processes are not politically contested. A number of the interviews spoke to the political divisions that increasingly define development processes. A young youth leader told us of how “If I don't belong to the ANC, I don't get anything”. A non-profit representative confirmed that “if you don't belong to their political organisation, they don't look after you: it's not supposed to be like that”. Another non-profit representative/educator talked about the increased level of infighting amongst local community structures; one street committee for one party, etc. She said, “This is something that is growing and I am afraid that it is going to escalate and overpower the other good things. Positive development processes in the area will be impeded because of the fighting. I see it happening”. Various people noted that although there have always been divisions, these are becoming more prominent with COPE on the scene. However, there is also an obvious political pragmatism practiced by many: “getting stuff done here is what counts” noted a local estate agent (1 June 2009), whichever political party is offering 'the stuff'.

In terms of diversity and social integration, a representative of the VPUU (27 May 2009) provided a useful analysis, saying that Khayelitsha generally exhibits a particular “South African schizophrenia” around the issue of foreigners: there is some tolerance mixed with an explicitly “local first” approach by KDF. A local church leader (3 June 2009) added that we cannot talk about social integration here so much as assimilation: “there is no compromise here: either you are assimilated to Xhosa or nothing”. Interviewees told us that there are some foreigners (but not a lot) in the T1 V2 area, renting shacks, rooms in houses, or houses. However, the relative scarcity of these foreign nationals (as compared to other areas like Harare for example) may have something to do with the following: two respondents, one foreign national and one local South African (1 June 2009; 27 May 2009 respectively) thought this lack of foreigners was because the area was relatively better off, and people did not have to rent their backyards out to strangers – their children or relatives stayed there. Some respondents noted that foreigners were originally shunned when they started arriving after 1994, but as time went on, intermarriage happened and more assimilation. There are few coloured families (who also become Xhosa speaking interestingly) and no whites. During the xenophobic attacks of 2008, there were “some problems” we were told, but it was “managed”. We were also told that there are only two foreign owned businesses in this section.

Services and infrastructure

At a Khayelitsha scale, the shortage of land for housing and infrastructure is a major hindrance. The politics around land, between different tiers of government are exacerbating this. Land invasions are a major problem for development managers, and land that is privately owned has also been difficult. Ultimately, development is hamstrung by the fact that “We cannot create land” a member of the WDF noted (5 June 2009).

This shortage of land is very real in T1 V2, which has been surrounded by other newer neighbourhoods in the last 20 years. Housing shortages remain a key issue in the Core, as well as wider Khayelitsha and its informal settlements of course. No new housing has been built in T1 V2 since the 1980s, meaning that subsequent generations have few housing options, especially in competition with all the newcomers in the peripheral informal settlements. Young people overcrowd with their own families in their parents' houses in T1 V2, or live in a backyard structure or extensions. There are many backyarders in the T1 V2 sections, because of relatively large plots. There are some tensions over sharing services with the main house, however,

backyarders seem to be much less of a priority than informal settlement dwellers on the development agenda as a member of the Khayelitsha Youth Development Council (27 May 2009) told us.

In terms of home ownership in the area, a lot of people bought their house about 10-15 years ago from the bank or the state, and have invested in their homes. Home ownership is complicated: people don't always know if they own legally or not, noted a real estate agent (1 June 2009). Rent collection and eviction are politically very difficult. There is a largely informal property market, but very active. Banks are increasingly coming to the party, and will give mortgages for property over R100,000 – so the market may become more formal as people get used to financial and formal property processes.

Outside of housing, other services are less of an issue here than in the poorer, newer parts of Khayelitsha: people did not really express dissatisfaction with water provision, electricity, transport, schooling, etc. An entrepreneur who we spoke to (1 June 2009), a long term H section resident, did complain of the deterioration of these services though. And while transport is available, real mobility remains expensive and exclusive to those with cars. Schools, while present, are overcrowded – some classes are as large as 70 learners, noted a representative of the Khayelitsha branch of SHAWCO (27 May 2009). Retail is also lacking (the nearby Eyethu Centre is pretty derelict, Sanlam Centre is some distance away), but this has been improved with the new KBD (although this is quite an exclusive centre). People were very excited about the banks at the new shopping centre (although otherwise people are not very impressed with the 'shopping centre' as they call it – it does not deserve the label of 'mall'). There is also a shortage of nearby clinics. Other services like information and financial services are also important here. Government services have set up shop locally so that has also made these more accessible, while safety and security remain another big service need, as mentioned by representatives of the VPUU (27 May 2009) as well as the school representative (5 June 2009).

Khayelitsha Core and T1 V2 positioning in the Khayelitsha development landscape

There was a definite sense that despite all that is going on in Khayelitsha, the Core (of which T1 V2 is a key part) are not on the main development agenda now, compared to new neighbourhoods like Kuyasa and Harare. It is almost as if they had their turn in the '80s, and now receive little input. This is in the context of the wider and very capital intensive URP strategy which has some serious nodes of activity in other parts of the ward, as explained by a representative of the URP in Khayelitsha (29 May 2009). Because of this perceived need for continued development, there is some tension between Core dwellers and informal settlement dwellers: not only in terms of class and place of birth (town-born vs Eastern Capers, but mainly in terms of resources. Brick houses are pitted against the shacklands, as many respondents noted, with their very different service needs, in a bid to get a piece of a pie that is only catering to some 300,000 people (when there are obviously many more). The URP representative (29 May 2009) commented on the tensions faced by the URP to improve the existing housing stock on one hand, but also build new stock on the other. The WDF member (5 June 2009) explained that: "In the informal settlements there are no water or sanitation services, with people relying on communal toilets or having to relieve themselves in open spaces around the settlements. In the core areas [under which T1 V2 falls] the services are not a 100% but they are far much better than in the informal settlements." In terms of negotiating these demands, he explained that they do

