
Making Great Places in Slums/ Informal Settlements

Reabetsoe Mpe¹, Aurobindo Ogra²

¹Research Student, ²Lecturer

Department of Town and Regional Planning

Faculty of Engineering and the Built Environment

University of Johannesburg, Beit Street, Doornfontein-2028

Johannesburg, South Africa

Tel.: +27-11-559613, Fax: +27-11-5596630

¹Email: Reabetsoe.mpe@gmail.com ²Email: aogra@uj.ac.za

Abstract

According to UN-Habitat (2007) “a slum is a heavily populated urban informal settlement characterized by substandard housing and squalor”. The word slum is generally used to describe low-income settlements with deprived conditions. (UN-Habitat, 2006). There is no universally agreed definition of the word slum. As conditions differ from country to country, different scholars from various countries define the term “slum” differently. Definitions mainly include: illegal, poorly-constructed settlements without basic services, even when some of them are relatively more different and have proper structures? An informal settlement can be defined as stated by Huchzermeyer and Karam (2006) as those settlements that were not planned by nor have formal permission to exist from government. Srinivas (1991) defines informal settlement/ slums as an area where the urban poor resides and usually have no access to tenure rights and are forced to ‘squat’ on vacant land either private or public. While slums/ informal settlements differ in size and other characteristics in different counties, but what most slums/informal settlements share in common are the lack of reliable basic services such as the supply of clean water, electricity, timely law enforcement and proper services. (UN-Habitat 2007).

Place making is described as an approach that is used to inspire and encourage communities to create their own space/ places. Place making is how we collectively shape our public realm to maximize shared value (Project for public spaces, 2009). The focus on place making was intended to remind planners of the human aspect of city-building and the ultimate goal is to create places that people use, that inspire social interaction and promote community stewardship (Urban Strategy Inc., 2008). This paper highlights critical determinants of place making in slums/informal settlements. In the context of slums/ informal settlements, firstly it covers what great places are and what constitutes as a great place. Secondly it covers the characteristics of a great place/ place making and how we can upgrade slums/ informal settlements in to great places. Lastly what is the perception of communities of great places and what they think is needed to make their settlement a “great place”. The paper is based on a research study of Kaya Sands slums/ informal settlements of Midrand, South Africa.

Keywords: Slums, Informal Settlements, Community Development, Place Making, Human Settlements, Urban Transformation

1. INTRODUCTION

Rapid population growth and urbanisation processes taking place in most developing countries throughout the world have resulted in an increase of pressure on public services and changes to spatial composition that governments in the Global South are unable to keep pace with the growing demand and scarcity of

resources (United Nations Development Programme, 2013). As a result of urbanisation and the fluctuated increase in population and scarce resources over the past decade many citizens are now living in depreciated poorly constructed settlements. According to Project for public spaces (2009) place making can be used to improve all types of spaces, where people gather in the community such as parks, streets, sidewalks, businesses and other public spaces as it usually encourages greater interaction between the community members and promotes a more social and economic environment in communities. In South Africa the concept of place making is yet to be adopted or incorporated in the context of slums/informal settlements plans and/or upgradation techniques. Ultimately Place Making is not just an act of fixing up or building places and/or communities it is in actually a process that adopts the creation of communities, the kind of places where people feel a strong stake in their communities and commit to making things better.

Recent studies from City of Johannesburg show that there are currently 189 registered informal settlements in Johannesburg (Housing Development Agency, 2012a). Although formally registered with the council, the settlements still live under depicted and impoverished conditions. The issue of providing sustainable viable settlements becomes a growing concern by day, as the council is struggling to produce what it has promised its people in the aim of “providing a better life for all”. The government is pressured to meet new responsibilities with a greater accountability and the inclusion of community participation in settlement planning while current governance structures cannot adequately ensure effective delivery of basic services (UNDP, 2013).

The rationale for this paper is to investigate how informal settlements can be transformed in to ‘Great Places’ for communities. It will highlight the critical determinates of place making that will be needed in an informal settlement/ slum such as Kya Sands in order to make it a great place . Firstly the paper will cover what are slums/ informal settlements and conditions thereof. Secondly what great places are and what constitutes as a great place. Thirdly it covers the characteristics of a great place/ place making and how governments can incorporate these techniques in to their plans of slums/ informal settlements in order to make great places. Lastly it will cover what the perception of communities of great places and what they think is needed to make their settlement a “great place”. All in all place making is about communities creating places for their community needs and what is suitable for them.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

