Continuous spatial transformation is a characteristic of any settlement, whether it happens regularly, for example in large cities and metropolitan areas, or is part of a slow process, as in small rural villages (Madanipour 1996). Urban structure and form is dynamic, continuously changing in direct relationship to its producers and inhabitants, through a continuous process of spatial transformation. Thus, when needs or urban activities change, urban form has to adapt to these and change as well. Over time, land-use patterns transform the arbitrary layout into structure filled with information, into a place filled with possibilities. This again sets up further possibilities for physical and social reaction.

Gated communities are closed-off spaces, representing a transformation of open space to closed space through physical boundaries. The study of gated communities is therefore also concerned with the physical transformation of space. The number of gated communities in South Africa has increased tremendously since the late 1990s, with various types spreading across the urban landscape. As a significant contributor to urban spatial transformation in many areas, there is a need to understand the extent and impact of different types of gated community in Greater Johannesburg and their implications for spatial restructuring and sustainable development.

The spatial history of South Africa is characterised by racial segregation under the apartheid regime which, among other things, entailed the intentional segregation of neighbourhoods. This led to centrally located neighbourhoods being reserved exclusively for whites, with non-white areas and areas of poverty located on the outskirts of the urban areas. This resulted in the scarring of cities through decentralisation and sprawl.
(Horn 2002; Prinsloo and Cloete 2002). Apart from the immense task of reconciliation, post-apartheid South African cities are therefore also concerned with spatial restructuring and integration of residents across the urban landscape.

This raises many questions related to the appropriate nature of new developments to facilitate spatial integration in these cities and the role that planning and relevant policies should play to accommodate appropriate transformation. Given the major role that planning played historically in the spatial segregation of races in the country, the post-1994 planning system had to change to address this, highlighting four aspects that need consideration: the ethical values that should guide it, an assessment of new policies and practices, an examination of the processes of change, and an enquiry into the transferability of new knowledge and ideas in a specific context (Harrison et al. 2008). In this chapter we map the spatial transformation through gated communities in Johannesburg and reconsider these four aspects in the light of this transformation.

Changing space: the process

An enquiry into the spatial change in Johannesburg cannot be concerned with physical space alone. It also needs to incorporate social space in its broader sense. Spatial research therefore needs to make use of a socio-spatial approach to understand physical form and its transformation over time and meaning. This necessitates a focus on the process and an exploration of what physical and social spaces encompass as part of the process of spatial transformation in cities. The following framework offers a way to understand spatial transformation as a socio-spatial process. This happens through a process involving space, need, idea, order, form and meaning, and parallel with these, the production and management of the spatial intervention in a specific context (Figure 11.1). Space refers to the unbound natural or existing constructed space and is usually informed by particular needs at a specific time that directly relate to the specific context. The need gives rise to an idea about how to address it. This is the beginning of order, of structural organisation to guide urban form. The settlement form is the physical manifestation of the need and idea, and takes on a particular shape, texture, size, etc. It reflects the character of a space and contributes to the creation of a particular place, which in turn can be modified over time. Space and place are not arbitrary. They encompass meaning. Spaces or places can therefore be ‘read’ and ‘experienced’ and can appeal to people’s emotions – for example, feeling safe or unsafe in a specific place. As such, physical space also influences the use of space and people’s behavioural patterns and reactions to different spaces and places. As a result, these modified places can also elicit a number of responses, which in turn can add to the transformation of specific spaces if considered necessary by a sufficient number of supporters. This returns the cycle to the beginning, where a need arises to change existing constructed space. This process is influenced by a range of players involved in the production and management of space, which constantly influences the need/demand, idea, form, order and meaning in settlements (Landman 2006, 2010; Roitman et al. 2010).
This framework offers a model through which to consider the process of spatial transformation in relation to processes of social, economic, environmental and political change in a specific settlement. It therefore offers a good framework to understand and map spatial transformation through gated communities in Greater Johannesburg.

