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Abstract

As in many other countries, the processes of gentrification in South Africa have taken the form of urban regeneration. However, little geographical research has been conducted on gentrification in South Africa. This study adds to the literature by presenting the case of Parkhurst, a Johannesburg suburb, that has undergone gentrification. Parkhurst displays three of the four characteristics of gentrification: (1) the housing stock has undergone extensive physical improvement (2) property values have increased and (3) the original residents have been displaced. Although gentrification is usually also associated with a change in housing tenure from rentals to ownership, it was found that ownership was, and still is, a common feature, both prior to, and subsequent to, gentrification. The study found that Parkhurst has a demographic and a socio-economic profile typical of a gentrified suburb in that it is populated by young, educated and childless couples, many of whom are high-income-earning professionals, and new residents to the area. Due to its past designation as white space, this suburb is still a reflection of South Africa’s racially stratified past in that it is still numerically dominated by white people. Furthermore, the gender ratio is skewed in favour of males. Almost one third of the housing stock has been renovated or is under renovation. Some of the residential stands in the suburb have been converted into business units such as restaurants and antique shops. This research concluded that for Parkhurst the process of gentrification has been driven by consumptive patterns of behaviour, with individual consumption patterns in particular driving the process.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1. Introduction

The purpose of this study was to establish whether Parkhurst, a suburb of Johannesburg, was gentrified or not. This will be done by looking at various definitions and processes of gentrification, both locally and internationally. This chapter introduces the research by outlining the problem statement, the research questions and the hypotheses. The importance and objectives of the study, as well as the research methodology and study area, are then discussed. Gentrification has been associated with the physical upgrading or renewal of what was once highly dilapidated housing stock to meet the requirements of new owners (Hoogendoorn, 2006; Butler, 2007). In the United States, and most parts of Europe, gentrification is characterised by the transformation of apartments into condominiums and the renovation of homes in a specific area (Gottdiener & Budd, 2005).

1.2 Defining Gentrification

Various definitions and examples of gentrification abound, but the term was coined by Ruth Glass in 1964 when she described what were then new and highly noticeable urban features affecting London’s inner-city areas (Lees, 2008):

“One by one, many of the working class quarters of London have been invaded by the middle classes. Shabby, modest mews and cottages have been taken over, when their leases have expired, and have become elegant, expensive residences. Larger Victorian houses, downgraded in an earlier or recent period – which were used as lodging houses or were otherwise in multiple occupation – have been upgraded. Nowadays, many of these houses are being subdivided into
costly flats or “houselets”. The current social status and value of such dwellings are frequently in an inverse relation to their [former] status, and, enormously inflated in comparison with previous [price] levels in their neighbourhoods. Once this process of ‘gentrification’ starts in a district, it goes on rapidly until all or most of the original working-class occupants are displaced and the social character of the district is changed” (Glass 1964, as cited by Lees, 2008, 4).

Gentrification has developed significantly through the years as a consequence of various urban processes. Disinvestment, usually the first step towards neighbourhood deterioration, can often, in the long term, result in gentrification. Disinvestment occurs when old buildings in an area are not maintained, upgraded or replaced (Slater, 2002) and can be triggered by more general municipal-wide disinvestment such as when municipal services (e.g. refuse removal, pavement cleaning and park maintenance) are terminated or become intermittent. In order to attract tenants under such conditions, rents per unit need to be low (Fyfe & Kenny, 2005). However, if the run-down area is located within an economically attractive zone, such as a business centre, or is characterised by unique and/or highly valued architecture and/or is home to restaurants, then re-investment and re-vitalisation (termed gentrification) could well occur.

Once this happens, gentrification takes place and the poorer or working-class residents are displaced as they cannot afford the rising rental costs (Kennedy & Leonard, 2001). Gentrification then is the physical upgrading or renewal of what was once highly dilapidated housing stock to meet the requirements of new owners (Hoogendoorn, 2006; Butler, 2007).
Amongst the negative impacts of gentrification is the issue of displacement of the original or lower-income residents (Slater, 2001, Lees, 2008; Larsen & Hansen, 2008).

Internationally, gentrification has reached a mature stage in its developmental process and is evident in areas other than the residential sector (e.g. those dominated by economic, cultural, social and political functions respectively) (Davidson & Lees, 2004). That said, although gentrification has been identified in a number of large North American, European and Australian cities, it is still a “small-scale” and “geographically-concentrated phenomenon” (Hamnett, 1991, 173).

1.3 Problem Statement and Research Questions

This study seeks to establish whether Parkhurst is undergoing or has undergone a process of gentrification. Thus, the research needed to find answers to the following questions:

(1) Has the demographic profile of Parkhurst undergone a change?

(2) Has the original physical character (built environment) of Parkhurst changed?

(3) Have the original residents been displaced?

1.4 The Importance of this Study

This study is important since it adds to the knowledge base of geographers, urban planners, public officials and developers, as, currently, little is known about the process of gentrification in Johannesburg. Limited research has been conducted on gentrification in the South African context, with the exception of the work of Garside (1993), Kotzé (1998), Kotzé and Van der
Merwe (2000), Rule (2002), Hoogendoorn (2006) and Visser & Kotzé (2008). Visser (2002) noted that literature on gentrification in Cape Town is available, but, that there are significant gaps in it with respect to other South African cities, such as Johannesburg and Pretoria. Furthermore, this study also partly addresses Visser’s 2002 call for an active examination of other South African cities in order to firstly assess whether they are undergoing gentrification; and secondly whether they have the potential for gentrification or not.

1.5 Methodology

Various sources (primary and secondary) were used to collect the data for this research. A great focus is placed on local literature from authors such as Rule (2002) for comparison with international literature. These sources made it possible to find answers to the following research objectives:

1. To assess the demographic profile of Parkhurst: Questionnaires were randomly distributed to Parkhurst residents to obtain demographic data, such as age, gender, home language, and race, level of education, marital status, family size and income.

2. To examine the extent of renovation or renewal that is taking place in Parkhurst: Primary data on the physical condition of the buildings were collected using a door-to-door audit of the properties. Individual properties were selected randomly. The properties were divided into those with a business function and those that are residential. Approximately 10% of the houses were subjected to the audit. Additional primary data were obtained from semi-structured in-depth interviews with key stakeholders, such as tenants, home-owners, landlords, estate agents and business-owners in Parkhurst.
Primary data for the study were collected by means of short questionnaires and interviews with key role players, such as some residents, business-owners and estate agents. The questionnaires asked for information on housing characteristics, as well as selected demographic and socio-economic characteristics of the residents. For purposes of analysis, the questionnaire was based on a similar one used for an unpublished study conducted in Cape Town by Kotzé (1998), as well as one used by Kotzé & Van der Merwe (2000). The survey questionnaire used for this thesis is referred to as the Parkhurst Survey 2011. All participants gave informed consent and all could opt out of the study should they have wished to.