Slums have been defined as the poor living conditions of urban dwellers since the beginning of the term ‘slum’ in the 19th century, when it was first used to describe the conditions of streets, alleyways and/or courts situated in a crowded district of a town or city (Friedman, 1968; Pugalís et al., 2014). The UN-Habitat (2007) defines a slum as a heavily populated area that lacks mainly, sufficient housing, security of tenure, access to basic service (e.g. Water and sanitation) and/ or sufficient living space. The structure that mainly exists in informal settlement/slums usually do not comply with minimum standard planning and building regulations, they are an informal and free-market response migration, unemployment and the unaffordability of housing that meets with the legal requirements imposed by revenue and planning regulations (Patel et al., 2011). The word slum is usually used to define different types of low-income housing and deprived living conditions, definition varies from country to country (UN-Habitat, 2006) and it carries a derogative stigma with it. Other terms such as informal settlements, shanty town or low income neighbourhoods have been suggested in the place of the word slum as they appear to be more neutral in their meaning (Pugalís et al., 2014). An informal settlement can be defined as stated by Huchzermeyer and Karam (2006) as those settlements that were not planned by nor have formal permission to exist from government. Srinivas (1991) defines informal settlement/ slums as an area where the urban poor resides and usually have no access to tenure rights and are forced to ‘squat’ on vacant land either private or public.

The word slum/ informal settlements have always had a negative representation and for those who live in these places, are readily described as people who are undisciplined, thriftless, dangerous and uncontrollable which is not always the case as studies show that slum dwellers are just ordinary people that just happen to live in extraordinary circumstances due to life's circumstances (unemployment), structural inequities and injustice in this dominant and neo-liberal global system (Pugalis et al., 2014; Harvey, 2008). People often result to living in slums because there is a lack of affordable housing in the urban area that is close to their work of employment and/ or their migration hopes of employment in the city was not successful so they end up unemployed and living in slums (Majale, 2008). In most instances slums/ informal settlements emerge because the urban poor are unable to pay for land and housing in compliance with all revenue and planning regulations and to pay for construction that complies with the planning and building regulations (Patel et al., 2011). In spite of the controversies associated with the term 'slum', it has re-gained creditability in most countries as those who live in these conditions are usually the ones that identify themselves as 'slum dwellers' (d'Cruz and Satterthwaite, 2005). Thus it can be argued that meaning of the term 'slum' has evolved beyond the controversies it was previously associated with it (Pugalis et al., 2014).

2.2 The Concept of slums

Slum/Informal settlements mainly formulate due to the increasing rates of population migration to urban areas. Those in search of jobs often move to urban areas where they perceive there would be economic opportunity in hopes of a better life. Unfortunately, most migrants find themselves unemployed, living in one of the many informal settlements on the outskirts of the urban area and marginalised from both access basic services, to economic opportunity and as well as housing opportunities (Allen & Heese, 2013). Problems and issues that mostly arise in informal settlements/ slum dwellers are that of social, economic and environmental basis, issues of infrastructure and development, unhealthy living conditions, overcrowding, inadequate services, no economic opportunities and social development (Karam and Huchzermeyer, 2006). In Harvey perspective it can be argued that slum dwellers are not a burden to the urbanising city as they have the right to produce space and the right to the city but could be said that slum dwellers are its most dynamic resources as they bring forth an untapped economic source (informal trading economy) that governments should take in to consideration when it comes to job creations and local economic development strategies.

Rapid urbanisation is a phenomenon of global implication, with far-reaching changes to the spatial compositions of different communities, notably although not limited to countries in the Global South. As most of the world's population lives in towns and cities, the WHO (2014) states that there is currently an estimated 828 million people who live in slum/ informal settlements, representing around 1/3 of the world's urban population. The vast majority of these slums/ informal settlements (more than 90%) are situated in cities of Global South such as Asia, South America and Africa. Sub-Saharan Africa is the currently being recognised as the most urbanising region of the world (UN-Habitat, 2004). In 2011, statistics showed that the urban population in Africa made up about 11% of the world's urbanised population whereas, by 2050, projections suggest that this will have increased to around 20% (Pugalis et al., 2014).

Some countries in Africa have more than 70% of their inhabitants living in what are universally known to be substandard informal settlements/ slum conditions (UN-Habitat 2010). This shows that the current intervention methods being used remain inadequate to improve the living conditions of the majority of the global population, let alone the urban populations, out of poverty. Slums in Sub-Saharan Africa are reported to be the fastest growing urban population in general (UN-Habitat, 2006). In fact, Sub-Saharan Africa has the highest annual slum and urban growth rates i.e. 4.53% and 4.58%, out of any other continent in the world; nearly twice those of southern Asia, where rates are 2.2% and 2.89%, respectively (UN-Habitat, 2006). It has been documented that the majority of 'slum dwellers' in the world are between the ages of 18-35. Slums/ informal settlements are often economically vibrant; today, about 85 per cent of all new

employment opportunities around the world occur in the informal economy that is something the government should take in to perspective when it comes to job creation strategies.

