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Abstract

In the past five decades the focus of planning component for sustainable land use management is torn between form and process. With the inception of neo-liberalism in global economics in the late 20th century, the focus on process in planning gained momentum in core capitalist countries where the production of planning knowledge is known to concentrate. As this trend spread into developing countries, the meaning of spatial planning exploded into a complex web of characteristics, attributes, classifications and conceptualizations that have continued to evolve in diverse directions with no clear direction towards a universally accepted consensus, notwithstanding the stake-holding intervention of UN-Habitat. In effect substantive issues in planning that measure urban fabric indicators fell into insignificance as generic issues that explain process rise to pave way for market forces to determine urban form. Spatial planning competes or at the best cooperates with infrastructure planning especially transportation planning to determine land use in managing urban regions. As it were the emerging spatial patterns of space economy in Africa, represented mainly by development corridors, conflict with requisite theoretical foundation of form and function that delivers growth in tandem with the shaping of cities. The reversal of this trend in Africa is restrained under the weight of neo-liberal global economic system and its planning theory component. However, this reversal is in contention and this requires visionary review and integration of existing classic and neo-liberal theories of spatial planning. In the African region very limited effort in this direction is found outside South Africa where the amalgamation of planning concepts is underway. Already, an independent source postulates strategic spatial planning concept [1,2]. Mindful of the peculiar nature of South Africa’s experience compared with other political economies in Africa, a case study of this Act is undertaken to seek principles and guidelines for application in the integration of a continental model.
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1 Introduction

The share of experience of African countries in spatial planning dates back to the empire building period which ensued in the 8th century with the inception of Ghana Empire in western Sudan when popular design tradition in planning prevailed. Both state-building and stateless societies that existed then in the regional blocs that account for African civilization had their share of experience based on their epistemological backgrounds. Summarily functional specialization of cities and trade routes controlled by visionary charismatic leadership were major elements that informed use of space in the sub-regions. The cities or the homeland areas that exude considerable civic identity generally featured large grain homogenous land use pattern organized along the lines of extended families, professional and occupational groups. The territorial boundary of the homeland which accommodates resource and production areas were spatially segregated from the commercial centres located at the interface of adjoining homeland territories. These spatial entities were linked with regional trade routes to facilitate culture-specific, pre-industrial and pre-capitalist market systems carefully organized in space and time. Unfortunately this structure of space that was used to grow the economy was truncated in mid-nineteenth century due to contact with western civilization and re-creating a similar structure in a capitalist dispensation is a critical reference point for understanding the current challenge facing spatial planning to guide land use management in contemporary Africa.

Major socio-economic and political transformations that informed African civilization provides insight for mindset and outlook issues seldom considered in determining appropriate thinking instrument that leads to an acceptable concept of spatial planning in Africa. Neo-liberalism as a thinking instrument for conceiving spatial planning is problematic given its bias for market force as basis to guide land use management in which spatial planning serve as a facilitating instrument. This orientation does not necessarily fit in the African context. Indeed a reverse situation is most suited to nurture normative outlook for reforms in land development although it fails in principle to support Universalist planning theory. This brings the notion of dualist planning theory to the fore because as visions are different, so do targets differ as well as road maps to meet them differ, both in theory and in practice.

The capitalist dispensation that prevails at the moment puts space economy at the centre stage of land use management as led by market force. In line with neoliberl global economic imperatives, the extension of market-space economy of core capitalist political economies across their territorial boundaries into African space economy is seemingly underway and transport planning as a dynamic
element in land use management serves a very useful purpose in this regard. This
trend consolidates the history of restructuring of the economic geography in Africa
which made it subservient to the western civilization. Thus it is not clear if the so
called ‘development corridors’ concept currently in vogue in Africa is not indeed
conduit structure used to push the agenda of external economies. This position
draws from the tendency of existing corridors found mainly in South Africa and
the potentials of proposed corridors spread at the coastline of Africa to sustain
extroverted economic system with their focus on trade in foreign goods and trans-
fer of raw materials abroad. Whether these corridors are actively interactive in
growing local economies is yet to be verified.

As Todes [1] indicates, spatial planning is linked with the economic fundamen-
tals of countries. A recent iterative analysis of literature reveals that in most Afri-
can countries except Tanzania and perhaps Egypt GDP composition tends to
correlate inversely with employment structure. In these countries, the economic
sector that powers the national economy consistently offers less employment
opportunities and in extreme cases, such as in Nigeria and South Africa, inequality
is high and poverty is growing because majority of the people are unproductive
and immaterial in the management of the national economy. Enclave economy,
such as in Angola, that depends on resource mining, especially petro-chemical
resources, gives a wrong impression of healthy national economic development,
whereas in real terms economic growth does not reduce poverty. The increases
recorded for GDP per capita do not reflect in the dynamics of poverty. Given this
economic scenario, coupled with unprecedented urbanization, land use manage-
ment is fraught with informalization that has informed paradigm shift in planning
from statutory land use master plans to broad guideline frameworks determined by
market forces.

The new planning approach that popularizes participatory process is heavily
project-oriented ostensibly tailored to manage current economic scenario rather
than redress its spatial content. To this end several perspectives of spatial planning
that extend to informal planning are options on the table to address land use man-
agement irrespective of the widening gap in principles and practice that has ensued
as a result. As the ethos of participatory process dominates principles on account
of sustainability, traditional planning practice remains resilient. In the circum-
cumstance, deciding the concept of spatial planning that is best suited to address land
use management in a sustainable manner is a daunting task especially where the
remodelling of existing urban form to remedy economic fundamentals is in con-
tention. Somehow where the tenacity of restructuring the urban form for increased
urban productivity is weak as perhaps it is the case in Africa, spatial planning tends
to lean towards integrated land development with focus on land use change and not
urbanity that links spatial models for urban development with sustainable land use
management.

The transition to post-modernity in planning for the African region requires
instruments that are yet to be properly conceptualized and theorized. The challenge
ahead is subsumed in three primary trans-boundary issues: sprawl urban
expansion and suburbanization identified to be led by the proliferation of informal settlement development, extroverted national economies overwhelmed with the development of survivalist informal sector operations and dualistic and fragmented space economy stratified spatially along the lines of rural and urban economies and resulting in uneven spatial structures (distortions) in the urban regions. Current trend in planning indicate that broad guideline frameworks determined by market forces are extending into regional and local planning thus creating a lacuna in framework planning that deals with shaping the city. So far the new planning approach sourced from neo-liberal perspective is marginally able to address growth but is completely useless in modelling the form of urban regions and addressing the shape of cities. UN-Habitat admits that how the new planning approach will address spatial and physical shape of cities is yet to be fully understood [3]. The AU has also realized this deficiency with its RAIDS strategy. Nevertheless NEPAD cities initiative could serve as a launch pad for putting the acts of planning together at the continental level in Africa.

