

# The Production of Quartered Spaces in Stellenbosch

Inaugural Address: Prof Ronnie Donaldson, 4 September 2014, University of Stellenbosch, Department of Geography and Environmental Studies

## Introduction

To understand and to influence, not just to describe, the patterns of space in cities remains a prime task of urban theory (Marcuse, 1997: 244). I was schooled in the positivist tradition in the 1980s, when social science worked only with empirically observable events, which were supposed to be objective, neutral and value free, aimed at a rigorous, numerical and controllable methodology, and when the body of theory developed had to be applied universally (Barnard, 2001). As a student, this particular science always troubled me. So when I was introduced to postmodern readings during my doctoral study I immediately felt at home, albeit completely confused about the new scholarly debates. Here was a theoretical discourse that argues that “everything that has gone before (modernism) has been singularly unsuccessful in explaining societal differences. They believe that to search for a single answer or solution is not productive, no method is better than another, no one speaks with more authority about something than another. They believe that there is no absolute truth but that any truth is dependent on interpretation. They believe that it is more productive to read and interpret society than to observe and seek causes. They believe that the best way of working is to deconstruct (meaning intricately tease apart) human society, its practices and cultures” (Spence & Owens, 2007: 20). All of a sudden, the saying “almost anything goes!” was associated with postmodernism, with new meanings ascribed to style, method and epoch. The shift in thinking has been acclaimed as invigorating, exasperating, and even as a directionless exhilaration (Dear, 2000). For most of my academic career, therefore, I have found myself straddled as an empiricist seeking comfort in a postmodern body of literature. I have been a keen follower of the works of postmodernist urban scholars such as Edward Soja and Michael Dear, but in particular have found the work of Peter Marcuse (2009, 2001, 2000, 1997, 1989) to be invaluable in shaping my thinking about how to contextualise the restructuring processes South African cities are experiencing after the regime change in 1994.

In the context of Van Kempen’s (2002:50) argument that “cities are not ‘naturally’ divided: they are actively partitioned”, it is clear that introspection on urban spaces in Stellenbosch is necessary to provide a meaningful, imagined urban environment. In this paper<sup>1</sup> I draw theoretically on Marcuse’s postmodern urbanism debates on the quartered city. I will highlight some of the most significant dynamic quarters produced in Stellenbosch as a result of spatial, socio-economic and counterproductive, politically-driven processes within the quartering debate. The discussion is divided into two parts. In the first part, a brief background to Stellenbosch is provided within the debate on the significance of urban spaces, sense of place, ‘placelessness’, and quality of urban space. In the second part I discuss four processes actively producing quartered spaces, namely studentification, gating, post-productivist countryside creation, and abandoned spaces.

## The Stellenbosch context

The historical town of Stellenbosch has been identified in two consecutive studies to have the highest growth potential in non-metropolitan Western Cape (Van der Merwe et al., 2005; Van Niekerk et al., 2010). Spatially, the municipal area encompasses a diverse and distinctive space; both soft (mountains, rivers and winelands) and hard (education institutions, restaurants, art galleries, etc.). The university town has undoubtedly undergone a dramatic

---

<sup>1</sup> An earlier version of this paper was published as Donaldson, R. & Morkel, J. 2012. Quartering Stellenbosch’s Urban Space (pp 57 – 67). In Swilling, M.; Sebitosi, B. & Loots, R. (Eds.) *Sustainable Stellenbosch: Opening Dialogues*. SunMEdia: Stellenbosch.

spatial and demographic transition since the 1970s. According to the 2001 census data, the town's population grew from 29 955 in 1970 to 96 250 in 2001, with the highest growth rate (595%) among black people (although they constitute only the third largest group in terms of numbers) (Donaldson & Morkel, 2012). The dramatic growth in population between 1980 and 2001 has had an unexpected impact on the town's urban space in various ways: pressure on accommodation for students, pressure on accommodation for mostly migrants from the Eastern Cape, and pressure on accommodation for the affluent, who desire secluded lifestyle environments. When the actual population growth per former group area is correlated with the actual urban spatial expansion, it is seen that there is a mismatch in terms of race-space relations. In 1938, the physically built footprint of Stellenbosch (excluding Kayamandi) was 263.415 ha; by 1983, it had increased to 1 083.355 ha; and by 2009, it had grown to 1 516.739 ha. At the two latter points in time, Kayamandi had a footprint of 3.132 ha and 99.984 ha respectively. This reflects a horizontal spatial expansion of 40% for Stellenbosch (excluding Kayamandi), compared to 3 092% for Kayamandi.

Stellenbosch, more often than not, is considered to be insulated from the harsh realities of South Africa. Are the urban spatial realities elsewhere in the country mirrored in the town (refer to Freund's 2010 study, for example)? Developmentally, Stellenbosch clearly is a town bursting at its seams, a trend that is in all likelihood not going to disappear soon. The town is at a crossroads, and is in an institutional crisis for which urban politics is directly responsible. I call this an 'urban spatial identity crisis'. Marcuse and Van Kempen (2002:5) argue that "the state's [proactive rather than reactive] actions are crucial to implementing partitioning. By the same token, the state can be effective in countering the forces that lead to partitioning". Seethal (2004) explored the politics of reaction, the politics of resistance (and reconstruction), and the cultural politics of difference and identity that characterised the Stellenbosch Municipality from 2000 to 2002. Although Seethal's study is dated, the application of his analysis may have had similar results in 2014. He argued that political hegemony in Stellenbosch, as dominated by the Democratic Alliance regime, "advanced middle-class material successes, co-opted senior municipal officials and maintained cosy neo-traditional preserves into which they retreated (even though the majority poor residents were denied basic services and infrastructure)" (Seethal, 2004: no page number). After 2002, the then dominating ANC-NNP Alliance engaged in the politics of exclusion and the marginalisation of the opposition – pushing the 'others' to the margins of discourse and of physical space (for example in Council debates, and in its efforts to prematurely terminate the appointments of senior white officials). The net result of the seesawing political stage has been a political hegemony for urban space/place-making and the geography of difference in Stellenbosch; moreover, given this highly contested political environment, it is unlikely that political hegemony for urban space and the negative impacts it has for sustainability will dissipate soon. In interviews held with Stellenbosch local councillors from both major parties, I have found that the so-called 'other' mentality persisted. Nahnsen (2006) argues that the starting point for an urban politics of reconciliation is to understand the city as an imagination, as a space of projection of individual and collective desires and fears, and as a space of experience that, both in its materiality and in its imaginary construction, serves to create a place of safety for social identities. Notwithstanding the socio-spatial changes undergone in Stellenbosch, as in many Western Cape medium-sized cities and small towns, the town somehow has been untouched by a lot of visible change in urban space, such as change that reflects the changes in society as a whole.