When it comes to slums, South Africa is of no exception. With famous informal settlement/ slums such as Alexandra and Khayelitsha, they are currently 2 754 reported informal settlements in 70 municipalities in South Africa (Housing Development Agency, 2012b), 434,075 households in Gauteng are living in informal settlements and 189 informal settlements/ slums are registers within the City of Johannesburg jurisdiction. The case study, Kya Sands informal settlement/ slum is one of the 189 registered informal settlements in the City of Johannesburg located, in region A of the municipal boarders.

The terms 'Slum' is different from country to country and even more so complex when we consider the different situations faced in different countries and the different languages in Brazil an informal settlement/ slum I called a Favelas, a Kampung in Indonesia and Bidonvilles in France. "Within the Egyptian context slums have been known as 'Ashwa'yyat', which for them literally means 'disordered' or 'haphazard'" (Khalifa, 2011). It refers to urban areas that suffering from problems of accessibility, informality, very high residential densities, and inadequate infrastructure and no basic services (World Bank, 2008). In South Africa an informal settlement is defined as an "unplanned settlement on land which has not been surveyed or proclaimed as residential, consisting mainly of informal dwellings (shacks)" (Statics SA, 2004). The word 'Slum' however, in South Africa it is seen as a derogatory term, although it has a similar definition to the word 'informal settlement', but because of the way it was used during the apartheid era to insult and segregate the term is thus excluded (Huchzermeyer, 2004).

Slum dwellers experience different types of problems associated with their living conditions that manifest as a result of different forms of deprivation from economic, physical, social, and political. They live in overcrowded, poorly constructed structures, often with insecure land tenure (WHO, 2014). Housing in these settlements ranges from shacks to plastic sheet tents/ panels on sidewalks and often located in the marginalised/ outskirts of the city such as steep hillsides and riverbanks which are subject to flooding or around industrial areas. Slum dwellers' health is further affected by lack of access to food and clean water, poor sanitation, a breakdown of traditional family structures, high crime, high unemployment rates and no access to education. Due to the high population density, overcrowding, and lack of safe water and sanitation systems (e.g. There is one toilet for every 500 people in the slums of Nairobi) (UN-Habitat, 2010), slums are productive breeding grounds for diseases such as tuberculosis, hepatitis, pneumonia, cholera, Ebola and diarrheal disease. Despite the tremendous need, healthcare services are generally difficult to access in these situations (WHO, 2014) or are sometimes nowhere to be found surrounding the settlements. Across the global community, the challenge of slums has been met by several international initiatives for the improvements of the living conditions of slum settlements and has been identified as a key objective to help achieve the broader goal of eradicating poverty. More so, in South Africa the Target 11 of the Millennium Development Goals (MGD) with the specific target goal to have achieved a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers by 2020, which was met ahead of schedule mainly through some informal settlement policies and programmes different governments have implemented since (United Nations, 2013; Patel et al, 2014; Gulyani et al., 2014).

This Target 11 initiative has thus lead way to many informal settlements/ slum upgrading strategies and programmes in different countries. Some scholars would argue that many of the upgrading strategies in place in many countries are just cookie cut strategies that sometimes work and do not work as they do not take in to perspective the country and/or informal settlement/ slum conditions to heart while trying to improve the place. "Donor agencies and local policy makers, in particular in the developing world, require better information about the different conditions in shelter to implement effective urban policies in order to reduce inequalities" (Flood, 1997; Martinez-Martin, 2005; Martinez et al., 2008).

In Nigeria, in an attempt to tackle the problem of slums, the Federal Government asked the World Bank for financial technical support in terms of eradicating their slum problem. Thus, the Nigeria “Community Urban Development Project” (World Bank, 2002) and the “Community based Poverty Reduction Project” were formulated in the process. The slum upgradation programme highlighted a few lessons that the programme proceeded on such as the poor were willing and capable to pay for infrastructure investment and services; capacity-building activities are essential for both communities and local governments; extensive public participation that empowers people was essential for critical decision making; if central and state government agencies implement and carry out upgrading projects separately they are less likely to succeed, because success depends on the implementation and coordination capacity of the one government agency, and it is more likely to fail (Pugalis et al., 2014) .