Gated communities in Johannesburg are the product of an intricate process of transformation where social space influences the modification of physical space, which in turn impacts on the social space within cities. Within the context of high crime rates and multiple levels of insecurity in Greater Johannesburg, gated communities address the needs for safety and security (Fabiyi 2006; Harrison and Mabin 2006; Jürgens and Landman 2005; Landman 2006), territorial control (Landman 2007), financial security (Fife 2002a,b), efficient service delivery (Bénit-Gbaffou 2007; Dirsuweit and Wafer 2005), a specific lifestyle (Fife 2002a; Hook and Vrdoljak 2001) and a desire to be close to nature. The ideas influencing the establishment of gated communities in South Africa are themselves influenced by a number of international ideas, such as the crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) and ‘urban village’ and sustainable development concepts, through the idea of eco-estates. These find specific concrete manifestation in different types of gated communities, ranging from large luxury residential estates and office parks, to townhouse complexes and gated apartment blocks. Enclosed neighbourhoods also transform existing urban neighbourhoods into fortified enclaves.
with controlled access. Changing urban space in turn leads to changed use and behaviour within these spaces, influencing general levels of accessibility and integration (Landman 2006, 2007). The result is a collection of enclosed cells of differing sizes scattered across the urban landscape, fragmenting the urban form into a series of broken-up pieces and limiting access to the remaining open areas, as pointed out by a growing number of commentators (including Dirsuweit and Wafer 2005; Tomlinson 2003). However, due to the contested nature of these developments, responses have been varied and as a result policies are cautionary but not completely restrictive (Harrison and Mabin 2006).

Change factors: the different types of gated community

Despite an increasing body of literature on gated communities, there is a lack of agreement on the definition of such communities. This is the case internationally, within South Africa and even within Johannesburg. While some urbanists consider only security estates as gated communities, others include enclosed neighbourhoods and/or townhouse complexes, with some even referring to hostels as ‘gated ghettos for the poor’ (Beall et al. 2002). However, if one focuses on the spatial and returns to the physical roots of the term ‘gated community or neighbourhood’, it clearly refers to the physical characteristics of the area. Hence, a gated community can broadly be defined as a physical area that is fenced or walled off from its surroundings, either prohibiting or controlling access to these areas by means of gates or booms. In many cases the concept refers to a residential area with restricted access, so that normal public spaces are privatised or their use restricted. It does not, however, refer only to residential areas, but may also include controlled access areas for work (office parks), commercial (shopping malls) and/or recreational purposes (Landman 2006).

Bearing in mind this definition, it is possible to distinguish between two broad types of gated community in Johannesburg, namely enclosed neighbourhoods and security villages, in the latter case understanding ‘village’ in a very broad sense. Enclosed neighbourhoods refer to existing neighbourhoods that are closed off for security purposes, while security villages or developments include new, private, gated developments with a variety of land uses, depending on the subtype. As indicated in Figure 11.2, these subtypes range from large estates to medium and smaller gated townhouse and apartment complexes and can even include predominantly non-residential gated parks with a range of different land uses.

Enclosed neighbourhoods

Enclosed neighbourhoods refer to existing neighbourhoods that have controlled access through gates or booms across existing roads. Many are fenced or walled off as well, with a limited number of controlled entrances/exits and security guards at these points (Figures 11.3 and 11.4). The roads within these neighbourhoods were previously, or still are, public domain, depending on the model used. There are two models of enclosed neighbourhoods in South Africa: a public approach and a private approach. Municipalities may support one of the two approaches, a combination of the two, or offer both approaches for residents
to choose from. The implications of these two approaches are very different. In the public approach, the roads, parks and sidewalks are still owned by the local authority, which is therefore responsible for their maintenance. However, if the areas are taken over by the residents’ association, they become private space and the residents are responsible for their maintenance (Landman 2000a, 2006). Within the City of Johannesburg, only the public approach is allowed.

Since 5 March 1999, the Rationalisation of Local Government Affairs Act (No. 10 of 1998) has enabled communities in Gauteng to apply to the local authority for restriction of access to public places for security and safety purposes. As a response to both the Act and the huge demand from communities in Johannesburg, the city developed a policy on access restriction to ensure that the Act is interpreted correctly and to guide residents and city officials towards achieving the goals intended by the Act.