2 Point of Departure

A new planning paradigm may advocate new approaches to planning but should not seek to reinvent planning. The ex-ante thesis of public participation in planning popularized by social scientists, tend to complicate the meaning of planning especially as it applies in the context of urban and transnational planning. Unfortunately, the planning profession on its own seems unable to reinforce its theoretical arsenal. Most of the inputs on new approaches to planning tend to be influenced by social scientists themselves. As a result, planning theory gradually drifts from its status as an environmental concept to assume a fluid position as a social science concept. It is now subject to all sorts of interpretation. Current events exhibit very awkward relationship between urban planning, urban economics and urban sociology. Rather than integration, their relationship seems to suggest usurpation of urban planning and this complies with the quiet revolution focused at ‘reinventing planning’ apparently for the benefit of developing countries where planning is largely reactive. In the global north for instance Germany, Bulgaria, Japan, Israel etc., all attributes of statutory planning including its restrictive content are still relevant in their planning system. Land use planning in United Kingdom and Singapore and new urbanism in the United States are all at variance with the crusade of non-restrictive planning.

The perception of planning as an eco-centric and a techno-centric concept remains valid. As an eco-centric concept, it is concerned with ends that seek to achieve sustainable urban form which respect the integrity of the natural ecosystem and the cultural habitat. As a techno-centric concept, it is concerned with different kinds of means. To this end it perceives the natural environment as a natural stuff different from which man can profitably shape his destiny. Hence, it accepts population pressure and economic growth as inevitable forces that can and must be accommodated by proper multiple purpose management and the application of
sensitive planning controls [4]. In the current dispensation it is a conservation instrument committed to achieving modern environmentalism or in practical terms, urban sustainability. It is a design oriented activity based on space and time.

Both, in conceptual and practical terms, the new approach to planning in developed countries does not interfere with expertise-oriented spatial planning which extends to elaborate and detailed land use planning coded in quality urban design operations. This is the case for example in the United States with the smart growth strategy and in the Netherlands with the participation ladder in their planning process which leads up to zoning plan and urban design provisions. The situation in United Kingdom, Germany and Italy and other places is not different and is indeed responsible for current moves towards the Europeanization of planning. The participatory option plays a complementary role and scarcely aspires to usurp the creative attributes of planning. In the global south, the new approach to planning is not oriented in the same direction except perhaps in ASEAN countries. It seeks to usurp land use planning for reasons that are ultimately political and not unconnected with subtle moves for external forces to control the space economy vis-à-vis land use management in developing countries. Somehow it represents ‘do-nothing’ strategy in urban development which indirectly deregulates and delivers spatial planning responsibilities to external development partners.

The development partners find it convenient to use the mechanism of foreign direct investment (FDI) to decide the spatial distribution of ‘development projects’ earlier fabricated through different dimensions of participatory process. Therefore relinquishing the right to land use planning is apparently the price developing countries will have to pay for attracting foreign aid required to solve the funding problems of plan implementation. In Africa, Egypt and Senegal have paid that price considerably; Kenya and Tanzania in east Africa as well as Angola are under siege, South Africa is vulnerable unlike DRC where zero-tolerance seems to exist. Other African countries are at different stages of negotiations with the new concept and with global forces especially through the platform of slum clearance and urban upgrading schemes sponsored by donor agencies.

### 3 Definition of Terms and Background

‘Spatial planning’ and ‘land use management’ are two terms that are pivotal in this discourse. The development of these concepts elicits attention. Planning is contained within, and constrained by, economic and political forces and priorities [5]. Hence statutory planning under the banner of ‘professional design tradition’ emerged globally in the context of imperial capitalism and at the period of rapid urbanization, technological innovations and increased mobility. These conditions obtained in the context of political dispensation led by charismatic leaders such as George Washington in America. Statutory planning subsists and operates invariably with the master plan instrument and in some cases coupled with advisory concept plans as it is the case in Singapore [6]. The master plan instrument ‘is a comprehensive plan, broad-based and an open-ended document encompassing
social, economic, administrative and fiscal matters. It is the official document prepared to articulate the physical development intended over a period of about 25 years [7]. Zoning map, renewal map, schemes and layouts are sub-set and lower order tools for achieving the intents expressed in the master plan.

Hence, statutory plans such as master plans are inherently spatial in so far as they impact land use distribution. The spatial aspect of planning succinctly referred to as ‘spatial planning’ was apparently taken for granted until the modernist period in planning (i.e. 1970s–1980s) when it drew considerable attention and underwent re-engineering. As the wave of change gained momentum, spatial planning concept started shifting from product-oriented to process-oriented activity, a process that was triggered by heavy criticisms against the master plan instrument. At the outset, the master planning critics [8–11] adopted the technique of diffusing attention from design attributes of spatial planning to socio-economic concerns. Their efforts coupled with those of contemporary critics [12–16], informed the prevailing demand to upgrade public participation in planning and in the process deregulate planning-decision making.

As a theoretical concept, spatial planning diverts attention from the statutory attributes of planning (as represented by statutory planning concept) to the broad spectrum of non-statutory attributes that apply on a wider scale. So, in terms of coverage of issues and scale of operation spatial planning is a more integrated concept. Indeed it is an activity that may take different forms in different contexts, depending on institutional and legal context, or variations in planning cultures and traditions [17]. Hence spatial planning discourse seldom proffers conceptual definitions although Planning Officers Society [18] maintain that there are ‘many definitions of spatial planning in existence’. There are definitions but often times these definitions are not theoretically compelling. They are either implied or subsumed in assessment statements of the quality of urban development. However Adams et al. [19] presented compelling explanations in their analysis of regional development and spatial planning in an enlarged European union. Amongst other explanations, spatial planning remained steadfast as a non-statutory, area-related public sector task.

The ‘Torremolinos Charter’ adopted in 1983 by the European Conference of Ministers responsible for Regional Planning (CEMAT) presented one of the earliest definition of spatial planning. It states: ‘Regional/spatial planning gives geographical expression to the economic, social, cultural and ecological policies of society. It is at the same time a scientific discipline, an administrative technique and a policy developed as an interdisciplinary and comprehensive approach directed towards a balanced regional development and the physical organization of space according to an overall strategy.’ The Royal Town Planning Institute offered two definitions. One is, ‘spatial planning is critical thinking about space and place as the basis for action and intervention’ and the other defines spatial planning as ‘making of place and mediating of space’ [20]. According to Wales Spatial Plan, ‘spatial planning is the consideration of what can and should happen where. It investigates the interaction of different policies and practices across regional space, and sets the role of places in a wider context. It goes well beyond
“traditional” land use planning and sets out a strategic framework to guide future development and policy interventions whether or not these relate to formal land use control’ [21]. For Wikipedia [22], ‘spatial planning refers to the methods used by the public sector to influence the distribution of people and activities in spaces of various scales’.

In an independent representation of spatial planning, Adams et al. [19] stated thus: ‘spatial planning seems to reflect a more ambitious holistic approach to territorial development, incorporating all actors in a region to follow a joint vision for the development of a geographically-defined territory’. They also stated that ‘spatial planning is a particular form of public policy, one that claims to be focused on the spatial dimensions of a wide range of other sectoral policies, from economic development, transportation and environmental protection through to health, culture and language’. Furthermore they explained that ‘the holistic feature of spatial planning results from its cross-disciplinary nature, linking social and economic, as well as cultural and environmental dimensions of urban and regional development’ [19]. Another independent representation states that spatial planning is the management of change, a political process by which a balance is sought between all interests involved, public and private, to resolve conflicting demands on space [23].