In India Mumbai, UN-Habitat (2003) estimated that there are currently 155 million slum dwellers residing in India. However, when the country itself conducted statistical projections (Census of India) it revealed a vast difference from what was concluded in the UN-Habitat estimation. The domestic figure revealed that there are about 54 million slum dwellers residing in India. This gap could mean significantly affect the budget and resources needed in the upgradation policies and programmes as currently urban planners rely on these estimates in order to identify household beneficiaries and to budget for slum intervention programs such as the “Environmental Improvement of Urban Slums Program” and the “National Slum Development Program” (Patel et al., 2013). “It is well known that inadequate targeting is one of the main reasons for failing to make the expected impacts of slum policies” (Mathur, 2009). It is thus evident that statistics estimations are crucial part in the eradication of slums and policy making processes (Patel et al., 2013).

2.3 Place making in Informal settlements

Place making is a quiet movement that reimagines public spaces as the heart of every community, in every city. Place making is a transformative approach that inspires people to create and improve their public places (Project for Public Spaces, 2009). The place making practice has had many goals over time, but at its core it has always advocated for a return of public space to people. The idea of making great, social, human-scale places is not new it has been around since the very beginning of planning the context is just changed. Place-making can be defined as ‘the way in which all of us as human beings transform the places in which we find ourselves into places in which we live’ (Lombard, 2014). Elsewhere, place-making has been defined as ‘part of an everyday social process of constructing and reconstructing space’, both a communicative process and an individual mental one highlighting its individual and collective dimensions (Lombard, 2014). Place-making captures the nature of a place, in that it includes the activities of the many ordinary citizens who pass through, live in, use, build, visit or avoid a place, and are thus involved, directly or indirectly, in its physical and social construction (Project for Public Spaces, 2009). In an article by Friedmann, place-making is defined as the process of appropriating space in order to create a ‘mirror of self’. At neighbourhood level, this concept occurs by ‘appropriating an already existing “place”’, through learning about the physical place, getting to know local people, and getting involved in local activities. Through making claims on space with activities such as naming, signifying, taking part in social relations and recurrent rituals, such places become lived in, and ‘by being lived in, urban spaces become humanized’ (Friedmann, 2007)

The objective of exploring informal settlement through place-making is to understand the socio-spatial processes of construction of places in this context, as a response to the gaps in urban theory and the stereotyping of specific types of place through dominant processes of knowledge production. It also serves to emphasise the creative elements of human action, and interaction, which are crucial to constructing these places, not only as locations but also places of meaning to the communities (Lombard, 2014). Place making in informal settlements suggest a way in which governments can minimise poverty and improve the living conditions of many living in such places, thus giving citizens the ‘right to the city’. The Place maker’s Guide to Building Community’, suggests place- making as a means of addressing vulnerability, establishing

local economic activity, counselling local professionals to pay attention to a place, its meaning and association in communities, as well as the location it is situated in. In this instance, place-making is used to understand the meanings assigned to particular places (informal settlement/ slums), both by the residents engaged in constructing them, and in terms of the state and other urban actors, which may contribute to the production of knowledge about these places for effective improvements and development (Silberberg et al, 2013). An effective Place making process capitalizes on a local community's assets, inspiration, and potential, ultimately creating good public spaces that promote people's health, happiness, and well-being.

Considering that the shaping of our physical surroundings to better our lives is a basic human activity, place making is often hard to sell. Principals of place making for communities mainly include (Projects for Public Spaces, 2009):

- The community as experts: - Normally people who use a public space regularly are able to provide the most valuable perspective and insights into how the area functions, the needs and what is lacking in the area.
- Creating a place and not designing: - traditional planning methods and technique are to be regarded. Place are formulated on what the communities need and how they can improve their living situations.
- Community participation: - A good place needs partners and stakeholder together with the communities who contribute ground-breaking ideas, financial or political support, and help plan activities.
- You can see a lot just by observing: - Observation of a space allows designers to learn how places are used and how it can be improved for the better.
- Develop a vision: - a place that has a vision helps provide an identity for the place in terms of its character, the types of activities it has, the uses, and meaning it represents to the community. This vision of the place should be defined by the people in the space.
- Money is not the issue: - funds for settlement upgradation and improvements are often scares, but should not intervene in the process of place making, government intervention and UN intervention is key in such cases.

The concept of place making in developing countries for informal settlement/ slum upgrading is only recently being introduced. It has been recognised by UN-Habitat that place making can be used as a tool to address human social needs, economic development, environmental consequences and is needed to embrace a sustainable and equitable process that builds community, enhances quality of life, and creates safe and prosperous neighbourhoods in slums/informal settlements (Project for Public spaces, 2009).

3. OBJECTIVES / RESEARCH QUESTIONS

- Identify the key determinants of place making in slum dwellers residing in informal settlements of Kaya Sands in Midrand, Johannesburg.
- Identify the characteristics of great place/ place making in slums / informal settlements.
- Highlight the perception of communities about what constitutes 'great places' within the context of slums/ informal settlements.