The main data collection method was that of a systematic random sample questionnaire survey and interviews conducted in the neighbourhood. There are 2,147 stands in Parkhurst, used either for residential or business purposes. Every eleventh housing unit on every street was targeted in order to achieve an ideal 10% coverage of the study area. For the in-depth interviews, business-owners provided critical information on the type of consumers in the area, their behavioural patterns and the nature of their spending patterns. Real estate agents provided information on the characteristics of home buyers in the study area, and their reasons for buying in this neighbourhood. The in-depth interviews were conducted with the assistance of a longstanding resident of Parkhurst, who has lived in the neighbourhood for over decade. The random selection of the surveyed residents resulted in a mixture of young and old, new and longstanding residents. Businesses were selected randomly for participation. For real estate agents, the snowball method was used. All the real estate agents elected to answer questions via e-mail.
1.6 Parkhurst: the Study Area

The residential suburb of Parkhurst (see Figure 1.1) is about 162 hectares in area and situated northwest of the city centre. Originally forming part of the old farm, Braamfontein, Parkhurst was established in 1904 and lies about six kilometres from the Johannesburg city centre. Topographically, Parkhurst is sited on one of Johannesburg’s steeper hills, with most of the neighbourhood boundaries demarcated by streams or watercourses. Adjacent to Parkhurst lie the suburbs of Parktown North, Victory Park, Craighall Park and Greenside, all of which also originally formed part of the original Braamfontein farm.

Most of the development of this suburb took place around the 1930s. The sales and development of houses proceeded at a slow pace. By the end of the 1930s only half of the stands had been sold, and only about a third had a dwelling. Property sales and the building of houses intensified as a result of a widespread and serious housing shortage experienced after the Second World War (Truluck, 2004). Thus, returning soldiers bought property in the area in significant numbers (Truluck, 2004). By the end of the 1950s, most of the erven had been built upon and Parkhurst could be classified as a suburb (see figure 1.2). The development of service facilities and the infrastructure was virtually complete by the 1950s, with a sewerage system, water and lights, a junior school, tarred roads, shops, churches, sportsfields, and many planted trees.
Figure 1.1: Map showing the location of Parkhurst within Johannesburg, Gauteng

*Note that the borders of the map have resulted in the exclusion of information
Soon the suburb became popular due to its good schools, parks and sportsgrounds, satisfactory transport system and favourable distances to the CBD (Truluck, 2004; Rule, 2006). For most of its history, Parkhurst was designated as a ‘white space’, that is, a residential area for white people. In the past, Parkhurst was perceived as a lower middle-class neighbourhood compared to the more upmarket suburbs surrounding it such as Rosebank, Greenside and Parktown (Rule, 2006). The houses in Parkhurst are on small plots, their sizes at approximately 495m² (also common in areas such as Norwood and Orange Grove) in size compared to almost half a hectare in areas such as Bryanston (Rule, 2006).

Figure 1.2: Housing Development of Parkhurst over time (Truluck, 2004)

Parkhurst is conveniently situated between major and popular shopping and commercial nodes, namely Rosebank, Parktown North and Greenside, thus making the suburb even more attractive
(see Figure 1.3). An added feature that has made Parkhurst popular among the middle to upper class is that of the commercial development on Fourth Avenue. In the 1980s, there were a number of small corner café-type shops, butcheries, clothing shops and barbers (Rule, 2006). The core functions of these establishments were to cater for the local community.

Figure 1.3: Map showing Parkhurst in relation to the major shopping malls of northern Johannesburg
This scenario remained unchanged until the 1990s. It was only during the late 1990s and the early 2000s that the commercial scenario was transformed, with more modern types of retail services being established (Rule, 2006). Parkhurst became well-known for its antique stores, classy restaurants and interior-design consultancies. Access to these high-order goods and services appealed to the upper class and thus attracted a number of such home buyers to the suburb (Rule, 2006).

1.7 Research Structure

The first chapter of this thesis looked at the problem statement, research questions and methodology. Chapter 2 describes gentrification by examining international literature and notes that it is a contested process. Chapter 3 provides an analysis of gentrification processes in South Africa. The works of various local authors are explored to compare the processes taking place in South Africa with those prevailing internationally. Chapter 4 follows with an analysis of the primary data collected on the residents of Parkhurst. Emphasis is placed on the suburb’s demographic profile, as well as on the socio-economic status of the area. Because the research is highly descriptive, Chapter 5 is also used to further describe Parkhurst by looking at the physical character of the suburb. This is done by examining its morphological characteristics. Chapter 6, the concluding chapter, summarises the research results, answers the research questions and makes recommendations for further research (see Figure 1.4).
Figure 1.4: Research structure
1.8 Conclusion

This chapter introduced the thesis by looking at various introductory themes such as the problem statement, the formulated research questions and the methodology used. The study area was described by looking at its location in relation to other surrounding suburbs. This chapter also provided a research structure. Chapter 2 unpacks the term “gentrification” and the processes associated with it on an international scale.
Chapter 2: International Literature Review

2.1. Introduction

It has been almost half a century since the coinage of “gentrification”, a term used to describe the movement of gentrifiers (usually middle-class people) into dilapidated and rented areas in the West of London (Badcock, 2001). They bought either apartments or houses to renovate and then occupied them. This chapter explains the different aspects of gentrification, starting with an examination of a number of international definitions of the term. These definitions show how the concept has evolved over a period of five decades from its initial inception as ‘classic gentrification’ to a more modern incarnation as ‘built gentrification’. This chapter also traces the history of gentrification, with an analysis of both classic gentrification and the stage models of gentrification. It tracks investment, the disinvestment and the re-investment of capital in inner cities, and unpacks the underlying factors causing gentrification. Also under the spotlight are explanations of the production and consumption aspects of gentrification. Thereafter, an analysis of the consequences of gentrification - either good or bad – follows. It includes details on the displacement of the original residents, racial injustice, increasing taxes and the changing character of a suburb.

Gentrification, in the context of public policy, also receives attention in this chapter, with the influences that policy-makers exert on gentrification outlined. This section explains the long-standing relationship between policy formulation and gentrification. An important instrument used by policy-makers, namely social mixing, is also highlighted - to demonstrate its importance.
in an inner city undergoing gentrification. The chapter concludes with a discussion on the relationship between gay and lesbian space/communities and gentrification.

2.2. Unpacking the term “Gentrification”

Gentrification as a concept was first introduced in the early 1960s by Ruth Glass to explain urban processes occurring in London. Since then, there have been heated academic debates regarding the definition of the term. However, many modern authors, such as Loretta Lees (2000); Neil Smith (1996); Tom Slater (2004); Elvin Wyly (2004), as well as, Mark Davidson (2006) agree that there has been a marked change in the meaning of the term gentrification and its scope since it was first introduced by Glass in 1964 (Visser & Kotzé, 2008).

However, authors hold different views on gentrification. For Smith (1986), cited in Fyfe & Kenny (2005), gentrification is a process driven by the demands of production and the desire for profit by builders, developers, landlords, mortgage lenders and real estate agents. Thus, it has been described as a complex set of processes that involve the physical improvement of the housing stock, housing tenure change (from rentals to owner occupation), property value increases, as well as the displacement of working-class residents by the middle class (Bridge & Watson, 2000). In line with this, Slater (2002) defines gentrification as a complex and varied form of urban regeneration. For Bourne (1993), gentrification is the invasion of working-class inner-city neighbourhoods by higher-income-earning, middle-class people. Thus, gentrification involves a varied form of urban regeneration since it results in a class transformation of the neighbourhood owing to tenure changes and higher house prices (Bourne, 1993).
Smith (1996) posits that gentrification results in socio-cultural changes in an area as wealthy people buy property in a less prosperous community. For Kennedy and Leonard (2001), then, gentrification changes the original character and flavour of the neighbourhood. It embodies the transformation of neighbourhoods from low to high values, with the potential to cause displacements of both long-term residents and the businesses serving them. This makes gentrification not only a housing, but also an economic, issue. Overall, gentrification significantly impacts upon the history and culture of the neighbourhood as well as upon the displaced working-class community, in particular, by reducing their social capital (Betsky, 1997; Reid & Adelman, 2003).