Enclosed neighbourhoods also have different implications for accessibility. According to the South African Constitution, it is the right of all people to have access to and free movement within all public space. The important issue is whether the enclosed area remains under public control or if it is taken over as ‘private space’ by the residents’ or home owners’ association. If the enclosed area stays under public control, all people have the right to enter the public spaces.
Security estates

The Estate property developments website identifies a number of different types of estate in South Africa. These include coastal estates, golf estates, nature estates, lifestyle estates, senior estates and wine estates. Although it does not provide any definitions of these types of estate, a comprehensive list of examples is provided, which starts to point towards certain characteristics of these estates. From the examples, the website identified only three types of estates in Gauteng and more specifically the Greater Johannesburg area: golf estates, nature estates and lifestyle estates. However, it is likely that these definitions are used primarily for advertising purposes as some estates are listed under both nature and lifestyle estates, for example Mogham Farm, Olive Crest and Blair Atholl. AfriGIS uses a slightly different system of classification and refers to golf, country, eco, fly-fishing, private and residential estates, as well as retirement villages. As estates are private developments, it is not clear what the difference is between private estates and the others. In addition, the other types of estates also include residential land use. This highlights the difficulty in trying to identify the differences between different types of estate. It would perhaps be more appropriate to rather use the key characteristic, i.e. a golf course, to classify the different estates.

Supported by additional information from other websites, previous studies and field observations in the city, it is possible to identify three types of estate in Johannesburg, namely golf estates, nature or eco-estates and lifestyle estates. There is, however, not always agreement on the interpretation of the type of estate. Some golf estates are also classified as country estates, for example Dainfern, or as nature estates, for example Blair Atholl. Others are exclusively classified as country estates, for example Arlington Estate. In some cases estates are classified as both nature and lifestyle estates, for example Olive Greek Estate.

Golf estates, as the name suggests, are mainly characterised by the presence of a golf course within the boundaries of the estate. One of the most prominent golf estates in Johannesburg is Dainfern, which is designed around the Jukskei River and the golf course. The entire estate comprises a number of smaller neighbourhoods, each with its own name.

![Figure 11.3: Part of the entrance to a luxury gated golf estate located in the northern suburbs of Johannesburg.](image1)

![Figure 11.4: A road closure restricts access into an enclosed neighbourhood in the central to northern part of Johannesburg.](image2)
and particular atmosphere. Dainfern offers a wide range of services to its residents, ranging from intensive security services to water and garden services and access to a number of facilities and amenities, including a country club, golf course, pavilion, nature club, garden club, a private college and a wide range of other sports facilities.

Both the terms ‘nature’ and ‘eco-estates’ are used to advertise the benefits offered by these types of development. One of the main features is the proximity to nature and the incorporation of many natural elements and sometimes wildlife as well. A prominent nature estate is Aspen, which is designed around a number of soft open spaces, with a river running through the estate and unspoilt countryside, including rolling hills, lakes, parks and walking trails. The entire estate is protected by a security company, with high-technology systems monitoring all entrances and boundaries 24 hours a day and a 24-hour armed-response vehicle patrolling the estate.¹

Secure townhouse complexes

Secure or gated townhouse complexes refer to sectional title schemes that are fenced or walled and have controlled access through a gate and sometimes a boom-gate as well. This entrance can be operated through remote control and/or managed by a private security guard, depending on the size of the complex and the residents’ level of income (Figure 11.5). These complexes range from luxury villas to smaller units catering for the lower middle class in Johannesburg. The units are mostly single or double storey with a separate entrance at ground level.