“recognise that there are also challenges in the core houses, where for example you will find backyard dwellers who say 'we have grown up here, we also want access to housing so we can be independent and establish ourselves'. But on the other hand we see that the issues are more complex in the informal settlements where people have to make do not only with informal housing, but without basic services such as water and sanitation. The person in the core houses can go easily get water from taps (inside or as in the case of backyard dwellers just outside their house structures) so we have to weigh what is bigger... There aren't necessarily tensions between people coming into the area and those who have been here [for a long time], but people in the informal settlements often do not feel like they are a part of the community. Not only are they different in terms of access to basic services but may feel isolated as they do not receive the information they need about what is happening in the community” (WDF member, 5 June 2009).

Not only is there some tension over development resources between core neighbourhoods like T1 V2 and other newer, informal areas, but within T1 V2 there are generational tensions. Older people benefited from the development of Khayelitsha core in the 1980s; however, their children have no such promise to look forward to. Maybe younger people in new areas like Makhaza and Kuyasa will get something, but in the core sections, there is little hope for new development.

Conclusion

So overall, in terms of changes between 1994 and 2001, there were not many government or economic interventions in T1 V2, other than interventions around some schools by KDF and the like, some new non-profits setting up shop, new informal businesses springing up and private residents extending their homes. The area was heavily invested in during the 1980s such that it has been regarded as needing little interference since then. Most services were in place since then (water, electricity, sanitation, etc.), but maintenance has been somewhat of a problem. There remains a dearth of health and retail facilities particularly. In terms of social makeup, some foreigners have moved into the area since 1994, but not many. Backyard structures have multiplied, catering for younger generations' housing needs. If people are economically better off, they are more likely to have had long term employment since the 1980s, or set up their own home business – new formal job opportunities, especially for young people, are limited. Community structures are strong and organised, with each section having its own section committee, made up of street committees, who then report up to a complex structure with the Ward Development Forum, the Councillor and then the KDF and its sector committees. However, these structures are also characterised by more infighting and political fractures than they were in the early 1990s. And while T1 V2 is economically and infrastructurally better off than many other parts of Khayelitsha, there is a sense of stasis: a development plateau was reached by the 1990s, and little has progressed from there, other than when individual residents have made it happen. But perhaps that is the hallmark of a normalising neighbourhood. This study would have also benefited from interviews with more residents of T1 V2, not just development 'experts' who found it difficult to talk just at the scale of T1 V2.

Section 2, part 2: Overview of Literature available about Khayelitsha

Government Articles

City of Cape Town Census 2001 – 2006 Wards, Ward 94

This document gives the most recent census level data on the Ward 94 area (which was newly demarcated in 2006). It includes the areas of Ekuphumleni, Khayelitsha T1 V1 and Khayelitsha T1 V2. The population is 99% black, with 96% Xhosa speaking (some 2.29 speak other African languages). Of those who came to Ward 94 between 1996 and 2001, some 57% came from the Eastern Cape, then 29.45% from other areas of the Western Cape, and less than 10% from other provinces. More than 60% have less than Grade 12 education. 56.57% are employed, 36% (the largest category) within elementary occupations, and 15% (the next biggest single category) as service workers and then approximately 25% working as clerks, professionals and managers. Monthly incomes for over 95% are under R6400 a month. 72% live in brick houses on separate yards, and only 11% in backyards (formal and informal). 14% live in informal, stand alone structures. 42% own and have paid off their properties, 18% have yet to pay it off and some 28% rent. Most households are between 3-6 people. 88% use electricity; 11% use paraffin. 68% have access to inside piped water, 30% either in the yard or within 200m. 88.6% have access to a sewerage toilet, 10% have nothing. 99% have refuse removal weekly. Transport: about 20% of both men and women walk to work or school. Only 6% of men take buses, whereas 11% of women do. About 11% of both men and women take the train. Very low percentages take taxis – some 3% of men, 4% of women. For employed people, train is the most popular mode of transport. Household goods are also very interesting: some 75% own a refrigerator and some 75% own a television. Computers are very rare.

City of Cape Town Census 2001. Khayelitsha.

This document gives the most recent census level data on the wider Khayelitsha area: which is particularly useful to contextualise Ward 94, and T1 V2 within that. The stats are similar for race, ethnicity, language, etc. However, differences can be seen around education levels: more people in Ward 94 have matriculated or more. Only 49% of the wider Khayelitsha area is employed, vs. 56% in Ward 94. But the sectors are relatively similar. Income shows huge disparities: in wider Khayelitsha, most earners (some 78%) earn less than R1,600 per month, whereas 63% earn this or less in Ward 94. Also of huge disparity are the stats around housing: only 30% of wider Khayelitsha live in brick structures on separate stands, whereas some 72% do in Ward 94. There is also a much higher number of informal settlement residents in the wider area: 57%. With this, the home ownership stats adjust, as well as the service stats. Twice as many people use paraffin in the wider area: 22%; most do not have piped water in the house (only 20%); 26% have no sanitation. Within this context, Ward 94 looks very established (in terms of infrastructure and services) as well as better off (in terms of education and income).

Socio-Economic Profile for Ward 94. 2005 City of Cape Town.