Rowley (1998) suggests a number of considerations for meaningful place-making: functional and social use, sustainability, visual characteristics, and quality of the urban experience. Complexity, surprise, diversity of activity and users, vitality, a sense of time, and historical continuity are some of the key requirements for a meaningful urban experience (Rowley, 1998). To retain a particular local quality and to protect the character of a place, the spirit or sense of place has to be preserved. There is growing concern about the disappearance of

sense of place in Stellenbosch, as is evident in the placeless approach of modernism. The Stellenbosch Spatial Development Framework (SDF) formulates the goal as being to “conserve the architectural, historical, scenic and cultural character of the settlements, forms and areas” (CNdV Africa, 2010:7). The SDF emphasises the need to guard against the erosion of the city’s strong sense of place that has become an international brand (CNdV Africa, 2005:3). Over the past few years there have been a number of urban conservation and design proposals formulated for Stellenbosch by consultants appointed by the Stellenbosch Municipality, but implementation remains uncoordinated and ineffectual. Is there a plan for managing urban change that encompasses both the historical and everyday human experiences of the town?

The concept of sense of place also has been much appreciated because of its respect for the conditions of the authenticity and integrity of heritage in contemporary conservation practice. An analogy can be drawn between the work of Guignon (2004:2-3), on how a person, in order to become authentic, first has to discover the ‘you’ in ‘yourself’, and that of understanding how urban space needs rediscovering. According to Guignon, this you “that is discovered is a you that is for most part concealed, hidden, lost, displaced, almost totally forgotten”, and therefore a “project of self-transformation” (*ibid*:13). In other words, the “ideal of authenticity is a project of becoming the person you are” (*ibid*:13). In drawing on Socrates’ notion of “know thyself”, he argues that “to know yourself, then, is to know above all what your place is in the scheme of things...Only because finding your place in the scheme of things is what is truly important does it become worthwhile to assess your personal nature... The modern outlook brings to realization a split between the Real me – the true inner self – and the persona (from the Greek word for “mask”) that one puts on for the eternal world. With this division comes a sharp distinction between the way one appears in public life and what one truly is in one’s inner self” (Guignon, 2004:13-14 & 34-35).

The proclamation of authenticity needs introspection. In 2014, the urban spaces of Stellenbosch as public life appearance, and urban space as an inner self, are opposites. The destruction of the ‘true inner self’ – in other words the built environment heritage of the town and ‘ruralscapes’ – is slowly, but surely, masking a persona of progression, class advancement, almost uncontrolled (post)modernisation, and untouchability. However, a good surviving example of such a meaningful open space (with the potential of being further enhanced) as third places (gathering places to enhance the lives of residents are called third places and provide a place to connect with the people in communities, as well as a place to exchange ideas and news - Waxman, 2006:35) is *Die Braak*, where the landscaping reinforces the rural character and allows views to the mountains (balance); where all people are free to act out daily life (freedom and equity); and where quiet and busy, sunny and shaded spaces are provided, defined by harmonious yet varying facades (necessary complexity). It is visible and accessible (integration), and provides a strong sense of belonging and identity (community), at least in terms of planning and urban design theory.

Urban places without a sense of place are sometimes referred to as ‘placeless’ (or inauthentic) places. Placeless landscapes are those that have no special relationship to the places in which they are located – they could be anywhere, such as gated estates with pseudo-vernacular styles and monotonous studentified residential spaces. Recommodification of historical areas that have been purposefully touristified (such as the inner historic core of the town), and standardised massification of housing developments (e.g. Academia and Concordia), result in such places losing their sense of place. Another of the many examples is the singularly out-of-character and out-of-place Star Trek service station in Dorp Street, opposite the iconic Oom Samie se Winkel and De Akker (Donaldson & Morkel, 2012).

Yet, for communities struggling to adequately feed, house and ensure the health of their citizens, the devotion of time and energy to authenticity goals may appear to be a luxury that is not shared equitably. Why then search for authentic historic urban spaces in Stellenbosch? Place, rather than site or building, has now become the focus of protecting authentic urban environments. Strategies towards places means “preserving what is valuable from the past even while adapting to change with new buildings and the creation of new landscapes”

(Ferris, 2002:n.p.). If left unchecked, authentic urban spaces could be completely transformed within twenty years into new townscapes depicting the current trend of a fantasising lifestyle based on escapisms: converting a 1960s-styled house into a Tuscan villa, or into Byzantine style. It is ironic that the strong property market at the high end of the scale, driven by the exceptional scenic and small-town qualities found so close to the City of Cape Town (CNdV, 2005), has led to strong pressure to develop the exact scenic landscape that it is drawn towards and, in the process, create inauthentic spaces. Confucius stated that “the nature of man is usually quiet, but when it is affected by the external world, it begins to have desires. With the thinking mind becoming conscious of the impact of the material world, we begin to have likes and dislikes. When the likes and dislikes are not properly controlled and our conscious minds are distracted by the material world, we lose our true selves and the principle of reason in nature is destroyed. When man is constantly exposed to things of the material world which affect him and does not control his likes and dislikes, then he becomes overwhelmed by the material reality and becomes dehumanised or materialistic... [and then] the principle of reason in Nature is destroyed and man is submerged in his own desires” (Yutang, 1938:255-256). Desires manifest spatially in various manners through the production of specific urban quartered spaces, such as gentrification spaces (or bourgeoisification after Lefebvre, 1991), studentification spaces, the changing production of the countryside through gated developments and multi-use landscape spaces, and abandoned spaces.