The complexes are governed by the Sectional Title Act (No. 95 of 1986), which defines common property as that part of a sectional title scheme which does not form part of any section. Examples of common property are driveways, parking bays and garages, private gardens and gardens, swimming pools, corridors, lifts and entrance foyers to name a few. Some parts of the common property can be designated as exclusive use areas under section 27 or section 27a and allocated to a particular owner for exclusive use.²

FIGURE 11.5: A luxury gated townhouse complex surrounded by a solid wall in the northern suburbs of Johannesburg. Security is stringent with security guards, key codes, booms, a security fence and CCTV cameras.
Secure apartment blocks
Secure or gated apartment blocks are fenced or walled and have controlled access through a gate and/or a boom-gate. The entrances are operated by remote control or managed by private security guards. These blocks or complexes can range from large luxury apartments to those catering for the upper middle classes to gated apartments for the lower-income band, including affordable and low-income housing units. For example, there is a very low-income housing unit in Alexandra, where the security guard house is much larger than the rooms which are let to low-income earners. The entire complex is protected by a fence with strict access control through gates and enforced by security guards. In addition, there are vertical gated apartment blocks in the inner city of Johannesburg which are increasingly catering for professionals during the week. They have strict access control and residents are forced to hand in their identification documents upon entry. Some of these apartments are governed by the Sectional Title Act, while others are managed as social housing schemes. The apartment blocks vary in size. They include individual four-to-five storey blocks scattered on the site or larger perimeter blocks that start to define the street space, or even blocks with separate rooms and communal bathroom and kitchen facilities for very low-income earners.

Non-residential gated parks and mixed developments
Gated communities in Johannesburg are, however, not only restricted to residential land use but often also include other land uses such as business, commercial and even industrial. These can also vary in size, from a small urban block to large office or commercial parks. These developments are fenced or walled and have controlled access through a gate and/or boom-gate. The entrances are usually staffed by private security guards who require identification and purpose of visit from potential visitors. AfriGIS distinguishes between the following subtypes: business estate and park; commercial park; corporate park; industrial estate, park and village; production park; office block, court, estate and park.

There are also a limited number of gated communities that start to incorporate a broader mix of uses, for example Melrose Arch in Johannesburg. Although strictly speaking any member of the public may venture into the area, it is strictly controlled by private security guards who monitor all movement of people. In this sense it resembles other private spaces that are open to the public but strictly controlled, such as shopping malls and enclosed neighbourhoods, where the public may enter but under strict surveillance.

Changed space: the outcome
Distribution of different types of gated communities
Gated communities in the City of Johannesburg are concentrated in the northern parts (see Plate 43 in the colour section). While there are some townhouse complexes, one estate and one enclosed neighbourhood in the south, these are very scattered and do not have a significant impact on spatial transformation in the area.

Enclosed neighbourhoods are mainly concentrated in the north, located predominantly
in the inner ring formed by the ring road (N1 and N3 highways) and to a large extent east of the M1. There are also a number of enclosed neighbourhoods located just outside the ring road, just north-west of the N1 highway, and a few large ones in Midrand and Chartwell. It is noteworthy that many of the enclosed neighbourhoods occur in the more established, older areas of Johannesburg, closer to the CBD and within the ring road.

The estates are mainly distributed along the north-western edge of the metropolitan area, with about ten large security estates in Midrand, Fourways, North Riding and Ruimsig. These estates are outside the built-up area and therefore extend the built-up area into the surrounding landscape, which may impede on high-potential agricultural land and transgress the city’s urban edge, thus obstructing attempts at urban consolidation or compaction.

The townhouse complexes or sectional title schemes are scattered over a much larger area, stretching from the inner city of Johannesburg to the north and west and to a lesser extent the east. Smaller pockets or concentrations of townhouses also occur around certain intersections or along major roads, for example just east of the inner city alongside the western bypass (N1) in the vicinity of Northcliff and Fairland, just south of Ruimsig, around Fourways and Lonehill and around Vorna Valley in Midrand. There are also concentrations in Bramley and Sandton. There is a smaller concentration of sectional title schemes south of the inner city, scattered around the southern bypass (N3). There is a fairly large concentration of townhouses and business/office parks in Sandown, Atholl Gardens and Strahavon. They offer good accessibility to the growing nodes in Rosebank and Sandton and the new Gautrain stations in those areas. The concentration is then spread out in the direction of Morningside, almost creating a corridor of sectional title schemes and transforming the road into a closed-off tunnel in many places.