4. APPROACH & METHODOLOGY


The research methodology approach adopted for this study is a mixed method approach that covers both aspects of qualitative and quantitative data. In undertaking this study, Kya Sands informal settlements/ slum

was selected as a case study. Kya Sands informal settlements/ slum is one of the 189 registered informal settlements under the jurisdiction of the city of Johannesburg. Many informal settlements/ slum in Johannesburg just like Kya Sands lack several basic services and amenities. The slum intervention policies for slum upgradation are not working in some of the informal settlements and thus brings a need to bring new techniques and approaches such as place making in improving the conditions of slums/ informal settlements.

Primary data was collected to provide a baseline of the general perspectives about Kya Sand slum/ informal settlements, current situation and future government plans thereof. A random sampling technique was adopted and 100 questionnaires were distributed to slum dwellers/ residents of Kya Sands informal settlements/ slum. The interviews were conducted to the municipal /government officials that work with Kya Sands informal settlements/slum. The interview with ward councillor of Kya Sands ward 96 was also conducted.

5. RESEARCH ANALYSIS & FINDINGS / RESULTS

Map 1: Map and location of Kya Sands Informal Settlement




Kya Sands Informal Settlement is located in South Africa's Gauteng province in Region A of the City of Johannesburg, about 15 km north-west of the Sandton Central Business District (CBD). The settlement lies on either side of the North Riding Stream and is closely bordered by the Kya Sand industrial area to the west, the Bloubostrand residential suburb to the east, the Hoogland industrial area to the south and mostly small holdings to the north. The settlement occupies both private and government-owned land, lying on 6 different farm and agricultural holdings. As per 2007 figures of the City of Johannesburg, the initial estimated population of Kaya Sands comprised of 7,500 people living in 1,200 'units' (City of Johannesburg,

2007). In 2009 a survey was done by Professional Mobile Mapping that reported a population of 16,238 people living in 5,325 dwellings (Professional Mobile Mapping, 2009) (Weakley, 2013).


A hundred questionnaires were distributed to the local residents of Kya Sands informal settlements, out of 100 participants that took part in the survey study 58% of the residents were male and 42% were female. Around 6% of the residents were between the ages of 18 and younger, 70% of which were between the ages of 19-35, 22% were between the ages of 36-55 and 2% were of the ages 55 and higher. Most of the local residents of Kya Sands which is 62% of this sample is unemployed and only 38% are employed and make less the R7000 per month and are mostly employed by the local surrounding industrial area of Kya Sands. When the survey was conducted a correlation between the employment status and education rates were observed, as there are no schools in Kya Sands informal settlement/ slums (Figure 1), 16% had no education at all, 9% only had primary education, 27% secondary education, 34% had grade 12/ matric education and 14% had higher education/ Graduation (are mainly of foreign nationality such as Mozambique and Zimbabwe). As only most of the people who have had higher education or matric are the ones who are working. It can be observed that as one of the strategies of job creation that the government should adopt is to provide access to schools and/ or encourage some type of education in the settlement.

Figure 1: Kya Sands informal settlement Employment/ Level of Education/ Age comparison data



Participants of the survey were further asked about their housing typologies and number years they have been living in the slum/ informal settlement (Figure 2). 66% of the residents stated they live in shacks, 21% in wood panel housing structure and 11% in brick housing structures, figure 2 shows the number of years/ living status of the residents.

Figure 2: Housing demographics of settlement (number of years and housing structure types)



Most of the local economic activity that occurs in the settlement are of informal nature, such as Spaza/ tuck shops, vegetable and fruit markets, kitchenettes (restaurants), salons, taverns, shoe repairs business and crèches. The survey also observed if there was an interest in the community in establishing their own business. 83% of the respondents said that they had interest in the community economic activities in creating their own businesses. The challenges for funding was reported as one of the biggest problem. Around 17% reported they were interested in government support instead of them doing something for themselves to improve their current living conditions.

The general perception of the community about the government intervention efforts in the informal settlement/ slum is very negative. Most of the community thinks that the delays of the government are caused mainly by corruption within the government, that the governments does not care about the settlement; that the government thinks their settlement is a dumping ground and is not worth fixing etc. Many of the residents of the informal settlement/ slum identified crime as one of the biggest problems facing their community apart from poverty and lack of basic services such as electricity and sanitation and said that the ward councillor or police are of little help. Crime such as mugging, burglary, rape, drug and even murder are of a grave concern to the community members.