### **What is urban quartering?**

A number of urban spatial processes are at work in the partitioning of urban space, which include clustering, segregation and desegregation, congregating, walling out (the process of formation of an exclusionary enclave), fortification (process of the formation of a citadel), and the quartering of space. Empirically, we find spatial patterns that share the characteristics of more than one of these spatial definitions (Marcuse, 1997). In view of the above I have decided to frame the discussion within the context of one spatial process only, namely quartering. In spatial terms, according to Marcuse (2001), quartering is the division of urban space into quarters created by the operation of the private market in real estate and housing, based on the income or wealth of households. In the urban context in particular, globalisation has led to a number of different and often conflicting identities (across issues such as race, income status, nationality, ethnicity, etc.). Space can be viewed as a mental construct, as it is to a large extent constituted by one’s thoughts and how one translates them into language and discourse (Lefebvre, 1991). The “dimensions of space (size, density, distance, direction, territory and location) exert powerful influences on urban development and on human interaction”, and space therefore is more than a medium in which social, economic and political processes operate (Pacione, 2001:24). The contemporary South African city “is not only the site of new kinds of dwelling, activity and interaction; it is also a setting for the production of new urban imaginaries, through which the city is made intelligible and its social spaces rendered legible” (Popke & Ballard, 2004:100). Manifestations of socio-spatial restructurings of urban space are increasingly related to urban form. Marcuse (1989) employed the concept of the quartered city in which he paralleled five ‘residential cities’ with their ‘cities of business and work’: (i) Luxury city: Controlling city; (ii) Gentrified city: City of advanced services; (iii) Suburban city: City of direct production; (iv) Tenement city: City of unskilled work; (v) Abandoned city: Residual city. For Garrido (2013: 166), the emergence of a quartered city (consisting of parallel patterns of residential and business space) poorly describes the reality of segregation in cities of the Global South, despite the simple addition of the informal city and the city of illegality. For cities in the Global South, the pattern of urban segregation “commonly associated with polarization – urban landscapes fragmented into networks of privatized elite spaces overlaying the public city – has more to do with colonialism than with globalization in its contemporary manifestation” (Garrido, 2013:167). However, Van der Merwe’s (1993) research has shown that the South African city corresponds to a multi-faceted international profile of First World prosperity, Second World central intervention and Third World deprivation. While the South African city displays numerous similarities to international city form, it has obtained a unique character as a result

of the legal enforcement of apartheid. Quartering in our cities are therefore associated with colonialism, globalisation and apartheid.

### **Quartered gated spaces**

The urban social divide is reported to be widening, leading to a small suburban elite surrounded by vast poverty (Soja, 1995; Dear, 2000; Harrison et al., 2003). This has resulted in what Harrison et al. (2003:16) have termed ‘protective citadels’ due to a fear of the poor – the ‘other’, leading to further segregation. A first sociospatial impact of quartering derives from gated developments (GDs). Gated communities (or gated developments) are commonly categorised as lifestyle spaces (golf estates, country clubs, retirement villages), and prestige and security zones (gating as crime prevention strategy). In a country struggling to shed its apartheid legacy, it has been widely argued that gated developments inherently present undertones of re-segregation – a re-creation of urban spaces of separation (Donaldson, 2012; Spocter 2013). According to Ramoroka and Tsheola (2014), the emulation of the West’s privatisation of urban spaces and securitisation and policing through city settlement planning has uniformly reinvented spatial social segregation in the developing world. Accordingly to them, reverence of the gated-community model in democratic urban settlement planning has paradoxical sustained social segregation in South Africa.

Critical viewpoints on gating revolve around issues of lack of spatial integration, proposed policy on social mixing, access to natural and urban public spaces, spatial fragmentation, social exclusion, economic segregation and the inability of local authorities to render proper services (Landman, 2004; Durlington, 2006; Landman, 2006; Lemanski, 2006a, 2006b; Dirsuweit, 2007; Lemanski et al., 2008; Spocter, 2013). Scholars speculate that the primary reason for choosing to live in a gated development in South Africa is crime and/or fear related (Landman & Schonteich, 2002; Lemanski, 2004, 2006a). Khan (2004) makes reference to the discourse on fear and how this is shaping the urban form to reinforce patterns of segregation, fragmentation and social exclusion. Van Donk (2006) states that there is a high reflection of fear of crime especially among the minority groups and that, to some extent, it is this fear that drives the emergence of gated communities. But it is also fear of ‘the other’, often masked as a vote of no confidence in the police and local government. Indifference and unwillingness to accept the ‘other’ relates to racism, where the living spaces of the poor are stigmatised (Ballard, 2005; Lemanski, 2006b). It is now argued that, during apartheid, the masses were fenced in and that, under a democratic dispensation, are fenced out (SAHRC, 2006:15). This is achieved through the local authority’s claim that “municipalities are in tough financial situations, and the privatisation of public property can help relieve budget pressure” (Nissen, 2008:1141). Other debates on gated developments focus on moral and justice issues, environmental sustainability (Landman & Du Plessis, 2007), privatisation and implications for public space (Landman, 2006a, 2006b), spatial implications (Lemanski, 2004), ethnographic and cultural reasons for moving to gated developments (Durlington, 2006), and the tourist potential of gated developments (Dirsuweit & Schattauer, 2004). In addition, with the exception of a few studies, there has been little insight into the aspect of urban management and planning (Harrison & Mabin, 2006), and specifically new urbanism (Dirsuweit, 2007). However, the literature suggests not only the loss of a clear distinction between public and private space, but also an international move toward spatial exclusion, which is partly due to the privatisation of space. Some sociologists and political scientists (Nissen, 2008) remark on the end of the public space. In its extremity, an analogy can be drawn between vigilantism and gated communities, where it is argued that, within the wealthier areas (former white group areas), vigilantism is being carried out in the form of gated communities (Donaldson & Van der Merwe, 2000). Physical spatial vigilantism in the form of gating equates to physical punishment. Schönteich (1999:18) also links the phenomena of private security and vigilantism and argues that most people cannot afford the services of a private security company. Vigilantism is often the poor man's version of private security, and the poor, according to statistics, are hit hardest by crime. Out of

desperation they seek to protect themselves, or they seek protection in numbers through the organisation of groups that often engage in, or encourage, vigilante action.

It is perhaps worth mentioning that South Africa is probably the only country in the world where a Human Rights Commission investigated GDs from a legal and human rights perspective. The Commission concluded that there was no reliable evidence to suggest that booms and road closures enhance safety, thus nullifying the notion that GDs are rationalised as the creation of safe spaces. Human rights contraventions include the right to privacy, to human dignity and to equality, freedom of movement, and freedom of trade, occupation and profession (Van Donk, 2006). According to the South African Human Rights Commission (SAHRC, 2006:5), gated developments “cause social division, dysfunctional cities and lead to the further polarisation of our society” – a scenario very much evident in Stellenbosch. Although Stellenbosch does not have many gated developments yet (Spocster, 2013), the existing ones on the periphery of the town already dramatically scar the rural landscape and transform the rural spaces into urban quarters of homogeneity. Much has been debated in the local media on the raping of the ruralscape of Stellenbosch, because it is the spatial outcomes of these gated developments that have a direct impact on the town’s identity. Land for development is running out. It is my contention that the *de facto* local authority emerging from this is the property developer, who will insist on walling a new development that happens to be located in ‘undesirable spaces’ near a township or low-income area – Welgevonden, De Zalze and La Clémence, as well as the ‘Berlin-styled’ Mount St Simon, wedged between Kayamandi and Cloetesville, are cases in point.