Produced for every ward, this document explains which neighbourhoods are included in Ward 94 (the “suburbs Khayelitsha” - which are the core areas – and Site B), and then shares 2001 stats on those particular areas. There are some 32,747 residents, of which the vast majority are black (less than 1% other); some 56% employed (mainly women) in predominantly elementary occupations. The bulk (40%) earn between R19000 and R76800 per household per annum. There are 15 formally registered businesses which employ 165 employees. Interestingly, some 80% of this ward is zoned as commercial land and 45% as industrial – which do not resonate with the high residential usage. In the “Service profile”, there are 7 schools, 2 libraries, 1 taxi terminus, 1 bus terminus and one railway station in the area. Some 88% use electricity; 68% have access to piped water inside the house; 99% have their trash removed weekly by local government and 89% have access to a sewered flush toilet. Some 72% live in a house or brick structure on a separate stand.

What is most useful about this document is its review of current and past economic and human development projects and programmes, which in this area are mainly carried out under the City in partnership with the Urban Renewal Programme. These include the KBD and its attendant facilities, the Ntlazane upgrading and construction, Lookout Hill facility, a youth clinic, an HIV-AIDS project, an economic empowerment project and various Expanded Public Works Programme (EPWP) projects. There are no current provincial government initiatives in the ward at the time of writing.

Economic snapshot: Khayelitsha, Western Cape. [based on Census 2001 data, document undated].

This one-pager is also based on 2001 Census data, but has some interesting additions. Khayelitsha is said to be 35kms from the city. It also has some 2005 Population Register stats which put the population at 406779, and the employment rate at 35% (although I think they mean unemployment rate). Their use of the Household Subsistence Level as a poverty indicator is also different. They map out some urban themes: under housing, they note the high level of informality because of in-migration and decreasing household size; the lack of land and land invasions - “Housing remains the area's most significant development challenge”. Under commercial, they note the vibrancy of the informal sector particularly around transport hubs, as well as the new CBD. In terms of linkages to the rest of the city, they note that Khayelitsha is a long way from the city and other nodes, and the difficulties of public transport at this point. They mention the URP and its work in upgrading and densifying the area, as well as investing in infrastructure. As per local governance: “Frequent political changes have resulted in some institutional instability and delays in decision making.” They make a number of recommendations: for encouraged investment; housing provision; transport infrastructure; assist in formalisation of businesses.

Business Plan for Urban Renewal Programme: Khayelitsha and Mitchell’s Plain (document undated).

This document is useful in understanding the history, the vision, mandate and structures associated with the national Urban Renewal Programme. The “overall objective of the programme is to enable a systematic and sustained intervention to alleviate poverty and

significantly address underdevelopment in the Khayelitsha and Mitchell's Plain area" (pg. 6), with a variety of focal areas (pg.7-8). What is particularly interesting is seeing how the various levels of government, stakeholders and interest groups fit into the partnership: of which Khayelitsha Development Forum is a key group (see pg. 5).

Also useful are some other statistics and historical information about Khayelitsha as a neighbourhood. For example, on pg. 13 they quote a DBSA survey done in 2001 which found the population to be some 420,000 people in Khayelitsha – the same year that the StatsSA Census found 329,000. Also, "Khayelitsha developed in the 1980's for the purpose of absorbing the overflow of squatters from other townships within the metro." (pg. 13).

"Khayelitsha is a Xhosa name meaning a 'new home. Khayelitsha was conceptualised and established in the early eighties by the then apartheid government in order to accommodate all the African people that live in and around the Cape Metropolitan Area. The predominant planning objectives applied in the development of Khayelitsha were containment and isolation. As a result of being a product of an ideological initiative and not a developmental agenda, Khayelitsha is situated far from the centres of economic opportunity (located approximately 27 kilometres from Cape Town), and is located on a land that is costly to develop and to habit (has high water table and is sandy).

Khayelitsha forms part of the City of Cape Town's Metro South East Region, commonly known as Cape Town's 'poverty trap'. Whereas the community of Khayelitsha is not homogenous, the majority is classified as being poor. Despite numerous attempts to change the situation, the community of Khayelitsha is still living under appalling conditions and is engulfed by numerous social ills.

Since inception, Khayelitsha has grown at a phenomenal rate to accommodate an influx of people from the Eastern Cape. After the demise of apartheid government, the influx of people into Khayelitsha accelerated. Today Khayelitsha is the fastest growing residential area in the Cape Metropolitan Area. Originally planned for a population of 250 000 residents, Khayelitsha is presently home to approximately 600 000 people.

Critical priorities: Housing and health, safety and security as well as job creation are priority issues for Khayelitsha and are reflected in the lack of formal housing, overcrowding and general dysfunctionality of the area.

Trends: Unless interventions are made, the following trends will continue:

- Deterioration of the physical living conditions linked to high levels of HIV/Aids/TB,
- High levels of crime,
- Physical separations from metro, but also with regard to economic integration." (pg.14-15)

They go on to flesh out ways of responding to this through the URP strategy (pg. 15; 18-19).

There are then progress indicators (pg.20-1) and funding details (from pg. 23) towards the end of the document.

Department of Provincial and Local Government & the Business Trust. ????. Khayelitsha Nodal Economic Development Profile.