Spatial restructuring at a provincial and metropolitan level

The Gauteng Spatial Development Framework (GSDF) is one of the key documents giving direction for spatial restructuring in Gauteng province. One of the key precepts of the GSDF is that the ‘horizontal spatial extent of the urban system is kept tight and an outer development boundary is placed on outwards sprawl’ (GDED 2010: 41). Plate 44 depicts the distribution of different types of gated communities in relation to the suggested areas for present and future consolidation in Gauteng. Most of the large residential estates are located in areas marked for urban consolidation, for example Midrand and Modderfontein. Consolidation in these areas will thus be impeded due to the low density of these estates, especially within the boundaries of the city where there is comparatively little developable land left. There are also a number of residential estates in areas marked for future consolidation, especially in the north-western part of Johannesburg, west of Midrand and north of Chartwell. These estates will also have implications for future consolidation efforts. While there is not much one can do about those that have already been developed, it raises interesting questions in terms of future applications for residential estates in these areas, which, according to the criteria in the GSDF, should not be encouraged or permitted. However, enforcement of the criteria is likely to lead to further tensions as almost the entire
Johannesburg area is set out for present or future consolidation due to its strategic location and the value of the land, leaving little or no open land for future residential estates.

The city also promotes regulating peripheral growth and urban sprawl and facilitating growth within a polycentric hierarchy of nodes connected by a viable transport system. Plate 45 depicts the distribution of gated communities in Johannesburg in relation to the strategic public transport network and public transport influence areas – two key aspects of the city’s Spatial Development Framework (SDF). The large residential estates are not likely to have major implications for spatial restructuring as they all fall outside the public transport influence areas and very few are directly connected to the strategic transport network.

Enclosed neighbourhoods, however, are likely to have a far greater impact on integration and accessibility. Many of the enclosed neighbourhoods in the north, especially those falling within the ring road, are located directly adjacent to the roads forming part of the strategic transport network. In addition, many also fall within the public transport influence areas. Whereas the aim behind the strategic transport nodes is to create greater integration in the neighbourhoods and facilitate accessibility, the enclosed neighbourhoods do not facilitate this. Not only do they limit access to secondary roads from the main strategic transport roads, but they also limit through traffic in large parts of the urban environment in the north. They therefore change the urban fabric from a fine grain to a much coarser grain, leaving a series of major transport routes to bind a collection of closed neighbourhoods. This creates a very unfriendly and often uncomfortable environment for pedestrians and cyclists, who have to negotiate space with fast-moving traffic on the remaining open roads.

Townhouse complexes or sectional title schemes are also likely to have a larger impact on spatial restructuring than estates. Plate 45 indicates that many of these complexes are located along the strategic public transport roads or within the public transport influence areas. Due to the extent and nature of these complexes, they challenge the principle of settlement restructuring that considers the urban design and finer detail of neighbourhood development to be as important as urban form. The potential influence on urban design and spatial restructuring at a district and neighbourhood level is even more pronounced if one considers the number of townhouse complexes clustered alongside major transport routes and within public transport influence areas. In some case these clusters – for example in Sandown and Atholl Extension 12, Ferndale and Morningside Manor – start to transform the original grid pattern in larger urban blocks, restricting mobility within the clusters. This has implications for pedestrian access and the creation of a finer urban fabric.

The city’s planners are aware of the potential implications of gated communities and acknowledge that they are one of a number of contributing factors that may influence the SDF in terms of the chapters on movement, public transport and land use. These communities may also have implications for the implementation of certain principles, as they directly influence both the transformation of public spaces into ‘pseudo’ private spaces as well as pedestrian access in the city. City planners also acknowledge the importance of recognising the different types of gated community and their different implications.
Although the current SDF does not directly address the issue of gated communities, these developments may play a more prominent role in the next review.