One alternative to gated sprawl into high-value agricultural areas in the Cape Winelands is the reshaping of the urban settlement system for the development of agri-villages, eco-villages and green urbanism – the so-called new ruralism approach. These developments, if properly introduced, can counter the unsustainable and highly (segre)gated golf, polo and other lifestyle estates and avoid a replication of the Jamestown node, where gentrification is displacing the poor. Such a system can be facilitated in nodes on land of varying quality, size and situation, and plan for sustainable urban agriculture and local food system movements, such as the Slow Food Movement, where the farmer’s market becomes a basic town centre amenity. Unfortunately, such initiatives, in turn, also become commercialised and lose their authenticity, such as the so-called slow-food market in Stellenbosch. At the same time, new urbanism projects and smart growth initiatives have demonstrated the possibility of creating healthier, more liveable urban centres (Krause, 2006). For the implementation of this paradigm to succeed, nodal developments should guard against the continued growth in mono-functional gated developments. The Lynedoch Eco-Village is an example of a socially mixed hamlet built around a school and crèche for poor people and non-partitioned, ecologically designed housing. The Klappmuts node (sometimes referred to as the potential Midrand of the Boland), on the other hand, is in the process of being carved up into walled security estates with the institutional endorsement of Stellenbosch Municipality and the National Department of Housing – a ‘new town’, composed of, in the words of Swilling (2011: no page number), “disconnected spatially coterminous gated communities ... an urban horror story”. The Raithby case is a typical example of how developers exploit sustainable development ideals for their own personal gain. Planned and approved as an organic community with an ecologically designed, semi-gated community, this development was supposed to reflect an emergent middle-class green urbanism. However, since its approval, the focus has seemingly shifted from an ecologically sensitive development to just another gated estate. Globalisation influences on quartering are most prominent in the new, so-called Gemeinschaft gated village of Nooitgedacht. The development is believed to have been influenced by small towns in Brazil, France, Italy, Spain and Turkey, and the marketing of the village proclaims it as “an old European village” (Die Burger, Eiendomme, 3 Mei, 2014:4). The spatial outcomes of gated developments have a direct impact on the town and regional identity. Wilson (1995:n.p.) refers to Lewis Mumford’s view of the relationship between the urban and the rural, arguing that Mumford’s observation in the 1960s is

applicable to Stellenbosch today in the sense that sprawling urban spaces will inexorably lead to necropolis, the death of the city.

### **Production of studentification quarters**

Studentification is the process whereby students start inhabiting certain parts of a suburb or town, gradually displacing the original residents (Donaldson et al., 2014). The spatial consequences of studentification are immense and include an array of economic, social, physical and cultural impacts (Smith, 2009). Studentification of suburbs causes spatial dysfunctionality, where, in most cases, eventually only the needs of a student subculture are catered for. More often than not, planning policy is formulated to change the zoning from single residential to general residential, resulting in social protest by residents for fear that their suburb would be invaded by student accommodation. The dramatic percentage increases in student enrolment and resident-based totals contribute directly to a fundamental spatial transformation of suburbs regarding socio-spatial relations, urban spatial expansion and the resultant spatial impacts as a consequence of these pressures. In Stellenbosch, neither the university nor the municipality has kept pace with this influx, and alternative quartered urban social spaces have subsequently been produced. Negative social, physical and cultural impacts are experienced in the studentified neighbourhoods, resulting in problems such as noise, traffic congestion, high residential density, and the loss of neighbourhood character (Benn, 2010; Donaldson et al., 2014). In Die Weides and Simonswyk there is a lack of social cohesion between the permanent residents and students, a situation that is exploited by property developers. In the process, studentification has inflated the property market, thus denying low middle- and middle-income earners the opportunity to buy property in this part of the town. In the case of Stellenbosch, it has been seen that, notwithstanding proper zoning, regulated suburbs have experienced dramatic changes in the built and social environment.

De Weides was proclaimed and zoned as a single residential suburb in 1929. In 1979, the zoning was changed to general residential. The new zoning implied that students may be accommodated, but the owner had to live on the property as well. The zoning type was known as a boarding house. Numerous university lecturers were living in this suburb at the time. In the immediate years after the rezoning of the area, houses were monitored by the municipality for compliance on a regular basis. However, as a result of local authority level regime changes since the 2000s (Seethal, 2004), the local authority failed in this function and a blind-eye approach became the norm, ignoring the growth in student houses in the area. Controlling student houses did not feature as a priority on the political agenda at the time. Between 1999 and 2005 there was no change in land use in De Weides. Since 2008, however, the urban geography of accommodation in De Weides started changing dramatically. According to the Stellenbosch Municipality's Integrated Development Plan of 2009, De Weides was earmarked as an area necessary for densification in the peripheral areas – outer fringes – and that the inner areas remain single residential: in effect to create a doughnut shape aiming to conserve the historic fabric in the inner area. This allowed for the erecting of multiple flats and boarding houses on properties. An all too familiar resultant scene is the following: as student houses gradually increase, more and more permanent residents leave the suburb. They either sell their properties directly to a developer, or rent out their houses to students. Over time, and with the accumulation of students in the suburb, the area falls into decay. Houses and gardens are not maintained. In some cases, the houses bought by developers are left vacant and are vandalised by criminals and homeless people. Such houses are left to the elements of destruction. Because many of these houses are older than 60 years, they are protected by national heritage legislation (i.e. they cannot be demolished or altered). Developers do not want to protect a single house; instead, they want to erect a block of flats on the property. As the houses deteriorate further they submit applications for destruction to the municipality in the context that the original, historic house has been destroyed by the elements in any case. However, the intended doughnut shape did not happen. In many cases,

single residential properties were consolidated into a bigger property on which flats are being developed. These developments are also occurring anywhere in the suburb and not only in the periphery of the area, as was planned. Actual student houses were counted in 2010: there were then already 44 student houses and only 37 permanent residential housing units (guesthouses/B&Bs included) left in De Weides.