The definitions of spatial planning do not follow any specific orientation although it is increasingly being oriented towards an instrument for resolving conflicting demand on space. All aspects of development policies and processes provide unique perspective for an alternative definition. The general impression is that it is a thinking instrument that resolves space-activity relationships and proceeds to determine their distribution in the superficial structure of the living environment. Today comprehensive spatial planning with enlarged content is in vogue and it looks at the spatial dimension of all strategic policies and aims at integrating and coordinating all space-consuming activities in a geographic territory. It goes beyond traditional land use planning to bring together and integrate policies for the development and use of land with other policies and programs which influence the nature of places and how they function. The inherent procedural/methodological renaissance and scoping define the point of departure for comprehensive spatial planning models that encouraged ‘the design of spatial framework in which the evolution of society and economy could be accommodated [24]’. This elicits increased attention on understanding local contexts and formulating guiding frameworks that inform land development and management [25]. However with these transitions to policy analysis and emphasis on procedural changes, spatial planning is endangered as a tool for practical application in direct intervention in geographic space.

On account of the need to secure sustainability, current trends indicate the gradual return of emphasis to the classical view of spatial planning in which planning could be visionary and done on a large scale [26–29]. This trend puts on hold the incidence of ‘communicative planning’, a new planning paradigm that almost emerged to consolidate procedure-based planning in which planning was on longer acting on the city [30] and planning assumed the role of a synthesizing holistic
practice committed to integrate different sectoral elements creatively. This creative orientation informed the perception of spatial planning in South Africa as ‘planning of the way in which different activities, land uses and buildings are located in relation to each other, in terms of distance between them, proximity to each other and the way in which spatial considerations influence and are influenced by economic, social, political, infrastructural and environmental considerations.’ Although, spatial plans anticipated should not attempt to be comprehensive.

Having reviewed the definitions of spatial planning from various perspectives it is argued that the concept is a creative process of determining the use of space for sustainable land use management. It is a modelling process that adopts formal and informal expertise knowledge on relative functional bases to create meaningful and sustainable urban forms as determined by patterns of land use distribution. Therefore, the principal focus of spatial planning is indeed the city vis-à-vis space economy as lead by a mindset and visionary outlook that draws from epistemological backgrounds. In its wider perspective, it applies to all dimensions and configurations of space that is to say land, water and air space. At the city level and with the main objective of securing growth in tandem with shaping the city spatial planning translates to urban design activities to facilitate integrated plan implementation and not verse versa. Common experiences in African countries show that the reverse situation where plan implementation is the focal point, planning decision is decentralized thus politicizing planning beyond the traditional levels of politics in planning in which case sectoral departments tend to operate as ‘silos’. The challenge for planning is to ensure the efficient use of limited land resources and to contribute to balanced regional business development and balanced use of resources, including natural and landscape resources, soil, water and air [32]. Therefore, plan implementation is not necessarily the central element of spatial planning notwithstanding the expedience of plan implementation in development processes. Moreover the problem with plan implementation in Africa correlates more with financial probity and accountability than with civic identity sought through participatory process which causes planning process to compromise the creative attributes of spatial planning. Land use design otherwise physical planning is endangered coupled with land use planning both veritable subsets of spatial planning that combine with land development to constitute land use management.

Land is the integrated part of space that is defined as ‘...a delineable area of the earth’s terrestrial surface, encompassing all attributes of the biosphere immediately above or below this surface including those of the near-surface climate, the soil and terrain forms, the surface hydrology (including shallow lakes, rivers, marshes, and swamps), the near-surface sedimentary layers and associated groundwater reserve, the plant and animal populations, the human settlement pattern and physical results of past and present human activity (terracing, water storage or drainage structures, roads, buildings, etc.).’ A Sustainable land use management is a system of land use management which covers planning, implementing, and controlling the utilization of land to establish a sustainable development related to land for the maximum prosperity of the people at present and in the future time [33].
It encompasses land use planning, land use design and land development. As Canadian Institute of Planners put it, land use planning conceptually implies ‘….the scientific, aesthetic, and orderly disposition of land, resources, facilities and services with a view to securing the physical, economic and social efficiency, health and wellbeing of urban and rural communities’. In practical terms it is the planning of human activity to ensure that land is put to the optimal use, taking into account the different effects that land-uses can have in relation to social, political, economic and environmental concerns [34]. According to the white paper it serves as an instrument of ‘planned development (which) can only be successful if it is implemented through the arrangement of land use and land tenure as an integrated element of development based on policy at national and local levels and takes into account the existing local conditions.’ This category of activities elicits considerable attention without commensurate concern for land use design that contemplates form in space economy. It is observed that spatial models of urban regions and attributes of urbanity in three-dimension which identifies form-based land use planning seldom influence the conception of land use management for sustainable development. This leaves the land development aspect of land use management in limbo in spite of the presence of spatial plans.

Land development deals with land use change. Therefore it is concerned with growth elements that are incidental to the dynamics of increasing urbanization. Land use change is a function of urban growth which could be quantitative, qualitative, structural, marginal or smart depending on urban processes and transformations in socio-economic and political fundamentals of a society. Dealing with these growth variables is a subdued dimension of land use management that permits attention to focus on land administration, land tenure and land law. This focus correlates more with sustainable land management, a concept that grew out of a workshop in Chiang Rai, Thailand, 1991. Sustainable land management combines technologies, policies, and activities aimed at integrating socio-economic principles with environmental concerns so as to simultaneously maintain or enhance production, reduce the level of production risk, protect the potential of natural resources and prevent (buffer against) soil and water degradation, be economically viable, and be socially acceptable [35]. Its objective is to harmonize the complimentary goals of providing environmental, economic, and social opportunities for the benefit of present and future generations, while maintaining and enhancing the quality of the land (soil, water and air) resource [35]. These concerns are congruent with environmental planning paradigm which has assumed prominence at the expense of land use planning in the preparation of spatial plans. The case of sustainable land use management in Rwanda is typical [36].

Spatial plans for successful land use management derive from land use plan. Since the land use plan describes essentially the spatial dimensions of development, the land use plan can only be prepared if the development plan has been stated [33]. In other words a land use plan is essentially the spatial dimension of development plan. It explains the link between spatial and infrastructure planning especially movement network and transportation.
4 Spatial Planning Perspectives and Land Use Models

There are different traditions of spatial planning that are spread across the four major blocs of global economy. Within the European bloc the European Commission, 1997 indicates that four perspectives obtain: first, the regional economic planning approach used in France as a policy tool to address equity in spatial development; second, comprehensive integrated approach found in Denmark and the Netherlands in which a system of framework control in a hierarchical order applies; third, land use management approach that is synonymous with the UK tradition of ‘town and country planning’ where planning is a technical discipline and regulatory; and fourth, urbanism approach highly regulatory and commonly found in the Mediterranean countries with focus on architectural flavour and urban design. The American bloc is committed to new urbanism and smart growth approach while the ASEAN bloc operates extended metropolitan region (EMR) approach sometimes referred to as borderless cities approach. Africa is in the process of stunted transiting from land use management approach conducted with master planning. The dynamics in the development of these spatial planning approaches are in two major shifts that are predicated on European and African experience.