**Spatial restructuring in districts and neighbourhoods**

Similar to the city’s SDF, the GSDF also promotes development along activity spines, where urban structuring elements such as consolidation zones, urban corridors, urban activity nodes and activity spines are defined to create a ‘skeleton’ to guide future urban development and structure urban form over time. The activity spines also start to give direction to urban densification. Plate 46 depicts the relation between gated communities and the GSDF spinal influence areas in the northern part of the city.

An interesting pattern emerges showing many sectional title schemes located within the spinal influence areas. On the positive side, this means that densification is already under way and that sectional title schemes in fact facilitate spatial restructuring in this regard, as most townhouse complexes can be considered medium-density housing. On the negative side, however, the built form does not facilitate integration between the complexes or with the public realm outside, since most complexes are designed as cluster houses that are oriented towards the inside and surrounded by high walls. They are thus not appropriate for zones facing the spines directly. Yet many are already located in these areas and may therefore have negative implications for spatial restructuring in terms of the desired built form and integration with the public realm. Those townhouse complexes that are located outside the spinal influence areas are likely to have little impact on spatial restructuring, as they comprise approximately one or even less of an urban block and will therefore have a limited effect on accessibility.

While the townhouses tend to cluster along the major transport routes and within the spine influence areas, the enclosed neighbourhoods fall in behind these, creating a series of different closed-off spaces within the urban environment. Apart from restricting access through these neighbourhoods, they do not affect the spinal areas in a direct way. In some cases, however, the enclosed neighbourhoods are located directly adjacent to the spines and fall directly within the spinal and transport influence areas, for example in Sandhurst, Willowild, Wendywood and Gallo Manor. These neighbourhoods consequently restrict access along the spines and defeat the purpose of trying to facilitate greater integration along them. This is of special concern as the main intention behind the spinal and main transport influence areas is that the first or last point of entry onto the public transport system should be accessible within walking or cycling distance for people who live and/or work in these areas. People should not be forced to use a private vehicle to reach this point of entry. However, due to the location of some of the enclosed neighbourhoods and street closures within the spinal influence areas, many bus and taxi access points are not accessible within walking or cycling distance.

Gated apartment blocks or affordable housing complexes should be considered in a different light. While some follow the form of townhouse complexes and are oriented inwards, for example Carr Gardens in Newtown, others, in spite of being gated with controlled access, adhere to the principles of densification, while still acknowledging the public realm through
orienting the buildings towards the street, for example Brickfields in Newtown. These types of
development may therefore have no or few negative implications for spatial restructuring and
may in fact start to assist with the process of densification, while offering an acceptable form
of housing to those who wish to stay behind walls and gates.

Spatial transformation and sustainable development
Both the GSDF and the city’s SDF state that the aim of spatial restructuring is to facilitate
the creation of more sustainable settlements. This implies that adherence to the principles
and criteria discussed above is likely to promote sustainable settlements, and vice versa.
However, the issue is not quite that simple, as many factors influence the sustainability of
cities and different types of gated community have different implications for sustainable
development. The complexities of the relationship between gated communities and
sustainable development have been explored in relation to different aspects, such as the
implications for implementing sustainable principles (Landman 2000b), the implications for
sustainable development in South Africa (Landman 2006; Landman and Du Plessis 2007)
and the impact of urban fortification on sustainability (Landman 2012). Suffice to say that
gated communities in Johannesburg will raise similar concerns. As Harrison et al. remarked,
‘there is a growing fashion for eco-estates of various kinds, including estates, but it is doubtful
that the construction of large gated estates, with poor access by workers, high levels of class
separation, and which are dependent on transport by motor car, can be seen as a model for
sustainable development’ (2008: 168). However, it is again important to distinguish between
different types of gated community as their influence in this regard will differ substantially.