Clustered student accommodation results in dead urban space that lies uninhabited for over a third of the year. An emerging sterile and disjointed student urban landscape destroys the historical nature of urban space in the town. Replacing one monotonous residential landscape (for example De Weides) with another monotonous landscape (studentification of De Weides), with no regard for integrating the streetscape and mixing land use, is foolish. The *ad hoc* densification of the emerging student housing node in De Weides may only serve as a temporary reprieve for a university that is growing in student numbers, without planning accordingly for better space utilisation. Likewise, the now defunct student housing policy of the municipality was seriously flawed in its attempt to control studentification and is in desperate need of rethinking and reformulation. The university's 'survival strategy' in not capping student numbers, while at the same time failing to provide housing alternatives, is inexcusable. In addition to the current completed projects, further infill and intensification are needed on the Stellenbosch campus, in terms of which hostels can be remodelled without having an impact on the current meaningful open spaces. The partnership formed between the university and the municipality (astonishingly formalised only in 2009!) should provide a sustainable platform for addressing the crucial urban spatial problems created by increased student intake and the studentification of residential spaces, or creatively help shape the (re)structuring of knowledge-based economic urban spaces (the town's official motto today proclaims it to be the 'innovation capital of South Africa', and it is also referred to as 'Stellicon Valley').

### **Post-productivist countryside quarters**

In the mid-1980s, economic globalisation and neo-liberalism gave rise to a shift in rural policy globally. In the midst of this crisis, the deregulation of agriculture, the reorganisation of local government and the privatisation of many rural services dominated in many places. These changes led to rising unemployment and debt and a period of rural discomfort among primary producers and the rural community (Ward et al., 2008). In response to these restructurings, capitalising on non-agricultural/consumption-based activities in the countryside emerged (Cloete, 2014), inevitably producing new quartered spaces. In the UK, the development of golf courses on previously agricultural land during the 1980s was viewed as an intervention strategy to stop declining farm incomes and to curb agricultural overproduction. The result was that local planning authorities saw a shift in the character of their countryside due to the proliferation of golf courses (Lowe et al., 1993). The tenets of post-productivism theory include a shift in focus from the quantity of food production to the quality of food production, the emergence of non-food-producing farm jobs and activities for income, the gradual removal of state support for agriculture, counter-urbanisation, the creation of a consumptionist countryside, the demand for amenity value from rural landscapes, and a widening of the agricultural community to include emerging farmers, organic farmers and hobby farmers (Van Niekerk et al., 2010). In essence, agriculture does not occupy a central role in the countryside anymore (Albrecht, 2007).

The immigrants driving this demand for changing the countryside tend to be middle- and upper-class urbanites, with their key driving forces being the quest for an improved lifestyle in exclusive housing units, the need to be close to nature and unspoilt areas, and for a higher degree of personal and property security compared to that in metropolitan areas. These spaces are slowly being transformed into a picture of urbanised rurality that may be embedded in the minds of the immigrants and their vision of the services needed to cater for their lifestyle. It is

significant that, concomitant with the development of residential sites in non-metropolitan areas, is the development of commercial and retail services, which further change the character of these tranquil spaces (Phillips, 2005). Post-productivism therefore is characterised by a move away from agricultural production towards the consumption of the countryside. In the past, leisure and tourism were separated from other activities, with the main aim being to avoid negative impacts on traditional agricultural land uses. Nowadays, demanding consumers request unique experiences and places filled with character and perceived authenticity. Leisure and tourism are now incorporated into development plans and the countryside is challenged to strengthen its adaptive capacities to anticipate the transition it is undergoing towards consuming the countryside (Wilson & Rigg, 2003).

This background context bears a striking similarity to the remaking of urban spaces in the Jamestown-Techno Park node of Stellenbosch. The Jamestown interdependent node presents a strong juxtaposition of varying urban space best exemplifying the inherited spatial complexities of partitioned urban spaces. The Jamestown node is therefore a good illustration of the destruction of a once authentic urban space – a historical rural hamlet (for coloured people) – by urban spatial transformation. After 1910, individual families who leased property in Jamestown had an option to buy. Strawberry farming was the main rural activity and land was passed from father to son for the next 80 years. A strong sense of family and collective community evolved over these decades but, since the 1980s, pressure to subdivide increased as families grew in numbers (Perold, 2010). In a short period, the urban space of this hamlet has undergone a dramatic transformation, from being a predominantly mono-functional, coloured, dormitory, rural agricultural village to being an eclectic urban spatial mix of squatting, retirement and lifestyle gated developments, a decentralised shopping centre, gentrification (or bourgeoisification, as Lefebvre calls it) and residential desegregation, all quartered. The question I pose is whether this intra-quartering of the town's nodes is desirable? Moreover, the danger of this model lies in it being replicated in other identified nodes (for example Klapmuts).

Post-productivism introduced the production of new forms of spaces, particularly for lifestyle purposes. When looking at the commercial transactions in the winelands between January 2005 and October 2009, it was found that more than half of these transactions were for lifestyle purposes rather than agricultural purposes (Scatigna, 2008; Reed & Kleynhans, 2009). In terms of post-productivism in the wineland countryside, Kleynhans and Opperman (2005) noted that there are several important motivations for buying a wine farm in Stellenbosch: terroir is the dominant site factor, as well as the most important motivation, followed by location relative to Cape Town, the aesthetic beauty of the farm, accessibility, potential for more/new vineyards, meso-climate, and the status associated with the 'address'. They add that the income-generating potential of the property is also a very important motivation, whether from wine grapes and/or winemaking, or from supplying tourism services like bed-and-breakfast facilities, restaurants or wine tasting. The study of Cloete (2013) found that farmers have become less focused on farming as a primary source of income. A reduction in the intensity of farming was observed and farmers are more prone to use agricultural land for the construction of accommodation and/or restaurants, as these modes of production broaden the income of the farm. His study found that a total of 119 farms in the Stellenbosch region are offering tourist- and lifestyle-related functions and activities. Agricultural land is depleted for the construction of tourism and hospitality superstructures, leading to an increase in built-up areas on the farms. In addition, when a farmer decides to introduce alternative functions/facilities on the farm, redundant buildings on the farm are retrofitted to accommodate tourists as opposed to the original inhabitants, the now displaced farm workers. However, in many cases, the absence of such buildings necessitates the construction of new buildings specifically for these purposes. Pressure to accommodate the urban poor also spills over into the winelands. The Stellenbosch Municipality purchased a portion of a farm that was converted into low-income housing for

Kayamandi. We now have overlappings of different quartered layers as postproductivist landscapes become quarters of abandonment.