The EU territory shares four regional perspectives in spatial planning. The challenge ahead was to integrate these perspectives and come out possibly with a unified European spatial planning perspective. How this can be done must find a methodology of accommodating diversities in the regional context of development. Hence towards the formulation of the European spatial planning policy guidelines, the four spatial planning blocs held their bargaining positions to express their concerns. The north-west perspectives spearheaded the collaborative process. It postulates the need for a formal planning competency that lead to the inclusion of territorial cohesion as a shared competence in the Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe [37]. British perspectives were more concerned with the complex link between spatial planning and land-use planning. Nordic perspectives spotted the discursive nature of European spatial planning and Southern perspectives apparently the missing link in the overall puzzle prefers to watch changes in planning practice. Rivolin and Faludi [38] synthesized these positions in their analysis of spatial planning as an experimental field for European governance.

The current configuration of a spatial planning policy at a European level manifests recourse to new policy processes, instruments and techniques [39,40]. The narrative that follows shows that the European context and the ESDP are beginning to be accepted as an important frame of reference in the production of Regional Planning Guidance. However it appears that changes or innovations in governance occasioned by objectives of European integration generates ripples over a shared understanding of what European spatial planning actually means. Sure enough, there is still a long way to go, and European spatial planning needs a clearer technical definition of what it is about in order to make its usefulness and capacity as a proper tool of European integration more transparent [41–43]. Southern perspectives are yet to be fully incorporated. Their planning tradition tends to
lean more towards neo-classical perspectives as practical option to achieve a more balanced and multi-centric system of cities. Albeit in France, a country also in southern Europe, this trend is not necessarily a typical situation. Each of the multiple contexts is unique. Hence lots of attention is required on progressive changes in local planning practices and institutions [38].

The turn of events greatly influenced by ESDP compelled Dasí, 2006 (quoted in [44]) to argue that the comprehensive integrated and regional economic planning styles are becoming more common, and, moreover, that this process is producing a ‘neo-comprehensive integrated planning approach.’ How this plays out in different scenarios depends on recent welfare reforms. The Dutch spatial planning is tending towards a more liberal approach. It is now more difficult to categorize the planning system in England as dominated by the land-use regulation model [44]. Most of the changes are derived from reformed planning legislation. The case of reformed Planning Act of the 1970s that decentralizes decision-making authority and promotes public-participation in planning in Denmark and the Spatial Planning Act (2001) in Bulgaria are typical examples that identify with recourse to comprehensive spatial planning approach. The 2004 Planning and Compulsory purchase Act for EU countries introduced critical reforms for local planning. Planning here (ostensibly under the influence of ESDP) remains within the drawing-board category and essentially two-dimensional in emphasis.

In Africa, master planning of land use approach and regional economic planning approach are common occurrence as indicated in Table 1. Following the launch of neo-liberal theories of development in Africa, in the 1980s external donor agencies lead by UN-Habitat introduced several strategic planning approaches based on participatory planning paradigm, until now being conceptualized, configured and contextualized in neo-liberal terms. These approaches are given multiple variants of adjectival qualifications that are potentially confusing because the tendency of some of the strategies to via-off the tenets of spatial planning concept or remain within the ambit of master planning processes is common place. However, the focus of the strategies are consistent in projecting interactive participation in planning as an instrument for sustainable development and a requirement for plan implementation. As the impact of this tactic is yet to be properly diagnosed, traditional master planning continues in several contexts [16]. It is not clear the conditions that will upset the current statuesque which obtains in a scenario of rapid urban growth, relatively stable democracy and inherent need for sustainable development. Perhaps the direction of change in democratic process could cause some dynamics in the inclusiveness of planning practice although the impact is likely to be precarious.

In Europe and Africa form-based planning is not as popular as it is in America. Sustainable urbanism or ‘New urbanism’ as it is called in America advocates design-oriented approach to planned development. It applies at the neighbourhood level and its tenet is characterized by relative density. Relative density enables a critical mass of inhabitants to be assembled, sufficient to sustain local commercial and community activities, together with viable public transport provision [45]. Hence the central doctrine of new urbanism is to create liveable built environments
Table 1: Spatial planning in Africa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Spatial planning intervention</th>
<th>Paradigm shift in spatial planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>Apart from the master planning experience in the 1950s and pilot zoning at regional level there were no formal spatial planning efforts in DRC until 2005</td>
<td>Recovered from more than two decades of urban planning vacuum in 2000 and maintained fate with land use master planning perhaps as the best practice instrument to manage their vast forest resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANGOLA</td>
<td>Stratified planning frameworks across territorial levels: action agenda at local level, master planning at regional level, and development framework at national level</td>
<td>Familiar with master planning but since 1990s attempts to imibe, at least in principle, participatory process in a new master planning approach particularly at the local level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALI</td>
<td>Applies land use planning across board</td>
<td>Trend and exogenous influence in the 1990s made possible the inception of the principles of participatory planning. It is not clear how successful the UMP participatory approach used in 2000 for the City Development Strategy in Bamako</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGYPT</td>
<td>As in DRC planning, Egypt is stratified along territorial levels: program planning at local level, master planning at regional level, and strategic development framework at national level</td>
<td>Gone beyond transition from master planning and well within participatory planning practice in their planning history with the inception of Shorouk planning in mid-1990s. The activities of USAID, UNDP, UN-HABITAT and GTZ are not unconnected with this speedy transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENEGAL</td>
<td>Stratified planning perspective is manifest: development planning at national level, strategic planning at regional level and a combination of land use master planning and upgrading programs at local level</td>
<td>Partial shift from master planning paradigm as most of the attempts on participatory planning is still limited to slum clearance and urban upgrading programs although a platform has been raised in 1996 for a determined consolidation of participatory planning practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Spatial Planning</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENYA</td>
<td>Development planning</td>
<td>Most likely resource based and sectoral is applied across board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIGERIA</td>
<td>Hierarchical strategic planning</td>
<td>Initiative that adopts multiple planning frameworks ranging from broad guideline to detailed master plan frameworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH AFRICA</td>
<td>Multiple categories of spatial planning frameworks</td>
<td>Heavily inclined towards the provision of broad guidelines for development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TANZANIA</td>
<td>Land use planning</td>
<td>Most likely broad based at national level leads strategic development planning at regional and local levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHIOPIA</td>
<td>Essentially engages in project planning</td>
<td>For sectoral development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approaching two decades of donor-supported reforms to decentralize planning decision which was initiated in the 1990s is yet to yield any reasonable result. The strategy which is the hallmark of participatory planning simply does not resonate in practice with local institutions.

Master planning seems to remain resilient in practice in spite of overtures for alternative paradigms which at the moment remain mainly at the realm of rhetoric. All the structures for master planning are still very much intact and planning decisions although very much prone to abuse by the political class are not liberalized.

In the course of reforms in planning it seems the paradigm shift is concerned more with the legal status and level of details expected in spatial planning frameworks. At the moment South Africa is yet to strike a balance but reasonable stability has been achieved.

Statutorily master planning still prevails while participatory planning is marauding seeking for an entry point to secure committed acceptance. The usual leeway of slum clearance and urban upgrading programs used by donor agencies to instil participatory planning seem not to be securing the desired commitment to oust master planning.

Receptive to paradigm shift at least to the extent of relaxing centralized planning and allowing some impetus for market forces to play some role in the process of rational land use planning which was introduced in the 1990s.

*Source: Own construction 2012.*
that are vibrant, vital, accessible, close-knit and aesthetically appealing [46]. New urbanism is committed to urban sustainability, thus it proclaims quality urban design with environmental features identified by The Prince's Foundation for the Built Environment as follows: mixed use, mixed tenure, mixed housing type, good public transport connections, walkable neighbourhoods, relatively high net densities, well integrated open space, and opportunities for a range of work/lifestyle choices [45].