This report overviews what has gone on in Khayelitsha as part of the Nodal Economic Profiling Project (see pg. 3 for details on this). Some particularly useful background information on pg. 4 confirms details in other reports, but adds that Khayelitsha is Cape Town's biggest township, and second largest in South Africa. It also asserts that it was designed as a "dormitory town" and therefore relies on commuters to commute to work and bring money back: this isolation is key to many development challenges. It lists areas of formal and informal development; transport details; demographic information (pg. 4-5); service provision and infrastructure (pg. 5); health care (pg. 5) and municipal budgets for development (mainly around URP Anchor Projects and from private sources). It highlights the main development needs at present (pg. 7) and then some projects that are responding to these.

The third section looks at the Khayelitsha economy, which shows an increase in GDP over the last decade, but one that is still below the Western Cape average (pg. 9). Wholesale and retail trade account for a large share of nodal GDP, as do civil sector employees. They believe that "construction, wholesale and retail trade, and transport and communication are the areas with the most potential for growth." (pg. 10).

Section 4 looks at Governance and the IDP: there is a very useful mapping out of various governance structures on pg. 10. However, this is too briefly dealt with.

Section 5 looks at Economic Growth and Investment Opportunity (pg.12-). Here, the main residential challenges are outlined (in comparison to Mitchell's Plain):

- Much of the housing in Khayelitsha is informal
- Continued population growth and the decreasing size of households is putting increasing pressure on housing supply
- There is very little empty land available and land required for other uses has been invaded
- Locating and securing land for low-cost housing is a serious challenge" (pg. 12).

They identify 4 sites for potential development (pg. 12-13).

In terms of commerce, they talk about the landmark KBD (pg. 13-14). They then address "City Linkages" (pg. 15-) where they call for more cooperative and coordinated multiple forms of public transport. However, they note that "The distance between the Metropolitan South East and the Cape Town CBD will remain a key constraint to integrating nodal residents into the circuits of Cape Town's economy." (pg. 15).

Overall, the report concludes:

"The key challenges facing Khayelitsha are spatial marginalisation, overcrowded living conditions, HIV/AIDS, crime and lack of access to public amenities. The population of Khayelitsha is poor, many people are unemployed or economically inactive, and most people earn below the household

subsistence level. Khayelitsha's GDP has increased gradually over the past decade, but its GDP growth and GDP per capita figures are far below those of the Western Cape. The wholesale and retail trade sector shows promising growth and accounts for a large share of nodal GDP. Even though Khayelitsha is far from the city centre, transport infrastructure is good. The rail extension and purchase of new rolling stock should alleviate congestion to some extent. However, little is being done to integrate Khayelitsha businesses into areas outside the node." (pg.19).

QSJ Consultants and Unit for Religion and Development Research, University of Stellenbosch. July 2006. Socio-Economic Profiling of Urban Renewal Nodes: Khayelitsha and Mitchell's Plain. Compiled for Information and Knowledge Management Department, City of Cape Town.

This document has more background on the URP strategy (pg. 5). It assessed the socio-economic status of Khayelitsha and Mitchell's Plain both quantitatively and qualitatively. They surveyed household heads, and ran qualitative focus groups from both informal and formal areas (where they asked about challenges in the community, integration in wider Cape Town, government projects on the go, etc. (pg. 7). For the survey, 547 households were visited in Khayelitsha (pg. 8-9 for sampling details).

Pg. 11 gives some useful background on Khayelitsha, some similar to other documents, but with some additions: Khayelitsha as a residential area came out of a cabinet decision in 1979; 1984 marked the first voluntary settlement (between 1979 and 1984 was a time of political violence and bloodshed). Some interesting data on migration is also analysed on pg. 14-15: "for the period 2000 to 2005 migration flows show a change from primarily in-migration from the Eastern Cape to internal migration within Khayelitsha, together with in-migration from areas within the City of Cape Town." (pg. 14).

Also interesting are their findings and analyses around education: "the high unemployment rate in Khayelitsha is not so much a function of a lack of educational training, but rather a lack in economic/employment opportunities for the economically active group." (pg. 19).

In terms of retail, the survey illustrates people's dependence on house shops or spazas for buying essentials – some 55% say that is their main source. (pg. 22).

The next section of the survey dealt with people's perceptions on the impact of the Urban Renewal Programme (pg. 24) – here, residents commented on each sector of service delivery.

The next section interrogated people's living conditions and social networks (pg. 30). There are a huge range of questions and data here, from crime to flooding to support networks.

See pg. 38-9 for their conclusions on Khayelitsha specifically. Pg. 72 onwards has their findings from the qualitative focus groups.

What might be particularly interesting with this document is comparing this survey with the results of the Census. Obviously the comparative aspect within the document (between Khayelitsha and Mitchell's Plain) is also useful – although the report does not do any comparative analysis of its own, the data is all there.

MCA Africa. August 2006. Shared Learnings from the City of Cape Town's Urban Renewal Programme. Compiled for the City of Cape Town: Information and Knowledge Management Department.

This evaluative report begins by mapping out the origins of the URP nationally (pg. 6), and then briefly that of the focal neighbourhoods in Cape Town.

“Khayelitsha, meaning new home, is a more recent development established in 1983 by the apartheid government as an area where black people would be housed in Cape Town. The township was planned in an inward oriented manner that maximised isolation with four major entrance and exit points. The area has grown at a rapid rate since the 1980s and the area originally planned for 250 000 is now home to well over 320 000 people most of whom are housed in inadequate accommodation. (City of Cape Town, 2006).”
(pg.11)

The report is particularly interested in the multi-stakeholder, participatory nature of URP. It also explains the German element (through the German Development Bank (pg.14)) that the VPUU is connected with (see Khayelitsha interview 1).