### **Abandoned quartered spaces**

No discussion about quartered spaces in a South Africa urban context can ignore the so-called ‘abandoned spaces’ (Marcuse, 1989). Bourdieu (1993:127) contends that “the ability to dominate space, notably by appropriating (materially or symbolically) the rare goods (public and private) distributed there, depends on the capital possessed. Capital makes it possible to keep undesirable persons and things at a distance at the same time that it brings closer desirable persons and things ... thereby minimising the necessary expense (notably in time) in appropriating them”. Conversely, the “lack of capital intensifies the experience of finitude: it chains one to a place” (*ibid*). Abandoned spaces as characteristic quartering of Stellenbosch are the spaces the indigent are ‘chained to’. Here we have urban space for the “very poor, the excluded, the never-employed and the permanently unemployed, the homeless and the shelter residents” (Marcuse 1989:705). We are all too familiar with where these spaces are located. Nationally, a crisis of urban discontent appears to be brewing, and there is general consensus that informal settlements are at the heart of this pseudo-revolution. A binary of disgruntlement perhaps mirrors the dual nature of the post-apartheid city of today best. On the one hand the affluent (of whom a significant proportion are now categorised black diamonds), who have retreated into new laagers, this time gated, fenced and protected by private security firms. On the other hand the indigent, those who have yet to experience spatially segregated, free urban living – those who are living in the informal settlements, RDP estates, the unemployed and homeless. It is an urban living we have become accustomed to over the past two decades. Despite attempts at the reconstruction of the South African city, it has generally remained segregated. The literature alerts us to three probable reasons for this lingering pattern of segregation (Smith, 2010). First, the failure of the government and its policies to implement integrated planning and provide access to public services and social facilities or to secure the equality and integration of settlements. Second, insufficient vacant land is available in well-situated spaces. This land is scarce and expensive, making the development of low-income areas difficult. Studies have indicated that peripheral areas offer fewer formal employment opportunities than central vicinities, thereby increasing inequalities. Moreover, residents of these remote settlements are subjected to increased travel expenses in order to reach economic hubs. Thus, it is desirable to integrate or link (preferably within walking distance) poor areas into established towns. Sprawl was further aggravated by the wealthy relocating to peripheral areas (mostly in the form of gated communities) in search of safety. The third reason is that of the intricacies of socio-economic integration. The process of change has been accompanied by various social tensions, dominated by economic, social and political power struggles. One of these has its roots in the NIMBYistic attitude mentioned by many authors on socio-economic integration. Research indicates that it is the poor areas that suffer most from segregation. Even though the white paper on local government warned that poorly delivered services would heighten segregation levels, poor service delivery continued in low-income settlements (see, for e.g., Turok & Parnell, 2009). Poor areas (including housing estates for lower-income groups) are often stigmatised and, as a result, individuals are discriminated against in terms of employment, credit access and education – relating to social exclusion. Integration can be considered in its physical or socio-economic construct. A physically integrated urban area is comprised of a mixture of activity areas and has a fine/intensive spatial fabric (Louw & Bruinsma, 2006). Socio-economic integration involves changing attitudes (Donaldson & Kotze, 2006), stimulated through an “overlapping of daily lives” (Lemanski, 2006a:422) and everyday commonalities between residents (Oldfield, 2004; Lemanski, 2006a & b).

Discarding innovative proposals for dealing with abandoned spaces is short-sighted, especially in the context of the National Spatial Development Perspective and the provincial

policy on prioritising infrastructural funding in towns with a very high development potential, such as Stellenbosch (Van Niekerk *et al.*, 2010). The inability to think proactively and creatively about undoing the abandoned spaces in the urban space and place-making process resonates with the notion of the geography of difference in Stellenbosch, where politicians and government officials are acting as disabling agents. Policy suggestions, such as that the “provision of low-income housing that is sustainable requires a new urban form, different to what has recently (the last 50 years) been accepted as the norm. This new urban form [that] should reflect the uniqueness of the surrounding setting as well as being affordable and capable of rapid development” (CNdV Africa 2005:3) remain worthless unless they are implemented and urban spaces are utilised better.

## Conclusion

There is always tension between continuity and change in a city (Liu, 2009). Although there is a symbiotic relationship between urban (town) and rural (countryside), Lefebvre (1991) proclaims that the urban becomes a privileged focal point. To him, the “town seems to gather in everything which surrounds it, including the natural and the divine ... As image of the universe, urban space is reflected in the rural space that it possesses and indeed in a sense contains” (Lefebvre, 1991:235). He refers to Jane Jacobs’s forceful demonstration of how “urban space, using the very means apparently intended to create or re-create it, effects its own self-destruction” (*ibid*:364). As has been observed in Stellenbosch, cities today, according to Marcuse (2000:270), “seem fragmented, partitioned – at the extreme, almost drawn and quartered, painfully pulled apart”. The dramatic population growth and pressure for urban expansion (especially for student accommodation, gated estates and informal settlements) experienced over the past two decades call for an imaginative re-look at how authentic spaces with a sense of place are to be conceived and produced over the next twenty years. If left unchecked, the transformation of authentic urban spaces into new townscapes, reflecting a current trend of a ‘fantasising’ lifestyle based on escapism, could be complete within twenty years. It is ironic that the strong property market at the high end of the scale, driven by the exceptional scenic and small-town qualities to be found so close to Cape Town, has led to strong pressure to develop the exact scenic landscape that it is drawn towards (CNdV Africa, 2005), and creating inauthentic spaces in the process. Changes to sensitive urban environments must respect the spirit, the prevailing character, and *genius loci* of a place; otherwise it will lose its identity (Norberg-Schultz, 1984). How may the *genius loci* (atmosphere) be preserved under the pressure of new functional demands? What is to be conserved? What is to be changed? How much can be changed? In order to maintain a sense of place, while at the time allowing for urban change, these questions should be incorporated into an urban policy-making vision. However, respecting the *genius loci* does not equate to copying old models. The challenge is to determine the identity of the place and to interpret it in ever-fresh ways. Development is seen to be in direct opposition to conservation and vice versa. Opportunities presented by appropriate development should not be overlooked in an attempt to resist development. Change is necessary, provided that it is appropriate and reinforces, rather than erodes, the local identity/distinctiveness. In order to manage a sustainable sociospatial transformation in Stellenbosch, it must be acknowledged that some changes are inevitable. The process of sustainable transformation is ongoing, but needs to be skilfully managed in order to achieve appropriate urban sociospatial development. Spatial approaches for growth and development may include the following: avoiding the destruction of the traditional agricultural landscapes; guarding against transformation of the rural-urban linkages into a post-productivist countryside; preventing the erosion of the urban historical fabric; appropriately managing the process of studentification of urban space; guarding against the expansion of fortified spaces; and sensibly dealing with sociospatial urban processes such as gentrification and social integration. Managing to restructure partitions, or exclusions, either by design or decay, is a non-negotiable course.