2.3. The Emergence of Gentrification

According to Clarke (2005), the actual process of gentrification had been taking place long before its coinage in the 1960s. Some examples include that of the Haussmannisation of Paris (Smith, 1996), where Baron Haussmann demolished residential areas in central Paris between the years 1853 and 1870, thereby displacing the poor people who lived there. Lees et al. (2008) argue that the earliest evidence of systematic gentrification was observed in the 1950s in metropolitan cities such as Boston, Washington DC, London and New York City. To fully understand the origins of gentrification, one must first unpack classic gentrification as it is the basic form to which all other types of gentrification are compared.

2.4. Classical Gentrification

Classical gentrification involves the physical change of inner-city neighbourhoods. Disinvested inner-city suburbs are upgraded and, as a consequence, the original residents are displaced (Lees et al., 2008). A good example of this type of gentrification is that of Barnsbury in London.
Barnsbury underwent a phase of serious decline after World War II when its upper-class residents relocated to newly-built suburban houses located on the outskirts of the London CBD (Lees et al., 2008). This trend characterised much of inner-residential London, not just Barnsbury, but Camden Town, Holloway and Islington too. These suburbs subsequently became deserted with only working-class people remaining. Sub-letting and large families meant that overcrowding began to characterise the area and soon physical deterioration, due to the inability of these households to adequately maintain their homes, set in (Lees et al., 2008).

According to Williams (1976) in Lees et al., (2008), it was in the very late 1950s that capital was made available by building societies to people who wished to invest in old properties. Gentrification in Barnsbury then took off between 1961 and 1975. The result was an influx of middle-class residents, with the middle-class population increasing from 23 to 43 percent in those years. The leading gentrifiers were architects, planners, university lecturers, school teachers, police officers, social workers and medical photographers (Lees et al., 2008). By 1972, building societies began to actively market Barnsbury. The result was even greater numbers of middle-class people buying homes in the area. Thereafter, a rapid tenurial transformation took place with owner occupation increasing from seven (7) to 19 percent (Hamnet & Rudolph, 1986; Lees et al., 2008).

It should be noted that the rapid changes were not only due to the actions of individual gentrifiers but also to what was termed the ‘value gap’, an hypothesis held by Hamnet and Rudolph (1986). This ‘value gap hypothesis’ is the measurement of a rented building’s annual rental income as
opposed to the future sale price of the building - once converted for owner occupation. This became significant in Barnsbury as landlords received a decreasing return on their rented property as opposed to the return that developers received on their capital. This meant that there was a huge incentive to buy rented property, evict the tenants and sell it onto a developer (Lees et al., 2008).

An example of classical gentrification in the United States of America (USA) is to be seen in the inner-city suburb of Brooklyn - Park Slope in New York City (NYC). Park Slope had a significant number of middle-class people move out of the suburb at the beginning of the 20th century (Lees et al., 2008). This suburbanisation, along with the Great Depression, that followed in the 1930s, led to the physical decline of the inner city, with the result that Park Slope became a slum. Suburbanisation was further accelerated by the white flight from the inner city, which took place between 1940 and 1970 (Lees et al., 2008). According to Carpenter and Lees (1995), the suburb experienced the highest level of residential abandonment in the second half of the 1970s. The white population was replaced by black and Hispanic people, who were generally more likely to be low-income earners or unemployed. Systematic disinvestment followed swiftly and the neighbourhood was soon trapped in a cycle of economic depression and physical decline (Carpenter & Lees, 1995).

At this point, the government intervened with legislation, encouraged reinvestment in the area. Property developers, neighbourhood organisations and pioneer gentrifiers emerged as significant role players in the gentrification process that ensued. The first gentrifiers were ‘sweat workers’
as they did much of the renovation work themselves. They received loans to finance some of the renovation costs, but they did the physical work themselves (known as sweat equity) (Carpenter & Lees, 1995). Another initiative was undertaken by the Park Slope Betterment Committee, which bought houses with the purpose of selling them to white-collar workers in order to stabilise the area socially. This early gentrification of Park Slope was intended to rebuild the suburb, businesses included, in order to make it a properous community (Lees et al., 2008).

The Betterment Committee also aimed at convincing the banks to contribute to the renewal of Brooklyn’s inner-city neighbourhoods (Lees et al., 2008). To this end, they encouraged public utility companies to invest. For example, Brooklyn Union Gas assisted with the renovation of a four-storey building. Without this intervention, it is unlikely that such a large building would have been restored as the costs involved were high (Lees et al., 2008). With financial support from the Greater New York Savings Bank and the Federal Housing Association, the Brooklyn Union Gas company managed to restore this building and others in Park Slope (Lees et al., 2008).

Furthermore, individuals were also assisted by certain banks. For example, the Urban Home Loan Program, introduced by Chase Manhattan Bank, offered packages that included the acquisition, construction and permanent financing of distressed property if the new owner/s wished to renovate (Lees et al., 2008). There were also state-led initiatives such as the Rehabilitation Mortgage Insurance and the Community Development Block Grants (Lees, 1994). The case of Park Slope demonstrates how classic gentrification is a process whereby a poor,
working-class suburb is displaced by an influx of private capital and middle-class home buyers (Smith, 1996a). These processes were encapsulated in Clay’s (1979) early-stage models of gentrification.

2.5. The Early-stage Models of Gentrification

The early-stage models of gentrification were introduced at the end of the 1970s by Clay (1979), and were similar to the classical gentrification models of Glass. Clay (1979) developed four stages in his stage model of gentrification:

2.5.1. The first stage: pioneer gentrification

The first stage, pioneer gentrification, takes place when a small group of people buy and then renovate properties for their own use. At this point, there is not much public attention, nor are there any displacements as the newcomers usually target vacant property (Clay, 1979, as cited by Lees et al., 2008).

2.5.2. The second stage: small-scale gentrification

The second stage involves a more people moving in and renovating houses. Crucially, they are joined by small-scale speculators who seek out cheap houses to renovate, the purpose of which is either to re-sell for profit or renovate-and-rent. Since large capital investments are still unavailable at this stage, there is no interest from large speculators. At the same time, though, some small-scale displacement occurs. Other events that could occur during this stage include a change in the name of the suburb, the delimitation of new suburban boundaries, and some media attention (Clay, 1979 in Lees et al., 2008).
2.5.3. The third stage: mass gentrification

The third stage is marked by the greatest amount of activity, when property developers move in and media attention reaches a zenith. Renovation activity becomes the dominant process and physical improvements are prominent. As a result of these improvements and media attention, property prices begin to increase and the displacement of the poorer residents begins in earnest. Those who buy property during this stage usually see their houses as homes and an investment. These new residents start making demands on public resources. They promote the area to other young middle-class people. There is often tension between the new and the old residents. Furthermore, banks start greenlining the area for re-investment purposes, making loans available to middle-class buyers and investors. Finally, the media deem this area a gentrified neighbourhood, portraying it as a haven for young middle-class professionals (Clay 1979, in Lees et al., 2008).