What is most interesting are the following from pg. 19. “URP is highly politicised. Whilst political influence and championing is essential in building the programme, in some instances, it has diluted the strategic focus of urban renewal and the possibilities for coherent and aligned action” (pg. 19). “Institutional instability within the City” (a good summary in the text box on pg. 20) has also frustrated policy coherence and project alignment across levels of government (pg. 20).

Following this, the report turns to community engagement and participation, which includes some interesting history on the KDF (pg.22-4) especially versus the defunct Mitchell’s Plain version.

“KDF was formed in a more ‘organic’ manner, emerging from the community in 1994 and drawing membership from political, labour, civic, youth, women, sports, religious, health and education organizations and institutions. It had a strong developmental agenda and has had support from the Foundation for Contemporary Research (FCR), which has provided support and training to the KDF. (Dyantyi, R and Frater, W). Whilst it was initially involved in certain challenges around its legitimacy as an umbrella body for civil society in Khayelitsha in the mid-1990s, it has since become firmly established as the representative body in the area. It has a specific URP Portfolio and development forums in each ward.

A major contributing factor to the success of civil society structures in Khayelitsha including the KDF, has been the fact that the energy that existed prior to 1994 has been retained, as many of the leaders have remained in Khayelitsha. A number of these leaders now occupy high level positions in their

working life, however are still active in community structures such as the KDF after hours.” (pg. 24).

There is also a reference to Dyantyi, R and Frater, W (not dated): *Local Economic Development Initiatives in Khayelitsha*, Foundation for Contemporary Research for more information on the KDF.

Pg. 26-31 provides a deeper look into the Khayelitsha CBD development.

Methodologically though, this report is limited by its lack of consultation and input from non-government players like the KDF, as well as City departments and provincial departments - their data is mainly based on interviews with URP staff, socio-economic data and strategy documents (pg. 5).

Karen Small. August 2007. A Comparison of Different Dwelling Types in Khayelitsha: Demographic and Socio-Economic Information. Strategic Development Information and GIS Department: City of Cape Town.

This report uses data from the above by QSJ and below, from the Unit for Religion and Development Research survey of 547 households. Focused on housing, it finds that of the population of 406,779 living in Khayelitsha's 108186 dwellings, some 38% were formal. Of course, a variety of other variable from age to education and employment are looked at and displayed graphically by housing type. What is particularly useful about this data is comparing the impacts of housing type on other variables, or vice versa. What is also useful is that it relies on post-2001 data, although the limited sample may endanger its reliability (which is noted at the outset by Small). Her main conclusions are as follows:

“For many of the demographic and socio-economic parameters there are not significant differences for those living in the different dwelling types. For all those in informal dwellings, aged 6 to 19, a far lower percentage attend secondary schools and a far higher percentage do not attend at all with the main reason for not attending being no money for school. Those in informal dwellings also have the highest percentage unemployed and looking for work and the highest percentage who are employed in the informal sector. This is also reflected in the monthly income of households where the largest percentages in the lower income groups are for those in informal dwellings. The average number of persons per household is higher in both formal (4.4) and backyard (4.6) dwellings than in informal (3.5) dwellings. The number of rooms in informal dwellings is lower than for either of the dwelling types with 56.7% of informal dwellings having either one or two rooms. Overcrowding, however, is only slightly higher in informal dwellings. Formal dwellings have more female than male household heads while the opposite is true for both backyard and informal dwellings.

In households in backyard and informal dwellings there is a much higher incidence of hunger, more than once a month, for both adults and children than in households in formal dwellings. More adults than children go hungry in all instances. Migration into the area also varies with the different dwelling types. In both formal and informal dwellings the highest percentage have been

in the area since before 1990 while in informal dwellings the highest percentage has move into the area since 1996. Those living in backyard and informal dwellings have experienced a much higher incidence of both fire and flood than those in formal dwellings. The level of satisfaction with service delivery is significantly higher for those in formal dwellings than for those in either backyard or informal dwellings. The satisfaction of the condition of specific services is generally the highest for those in formal dwellings and lowest for those in informal dwellings. ” (pg. 29-30).

Media Articles

18/02/03: In the heart of Cape Town's Khayelitsha township. *Financial mail.*

Describes the development of the Khayelitsha Central Business District. Written while the ANC ran the city, the article also hints at the “political wranglings” and lack of institutional capacity that have slowed down URP projects in Cape Town.

31/07/03: R300m for Khayelitsha CBD. From

http://www.southafrica.info/doing_business/economy/development/urban/khayelitsha-310703.htm

This article explains the wider development to include: “a retail centre, a service station, municipal offices, bus and taxi terminus, sports facilities, a multi-purpose community centre and 1 000 residential units.”, as well as informal trading regulation. The development “will complement the existing magistrate's courts and regional offices of the social services department.” 4/5ths of the funding would come from the private sector. Interestingly, it also says that Khayelitsha is an area of some 500,000 people, although the 2001 survey said 300,000. This is a continued point of contention.

27/5/09: Ziyanda Sidumo. MEC hits back amid protest. *Cape Argus.*

This article describes how in Site B, service delivery protests erupted recently with people barricading Mew Way with burning tyres, rubbish, old furniture, etc. This area is listed as on fo the top 5 priority areas for development housing delivery. People here have been living in the TR Section for more than 2 years and say “they have had enough of their living conditions, which they said were not fit for humans.” There is no sanitation, electricity and poor drainage. Elections have meant nothing there. Representatives of the KDF were to discuss the issues with the residents of the TR section. The housing department wants to identify community reps, do a needs analysis and then plan. The province is still in the process of transferring the land to the city – a process begun the end of 2008. But a resident said: “the city delivered only empty promises... They promise us the same thing every year. We've had enough now because we've been waiting too long” she said.