The ward councillor of Kya Sands informal settlements/ slum wards 96

In an interview with the ward councillor, the council's future plans for the informal settlement/ slum were discussed. The government plans on the relocation of the slum dwellers to government owned land formally known as Lions Park, where mixed development housing will be build, as the current land that the slum dwellers are currently residing on is both government owned and a portion is privately owned and the settlement has infringed on the privately owned land. The ward councillor also discussed that the government has a few intervention project and programmes in place to ease the slum dwellers living conditions and create some kind of economic income in the meantime before relocation can occur, with projects such as the pikitup clean-up of surrounding area and sorting for recycling purposes.

It was also highlighted that the informal trading sector has been recognised to have a huge influence on income and economic activity in the informal settlements. With new projects such as the Gauteng Premiers initiative for boosting economic development is targeted at townships and informal settlements/ slums to help legalise informal trading and encourage entrepreneurship in communities. The ward councillor has also stated that whatever the council is planning is often communicated with the community and there has been sufficient public participation that happens in the settlement contrary to popular believe that the slum dwellers are not told of anything that happens in the community in terms of upgradations, plans or renewals.

Place Making Determinants

In the survey conducted, the respondents were asked questions about place making and how they think what makes a great place and what factors are needed. The key determinants highlighted by the respondents include access to adequate: housing, public transport, social facilities (school, hospitals, shopping centres and employment opportunities etc.), affordable rates and taxes, crime prevention techniques, community to be involved in planning processes, mixed use development and ownership of shelter/ property where of importance to make a place great for habitation. Half of the sample size felt that there is a need for the place to have sufficient private and public parking spaces, green open spaces, and place signage. While the other half felt that those determinates are frivolous and they can live without them and are not as important or urgently needed in order to make a place great for habitation.

Photo 1: Kya Sands informal settlements/ slum local area




Item	Items (Do you agree need for such determinants in making great places in informal settlements/ slums)	Yes	No	Score				
				5	4	3	2	1
6.1	Access to sufficient housing facilities in the area	100%	0%	75%	18%	7%	0	0
6.2	Adequate public transit system in your area	100%	0%	84%	9%	8%	0	0
6.3	Access to adequate facilities: Schools; Hospitals; Shopping; Entertainment; Employment; Recreation	100%	0%	82%	10%	8%	0	0
6.4	Ownership of shelter	100%	0%	100%	0	0	0	0
6.5	Personal parking space	59%	41%	20%	8%	36%	6%	30%
6.6	Well planned and designed area	100%	0%	34%	10%	47%	5%	4%
6.7	Adequate street design elements	90%	10%	33%	6%	49%	6%	6%
6.8	Sufficient public parking spaces	68%	32%	23%	0	12%	6%	59%
6.9	Sufficient public green open spaces	93%	7%	69%	8%	12%	3%	8%
6.10	Sufficient place signage	88%	12%	31%	8%	50%	1%	10%
6.11	Mixed land use pattern/ development pattern	100%	0%	100%	0	0	0	0
6.12	Community engagement and participation on planning and development	100%	0%	100%	0	0	0	0
6.13	Affordable rates and taxes	69%	31%	0	0	45%	0	55%
6.14	Adequate measures for crime prevention and safety	100%	0%	100%	0	0	0	0
Score 5: Highly Relevant; Score 4: Relevant; Score 3: Slightly Relevant; Score 2: Neutral; Score 1: Not/ Least Relevant								

Table 1: Place making determinants


The table indicates the communities view on what in their perspective is relevant for making great places in informal settlements. Eight of the 14 determinants were fully agreed by the respondents as critical determinants for place making in informal settlements (Figure 3). These determinants include access to: sufficient housing facilities, public transit system, social amenities and facilities (schools, hospitals, shopping, entertainment, employment, and recreation), shelter ownership, well planned and designed areas, mixed land use pattern, community engagement and participation, and adequate measures for crime prevention and safety.

Figure 3: Eight of the Place making determinants (Score 5: Highly Relevant; Score 4: Relevant; Score 3: Slightly Relevant; Score 2: Neutral; Score 1: Not/ Least Relevant)



Many of the residents indicated that for them things like private parking spaces are not of urgent need (Figure 4) or would not be fully utilised in their communities instead many felt that there is a high need for things like green open public spaces (parks) for kids to play as they are currently plying on rubbish dumps and adequate facilities such as schools and hospitals that lack in their communities. Some of the residents expressed that they are unwilling to pay rates solely on the fact that they are not employed. Among the critical determinants deemed highly relevant by respondents in place making of informal settlements include: ownership of shelter, mixed land use pattern, community engagement and participation, adequate measures for crime prevention and safety, and access to public transit and social amenities/ facilities.