2.5.4. The fourth stage: mature gentrification

The fourth stage, is when a large number of properties are gentrified and the majority of residents now are from the business and managerial middle class. This stage sees even more middle-class to upper-middle-class people move in. There is now a significant emergence of specialised retail and professional services in the area. Displacement starts to affect not only the tenants but also some home-owners as house prices hike and rental costs spiral. At this stage, investors and speculators turn their attention to other neighbourhoods (Clay 1979, in Lees et al., 2008).
2.6. **The Processes of Gentrification**

Gentrification is a form of urban renewal and is usually related to the decay of an area or suburb. Its processes involve the inflow of capital into the real estate of an already existing suburb, usually a metropolitan region, the land and property values of which have become depressed (Gottdiener & Budd, 2005). This occurs when a process of disinvestment sets in. This can occur when there is a failure to maintain buildings and/or to replace dilapidated ones. Rental income falls and sometimes landlords compensate by dividing up houses or apartments into separate rooms/sections in order to maximise their rental revenue (Hebbert, 1998). Unfortunately, this usually sets off a vicious spiral of further deterioration in the houses and the neighbourhood, as the suburb was not built for such high densities. However, if such a declining area happens to be close to an employment centre, and/or incorporates novel/interesting architecture or businesses, capital will subsequently flow into the area again (Wetzel, 2002). This then triggers an investment cycle all over again. Residents, such as professionals, who can pay higher rents, are specifically attracted by developers in order to make their investments in the new constructions and renovations profitable. Soon after this process has taken place, the less-affluent residents are pushed out of the area and full-blown gentrification can be said to have occurred (Hebbert, 1998; Wetzel, 2002; Gottdiener & Budd, 2005).

2.7. **The Causes of and Explanations for Gentrification**

The causes and processes of gentrification are complex, as well as the explanations for them, largely owing to the manner in which research is influenced by the theoretical and/or political stances taken by the researchers involved (Visser, 2002). In general gentrification can be
explained in two ways. The first explanation focuses on the economics of the process, namely the relationship between inflows of capital into an urban space and the subsequent production of such a space. The second focuses on the characteristics of the gentrifiers and their consumption patterns. The latter can be explained in terms of the broader spheres of urban culture in a post-industrial society (Ley, 1996; Visser, 2002). These explanations are respectively known as the production-side and consumption-side gentrification.

2.7.1. The production-side explanation

Suburbanisation and inner-city decline are key attributes in the production-side explanations of gentrification. According to Jackson (2007), suburbanisation can be described as the growth of residential areas on the edge or fringe of a major city. There are various push and pull factors responsible for suburbanisation. Push factors may include high levels of population density in major cities and the resultant congestion (Hayden, 2004). Pull factors, on the other hand, include lower house prices and more open space in the suburbs (Wiese, 2005). Suburbanisation often leads to inner-city decline, as residents with spending power move out. De-industrialisation, changing population dynamics and economic re-structuring often result in the physical and social decline of inner-city centres (Morris, 1997; Gainsborough, 2002; Short et al., 2007).

Suburbanisation and inner-city decline can lead to the emergence of de-valued inner-city property located on what is potentially very valuable land (Bridge & Watson, 2000). This opens up the potential for profitable re-investment. In this case, the main drivers are investors seeking good returns on capital investments. Thus, gentrification is driven by the demand for capital and the capitalist land market. The role players are property developers, real estate agents and banks,
for example (Bridge & Watson, 2003). This production-side explanation renders the cultural inclinations and individual motivations of people less significant.

According to Briney (2010), the production-side explanations of gentrification focus on how gentrification is driven by capital and the demand for production. Briney (2010) has traced this as far back as to the end of World War II. Post-World War II, low rentals in suburban areas promoted the investment of capital in the suburbs, with a resultant decline of capital investment in the inner-city areas. Over time, increased investment resulted in higher land values in the suburbs. This resulted in even greater levels of capital flight or disinvestment from the inner cities with some inner-city areas effectively abandoned by the private sector (Smith, 1980; Briney, 2010). This gave rise to the rent-gap theory of Smith (1996). The theory explains the movement of capital, based on the evaluation of investment/return potential. That is, if there is a difference between land values based on the current use of the land versus its potential value. If such land were to be developed, then private capital would flow into the area in order to realise this potential (Smith, 1980). If the rent gap is large enough, developers will return to the inner city, to re-develop it and make a profit. As the rent gap starts to close - as a consequence of re-development - gentrification, with increased rentals, leases and mortgages, takes place (Briney, 2010).

2.7.2. The consumption-side explanation

This view argues that gentrification is better understood as a consequence of the shift from an industrial to a post-industrial society. This shift is physically manifested in particular cities. One of the consequences is a change in the class structure, in particular, namely the expansion of the
middle class. As a result, some cities are dominated by the social relations, cultural tastes and consumption practices of this group (Badcock, 1995). In this case, gentrification is the product of the ongoing economic transformation of major Western cities from industrial-manufacturing to business-service centres and places of consumption. This includes the expansion of both creative and cultural industries. The effects of these are changes in occupational structure, income distribution, gender relations, the housing market and cultural habits (Bridge & Watson, 2003).

The new middle class, for example, enjoys arts and leisure and is rather concerned with the aesthetics of the cities (Ley, 1994). Therefore, gentrification is tied to the rise of post-industrial cities (Badcock, 1995). These explanations were better coined by Ley (1986 & 1994), who looked closely at the characteristics of people and what they consume - as opposed to Smith’s rent-gap theory. These people, usually belonging to the middle to upper class, are able to access more advanced services such as medical and legal services (Briney, 2010).

2.8. The Consequences of Gentrification

Gentrification has both negative and positive aspects to it (Lees, 2000). In some instances, the effects or consequences are clearly positive or negative (Kennedy & Leonard, 2001). However, in others, both positive and negative effects could occur simultaneously, depending on the perspective of the individual. For instance, a particular group of the original residents in a suburb might miss the former corner store that was displaced by the process of gentrification (Kennedy & Leonard, 2001). But at the same time, those same residents may welcome and appreciate a new major chain pharmacy, which might have moved in as a result of the
gentrification process (Kennedy & Leonard, 2001). Other consequences of gentrification include racial injustice, the displacement of renters, home-owners versus local businesses, increasing rentals for residential and commercial tenants and increased taxes (Kennedy & Leonard, 2001; Powell & Spencer, 2003). There are sometimes conflicts between the old and new residents (Atkinson, 2000).

2.8.1. Social injustice

Social injustice as a negative aspect of gentrification and its processes was explained by Betancur (2002) in his case study of West Town, Chicago. Betancur (2002) argued that gentrification definitions usually do not include the destructive processes of class, race and ethnic alienation. He further stated that the most traumatic aspect of gentrification is probably the destruction of the complex community fabric. This has significantly negative impacts on the quality of life of low-income, immigrant and minority communities. The situation is exacerbated as most of these negative impacts occur without any compensation (Betancur, 2002). For Betancur (2002), the ‘untold’ story of gentrification is that of abandonment, displacement, hardship and class conflict endured by vulnerable residents.