Academic Texts

Dewar. D. and V. Watson. 1984. Introduction. The Concept of Khayelithsa: A Planning Perspective. Working Paper No. 31. Urban Processes Research Unit, University of Cape Town.

The introduction chapter of the working paper, “The Concept of Khayelitsha: A Planning Perspective” outlines how the “new African ‘city’” was originally conceptualised when it was

announced in 1983 and the changes to this concept as the area was set up (Dewar and Watson, 1984:1). Khayelitsha was originally conceptualised as an area which would by March 5 000'core' houses (defined as a bathroom and two rooms which people are supposed to expand and upgrade themselves) to which people from which "existing townships in Cape Town (Langa, Nyanga and Gugulethu)" as well as those labelled as squatters living in Crossroads and 'K.T.C.' (Dewar and Watson, 1984:1). This original concept changed over time in reaction to emerging challenges as the project unravelled. The paper documents that one of the important changes relates to the issue of security of tenure. In the original tenure no security of tenure was to be granted in line with the status of African in the Western Cape at the time but due to resistance of the township residents as well as calls from different quarters that the 'self-help' housing concept would not succeed without security, 99-year leasehold became part of the concept. The other changes described relate to stated intention to move the residents of the existing African townships to the new area as well as plans to destroy the Crossroads and K.T.C squatter camps whose populations grew in the interim period between the announcement of the concept in 1983 and the completion of first set of house in 1985. The "Concept of Khayelitsha: A Planning Perspective" working paper states its purpose as supplementing the debate on the Khayelitsha concept, from a planning perspective (Dewar and Watson, 1984:3).

Cook. G. 1992. Khayelitsha: New settlement forms in the Cape Peninsula in D. Smith (ed). The Apartheid City and Beyond: Urbanisation and Social Change in South Africa. Wits University Press: Johannesburg. pg. 125-135

The chapter by Gillian Cook gives a historical take of the Khayelitsha area, from the announcement by parliament in 1983 of the plan to set up this 'new town', for African residents of Cape Town, to the character of this area in the first few years of its establishment. The chapter describes different aspects of the area divided into the following sections: *Residential character; Housing; The people; Social and administrative organisation, Services and Economic activity.*

Residential character

Under this section Cook describes how "in line with the original conception of a well laid out town in which householders would upgrade core houses", the settlement is laid out in a curvilinear pattern in which lies a "a monotonous sprawl of uniformly low quality 27.8 square – metre houses" (Cook,1992: 126). The structures during the period Cook describes (based mainly on information collected before 1990) include mostly prefabricated junior schools, the limited formal housing and sprawling informal housing structures. She points to how in terms of the informal housing structures there are structures within the 'serviced areas of 'controlled squatting' as well as unserviced informal structures that are erected any open space. According to Cook, at the time four out of five people in Khayelitsha lived in shacks.

Housing

Cook begins by describing the limited stock of formal public housing in Khayelitsha and how this was accessed. She points to the long waiting lists for rental housing as well the means that are sometimes used to bypass the obstacles such as informal information networks and 'gifts' to council employees. Cook also indicates that the high level of arrears and defaults probably "reflects a genuine inability to pay rather than a boycott" (Cook, 1992: 127). The public housing stock was put up for sale, but by 1990 only 40 % of the houses on offer had been sold, which Cook explains as being the consequence of the inability of most Khayelitsha residents to afford

the fees required to qualify for a mortgage. Cook also adds that the 'anticipated upgrading of the two roomed core houses has not taken place' (Cook, 1992: 127). Based on the results of a survey by Nigel Measures (1988-89), she reports on the extent of change externally and internally as well as the cited reasons by residents for not upgrading, which are mainly linked to limited finances and the attitude that houses area are below started. Cook then goes on to discuss the introduction of formal private housing in the area by private developers, which are aimed at the "small number of upwardly mobile residents". The serviced controlled squatter areas of Site B, Site C and Green point are described in relation to materials used for shacks, size and rentals. The services include water and sewage systems and access roads. Cook adds that many of the sites where the 'truly informal squatter areas' are situated are "unsuitable for housing and the location of shacks changes in response to flooding or drifting sand". Cook includes detail of the type of material used for shacks and were this is obtained or purchased highlighting the ever-present danger of shack fires due which result from the combination of combustible construction material with use of candles, paraffin and gas for lighting, heating and cooking

The people

Under this section Cook starts by highlighting to the dramatic increase of the Khayelitsha population pointing to data from a survey carried out in 1988 (3 years after the completion of the first set of formal houses). Cook makes specific mention of Town 1 (which is the focus of this project), indicating that the 1988 survey estimated that "between 72,000 and 84,000 people lived in the 5 329 cores houses of Village 1,2,3 and 4" which make up Town 1 (Cook, 1992: 130). The estimated number of people living in informal structures in the site and service areas was between 38,000 and 79,000 and between 8,000 and 26, 000 in the unserviced informal sites. By 1990 the figures had gone up with 450,000 people living on less than a third of the land originally planned to house 600,000. Cook points to the link of the growing population to people coming in from the Transkei and goes on to describe the unemployment rate which she pegged at 80%, describing poverty in the area to be endemic. People in the formal houses (Town 1), were said to be better off. Another specific mention is made of Town 1, where a survey showed that heads of households were predominantly female and over 50% being single (Cook, 1992: 130).