## References

- Albrecht, D.E. 2007. Small town in global city. *Southern Rural Sociology*, 22: 1-14.
- Ballard, R. 2005. Assimilation, emigration, semigration, and integration: 'white' peoples' strategies for finding a comfort zone in post-apartheid South Africa. Paper presented at the 6<sup>th</sup> International symposium, Territory, control and enclosure: the ecology of urban fragmentation, Feb 28 - Mar 3, CSIR, Pretoria.
- Barnard, WS. 2001. *Conceptions of Geography*. University of Stellenbosch: Centre for Geographical Analysis.
- Benn J. 2010. Studentifikasie in Stellenbosch. MA Thesis. Stellenbosch University: Stellenbosch.
- Bourdieu, P. 1993. Site effects (pp 123 – 129). In Bourdieu, P. et al. *The Weight of the World. Social Suffering in Contemporary Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Cloete, G.J.A. 2014. The nature, extent and impact of multiple land uses on the agricultural landscape in Stellenbosch as manifestation of a post-productivist mode of agricultural change. MA Thesis. Stellenbosch University: Department of Geography and Environmental Studies.
- CNdV Africa. 2010. *Spatial Development Framework*. Stellenbosch: Stellenbosch Municipality.
- CNdV Africa. 2005. Integrated Development Plan: Preliminary spatial development framework. Stellenbosch: Stellenbosch Municipality.
- Dear, M.J. 2000. *The Postmodern Urban Condition*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Die Burger, Eiendomme, 'Nooitgedaght Village gee 'n 'Gemeinschaft'-gevoel', 3 Mei, 2014: p. 4.
- Dirsuweit, T. 2007. The production of 'secure' space in new urbanism developments and the democratisation of public space in Johannesburg. Paper presented at the 4<sup>th</sup> international conference of the research network private urban governance and gated communities, Paris, 5-8 June 2007.
- Dirsuweit, T. & Schattauer, F. 2004. Fortresses of desire: Melrose Arch and the emergence of urban tourist spectacle. *Geojournal*, 60: 239-247.
- Donaldson, R. 2012. Coastal spaces as 'walls': Gated developments in small towns on the West Coast (pp 263 - 275). In Donaldson, R. & Marais, L. (Eds.) *Small Town Geographies in Africa: Experiences from South Africa and Elsewhere*. New York: Nova Science Publishers Inc.
- Donaldson, R.; Benn, J.; Campbell, M. & De Jager, A. 2014. Reshaping urban space through studentification in two South African urban centres. *Urbani Izziv* (forthcoming).
- Donaldson, R. & Kotze, N. 2006. Residential desegregation dynamics in the South African city of Polokwane, *Journal of Social and Economic Geography*, 97 (5): 567-582.

Donaldson, R. & Morkel, J. 2012. Quartering Stellenbosch's Urban Space (pp 57 – 67). In Swilling, M.; Sebitosi, B. & Loots, R. (Eds.) *Sustainable Stellenbosch: Opening Dialogues*. SunMedia: Stellenbosch.

Donaldson, R. & Van der Merwe. I.J. 2000. Urban restructuring outcomes during transition: a model for South African urban development in the 21<sup>st</sup> century? *Africa Insight*, 30(1): 45-57

Durington, M. 2006. Race, space and place in suburban Durban: an ethnographic assessment of gated community environments and residents. *GeoJournal*, 66 (1-2): 147.

Ferris, J. 2002. *Conservation and Regeneration in the Nottingham Lace Market*. [Retrieved 20 December 2010] [www.arcchip.cz/w02/w02\\_ferris.pdf](http://www.arcchip.cz/w02/w02_ferris.pdf)

Freund, B. 2010. Is there such a thing as a post-apartheid city? *Urban Forum*, 21: 283–298.

Garrido, M. 2013. The ideology of the dual city: The modernist ethic in the corporate development of Makati City, Metro Manila. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 37 (1): 165–185.

Guignon, C, 2004. *On Being Authentic*. London: Routledge.

Harrison, P.; M. & Mayekiso, M. 2003. *Confronting Fragmentation: Housing and Urban Development in a Democratising Society*. Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.

Harrison, P. & Mabin, A. 2006. Security and space: managing contradictions of access restriction in Johannesburg. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 33 (1): 3-20.

Khan, F. 2004. Uneven development, ambiguous restructuring and enduring polarization. *Development Update The City and its Future: the Eternal Question*, 5: 1.

Kleynhans, T.E. & Opperman, J.M. 2005. Determination of priorities of buyers regarding value contributing characteristics of farm land in the Stellenbosch district, South Africa. *Agrekon*, 44: 496-510.

Krause, S. 2006. *A Call for New Ruralism*. University of California, Berkeley: Institute of Urban & Regional Development New Ruralism Initiative.

Landman, K. 2006. Who owns the roads? Privatising public space in South African cities through neighbourhood closures. *GeoJournal*. 66: 133 – 146.

Landman, K. 2004. Gated communities in South Africa. The challenge for spatial planning and land use management. *Town Planning Review* 75(2): 151-172.

Landman, K. & Du Plessis, C. 2007. The impact of gated communities on urban sustainability: a difference of opinion or a matter of concern?" *SA Town and Regional Planning*, 51: 16 – 25.

Landman, K. & Schonteich, M. 2002. Urban fortress: gated communities as a reaction to crime. *African Security Review*, 11(4): 71-85.

Lefebvre, H. 1991. *The Production of Space*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