Powell & Spencer (2003), who conducted their research in Chicago, found that the displacement of working-class groups and ethnic minorities was a serious concern. Their demographic studies of gentrifying and/or gentrified neighbourhoods in Chicago between 1980 and 1990 indicated that white residents had increased in number while black residents had drastically declined. For example, the black-white ratio of the suburb of Near West Side dropped from 6:1 to 3:1. This change was not confined to race alone, however. There was also an increase in the number of
young childless professionals, many of whom were well educated. Smith (1996) and Kennedy and Leonard (2001) found that displacement induced by gentrification hit minority communities the hardest. These displaced residents were forced to re-locate to areas where housing was more affordable (Lees, 2000). They clearly missed out on the social and economic improvements linked to gentrification, as well as incurred costs associated with moving.

2.8.2. Displacement of the working class

One of the most defining characteristics of gentrification is the displacement of working-class residents (Smith, 1996; Kennedy & Leonard, 2001; Wyly & Hammel, 2004). The magnitude of displacement can be linked to the tightness of local housing markets. When the housing markets are very tight, the extent of displacement and the impacts on the people that are displaced are great (Kennedy & Leonard, 2001). In the case of softer housing markets, the impact and the extent of the displacement is much less. An example of a soft housing market is that of Cleveland, where empty lots of land and low-priced commercial properties were developed into attractive housing units for newcomers (usually middle-income earners) without replacing the current residents (Jonathan, 2000).

Displacement is particularly harsh on renters, especially lower-income renters as they cannot keep up with the price increases demanded by the landlords/owners, who want to charge the new ‘market-based’ rates. Increased rentals can also be used to force tenants out, so that the building can be upgraded (Kennedy & Leonard, 2001). As much as displacement is strongly debated within the scholarship circles of gentrification, it is difficult to quantify. Atkinson (2000) described the task of measuring gentrification as ‘measuring the invisible’ as it is difficult to find
the people who have been displaced; even more so if they are poor (Newman & Wyly, 2006). Lees et al. (2008) found that researchers in general tend to steer away from displacement owing to the significant barriers to conducting research on the topic. On this basis, then, Hamnett (2003) concluded that the phenomenon of displacement does not exist as there is no reliable evidence of or statistical explanation for the displaced. Despite this, the work of Lyons (1996), Davidson & Lees (2000), and Atkinson (2005), found that displacement was clearly evident in London.

2.8.3. Tax revenues, physical change and public policy

Tax collection is an essential part of any city’s revenue stream. Importantly, a resident’s income is a significant variable when it comes to determining land tax revenues. High-income-earning residents can pay higher taxes compared to low-income-earning residents (Yee & Quiroz-Martinez, 1999). In an ideal situation, tax revenues alone can pay for services and allow for investments for the improvement or re-vitalisation of a neighbourhood. The incentive for municipal policy makers and officials to attract high-income earners into their city and into specific neighbourhoods is, therefore, huge. This does not mean, however, that there is a simple relationship between gentrification and tax revenues. The actual impacts of gentrification on the tax base vary, depending on embedded urban tax structures, as found by Kennedy & Leonard (2001, 18) in the following instance:

“In Cleveland (USA), 60 percent of city revenues come from an earnings tax on commuters who live outside the city. Thus, if gentrification were to occur, the new higher-income residents, particularly if attracted from neighbouring suburbs, would not have dramatic impacts on tax revenues for the city”.
In most cases, the influx of middle- and upper-income-earning residents into a suburb is associated with a number of impacts on the street character and leadership in the neighbourhood (Harvey et al., 1999). The newcomers, owing to their buying power, create great opportunities for both existing businesses and new ones. However, the influx of new businesses creates more competition for commercial space, usually resulting in higher rentals. Usually the long-term effect is for smaller, locally-owned businesses to be displaced (Kennedy & Leonard, 2001).

Gentrification can also bring about changes in a community’s political or power structure, as well as its religious and social affairs. Newcomers often come with new concerns, new contacts and knowledge. They often engage public officials, in order to get their desired changes in services, for example, rendered (Ley, 1996; Lees, 2000). If the new residents are parents, then they would rally for improved education, better schools, for example. If their concerns were to be crime levels, they would lobby for more ‘bobbies on the beat’. This may serve longstanding residents or it may not (Kennedy & Leonard, 2001). If long-term residents have different concerns, on account of differences in culture and socio-economic status, conflicts will naturally arise (Goodchild & Cole, 2001; Aalbers, 2006; Uitermark, 2007; Lees, 2008). Kennedy & Leonard (2001) gave an example of residents in Kirkwood (Atlanta), where locals voted in an African American city councilwoman but newcomers wanted a councilman who was a member of their gay and lesbian community. This caused conflict between the original locals and the newcomers to the suburb (Kennedy & Leonard, 2001).
Gentrification could also be a positive process as it can improve the number of economic opportunities available to the poor (Byrne, 2003). For example, the original residents of a suburb undergoing gentrification would be able to exploit the increasing job opportunities (Freeman & Braconi, 2002; Lees et al., 2008). Furthermore, an increase in the number of well-heeled residents usually brings with it a greater demand for municipal services. They in turn could benefit the poor, who could access these services and seize the opportunity to benefit from municipal-service-related job creation (Byrne, 2003). Lastly, gentrification “creates urban political fora in which affluent and poor citizens must deal with each other’s priorities in a democratic process“. As such, it helps to “ameliorate the social isolation of the poor” (Byrne, 2003: 421-424).

In the United Kingdom, local urban renewal initiatives have been working towards attracting more affluent, middle-class people into low-income areas through positive gentrification policies (Cameron, 2003). According to Lees et al., (2008: 199), the British government’s intention of “bringing the middle class back to the central city is to reduce socio-spatial segregation and to strengthen the social tissue of deprived neighbourhoods”. In this case, social mixing can rebuild excluded communities as people of different social and class groups will intermingle, thus, broadening their perceptions and taking their expectations to new levels (Rose, 2004).

2.9. Gentrification and Public Policy

For many cities, gentrification has become a significant aspect of public policy formulation. Wyly and Hammel (2005: 35) state that “more than ever before, gentrification is incorporated into public policy either as a justification to obey market forces and private sector
entrepreneurialism, or as a tool to direct market processes in the hopes of restructuring urban landscapes in a slightly more benevolent fashion”. In fact, there is a longstanding and mutual relationship between gentrification and public policy that can be traced as far back as to the 1960s (Lees & Ley, 2008). In that period, various public policies assisted gentrification. For example, in London, government grants were essential in driving inner-city gentrification (Hamnett, 1973, as cited by Lees & Ley, 2008).

According to Lees et al., (2008), the gentrification process has in more recent times become fully incorporated into public policy. Cameron and Coaffee (2005) also found that one of the core drivers of gentrification is public policy - in particular, public policies that place the positive impacts of gentrification at the heart of urban renewal. The result is that gentrification has become central to government urban policies world-wide. Therefore, the process should be managed (Freeman, 2006) and not resisted (Slater, 2006). They argue that if gentrification is embraced and well managed, it can be used to retain a more equitable and just society (Freeman, 2006).