Conclusion
Gated communities are not evenly spread through Greater Johannesburg and tend to occur
in clusters in the north and north-western parts of the metropolitan area. As a result, they
will not have a major impact on spatial transformation in the entire metropolitan area,
but are likely to have a significant impact in areas of concentration. The impact is also
likely to differ depending on the type of gated community and the extent of these types
in different concentrations. While large estates tend to influence urban consolidation and
the availability of high-potential agricultural land on the outskirts of the metropolitan area,
townhouse complexes and enclosed neighbourhoods are more likely to impede intended
spatial restructuring along major transport routes and spines in the older, well-established
neighbourhoods of the city. The intention of the spines and their influence areas, as well
as that of the strategic transport routes identified in the city’s SDF, is to facilitate greater
integration and accessibility. However, in some cases these two types of gated community
are unlikely to accommodate the achievement of this intention. This is especially a concern
in terms of large enclosed areas that comprise an entire neighbourhood.

Gated communities also raise a number of issues regarding future planning and
transformation. As noted, due to the role that planning played historically in facilitating
spatial segregation, planning systems now also need to facilitate the spatial restructuring of South African cities to address this. In this regard, Harrison et al. (2008) highlighted four aspects that need consideration. Each of these is valid when reconsidering gated communities and their role in the city.

The development of gated communities raises many issues related to the ethical values that should guide the future development and restructuring of Johannesburg. On the one hand planners are driven by the vision to promote integration and accessibility and open up urban opportunities for the poor, but on the other they are faced with the challenge to promote safer urban environments. While these two agendas do not necessarily have to be in opposition, they often are in practice, creating many tensions between the planning ideal and the contextual reality. Interestingly, gated communities in Johannesburg are not only the domain of the rich. Increasingly, residents of all income groups associate greater levels of security with increased security measures such as target hardening and access control. It therefore appears that gated communities for the upper income group may have created a precedent to be aspired to. As a result, a variety of gated housing complexes and apartment blocks are being developed to cater for lower-income households. This raises very interesting questions about ethical values and for whom planners should plan the city.

These communities also impact on the development of new policies. The transition to a democratic system and the gradual modification of planning and development policies to reflect the ideals of the democratic state set out to achieve a number of noble principles, including equity, efficiency, integration, sustainability and good governance. However, development practices such as gated communities may challenge the implementation of these principles in practice, necessitating a renewed assessment of the alignment of new policies and existing practices within the built environment.

An examination of the processes of change is required to determine to what extent gated communities reflect the aims of the new policies. The discussion has indicated that while gated communities in Johannesburg may facilitate some of the positive spatial restructuring outlined in the GSDF and the city’s SDF, there are many concerns related to their impact on urban consolidation and densification at a metropolitan level, as well as on greater integration and accessibility at a neighbourhood level. By examining these processes of spatial change and, in this case, by understanding the implications of gated communities for urban restructuring, existing spatial frameworks can be adapted to reflect these changes and to redirect future change.

However, this also implies understanding the processes that influence spatial change and the impact of new knowledge and ideas in a specific context. In this chapter we have illustrated that spatial transformation through gated communities is influenced by a range of social, economic, environmental and political issues and that the changed spaces in turn influence these issues. Therefore, as levels of insecurity related to personal safety, financial stability and environmental resources remain a major driving force, urban residents will turn to existing ideas from abroad to address these needs. This raises questions about the relevance of, for example, the CPTED and ‘urban village’ concepts within the South African context and in relation to the broad goal of spatial integration.
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Notes
1 See http://estate.co.za/propertydevelopments.
2 See www.aspennature.co.za.
4 The approach to densification in the GSDF is summarised as follows: ‘The activity spines are to form the basis for redevelopment and densification. Properties in these districts that are located on identified urban activity spines that can accommodate public transport are to be regarded as favourable for urban intensification and/or redevelopment at higher densities and at appropriate land uses and at heights of two to four storeys. Properties that do not face directly onto the active spines but form a contiguous zone abutting those properties that do face directly onto activity spines can be redeveloped at increased densities. Properties fronting onto local parks or public open space are to also be targeted for densification purposes. Areas that do not form part of the above criteria are to be targeted for selective densification and should retain the inherent character of the existing area’ (GDED 2010: 76).
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