The compact city model of urban land use is derived from the theocritical founding of new urbanism. Already doubts are stiff on the validity of the compact city concept as the best option for sustainable urban development. In Africa, the feasibility of the concept is inclusive in the criticisms, given its high-tech dependence. Albeit it shares structural similarities with traditional African cities especially with regards to relative density and walkable neighbourhoods. Most densification and consolidation initiatives find this concept useful in theory as it is the case with the densification initiative associated with corridor development strategy in South Africa. Its practical application demands the services of growth management instruments such as urban growth boundaries (UGB), urban development boundaries (UDB), urban service limits, etc. hitherto barely functional in Africa. The resultant sprawl development that is not unconnected with laissez-faire handling, leaves the urban region in a state of formlessness with spatial distortions that cannot reverse on their own. Yet there is very strong indication of the application of urban development strategies in different African countries (see Table 2).

In Africa, urban region development for metropolitan areas of mostly primate cities is common place. Although how development operations correlate with the decentralization policy of most countries is not clear especially where they are not related to any known urban region development model. Modelling of urban development seems to be caught in the web of informality and this has implications for urban productivity because not all urban forms generate growth especially the sprawl model that is prevalent in Africa.

5 Case Study and Background

There are two sets of reasons that are responsible for the renewed interest in spatial planning in mid-1990s. First was the bandwagon effect of global trend in relating spatial planning to infrastructure planning and second was the severe criticism of master planning allegedly for its inability to shape spatial change in cities (especially those in developing countries [62]). For most African countries, the first reason is more pronounced except in the rare case of South Africa where the rejection of master planning left a vacuum in spatial planning that elicited attention in the first instance and then followed by trend. South Africa needed desperately ‘to co-ordinate and integrate development, and to begin to alter the much distorted spatial patterns of the past’ [63]. Another representation point to a growing awareness of scarcity and the need for wise resource management, challenges of multi-level governance, and pragmatic ways of dealing with differences in and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>Decentralized Territorial Entities (DTE) [47] reminiscent of leapfrog decentralization within core regions; development corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANGOLA</td>
<td>No definite strategy besides development objectives. The Urban Development Strategy adopted by Mali’s Government in 1996, which is part of the national decentralization drive has three objectives: (i) creating an environment that promotes attentive management of urban growth; (ii) improving living standards in urban areas by reducing urban poverty, and (iii) stimulating municipal cultural policies [48]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALI</td>
<td>Growth centres and development axes strategy contained in the strengthening of development centres and inter-urban corridors in each of Mali’s regions [48]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGYPT</td>
<td>Greater Cairo primate city region development [49,50]; North Delta Region (NDR) [51]; Counter magnets contained in Shorouk planning – a overarching spatial strategy for desert development [52–54]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENEGAL</td>
<td>UN-Habitat proposal of Greater Dakar Urban Development Strategy point towards polycentric primate city region development model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENYA</td>
<td>1973 Nairobi Metropolitan Growth Strategy (allegedly not implemented); Nairobi Metropolitan Region (NMR) (State of African Cities 2010:179); Informal application of decentralization strategy that is reminiscent of EMR [55]; Decentralization of urban growth [56]; Rural-urban balance strategy; National development corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIGERIA</td>
<td>Federal Capital Territory, Abuja; State Capital Territories (with informal connectivity); Growth centres; Provincial (State) capitals; secondary cities (Local Government Headquarters); development axes (corridors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH AFRICA</td>
<td>Core urban regions (Cape Town, Ekurhuleni, Johannesburg, Durban) [57]; Regional metropolis and subsystem development: the Extended Metropolitan Region of Johannesburg [58]; National development corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TANZANIA</td>
<td>City-region development strategy [50]; Villagisation (Ujamaa) (1973–1978) based on decentralization policy of 1972 [59,60]; Growth Pole Strategy [61]; as at 2008 Tanzania drifted away from the growth-pole approach and adopted radical agro-polity oriented policies that endorsed the supremacy of territorial integration [58]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHIOPIA</td>
<td>City-region development strategy [50]; Villagization program (1985—early 1990)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Own construction 2012.*
between regions [64]. However they were politically charged altogether to search for an alternative approach to the prevailing pattern of spatial planning in a bid to carry through the effort that started in the 1970s long before it became an issue for most African countries. The issue at stake was the integrity of planning rationality and prudent financial management to promote greater spatial equity in economic growth along with shaping the city.

In South Africa, the first phase of effort to reconsider planning after the renewed interest in spatial planning occurred in the 1975–1996 periods. Two major events marked this period; the conception of National Physical Development Plan (NPDP) in 1975 and the Spatial Development Initiatives (SDI) that developed within certain sectors precisely the transport sector. The NPDP relied heavily on Guide maps that ‘were traditional spatial plans, close to the master planning approaches that have been so severely critiqued’ [63]. There is no indication that NPDP guided spatial framework at national level. At sectoral level the SDI program sufficed particularly with respect to the transit corridors identified by government agencies to move South Africa strategy. This assisted in establishing the development corridor idea as a key component of national government policy [64]. Most of the initiatives (about eleven in number) collapsed except for the Maputo-Pretoria-Gaborone-Walfish Bay corridor and Lebombo Corridor showing promise in recent times. By 1996, integrated development planning was being considered but was dropped the same year as government moved swiftly from statist ideologies of the political left to a more orthodox neo-liberal position [63]. Meanwhile planning has not significantly moved out of master planning orientation. Todes et al. [2] reaffirmed this position in the analysis they provided for Ekurhuleni metropolitan municipality, South Africa.

The neo-liberal context marked the watershed for the second phase of action which had to be contend with heavy political influence linked perhaps to the coarse and non-statutory nature of planning that prevailed. Amidst political manoeuvres, a draft National Spatial Development Plan (NSDP) [65,66] was eventually prepared ‘which includes a statement of spatial priorities and a coarse-grained mapping of development potential in relation to specified categories of development’ [63]. It was painstakingly approved in 2003 after almost five years of scrutiny was to be used to facilitate and structure a debate on State expenditure in and between spheres in all planning exercises [64]. In spite of its conceptual sophistication, it failed to redistribute the spatial development profile that is lopsided. The provisions of NSDP were built on economic expedience that conflicted with government commitment to prioritize rural development [63]. Planning rationality pitched against political influence to create a stalemated situation for planning at the national level.

Recourse to the 1996 constitution brought to the fore provincial planning which lacked conceptual definition. At least on account of constitutional provision for provincial planning, the KwaZulu-Natal province prepared a non-statutory and non-spatial provincial growth and development strategies (PGDSs) with intent to develop provincial spatial framework thereof. The framework prospects to provide ‘a perspective on anticipated spatial trends and essentially proposed that these
trends should be followed and reinforced, although attention should be given to areas outside the loop of economic growth’ [63]. The framework essentially provides guidelines for decision makers in planning matters thus leading to some land reform projects and the identification of some SDIs that guide the provision of services.