Figure 4: Eight of the place making determinants negatively scored by the residents (Score 5: Highly Relevant; Score 4: Relevant; Score 3: Slightly Relevant; Score 2: Neutral; Score 1: Not/ Least Relevant)



6. RESEARCH CONTRIBUTION

The informal settlement dwellers are challenged with multitude of issues which broadly range in terms of infrastructure, service delivery, access to adequate livelihood opportunities and quality of life. The research highlights the need for critical determinants essential for upgrading informal settlements through the approach of place making for turning informal settlements into great places for the communities.

7. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In order to archive the UN-Habitat Target 11 Millennium Development Goals for eradicating informal settlement/ slums and poverty in the long run it is clear that governments cannot just provide shelter and basic service only, but there is a need to identify that services such as education, health and employment opportunity provisions contributes the better lively hoods of slum dwellers and that informal economic activities are the core stables that provide many of the residents with food to survive and that there is a need for government to not only recognise this but possibly try to formalise the informal sector. Place making is not only about letting communities extensively involved in the improvements of their communities through development only, place making is also about recognising the communities ability to grow and sustain itself.

The whole concept of place making in informal settlements is for governments to realise what works for such communities and design intervention plans thereof for specific situation. For instance in this study through the aid of place making it helped identify what the Kya Sands informal settlements residents deemed for them necessary to have within their community in order for it to strive. The survey conducted also helped bring focus on issues that are facing the community and possibly hindering its progress, issues such as unemployment, lack of education and crime. The conclusion brought forth by the overall survey collected is that there is a disparity in council and community communication and it also identified some areas where the government slum policies can change or improve in terms of the community needs.

The aim for this paper was to investigate how informal settlements can be possibly transformed into 'Great Places' for different communities depending on their current living situations. It has highlighted the critical determinates of place making that will be needed in an informal settlement/ slum such as Kya Sands in order to make it a great place. Firstly the paper covered the context slums/ informal settlements and their conditions thereof. Secondly what great places are and what constitutes as a great place. Thirdly it covers the characteristics and principals of a great place/ place making and how governments can incorporate these techniques into their plans of slums/ informal settlements in order to make great places. Lastly it covers what the perception of communities of great places and what they think is needed to make their settlement a "great place". Although this concept of place-making is new and has yet to be seen incorporated in the context of informal settlement/ slums, but it holds promising results that suggest it can help with this problem of informality and inequality in the cities of today.

8. RESEARCH LIMITATION

The research is limited to Kaya Sands informal settlement and the results represent key determinants which are influenced by the demographics, socio-economic and informal settlements conditions of Kaya Sands only. The results obtained as part of the survey may not be necessarily generalized for all the informal settlements and hence requires inclusion of more case studies for representative informal settlements.

9. FURTHER RESEARCH

The subject of informal settlement/slum is a complex one, not only for South Africa but globally as well. A more in depth study in the subject of place making as an alternative means of intervention would be of great use in the future. For instance further studies should be conducted in order to look into what other factors such as lack of education, contribute to the formulation and creation of slum/ informal settlements and how the concept of place making can benefit communities in creating spaces that are theirs and suitable for them. Thus, future research in this field of study should seek to explore further, not only from an economic perspective but also a social, environmental and psychological perspectives of how people not only relate to places but also influence how places are formed.

10. REFERENCES

Allen, K. & Heese, K. 2013. Understanding why service delivery protests take place and who is to blame. Available at: <http://www.municipaliq.co.za/> (Accessed 03 March 2012)

City of Johannesburg. 2007. Action to Provide Short and Long Term Solutions for the Kya Sands Informal Settlement in Region A. Johannesburg: City of Johannesburg.

d'Cruz, C and Satterthwaite, D. 2005. Building homes, changing official approaches: The work of urban poor organizations and their federations and their contributions to meeting the millennium development goals in urban areas. Paper developed from a background report for the Millennium Project's Taskforce on Improving the Lives of Slum Dwellers, Human Settlement Programme, IIED. Available at: www.pubs.iied.org/pdfs/9547IIED.pdf (Accessed June 2014).

Friedman, L. 1968. Government and Slum Housing: A Century of Frustration. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Friedmann, J. 2007. Reflections on place and place-making in the cities of China. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 31(2), 257–279.

Flood, J. 1997. Urban and housing indicators. *Urban Studies*, 34(10), 1635–1666.

Gulyani, S., Bassett, E., M., Talukdar, D. 2014. A tale of two cities: A multi-dimensional portrait of poverty and living conditions in the slums of Dakar and Nairobi. *Journal of Habitat International* Vol. 43: 98-107

Harvey, D. 2008. The right to the city. *New Left Review* 53: 23–40

Housing Development Agency (HDA). 2013. South Africa informal settlement status. Published by the housing development agency (HDA). Pp. 1- 48

Housing Development Agency (HDA). 2012. Gauteng informal settlement status. Published by the housing development agency(HDA). Pp. 1- 48

Huchzermeyer, M. 2004. *Unlawful occupation: informal settlements and urban policy in South Africa and Brazil*. Published by Africa world press Inc.