2.9.1. The social ‘mix’ to solve the problem of ‘bad’ neighbourhoods

Gentrification is a matter not only of changes in housing stock, but also of changes in class dimensions (Slater et al., 2004). Regardless of whether it is urban or rural, gentrification involves the class dimensions of neighbourhood change (Slater et al., 2004). For example, social mixing initiatives have been introduced by policy makers to fight urban social problems. There is a notion that attracting the middle class into city centres or certain urban areas will help to
reduce urban social problems (Davidson, 2008). So, in the United Kingdom, the Labour
Government formulated an urban policy programme in the year 2000 which was named ‘The
Urban Renaissance’. The policy’s main objective was to attract the middle class to the city,
following on the principles or guidelines of the Urban Task Force Report, compiled by Richard
Roger (DETR, 1999; Davidson, 2008). This policy and others (DETR, 2000; DCLG, 2007;
ODPM, 2003) focused on developing more vibrant urban neighbourhoods (Allen, 2008).

Other such examples are evident in countries such as The Netherlands, where neighbourhood
renewal programmes have been developed, with gentrification processes in mind, to eradicate
neighbourhood effects that lead to concentrations of poverty (Kearns, 2003; Uitermark et al.,
2007). The United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) HOPE IV, as
well as its Section 8 programmes, has similar policies. Popking et al. (2004) write about the
replacement of deteriorating housing blocks with mixed-income, mixed-use urban developments,
which simultaneously displace and disperse some of the impoverished residents (Buck, 2001).

In Australia, government initiatives have seen the privatisation of public housing in order to
reduce the concentration of poverty in public housing estates (Wood, 2004; Davidson, 2008).
These examples are but a fraction of the global scope of gentrification being used as part of
development-orientated, neo-liberal urban policies (Brenner & Theodore, 2005; Harris, 2008).
In countries such as the United Kingdom, the United States of America and the Netherlands,
social mixing has become a primary tool for promoting gentrification (Lees, 2003). The main
defence being that social mixing improves the social balance, which can reduce negative
neighbourhood effects (Lees, 2008; Loopmans, 2008). Negative neighbourhoods are characterised by poor residents, low life expectancies, and poor educational and public health facilities (Norris, 2006). Such circumstances create a social environment that reinforces disadvantage (Randolph & Wood, 2003). It is believed that this problem can be solved or reversed through the promotion of social mixing programmes (Byrne, 2003).

Socially-mixed neighbourhoods are common in urban planning and policy initiatives in places such as Ireland, Scandinavia and Canada. Many of the cities in these countries market themselves as a collection of communities which thrive on accommodating a variety of incomes, cultures, age groups and lifestyles (Rose, 2004). The promotion of this livable image is crucial for allowing these cities to compete for investments in the globalised, knowledge-based economy (Florida, 2003). Thus, a city characterised by socially-mixed neighbourhoods has a competitive edge (Uitermark, 2003).

Of late, there have been debates and rapidly rising interest levels among urban researchers, governments and urban policy makers around the virtues of gentrification and social mixing (Schoon, 2004; Lees, 2008). Of particular interest is the idea that socially-mixed neighbourhoods create a ‘strong’ urban space and one that resists disinvestment, since their middle-class residents are able to successfully fight for public resources (Lees, 2008). Secondly, it is suggested that socio-economically-mixed neighbourhoods are capable of supporting a much stronger local economy than socio-economic-homogeneous ones, especially those that are characterised by high levels of poverty. Finally, there are those who argue that social mixing
allows for the merging of different forms of social capital, which in turn generate significant economic opportunities (Lees, 2008). A combination of social mix and gentrification improves the neighbourhood tax base and supports local business. Furthermore, having some affluent residents in the neighbourhood means that they can cross-subsidise social services, yet actually make little use of them - a double win for urban managers (Uitermark, 2007).

2.10. A Critique of Social-mixing Policies

Despite the positive press, there is little empirical proof that gentrification does in fact lead to high levels of social mixing and that social mixing improves the quality of life. In Doherty et al. (2006), it can be seen that social-mixing policies implemented in the mixing of housing units in the United Kingdom and Scotland did not seem to improve social well-being. Furthermore, the nature of the most ‘desirable’ social mix is contested (Goodchild & Cole, 2001; Wood, 2003; Walks & Maaranen, 2008). At the same time, we must accept that no neighbourhood has a totally homogeneous population (Goodchild & Cole, 2001).

Davidson and Lees (2005) found that in suburbs along the Thames, in London, social-mixing policies were ineffective in reducing socio-spatial segregation. In general, however, research on the causes and consequences of social mixing is limited (Randolph & Wood, 2003). Importantly, social-mixing theories do not indicate how to achieve social mixing within diverse neighbourhood groups (Lees, 2008). Clearly, the simple placement of middle-to-upper-income people amongst poor people will not automatically lead to social mixing (Freeman, 2006). Worse still is that the research that has been done shows that socially-homogeneous areas, rather than socially-mixed ones, can achieve higher levels of social capital (Robson, 2003). This leads to the
warning by some scholars against “the artificial imposition of social mixing” as tensions can easily arise at the local level, particularly if there are significant economic and social differences amongst the residents (Lees, 2008: 245). In particular, the influx of middle- to upper-class residents into lower-class areas can create dramatic displacement issues as poorer residents cannot afford the resultant higher living costs (Wyly & Hammel, 2004). A Canadian study has also shown similar effects. In Canada, policies of social mixing accelerated both rental increments and the displacement of the poorer residents (Slater, 2004). Another Canadian study concluded that gentrification has resulted in declining ethnic diversity within the cities of Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver (Walks & Maaranen, 2008).

Increased social mixing within a deteriorating neighbourhood would compromise the quality of life of the original residents (Atkinson, 2000). This occurs if the process results in the destruction of working-class social capital because in some instances, social segregation could have some advantages (by, for example sustaining group solidarity) (Betancur, 2002). In this regard then, social segregation and concentration can form a ‘protective shield’. As working-class social capital is weaker than middle-class social capital, the resultant clash will mitigate the authority of working-class service organisations, churches, schools and various other social institutions (Betancur, 2002).

A further criticism of social mixing is that most of the time it is imposed upon poorer suburbs in a manner that would not be possible in wealthier suburbs (Atkinson, 2006). Blomley (2004) puts it bluntly: Poor people cannot afford to live in - nor are they encouraged to move into - wealthier
suburbs. His opinion seems to be supported by the work of Atkinson (2005), who found a pilot study in the USA encouraging poor people to move into richer communities. In fact, only those tenants who were deemed ‘good’ enough, that is those with higher educational levels and work positions, were selected. The result was that both Cheshire (2007) and Kling et al. (2007) deemed the pilot a failure, as most of the proposed benefits, such as socio-economic improvements, were not achieved. Elsewhere, researchers found that even when poorer people are moved into wealthier suburbs, there are no clear improvements in their access to the job market or income levels. This begs the question: If the lives of poor people cannot be improved by moving them into more affluent and vibrant neighbourhoods, how can they be improved by moving wealthier people into poorer neighbourhoods (Katz et al., 2001)?