Social and administrative organisation

Cook describes the administrative structure for Khayelitsha at the time pointing to how as an African residential area Khayelitsha has no direct representation falling under a white Town Clerk and white representative on the Regional Services Council. She points to the anonymity of names used by officials to describe the area such as Town 2, and Village 3, boiling down this alphabetic listing and numbering of neighbourhoods to a reflection of the regimes attitudes to the area and its residents. The structures also included a mayor who was local headman, whom with his town council were accepted as representatives of Khayelitsha after being voted in, in elections held in 1988. Cook however adds that in the eyes of the residents their credibility was suspect as a result of allegations of patronage, a lack of forward thinking, failure to respond to grievances, and their association with violence and crime. Although a Khayelitsha residents' association had come into existence support was limited as result of threats and petrol bombing of the homes of members. The political party described to have the most influence during the period is the Pan African Congress, "preventing the ANC from taking over the structural organisation of Khayelitsha" (Cook, 1992: 131).

According to Cook social control was achieved “through a strict, unofficial network of informal courts operating in a three tier system (Burma, 1989 in Cook, 1992: 131). The lowest tier was the community council (which Cook equated to the street section or headman’s committees) who served a limited number of streets or a maximum of 100 houses. The community council dealt with domestic issues, disputes between neighbours as well as controlled access to sites. Working closely with (though separate from) the community council were the community police or home guards.

Services

In her chapter Cook also describes the services in Khayelitsha from the road transport system (the buses and taxis) as well as the train service which are heavily used as residents travel the long distances to their work places outside the area. She also describes the limited health services in the form of only two resident doctors, two general clinics staffed by a less than standard number of practitioners.

Economic Activity

The local employment opportunities were described as very limited, with little effort to integrate Khayelitsha with the economy of the rest of Cape Town or support provided for developing entrepreneurial skills. Although they complained that there were too few shops and prices were high, residents had to do their shopping locally to save on transport costs, while mobile residents shop in neighbouring Mitchell’s Plain. The outlets were described as being geared to the “low economic status of their clientele” selling sugar by the cup and bread by the slice (Cook, 1992: 133). Two shopping centres were operating in the area at the time with only one supermarket each, and one or two fruit and vegetable outlets. With the absence of trading restrictions local residents run shops (spazas) from their homes which provide credit and open till late. Other trade was in perishable foodstuff as well as trading in second hand –furniture, household goods and clothes on arterial routes. Cook described discotheques, shebeens (taverns) and ‘survival entrepreneurs’ (concerned with prostitution, protection and other ‘illegal’ activities) as flourishing and proliferating.

Cook concludes by summarising her chapter and highlighting the failure of both the formal housing and site and service development to keep pace with household formation resulting in huge number of people living in high densities in poor unserviced conditions.

T.M. Tuswa. (date unknown). Service Delivery in the City of Cape Town: A Case Study in the Water Service in Khayelitsha. MPA, UWC.

Chapter Three: The Socio-economic Status of Khayelitsha.

This chapter from Tuswa's (2002) thesis on water service delivery based on work carried out in 2002 on water cuts and evictions in Khayelitsha, examines the socio-economic status of the community as whole. The author describes Khayelitsha as a “predominantly an informal settlement”, with low income housing, established as “monofunctional dormitory town with no economic base” (pg. 20). They also points to the isolation from economic and social opportunities, poor health conditions, disparities in levels of social and economic development, inequitable access to basic services as well as high levels of unemployment and crime which are part of the reality for Khayelitsha residents. Reference is also made in the chapter to the National Urban Renewal Strategy a development plan which includes Khayelitsha which was

announced in 2001 and at the time of the authors writing was still in its inception. The chapter is divided in sections under which the author discusses the population, employment, economic status, education, health, and transport in Khayelitsha concluding with a discussion of the potential of the Urban Renewal Strategy for the area.

Population

The author points to how, given the population density and “cumbersome informal settlement arrangement” (pg. 20) it is difficult to estimate the population of Khayelitsha. He points to the 1996 census figures of 410 000 and the predicted figure for the year 2000 of 600, 000. Using tables and figures the author shows the composition of the Khayelitsha population and also make distinctions between the number living in informal and formal areas.

Employment

Starting by reiterating how Khayelitsha was established as dormitory township with out an economic bases, the author then uses data from the Khayelitsha Retail Study (2001) to point to how the majority of residents in the are unskilled or semi-skilled labourers working outside the area. Figures from the 1996 census survey and Human Science research Council (HSRC) and the Foundation for Contemporary Research (FCR) are also used to describe the employment situation in Khayelitsha. The author points to the differences in employment status in the different residential sections. Income levels and income earning activities are also described using tables.

Education

Under this section the literacy services of people in Khayelitsha are described as well as the limitations of existing education facilities in light of the dense, young population of Khayelitsha resulting in students travelling outside to attend school. Lack of recreation and employment opportunities is attributed to be the cause of young people roaming around and resorting to crime.

Health

The author describes the health system in Khayelitsha as being in shambles as a result of inadequate health services, lack of professional personnel and theft of medicines. The conditions under which people live in, are said to be “exacerbated by the debilitating health conditions” (pg. 25). The absence of a secondary health facility for a population of between 600 000 to 900 000 is highlighted.

Transport

The transport system in Khayelitsha which is largely public transport, and ten huge volumes using this is described.

Khayelitsha Urban Renewal Strategy: set to succeed or poised to fail?