The PGDS was not considered to be a success and this led to a reconsideration of statutory planning. In 1996 a legislative provision compelled all local authorities to prepare Integrated Development Plans (IDPs). IDP reflects many of the current international approaches to planning: the emphasis on a strategic approach, avoiding the inflexibility of past comprehensive planning; the weight given to processes based on stakeholder participation rather than plans; and the link between planning and implementation [13,14]. Once more the IDPs were too broad to direct development although they provided opportunity to link spatial planning with sectoral planning hitherto very elusive. While the regional IDPs were handy for service provision in the region, lower order sub-regional plans were formulated to deal with land use management and land reform.

Around 2004, the national Department of Trade and Industry initiated ‘Geospread’, a regional development strategy. This led to the forth option, Regional Industrial Development Strategy (RIDS) (Department of Trade and Industry, 2007). This strategy was to address regional inequality through balanced development, which would entail State support for economic development in non-metropolitan regions and small towns with limited asset-bases. This meant a herculean task of transforming all regions into viable and sustainable economic space. The result was a frustrating disappointment. A presidential challenge in 2007 led to growth management strategy (GMS) that links spatial planning to infrastructure [62]. To give it effect, the GMS was tied to the capital budget and ‘all municipal entities submit bids for their projects which are assessed against the GMS through the Capital Investment Management System—a GIS based system which contains weightings linked to the GMS, held in the development planning and urban management department’ [62]. The application of GMS is presumed to be effective under strong political leadership in the municipality (Johannesburg).

In 2009, the fifth initiative was set to emerge from a Green Paper on National Strategic Planning which was launched for discussion. The Paper proposes a long-term plan for the nation as a whole with key milestones and targets, located within a developmental state with the necessary technical, managerial and political capacities to act [64]. Discussions on this paper are continuing in divers’ directions and a topical issue there is the decentralization of planning responsibilities. This trend led up to the recent enactment of the Spatial Planning and Land Management Act of 2012.

Within roughly four decades of continuous inquiry, South Africa has experimented with roughly seven alternative approaches to spatial planning each with an average lifespan of five to six years. Yet the highly elusive search for appropriate paradigm for spatial planning seems not to be conclusive. However, some milestones have been reached in three directions: first, linking spatial planning with infrastructure development or sectoral planning, second confirming that recourse to neo-liberal ideology had the effect of politicizing planning beyond the traditional
levels of politics in planning, and third, realizing the strategic need for statutory planning, strong leadership and detailed plans with which to direct development as prerequisites for effective land use management. These are hard facts ordinarily in the rhetoric of neo-liberal planning will not be easily accepted. The milestones achieved are still very precarious requiring time for emerging facts to be clearer and more legislative provisions to fortify grounds gained in paradigm development. However, there are outstanding issues yet to be resolved particularly finding a synthesis of planning paradigms that will deliver spatially equitable economic growth and shape the cities simultaneously. An example already in operation apparently since 2000 but somehow not visible in literature is strategic spatial planning which Todes [62] referred to that attempts to ‘promote more compact and integrated cities, and to redress patterns of inequality of the past’ in Johannesburg. This approach of planning is thought to be ‘more flexible (focusing on directional guidelines and key strategic interventions); go beyond land use plans to bring together sectors and institutions; involve forms of collaborative planning, including a range of stakeholders and wider levels of participation [16]; and link to implementation through projects and budgets’ [62]. Moreover, it portends ‘to link spatial planning and infrastructure development through a growth management strategy’ [62]. The elements in the package of initiatives are: the 2006 Growth and Development Strategy (GDS), statutory IDP and statutory Spatial Development Framework (SDFs) first published in 2003 from which more specific Urban Development Frameworks (UDF) have been developed [62].

5.1 Rationale and objectives of Spatial Planning and Land Use Management Act of 2012 (or else Wise Land Use Act 2012)

The Act draws from thirteen points of departure. The first four points addressed deficiencies in planning legislation that encouraged racial inequality, segregation and unsustainable settlement patterns. The two points that followed addressed the positioning of spatial planning, its poor linkage with infrastructure investment and minimal integration with informal and traditional land use development processes. Constitutional deficiencies that fail to address environmental protection, property rights and equity issues concerning access to land, adequate housing and sufficient food and water drew attention as a fifth point. The provision of basic needs for previously disadvantaged communities and sustainability in land development were summarized in three points. Three other points were concerned with due respect for the functional segregation of national, provincial and municipal planning. Lastly, concern was expressed for the establishment of a comprehensive system of spatial planning throughout the republic. In all of this, the major bone of contention is to redress the apartheid spatial landscape which many believe remains resilient after four decades of multifaceted interventions.

The Act is committed to ten objectives thus: To provide a framework for spatial planning and land use management in the Republic; to specify the relationship between the spatial planning and the land use management system and other kinds of planning; to provide for the inclusive, developmental, equitable and efficient
spatial planning in different spheres of government; to provide a framework for the monitoring, coordination and review of the spatial planning and land use management system; to provide a framework for policies, principles, norms and standards for spatial development planning and land use management; to address past spatial and regulatory imbalances; to promote greater consistency and uniformity in the application procedures and decision-making by authorities responsible for land use decisions and development applications; to provide for the establishment, functions and operations of Municipal Planning Tribunals; to provide for the facilitation and enforcement of land use and development measures; and to provide for matters connected therewith (Wise Land Use Act 2012). Efforts to achieve these objectives draw from five major principles which include: sustainability, equity, efficiency, integration and good governance.

5.2 The structure of Wise Land Use Act 2012

The Act is contained in 40 pages with 61 sections that are arranged in seven chapters some of which are subdivided into parts, plus three schedules. The first three chapters dealt with ancillary issues that cover definitions and conceptual frameworks, principles, norms and standards as well as intergovernmental support. The Act sets out to articulate a system of spatial planning and land use management for the Republic that can provide a functional working environment to redress the imbalance of the past and promote social and economic inclusion. Hence, the Act provides for spatial development frameworks to be prepared and adopted by national, provincial and municipal spheres of government; and using land use schemes to guide spatial planning, land use management and land development that is to say land use change. The categories of spatial planning anticipated, to be compiled, approved and reviewed include: integrated development plans, spatial development framework and land use scheme. Allied to these provisions are monitoring activities and policy reviews.

The principles of spatial justice that addresses equity issues, spatial sustainability concerned with limiting sprawl, efficiency that optimizes the use of existing resources and infrastructure, spatial resilience to ensure sustainable livelihoods in communities, and good administration that ensures integrated approach to spatial planning and land use management systems bear on all planning related activities. Norms and standards that are consistent with the planning and management systems are contained in Administrative Justice Act, 2000 (Act No. 3 of 2000), and the Intergovernmental Relations Framework Act. The Acts address national land use management and land development policy and urban form issues, management processes, land use diagnosis and design standards, technicalities for graphic presentation and report writing, monitoring and evaluation methodologies for spatial planning and land use management. Ministerial logistic support to provinces and municipalities for effective implementation of the Act is anticipated as embedded in the statutory support structure.

The fourth chapter states that the three spheres of government shall prepare spatial development frameworks that are coordinated, aligned and in harmony
with each other. A long-term spatial development vision statement and plan informs the preparation of frameworks primarily to address historical spatial imbalances in development. According to section 12(6) of the Act, spatial development frameworks must outline specific arrangements for prioritizing, mobilizing, sequencing and implementing public and private infrastructural and land development investment in the priority spatial structuring areas identified in spatial development frameworks. Through consultative participatory process, the frameworks which are subject to executive council approval and periodic review processes to be done at least once after five years derive from policies, plans and programs that have an impact on spatial planning, land development and land use management. After council approval, the framework takes legal effect upon publication in government gazette.