2.11. Gentrification and Gay Space

Often, gay and lesbian households are key pioneer gentrifiers. Gay and lesbian residents use their cultural capital and competencies to re-define, as well as re-sexualise, the urban picture, giving new meaning to space (Smith & Holt, 2005). The result is that gay and lesbian citizens are often viewed as ‘model citizens’ when it comes to urban development. It is surprising then to find that literature on the role that gay and lesbian people play in gentrification is thin. An influx of gay and lesbian people contributes to gentrification by making residential and commercial areas more cosmopolitan (Bell & Binnie, 2003). In particular, Sibalis (2003) noted the significant role that such individuals (especially men) play in urban inner-city re-development and gentrification (Sibalis, 2003).
Gay and lesbian communities are often attracted to a centrally-located neighbourhood that has deteriorated to some extent. They seek out the financial benefits of lower rentals and real-estate prices. Importantly, they are given an opportunity to control and change urban space in a manner that allows them to create a safe space for themselves that feels like ‘home’. This is often a crucial requirement in an urban environment that could be hostile to their lifestyle (Sibalis, 2003). For example, Le Marais in Paris, France, drew in a number of gay and lesbian people once the first stage of urban renewal had been completed. According to Garcia (2002), the development of Le Marais was then accelerated through investments from this community. Garcia (2002) noted that such a trend is typical of a number of capital cities, where the gay and lesbian community has taken over extremely dilapidated residential units in old neighbourhoods and revived them.

Gentrification by the gay and lesbian community in cities such as Amsterdam, London, Sydney and San Francisco has attracted considerable media attention over the past couple of decades on account of the development in these cities of vibrant commercial and entertainment areas catering for homosexuals. This is possible as the gay and lesbian community operates by establishing networks and institutions to satisfy the needs of its members and to accommodate their activities and behaviours (Bell & Valentine, 1995). The merging of these networks and institutions and their development alongside recent industrial and other job-creating initiatives could contribute to the further growth and expansion of social and political movements. These have the potential to grow to the extent that they become public, thus creating a specific gay and lesbian urban space (Knopp, 1994).
Despite the lack of literature on gentrification and homosexuality, the relationship between space and sexuality has been explored by a number of scholars. Some of this research has focused on the way in which gay and lesbian spaces have been created and maintained (Gorman-Murray & Waitt, 2009). A prominent example is that of Castro in the inner city of San Francisco in the USA. Research in Castro has shown how gay and lesbian people - especially men - in urban areas are enthusiastically committed to the renovation of both the commercial and residential space of the area (Valentine, 2002). Interestingly, this research showed that gay and lesbian neighbourhoods do not develop for the sole purpose of gentrification or even the need for economic growth. Instead, the objective is to form a territorial platform for political lobbying and to create a space that would allow for a sense of “cultural belonging” for the gay and lesbian community (Gorman-Murray & Waitt, 2009).

Knopp (1990) suggested that gentrification by the gay and lesbian community is a response to social oppression from mainstream society. This has led to the deliberate forging of areas by the gay and lesbian community that would accommodate their gay and lesbian identities. By creating such a space for homosexuals, it has thus been possible to lay the foundations for political and economic empowerment in the case of this community (Knopp, 1990). This space, resulting from the gentrification process, serves the special needs of gay and lesbian people in that it allows them the freedom to reflect their cultural values without any constraints.
2.12. The Next Generation of Gentrification

There is contention as to the future of gentrification: whether it will fade away or be as important to researchers as it is currently. Answering the question as to whether the gentrification process will continue or not will require researchers to unpack baseline measures developed by pioneer urban scholars and to “pursue subsequent follow-up analyses” (Lees et al., 2008, 240). This means that researchers must look at previous studies of areas dominated by privately-owned properties that underwent renovations, and in so doing, they will be in a position to predict possible growth and/or declining trends. However, making these assumptions or projections concerning gentrification is very difficult, especially when recent activity is compared to trends that took place over time (Wyly & Hummel, 1998). Another way of estimating the future trends of gentrification is through straight-forward theoretical approaches.

Theoretical approaches or projections should be combined with the consumption and production explanations (Lees et al., 2008). For instance, Bourne (1993a) suggested that weakening demand in an area will result in shifts in the demographics, economic growth levels, levels of education, preferences for living space, and so forth. Whilst production-side projections look at the ongoing devaluation of properties, as well as at the rent-gap processes that maintain stronger requirements for the continuation of gentrification, these theoretical analyses reflect positive processes that drive gentrification into the future.

Gentrification processes have matured and are now operating in new and somewhat different economic, cultural, social and political spheres (David & Lees, 2005). It is because of these new
spheres that researchers have moved away from empirical explanatory discussions of
gentrification to the more contemporary definitions that have emerged since the beginning of the
21st century. Early explanations of gentrification maintain a similar point, namely that
gentrification is the process whereby working-class neighbourhoods are being re-vitalised by
more middle-class professionals, landlords, as well as property developers (Smith, 1996). Today
and perhaps into the future, however, gentrified areas are likely to differ even more from Glass’s
definition. “Gentrification is no longer about a narrow and quixotic oddity in the housing
market, but has become the leading residential edge of a much larger endeavor: the class remake
of the central urban landscape” (David & Lees, 2008: 1166).

Contemporary gentrification is now taking place in different locations and in many different
forms that defy the old school definitions (Atkinson & Bridge, 2005). Unlike in the past, where
this process was found mainly in English-speaking countries, it is now emerging in Eastern
Europe, Asia, South America and South Africa (Smith, 2002). Furthermore, gentrification has
moved away from its classical city centre tendency to the outer suburbs (Badcock, 2001) and
even to rural areas (Phillips, 2004). As a matter of fact, Phillips (2004) has criticised the
research work on gentrification for ignoring such aspects of gentrification geographies.
Gentrification in the future will no longer be just about the upliftment of residential areas but
also about commercial development (Curran, 2004). Nor will gentrification only be restricted to
disinvested and dilapidated inner-city suburbs. Some suburban areas away from the city centre
that have already undergone some form of re-investment and re-generation, have experienced or
are experiencing another turn of gentrification, which Lees (2003a) calls super-gentrification.
Others have referred to this phenomenon as new-build gentrification (Rose, 2002).
As the varied factors and locations become more involved, modern gentrification will also become more complex. New-build developments are more likely to take place on vacant or abandoned properties, and will, therefore, pose no risks in terms of the displacement of the original residents (Davidson & Lees, 2005). Therefore, there would be no further direct displacements of lower-income residents as was the case with the traditional gentrification processes (Lambert & Body, 2002). This is not to say, however, that new-build gentrification would not cause any displacement, but rather that it would be indirect displacement. For instance, a neighbouring residential area may become more desirable but not affordable on account of higher rentals and purchase prices, and thus become inaccessible to lower-income households (Lambert & Body, 2002).

2.13. Conclusion

This chapter looked at the research conducted by international scholars, starting with the international definition of the term to the processes associated with gentrification. The production and consumption explanations of gentrification were outlined in this chapter. Subsequent discussions included the consequences of gentrification, social-mixing tools, gay space and gentrification, as well as future research prospects associated with gentrification. The following chapter looks at gentrification in the South African context.
Chapter 3: South African Cities and Gentrification

3.1. Introduction

The following chapter looks at gentrification in the local context. Significant emphasis is placed on the research conducted by scholars in South Africa, particularly those who have conducted research in major cities such as Cape Town and Johannesburg. The chapter looks at gentrification processes such as the conversion of retail and office spaces within inner cities, as well as the effects of gay gentrification in South Africa.