Huchzermeyer, M., & Karam, A. 2006. *Informal settlements: A perpetual challenge?* (pp. 1-19). Cape Town: UCT Press.

Khalifa, M, A. 2011. Redefining slums in Egypt: Unplanned versus unsafe areas. *Journal of Habitat International* Vol. 35: 40-49

Lombard, M., 2014. Constructing ordinary places: Place-making in urban informal settlements in Mexico. *Journal of Progress in Planning*, Vol. 94: 1–53

Majale, M. 2008. Employment creation through participatory urban planning and slum upgrading: The case of Kitale, Kenya. *Journal of Habitat International* Vol. 32:270–282

Martinez-Martin, J. 2005. Monitoring intra-urban inequalities with Gis-based indicators. With a case study in Rosario, Argentina. Enschede: Utrecht University-ITC.

Martinez, J., Mboupb, G., Sliuzasa, R. and Steina, A. 2008. Trends in urban and slum indicators across developing world cities, 1990–2003. *Journal of Habitat International* 32: 86–108

Mathur, O. P. 2009. A new deal for the urban poor: Slum-free cities. New Delhi, India: The National Institute of Public Finance and Policy. Available at http://indiacitycities.berkeley.edu/2012/docs/Mathur-Final_Poverty_Rep.pdf Accessed July 2014

Patel, A & Koizumi, N & Crooks, A. 2014. Measuring slum severity in Mumbai and Kolkata: A household-based approach. *Journal of Habitat International*, Vol. 41: 300-306

Patel, K. 2013. A successful slum upgrade in Durban: A case of formal change and informal continuity. *Journal of Habitat International* 40: 211-217

Patel, B., Joshi, R., Ballaney, S and Nohn, M. 2011. Slum Planning Schemes: A Statutory Framework for Establishing Secure Tenure and Improving Living Conditions in Indian Slums. *Journal of Environment and Urbanization Asia*, Vol. 2: 45

Professional Mobile Mapping. 2009. *Socio Economic Survey, Johannesburg North: Kya Sands and Lion Park Informal Settlements*. Bedfordview: Professional Mobile Mapping

Project for Public Spaces. 2009. A Guide to Neighbourhood Place-making in Chicago. Metropolitan Planning Council, Chicago, Illinois.

Pugalis, L., Giddings, B and Anyigor, K. 2014. Reappraising the World Bank responses to rapid urbanisation: Slum improvements in Nigeria. *Journal of Local Economy*

Silberberg, S., Lorah, K., Disbrow, R., Muessig, A. and Naparstek, A. 2013. Places in the Making: How place-making builds places and communities. MIT Department of Urban Studies and Planning, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Available at: <http://dusp.mit.edu/cdd/project/placemaking> (Accessed March 2014)

Srinivas, H. 1991. *Defining Squatter Settlements*. <http://www.gdrc.org/uem/define-squatter.html>. (Accessed 03 March 2014)

United Nations Development Programme. 2013. Local Service Delivery: Challenges of Local Service Delivery and Opportunities for Local Development. Available at: http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/ourwork/capacitybuilding/focus_areas/focus_area_details4/p_psd/local-service-delivery/ (Accessed 25 March 2014)

UN-Habitat. 2007. What are slums and why do they exist? Available at: www.unhabitat.org/downloads/docs/4625_51419_GC%2021%20What%20are%20slums.pdf. Accessed April 2014.

UN-Habitat. 2006. New report says urban dwellers badly off. Available at: www.unhabitat.org/content.asp?cid/43177&catid/45&typeid/46&subMenuId/40. Accessed February 2014).

UN-Habitat. 2004. State of the World's Cities: Trends in Sub-Saharan Africa, Urbanization & Metropolitanisation. SOWC/04/RB/4. New York: UN-Habitat.

UN-Habitat. 2003. The challenge of slums. Sterling, VA: United Nations Human Settlements Programme.

Weakley, D. 2013. *Recognising Vulnerability and Resilience in Informal Settlements: The Case of Kya Sands, Johannesburg, South Africa*. Faculty of Engineering and the Built Environment, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

World Health Organisation. 2014. Global Health Observatory: Slum residence. http://www.who.int/gho/urban_health/determinants/slum_residence_text/en/ (Accessed, July 2014)

World Bank. 2008. Egypt: Urban sector update, Vol. 1 of 2. Washington D.C.: World Bank.

World Bank. 2002. Community based urban development project appraisal document. Available at: http://www.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2002/06/01/000094946_02052104055865/Rendered/PDF/multi0page.pdf (accessed July 2014).