Provision is made for regional spatial development framework prepared for geographic regions as determined by the Premier in consultation with concerned Municipal councils. This category of framework comes into play in consultation with the public when a municipality fails to publish or review existing municipal spatial development framework in accordance with the Act. The framework is programmed to be consistent with environmental legislation and provide basic guidelines for spatial planning, land development and land use management in the designated area. The provision of implementation and funding strategies is a strategic requirement which was prominently expressed for the content of the municipal framework. The provincial framework seems not to have much of distinguishing provisional requirement for its content. It is peculiar for the national spatial development framework to ‘take cognizance of any environmental management instrument adopted by the relevant environmental management authority’. The municipal spatial development framework remarkably spotted the consideration of ‘the spatial form of the municipality, including development corridors, activity spines and economic nodes where public and private investment will be prioritized and facilitated’. Land development decisions are not permitted to deviate from the provisions of this framework except perhaps on site-specific circumstances that justify a departure.

The subject heading of chapter five of the Act is land use management however, attention focused on land use scheme prepared by the executive authority of the municipality in cooperation with the traditional council. The land use scheme which should be prepared within five years from the commencement of the Act is a zoning and regulatory instrument for built-up and non-built-up areas with special reference to the provision of affordable housing in residential land development. The schemes shall be designed within limits of environmental legislation to promote national and provincial policies as it relates to economic growth, social inclusion and efficient land development and minimal environmental impact. According to section 26(1a) of the Act, an adopted and approved land use scheme has the force of law, and all land owners and users of land, including a municipality, a state-owned enterprise and organs of state within the municipal area are bound by the provisions of such a land use scheme. Exceptions to this section are treated on their merit according to the provisions of the Act. Meanwhile the power
to execute the provisions of the scheme is issued through separate or integrated authorization. The change of the boundaries of a municipal area initiates procedure alterations in the provisions of the land use scheme to be executed within a set timeframe. Also amendment of the scheme could be as a result of rezoning that is considered beneficial to achieve the development goals and objectives of the municipal spatial development framework however, such rezoning exercise is done through participatory process to ensure fair play. However, the municipality could pass a bye-law in addition to appointing an inspector to monitor the enforcement of the land use scheme.

The sixth chapter of the Act deals with land development management but most of the provisions elaborate the management of Municipal Planning Tribunals. An initial reference to municipal land use planning drew attention to land development applications that must be submitted to the municipality as the authority of first instance. According to section 35(1) of the Act, a municipality must, in order to determine land use and development applications within its municipal area, establish a Municipal Planning Tribunal. The council of two or three municipalities or a district municipality could jointly set-up a tribunal and mandatorily publishes such ventures in the provincial gazette and a local newspaper in each of the affected municipalities. Membership of the tribunal whose term of office is five years with defined mandate determined by the municipal council is limited to full-time officials of the municipality and those appointed by the municipal council who are deemed to have ‘knowledge and experience of spatial planning, land use management and land development or the law related thereto’. The tribunal operates on democratic principles of simple majority in deciding an application before it that relates to ‘township establishment; the subdivision of land; the consolidation of different pieces of land; the amendment of a land use or town planning scheme; or the removal, amendment or suspension of a restrictive condition’. The decision is expected to be guided by development principles, norms and standards that are predetermined in the Act. The Act also made elaborate provisions for the functioning of the tribunal as an administrative body that is however burdened with technical duties involving the correlation of land development with the provision of services.

The powers of the Minister to deal with ancillary issues necessary for the implementation and administration of the Act were spelt out in chapter seven. These issues as they relate to regulations point to procedures for the lodging of applications and the consideration and decision of such applications, lodging of any appeals and the consideration and decision of such appeals, land development application and the operating procedure of a Municipal Planning Tribunal. Other issues include the delegation of power, exemptions, non-impediment of function, offences and penalties and transitional provisions. Several of the powers stipulated are intended to be exercised through consultative process. These provisions included in a long list of matters arising from this Act to be dealt with in provincial legislation are contained in the first schedule. The second schedule identifies and defines land use purposes (functions) anticipated for proper implementation of the Act. The land uses identified include: agricultural, business, commercial, community,
conservation, educational, government, industrial, institutional, mining, public, recreation, residential and transport. As indicated in section 59 the third schedule outlines four laws that are repealed in whole as the Wise Land Use Act come into operation. These laws are: Act No. 84 of 1967 Removal of Restrictions Act, Act No. 88 of 1967 Physical Planning Act, Act No. 125 of 1991 Physical Planning Act and Act No. 67 of 1995 Development Facilitation Act.

5.3 Analysis of Wise Land Use Act 2012

Multiple criteria analysis (MCA) is used to assess the prospects of the Act to secure spatial planning system that will deliver equitable land development for spatial sustainability and economic growth in the urban and regional landscape. In other to determine if the options are properly considered in establishing the objectives of the Act, a performance matrix of objectives in relation to the chosen options is weighed and scored using a three-phase criteria index as shown in Table 3.

The performance matrix indicates that the Act is a fairly good administrative document although it has issues to resolve with technical requirements. Spatial

Table 3: Performance matrix of the objectives (sections) of Wise Land Use Act 2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives (Sections)</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Options</td>
<td>Yes (+1) Moderate (0) No (−1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission identification</td>
<td>Epistemology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic fundamentals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mindset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Points of departure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Targeted objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Definition of terms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adoption of spatial planning concept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Score</strong></td>
<td>4 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development principles, norms, standards</td>
<td>Civic identity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Determination of guiding principles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning design standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land use schemes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban development strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diagnosis of land use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Score</strong></td>
<td>3 0 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
Table 3: Performance matrix of the objectives (sections) of Wise Land Use Act 2012 (*Continued*).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives (Sections)</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (+1) Moderate (0) No (−1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental</td>
<td>Logistic support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support</td>
<td>Technical documentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal expertise in planning decision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decentralization of planning activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developmental government agencies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan evaluation strategy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Score</strong></td>
<td>4 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial development</td>
<td>Economic development plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frameworks</td>
<td>Infrastructure planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developmental perception of spatial planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shaping the city</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statutory attributes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Score</strong></td>
<td>2 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use management</td>
<td>Planning rationality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Space economy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land use planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical Planning (Design)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inter-departmental coordination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning consultancy services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Score</strong></td>
<td>3 1 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land development</td>
<td>Rezoning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management</td>
<td>Urban growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Growth management instruments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedure for land development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Score</strong></td>
<td>3 0 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministerial powers</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan preparation and application.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict resolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Penalties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Score</strong></td>
<td>3 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate score</td>
<td></td>
<td>22 7 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
planning subsumed in spatial development framework and land use management which are the two cardinal objectives of the Act returned a neutral and negative result, respectively. Somehow this links with the slightly negative scenario in the determination of development principles, norms and design standards. On the other hand the performance in mission identification is outstanding followed by the handling of intergovernmental support and Ministerial powers, all concerned with ancillary issues in spatial planning. The situation in the provisions for land development management is rather precarious.