With the Urban Renewal Strategy being at its inception at the time of their writing, the author describes it conceptualisation and examines the process of conceptualising specific projects for Khayelitsha. The author reports finding out that these conceptualisation phases were carried out without the knowledge or involvement of the broader community, being spearheaded by what are described as an “elite clique of technocrats from the City of Cape Town and self elected ‘community leaders’ whose interest is to meet their own socio-economic ends” (pg. 27).

The author points to a random survey done with two hundred respondents which found none of the respondents to be aware of the urban renewal programme.

Huchzermeyer, M. 2003. Low income housing and commodified urban segregation in South Africa. In C. Haferburg and J. Oßenbrugge, Eds. Ambiguous Restructurings of Post-Apartheid Cape Town: the Spatial Form of Socio-Political Change. 115-135.

In an article arguing that the housing subsidy for low income housing only augments urban segregation, Huchzermeyer uses Khayelitsha as a case point. She begins with a historicisation of urban segregation under apartheid, and then the developments around housing policy and practice after 1994. She notes the following about Khayelitsha on pg.122: designed in the 1980s, planned for Cape Town's outer periphery

“according to a 'super block' structure, a western traffic planning device of the 1960s which assumes that neighbourhoods are best created as internalised 'villages' each served by 'local distributors' and surrounded and separated by 'primary distributors' (see Houghton-Evans, 1978:119,141). In the case of Khayelitsha, four 'villages' make up a 'town'. Each 'town' is surrounded by higher order (rapid) motor vehicle access routes, and four such 'towns' in a curved row make up the entire Khayelitsha, 9km long and 2.5km wide”. (pg. 122)

Figure 6.2 on pg. 124 demonstrates this.

“The development of Khayelitsha began in 1984, in the northern section closest to the city, yet still 6km from the nearest established township. It should be stressed that the spatial design of Khayelitsha envisaged high levels of internal segregation between different housing types, each restricted to individual 'villages': former transit camps of the late 1980s; core housing of the late 1980s; site and service areas of the early 1990s; developer housing (mortgage-financed); and post-1994 capital subsidy housing (Awotona et al., 1995). Notably, the completion of Towns 2 & 3 after 1994 is according to the original, highly segregatory masterplan of the 1980s.” (pg. 122).

She then describes post-apartheid housing development in Khayelitsha in various phases in Kuyasa. What she argues is that the limitations of the subsidy prevent finding more integrated parcels of land nearer to the city – cost keeps them on the periphery (pg. 123). She also interrogates the irony of government's subsidisation of transport – and how that could be spent on better located housing far better (pg. 125). She investigates the effects of these on health. Huchzermeyer then explores issues of ownership and housing markets (pg. 126-7), challenging freehold title models for their inapplicability.

This article is particularly unusual and useful in its specific reference to T1 V2, which has been difficult to come by in the literature and documentation.

Unit for Religion and Development Research, Stellenbosch University and Transformation Africa. (Date unknown). Khayelitsha Transformation Research Project.

This report's most useful contributions for this project are their colour-coded maps, although these are based on the 2001 Census data as well. From this, comparisons across Khayelitsha can

be made – and T1 V2 is included as a particular boundary which is also useful. They have also mapped out various amenities through GPS – such as churches, liquor outlets, incidences of crime, etc.

These maps are followed by a needs analysis based on focus groups (pg. 25-). Of interest are the neighbourhoods where they conducted these: Site C & D Section are mentioned.

Bidandi, F. 2007. The effects of poor implementation of housing policy in the Western Cape : a study case of Khayelitsha Site C. M. Public Administration, School of Government, University of the Western Cape.

This thesis includes some useful background on Khayelitsha: for one, it used to be part of the Tygerberg municipality (pg. 16). "Khayelitsha was established in 1984 during the tribal [sic] war outbreak at Crossroads informal settlement when the government tried to forcefully transfer some people to the new site and which gave birth to this name 'Khayelitsha' which means 'New Home'. The forced removal and transfer of informal settlements to their new home met with a lot of resistance..". The author quotes from the time: "'we are ready to die but not ready to move to this poor uninhabited area. It will be our dead bodies... in Khayelitsha". (pg. 17). Some 50,000 residents moved there in 1984, which had grown to 450,000 by 1990 (pg. 17). In 1990, some 80% were unemployed, 14% lived in small core houses, 54% in serviced shacks and 32% in unserviced shacks. There was no electricity and distant water points. The area was governed in the 1980s by unelected councils (pg. 17).

The author also picks up the tension around population figures, which currently range from 329,000 to 500,000 to 1,000,000. He finds data that says some 48,000 arrive in Cape Town annually and some half of these settle in Khayelitsha (pg. 18) – a planning nightmare. He picks up some very critical analysis of the situation from Dayile and Stern (2006): "[a]t the moment, regardless of the measures used, Khayelitsha is among the worst social and economic developments in Cape Town and indeed in the country as a whole." (pg. 18). An interesting quote on pg. 19 says "Saunders and Chopra (2004:17) argue that despite the large inequalities, local government policy makers and officials have found it difficult to shift resources from other wealthier districts to solve the housing crisis in Khayelitsha (Department of Health City of Cape Town, 2005)." (pg. 19).

Section 3: Photograph Album of Khayelitsha



Housing in T1 V2



Driving down Mongesi Road



Abandoned Eyethu Centre



SHAWCO premises on Mongesi Road



Khayelitsha Business District (KBD)



Park in T1 V2, off Lwandle Road



Front and back views of the new multi-purpose centre in T1 V2