- Lemanski, C.L. 2006a. The impact of residential desegregation on social integration: Evidence from a South African neighbourhood. *Geoforum*, 37: 417-435.
- Lemanski, C. 2006b. Residential responses to fear (of crime plus) in two Cape Town suburbs: implications for the post-apartheid city. *Journal of International Development*, 18(5/6): 707-802.
- Lemanski, C. 2004. A new apartheid? The spatial implications of fear of crime in Cape Town, South Africa. *Environment and Urbanization*. 16(2): 101-112.
- Lemanski, C; Durlington, M. & Landman, K. 2008. Divergent and similar experiences of 'gating' in South Africa: Johannesburg, Durban and Cape Town. *Urban Forum*, 19(2): 133-158.
- Liu W-K. 2009. *Everyday Life, Morphology and Urban Conservation: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Urban Change*. [Retrieved 20 December 2010] [www.ace.caad.ed.ac.uk/ear2009/upload/pdfs/014-Liux.pdf](http://www.ace.caad.ed.ac.uk/ear2009/upload/pdfs/014-Liux.pdf)
- Louw, E. & Bruinsma, F. 2006. From mixed to multiple land use. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 21: 1-13.
- Lowe, P.; Murdoch, J.; Marsden, T.; Munton, R. & Flynn, A. 1993. Regulating the new rural spaces: the uneven development of land. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 9: 205-222.
- Marcuse, P. 2009. From critical urban theory to the right to the city. *City: Analysis of Urban Trends, Culture, Theory, Policy, Action*, 13 (2-3): 185-197.
- Marcuse, P. 2001. Enclaves yes, ghettos, no: Segregation and the state. Paper presented at a Lincoln Institute course titled, "International Seminar on Segregation in the City," held from July 26-28, 2001. Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.
- Marcuse, P. 2000. Cities in quarters (pp 270 – 281). In Bridge, G. & Watson, S. (Eds.) *A Companion to the City*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Marcuse, P. 1997. The enclave, the citadel, and the ghetto: What has changed in the Post-Fordist U.S. city? *Urban Affairs Review*, 33 (2): 228-264.
- Marcuse, P. 1989. 'Dual city': a muddy metaphor for a quartered city. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 13(4):697-708.
- Marcuse, P. & Van Kempen, R. 2002. States, cities and the production of urban space (pp 3 – 10). In Marcuse, P. & Van Kempen R. (Eds.). *Of States and Cities: The Partitioning of Urban Space*. Oxford: Oxford Geographical and Environmental Studies.
- Nahnsen, A. 2006. *Emergency on Planet Cape Town? (Re-)Conciliation as a Tool for Urban Planning in a Post-Apartheid City*. BIS-Verlag der Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg.
- Nissen, S. 2008. Urban transformation from public and private space to spaces of hybrid character. *Czech Sociological Review*, 44(6): 1129–1149.
- Norberg-Schulz, C. 1980. *Genius Loci: Towards a Phenomenology of Architecture*. London: Academy Editions.

- Oldfield, S. 2004. Urban networks, community organising and race: an analysis of racial integration in a desegregated South African neighbourhood. *Geoforum*, 35: 189–201.
- Pacione, M. 2001. *Urban Geography. A Global Perspective*. New York: Routledge.
- Perold, K. 2010. To space: exploring its representations, constructions and negotiations in Jamestown, Stellenbosch, South Africa. Unpublished paper. Stellenbosch University: Department of Fine Arts.
- Phillips, M. 2005. Differential Productions of Rural Gentrification: Illustrations from North and South Norfolk. *Geoforum*, 36: 477.
- Popke, J.E. & Ballard, R. 2004: Dislocating modernity: Identity, space and representations of street trade in Durban, South Africa. *Geoforum*, 35: 99–110.
- Ramoroka, T. & Tsheola, J. 2014. Gated-communities and the privatization of public spaces in urban South Africa: Democratic social integration or exclusion? *Journal of Geography and Regional Planning*, 7(4): 58-68.
- Reed, L.L. & Kleynhans, T.E. 2009. Agricultural land purchases for alternative uses – evidence from two farming areas in the Western Cape province, South Africa. *Agrekon*, 48: 323-334.
- Rowley, A. 1998. Private-property decision makers and the quality of urban design. *Journal of Urban Design*, 3(2):151-173.
- SAHRC (South African Human Rights Commission). 2006. *Road Closures/Boom Gates Report*. Pretoria: South African Human Rights Commission.
- Scatigna, P. 2008. The South African wine industry: a mirror of a country in transition (pp 213-239). In Barbera, F. & Osche, E. (Eds.) *A Game of Mirrors*. Torino: Frame Lab.
- Schönteich, M. 1999. Vigilantes: When the judicial system fails ... *Frontiers of Freedom, Second Quarter*, 20: 18-23.
- Seethal, C. 2004. Postmodern urban politics in South Africa: the case of Stellenbosch (2000-2004). Paper presented at the Centennial Convention of the Association of American Geographers in Philadelphia, USA, March 2004.
- Smith, D. 2009. Student geographies, urban restructuring, and the expansion of higher education. *Environment and Planning A*, 41(1): 1795-1804.
- Smith, T.N.K. 2010. The rise of the Phoenix or the Achilles? Breaking New Ground's impact on urban sustainability and integration. MA Thesis. Stellenbosch: Department of Geography and Environmental Studies.
- Soja, E. 1995. Heterotopologies: A remembrance of other spaces in the citadel-LA (pp 13-34). In Watson, S. & Gibson, K. (Eds.) *Postmodern Cities and Spaces*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Spence, N. & Owens, A. 2007. *Methods of Geographical Analysis*. London: LSE - University of London.

Spocter, M. 2013. Non-Metropolitan Gated Developments in the Western Cape. Patterns, Process, Purpose. PhD dissertation. Stellenbosch University: Department of Geography & Environmental Studies.

Swilling, M. 2011. Personal communication.

Turok, I. & Parnell, S. 2009. Reshaping nations: The role of national urban policies. *Urban Forum*, 20: 157-174.

Van der Merwe, I.J. 1993. The South African city in relation to international city form. *Development Southern Africa*, 10 (4): 481-496.

Van Der Merwe I.J.; Zietsman, H.L.; Ferreira, S.; Davids, A.J.; Swart, G.P. & Kruger, D. 2005. *Growth Potential of Towns in the Western Cape*. Report commissioned by the Western Cape Provincial Government. Stellenbosch University: Centre for Geographical Analysis. Stellenbosch.

Van Donk, M. 2006. Gated communities: A spatial imprint of a mindset of exclusion and fear. *Isandla Development Communiqué*, 2 (1): n.p.n.

Van Kempen, R. 2002. The academic formulations: Explanations for the partitioned city (pp35 – 56). In Marcuse, P. & Van Kempen R. (Eds.). *Of States and Cities: The Partitioning of Urban Space*. Oxford: Oxford Geographical and Environmental Studies.

Van Niekerk, A.; Donaldson, R.; Du Plessis, D. & Spocter, M. 2010. A Revision of the 2004 Growth Potential of Towns in the Western Cape Study. Research study for the Western Cape Provincial Government Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning. Stellenbosch University: Centre for Geographical Analysis.

Ward, N.; Jackson, P.; Russell, K. & Wilkinson, K. 2008. Productivism, post-productivism and European agricultural reform: The case of sugar. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 48: 118-132.

Waxman, L. 2006. The coffee shop: Social and physical factors influencing place attachment. *Journal of Interior Design*, 31 (3): 35 – 53.

Wilson, E. 1995. The rhetoric of urban space. *New Left Review (a)*: no page numbers.

Wilson, G.A. & Rigg, J. 2003. 'Post-productivist' agricultural regimes and the South: discordant concepts? *Progress in Human Geography*, 27: 681-707.

Yutang, L. 1938. *The Wisdom of Confucius*. Edited and translated. New York: Carlton House.