The points of departure indicate the output of a mindset that is focused at the redistribution of land use development but how this redistribution relates to the restructuring of economic fundamentals to ensure growth lacked expression. Racially motivated land use redistribution as it appears to be the case at the moment may not guarantee economic growth except perhaps if South Africa is prepared for a trade off with the growth of survivalist informal sector services which is most likely in the current scenario of redistribution. It is argued that making the people more productive irrespective of their location is the critical issue for planning in which relocation should not be treated as a constant. The current mindset that informed the Act would have done better if it focused on growth that is drawn from the redistribution of space economy. In this case and without prejudice for population mobility it would have been more strategic for locations hitherto not productive due to epistemological realities to be transformed using targeted economic, infrastructural and planning policies rather than stimulate population mobility.

The development principles are more inclined towards spatial redistribution of population rather than restructuring land use in favour of generating new economic landscape. Since homeland areas are involved it is expected that civic identity should be part of the development principles. Besides, the elements of creative planning that takes advantage of cultural base somehow lacked expression. Form and function in planning perspective is arguably not an issue and design consideration in an urban scale is not a primary concern. The provision made for physical planning is contained in the application of land use schemes apparently for incremental layout development to accommodate population transfer as fortuitous circumstance permits. Against this backdrop, spatial development framework is framed on participatory paradigm in a neo-liberal platform. In this regard, infrastructure planning is the control element for development in a heavily statutory environment. Economic development plans do not seem to play a significant role in the conception of the spatial framework for development as it ought to conceptually, except perhaps that possibility is implied. Given the current setup, space economy is likely to emerge by accretion because it appears the developmental concept of spatial planning is at stake and considering also the poor premium given to shaping the cities. Not even the scanty reference to development corridors paradigm remedies the gap in guiding the form of space economy. There is no gainsaying the influence the corridor concept could bear in determining space economy but it lacks the credentials to work in isolation of planning frameworks.

The technical issues mentioned earlier which demand attention is founded on considerations for land use management. In the first instance, a greater percentage
of the consideration for land use management drew from linkages with environmental management at the expense of core issues of spatial planning. The next influential element is the tactic for plan implementation which favoured project planning and leaves land use planning of land use scheme category at the point of discretion to be recalled when residential and agricultural land use planning is at stake. The Act does not present the best of enabling environment for planning rationality and this is to be expected in a participatory setup where planning consultancy service shares relevance with informal planning. This explains the lack of emphasis on planning design which is a fundamental element of land use management. The gap identified adversely affects land use management as a basis for guiding the space economy especially as it relates to shaping the city. In the circumstance, interdepartmental coordination remains a serious problem as sectoral departments take advantage of the absence of the binding element of planning design and sectoral statutory provisions of the Act to function independently as ‘silos’. Such disconnected operational environment reflects the disability of economic growth to influence the configuration of development instruments.

Administrative provisions made land development management look good although considerations for this objective were ostensibly based solely on rezoning. Again major oversight is identified here as it relates to urban growth and growth management instruments. These issues are fundamental and cannot be assumed to be incorporated in the thinking process. Rezoning is related to densification and densification is a function of growth in urban structure and dynamics. In anticipation of growth this objective ought to be explicit on the use of growth management instruments. Contrary is the case because attention is not focused on the form that is epitomized in urban development models.

The provisions made for good planning administration is laudable but the snag is that these purely administrative bodies seem not to be properly equipped to perform technical functions. The drive to decentralize planning activities was foremost in the conception of government agencies and these agencies are not committed to formal expertise in managing planning decisions especially plan evaluation. The problem with technical documentation that informed the structure of the agencies lies with comprehension because services external to the agency shall be sought to deal with the technical component of administrative functions. Therefore the congruency of interdepartmental support with technical duties is in contention in spite of very elaborate operational provisions made in the Act. The Ministerial powers are well intended but it has the potential to increase the vulnerability of planning to politics especially in plan implementation. Some measure of authority should be extended to professional planning bodies to control inputs in land use and land development management as well as monitoring plan implementation and evaluation.

In conclusion, the Act is in tune with global trend of desiring the dividend of well-planned environment conceived in line with the principles of sustainability but it is sceptical about subjecting this responsibility to formal expertise knowledge in planning. It upholds the wisdom of linking spatial planning with environmental management and transportation planning and in the process concedes most
of the core elements of spatial planning. The concession allows participatory process in planning and redirects attention to project planning which is progressively assuming the orientation of infrastructure planning. This has implications for the politics of space economy involving different political economies. It seems that attention is drifting more in this direction however not without pull from planning for growth and urban sustainability. Attending to these contending pull factors in the current global economic dispensation simultaneously leaves planning in quagmire in developing countries. The experience of South Africa is uniquely outstanding in Africa having undergone the experience of apartheid planning which represents a harsh version of colonial planning that is common place in Africa. Since 1994, the transformations in their planning principles are rapid and numerous however it reflects in turn high propensity of failure to comprehend the principles hence the poor performance of their application in practice.

6 Proposals and Recommendations

At the moment, market forces and planning rationality contend for position as basis for guiding land use management. This has introduced lots of dynamism in spatial planning perspectives in an attempt to accommodate the contending variables in different proportions. The choice of the most appropriate perspective or a combination of perspectives is indeed the contentious issue in considering spatial planning as basis for land use management in Africa. The use of spatial planning to guide land use management is not new in Africa. It started in the mid-nineteenth century with the classic perspective following contact with western civilization, to rational perspective in late twentieth century and the gradual inception of neo-classic experience in early twenty-first century. All along market forces have remained in the background until the rational perspective gave it additional impetus through the participatory mechanism of process-planning which has the effect of devaluing planning rationality. After close to five decades of precarious experimentation with rational planning which failed to secure interactive participation that was vigorously sought after the need to introspect is inevitable, perhaps solace could be found in neo-classic perspective.

The choice of spatial planning perspective for Africa shall be based on two objectives that will determine the mission for land use management. The first objective is to facilitate the spatial structure for the reversion of economic fundamentals in African countries from extroverted to introverted political economies. This has implications for restructuring the space economy of African countries to make them less vulnerable to incursions following the expansionist program of external economies. In this case, growth in spatial terms has to be dependent on local economy. The second objective posits that economic growth has to be form-based in line with the school of thought of form and function. The spatial structure in contention shall be form-based. There are several classic urban and regional models that could be engaged or normative models could be spurn in so far as they are applied to generate the space economy which is responsive to local
institutions. Since form is a function of spatial growth, the expedience of growth management instruments is presumed along with the requirement of good urbanity for African cities.

The requisite spatial planning perspective shall incorporate land use planning and design led by formal expertise knowledge in planning however in consultation with informal expertise knowledge. It shall be a developmental concept as such committed to the sustainability of urban and regional development. The current integration of planning instruments could provide a good lead to its conception. Much is not required to arrive at a consensus because a lot of diagnoses have gone into a possible synthesis. The strategic spatial planning proposal looks good but further scrutiny is required to free it completely from apron strings of neo-liberalism. What is required is fidelity to African renaissance and not commitment to global trend, without apologies to Universalist planning theory. The mindset and outlook are key role players in this intervention and their focus to dismantle the continued dependency status of Africa in global economy shall be resolute. Otherwise the whole experiment will derail under the weight of external forces. It is recommended that intellectual platform that is not compromised be set up to conceptualize spatial planning perspective for Africa.
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