

Making urban land markets work for the poor

---

# Synthesis and advocacy considerations

Sarah Charlton

University of the Witwatersrand

November 2006

# Synthesis paper\*

---

- Part One (of two parts)
  - Key issues:
    - 1. The problem
    - 2. Motivations for access
    - 3. Meaning of making ULM work for the poor
    - 4. Key actions
    - 5. Key stakeholders
    - 6. Summary + action statement
  - Synthesis
- Thoughts on advocacy position
- \*Draft - authors have not yet commented on this

# Different perspectives

---

- 7 position papers

- Capturing unearned values/ leakages to assist markets to work for the poor (Brown-Luthango, M 2006)
- Attacking urban poverty with housing: toward more effective land markets (Cross, C 2006)
- Regulatory systems and making urban land markets work for the poor in South Africa (Kihato, M and Berrisford, S 2006)
- Opening up spaces for the poor in urban form: trends, challenges and their implications for access to urban land (Landman, K and Ntombela, N 2006)
- Conceptualising ‘the economy’ to make urban land markets work for the poor (Marx, C 2006)
- Land use differentiation, class differentiation and the urban land market: international and SA frameworks in MMW4P persp. (McCarthy, J 2006)
- Making urban land markets work for the poor in the context of existing local land access and transfer institutions (Royston, L 2006)

- Other viewpoints and considerations

# Nature of the problem

---

- Conceptual
  - Limitations in prevailing paradigms wrt relationship between poor and the economy (Marx 2006)
- Gaps in knowledge and understanding
  - Not enough known about existing local practices to inform debate (Royston 2006, Kihato & Berrisford 2006)
- Legislative & regulatory issues
  - Inadequacies in usage, and inadequate refinement of tools (Kihato & Berrisford 2006)

# Nature of the problem

---

- Inadequate policy mechanisms
  - Limitations in urban development policy tools (Brown-Luthango 2006)
- Problematic trends
  - Privatisation of public space leading to spatial exclusion & fragmented governance (Landman & Ntombela 2006, Kihato & Berrisford 2006)
  - Housing driven development (Landman & Ntombela 2006)

# Nature of the problem

---

- Positive market trends
  - Opportunity provided by residential filtering (McCarthy 2006)
- Ideology and values?
  - assumptions wrt perceived value of land underlies regulatory framework (Kihato & Berrisford 2006)

# Motivation for access to urban land

---

- Various reasons put forward by 7 position papers
  - Contribution to poverty alleviation (Cross 2006; Kihato & Berrisford 2006, Marx 2006)
  - Access to opportunities generated by the wealthy, & those of the broader economy (Landman & Ntombela 2006, Royston 2006)
  - Social interaction in shared public space (Landman & Ntombela 2006)
  - Historic inequality and lack of access (Brown-Luthango 2006, McCarthy 2006)

# Motivation for access to urban land

---

- Benefits of current economic growth distributed unevenly (Brown-Luthango 2006)
- Inadequacies of current policies (Brown-Luthango 2006)
- Economic argument: contribution to the economy (Marx 2006)
- That there should be access is not a universally shared position elsewhere (Napier & Ntombela 2006)

# Making ULM work for the poor

---

- Reinforcing and building on an existing pattern of development across market segments
  - Facilitate middle or higher income developments ('the goose that lays the golden egg'), use the spin-offs to further lever residential filtering (McCarthy 2006)
- Value capture from market activities; strategic use of public land
  - 'bold decisive strategic interventions in the market to ensure that the poor reap some of the benefits of government's investment in the market' (Brown Luthango 2006: 1)

# Making ULM work for the poor

---

- Planning and design guidance to development projects
  - Prevent negative spatial practices, promote urban planning & design interventions that are inclusionary (Landman & Ntombela 2006)
- Consolidating and expanding the low income housing programme
  - a strategy to secure the asset-value of state-provided houses + ‘instant, dirt-cheap housing options in a range of good city locations’ (Cross 2006: 20)

# Making ULM work for the poor

---

- Raising consciousness and deepening understanding
  - Acknowledge and understand local institutions, assess performance, balance debate (Royston 2006)
- Identifying poor peoples' activities as part of 'the economy'
  - 'engage in activities that reconceptualise dominant understandings of 'the economy' and especially, one of the key economic processes – economic growth' (Marx 2006: 1).

# Making ULM work for the poor

---

- Advocacy; intervention, integration
  - Profile urban land as a resource for poverty alleviation, engage with the process of developing and refining planning laws, integrate available instruments into coherent programmes (Kihato & Berrisford 2006: 30)

# Synthesis: what is involved

---

- *A: Intervening* in existing market practices:
  - Curtailing existing upmarket practices which have negative impacts (Landman and Ntombela 2006, Kihato & Berrisford 2006).
  - Imposing obligations on existing thriving market activities (Brown-Luthango 2006, Royston 2006).
    - May not be favoured by McCarthy (2006) if these are seen to be ‘punishing’ market performance.

# Synthesis: what is involved

---

- *B: Initiating or encouraging practices* which benefit the poor:
  - Providing incentives for upmarket developments to have a pro-poor spinoff (Brown-Luthango 2006, aspects of McCarthy 2006).
  - Promoting active public spaces of engagement (Landman and Ntombela 2006).
  - Consolidating and reinforcing the potential of the national state housing programme (Cross 2006).

# Synthesis: what is involved

---

- *C: Giving recognition to existing practices, and rethinking implications:*
  - Acknowledging, understanding and assessing existing local practices which are otherwise vulnerable to uniformed interventions (Royston 2006, Kihato and Berrisford 2006).
  - Acknowledging and exploring alternative conceptualizations of the relationship between the poor and the economy (Marx 2006).

# Synthesis: what is involved

---

- D: *Improving* the current 'rules of the game':
  - *Altering, reforming and streamlining* recognized land management procedures and regulations (Kihato and Berrisford 2006, Royston 2006).

# Advocacy considerations

---

- Different scales of engagement:
  - national, city-wide, & localised
- Different types of engagement:
  - lobbying, facilitating, research, piloting
- Both private and public space
  - spaces for ‘being’, accumulation, interaction
  - relationships between these spaces
- Across income spectrums
- Different understandings of use & value of land
  - Both long term and more transitory
  - heterogeneity of ‘the poor’ – and the rich?

# Advocacy considerations

---

- Context: ULM programme, & SA priorities
  - Intersection?
    - Poverty alleviation
    - Economic growth
- Urban land and planning
  - the ‘politics’ and socio-economic impacts of ‘technical’ activities
    - eg: regulations, land management, evictions
  - opportunity in Joint Initiative on Priority Skills Acquisition (JIPSA) ?
    - municipal planning a scarce skill (Mbeki 10/11/06)

# Advocacy considerations

---

- 1. Raising consciousness
  - assumptions about ‘the poor’
    - (NIMBY, ‘perceived negative externalities’, perceptions of the place of the poor)
  - assumptions about ‘informality’
  - assumptions about simplistic dualities
  - assumptions about economic growth
    - privileging a certain conceptualisation over redistribution
- 2. Profiling
  - importance of urban land for poverty alleviation
    - NB assumption not universally held

# Advocacy considerations

---

- 3. Raising debate
  - in what ways can land contribute to poverty alleviation
  - in what ways is it important for ‘the poor’
  - In what ways are current market practices negative
  - Property and income to cities
- 4. Securing political support
  - in mitigating negative impacts of powerful trends
  - acknowledging power relations
  - piloting ideas
- ‘Voice – mindsets – change’ (ULM 2006b)