3.2 An Overview of Gentrification in South Africa

For some, gentrification incorporates other forms of neighbourhood change, but not necessarily residential succession or displacement of lower-class households (Kotzé & Van der Merwe, 2000). Since the early 1990s, urban development strategies have been implemented in South Africa to keep track of global urban regeneration trends. Urban planners, private developers and government bodies have been working on urban development policies (McDonald, 2008) to combat urban processes such as the decentralisation and suburbanisation of service functions (Visser & Kotzé, 2008). Along with decentralisation and suburbanisation, are the major capital disinvestments and the white flight from the inner cities that have led to significant decay in the larger South African inner-city areas (McDonald, 2008). As in many other developed and developing countries, South Africa has adopted the process of gentrification as a form of urban regeneration (Visser & Kotzé, 2008).
Literature concerning the processes of gentrification in South Africa has, however, been largely absent. According to Garside (1993), little geographical research has been conducted on inner-city areas in South Africa – and in particular in respect of the issues of gentrification. In the past, South African urban geographers tended to focus largely on the development of the apartheid city, the urban economy, as well as black townships (McCarthy, 1992). Recent literature though, is starting to reflect the fact that gentrification has become an influential process that alters the physical, economic and social characteristics of urban areas (Visser & Kotzé, 2008).

3.3 The Geographical Scope of Gentrification in South Africa

The emergence of gentrification in South Africa can be understood by examining the two phases into which it has been differentiated and subsequently described. The first phase basically incorporates the time frames of gentrification during the 1980s to the earlier years subsequent to the Apartheid era. The second phase is that which has a strong relationship with the role that the state is playing when it comes to the Urban Renaissance (Visser & Kotzé, 2008). The first phase is typical of classical gentrification with its production- and consumption-side explanations, clearly evident in class differences and displacement (Bond, 2000). The latter phase looks at literature that focuses on urban regeneration, which is implemented via urban policy frameworks that were established in the early 2000s (Kotzé & van der Merwe, 2000).

The latest developments in the management of inner cities in South Africa such as the introduction of central-city improvement districts, especially in large cities such as Cape Town and Johannesburg, have led to serious changes within inner-city suburbs (Pirie, 2007). This in itself has given rise to the processes of gentrification as a platform for the regeneration of South
African suburbs. In the past, inner-city deterioration levels were the main academic topic for urban researchers. The decline of many inner cities in South Africa has, as mentioned before, been associated with decentralisation processes and the suburbanisation of capital institutions which started to emerge long after the 1960s (Beavon, 2000 & 2005; Visser & Kotzé, 2008). The resultant effect of these processes has been urban development in the affected cities (Donaldson, 2005).

Gentrification recently emerged as a measure to combat the declining effects experienced in city centres. It has manifested itself in the form of either production-side debates (as a result of rental gaps) or as consumption-side debates (as a result of a deliberate choice by the new middle class). The consumption-side of gentrification has been the more dominant one in the South African context, as can be seen from the research conducted in Woodstock and other Cape Town suburbs (Garside, 1993 and Kotzé, 1998), where middle-class residents renovated their dilapidated properties to increase their value (Garside, 1993 and Kotzé, 1998). These trends have continued throughout the Cape Town and Johannesburg suburbs, with more and more working-class residents being replaced by middle- to upper-class people. Furthermore, opportunities for investment and re-development have accelerated, thus contributing further to gentrification in South Africa (Visser & Kotzé, 2008).

There has been a growing need in gentrification research to shift away from research topics that are focused only on the production-consumption relationship. However, there is consensus that these two topics (production and consumption) complement each other but that there should be
more research conducted to develop a more theoretically-appealing alternative, that will better explain the terms (Visser, 2002). This is particularly important because these two terms are crucial for research in terms of the role played by gentrification in the South African urban research context (Visser 2003). The limited research, however, makes it difficult to achieve. In fact, there are currently only a few academic studies that one can turn to for research guidelines (Visser, 2002).

The gentrification process in South Africa has been followed by attempts at monitoring inner-city decline across the country (Beavon, 2000). Beavon (2000) looked at the inner-city decline in Johannesburg that goes as far back as the 1960s. The decline in central Johannesburg led to the creation of new municipalities (such as those serving Randburg and Sandton) - particularly on the northern outskirts of the city. For the new municipalities to generate their own tax base, they were forced into strong competition for both retail and office business in the Johannesburg city centre (Beavon, 2000). As a result, the decentralised areas - not only in Johannesburg, but also in other cities, such as Durban, Pretoria and Cape Town – experienced increased urban peripheral development. Furthermore, Rogerson (2001) added that the changing locations of facilities, land-use types, needs and the customer base during and subsequent to the Apartheid era contributed to the suburbanisation of manufacturing services. A combination of these processes explains the decline of most South African inner cities, and CBDs.

Steinberg et al., (1992) produced the first published research on gentrification in South Africa. Of the two main theoretical approaches in international gentrification research, Steinberg et al.,
(1992) focused on the production-side theories to examine gentrification in Johannesburg. According to them, gentrification took place because of the rental gap that prevailed at the beginning of the 1990s. Steinberg et al., (1992) contended that the redevelopment of inner cities in the late 1980s and early 1990s came as a result of the structural nature of finance in the South African economy. This also happened during a time when significant desegregation was taking place, allowing for the formation of class alliances within the city (Steinberg et al., 1992). According to Visser (2002), however, this study lacked empirical foundations and did not spark much debate regarding production-side gentrification in South Africa.

Limited research has been conducted in respect of consumption-led gentrification in South African cities. Garside (1993) led the pack of influential researchers on gentrification in Cape Town. Her research suggested that gentrification started well in the early 1980s, when mixed race people moved into Lower Woodstock, which was a predominantly white area. In her 1993 study she noted that local home-owners realised lower income renters were being replaced by middle-class renters, who could afford higher rentals. Home-owners then started to renovate their dilapidated houses in order to either attract middle-class renters or sell their houses at a profit (Garside, 1993). It was not long before a vicious cycle of working-class residents being displaced by middle- to upper-class residents throughout Woodstock was formed (Garside, 1993). Apart from this study however and those of Kotzé (1998) and Kotzé & Van der Merwe (2000), there has not been much research to examine the theoretical approaches to gentrification in other South African cities (Visser, 2002).
A study by Kotzé & van der Merwe (2000) looked at a few suburbs in Cape Town to determine whether some parts of Cape Town were undergoing gentrification or simply urban renewal. Six suburbs, including De Waterkant, Bo-Kaap, Lower Gardens, Salt River, and Woodstock, as well as Walmer Estate, were identified with the help of estate agents and town planners. The suburbs were also chosen as a result of their high potential for gentrification (Kotzé & van der Merwe, 2000). Data were collected throughout these areas using a 10% systematic sample survey, with every tenth housing unit in the street being selected for inclusion in the study. Close on three hundred (300) questionnaires were collected for this survey. They were compiled in such a way that data regarding the housing characteristics, the social and, to some extent, personal attributes of the residents could be obtained (Kotzé & Van der Merwe, 2000).

In their research, Kotzé & van der Merwe (2000) wanted to ascertain whether the renewal taking place in Cape Town could be classified as gentrification or not. To do that, they developed a gentrification profile of the city by identifying and profiling a typical Cape Townian gentrifier. In order to select such gentrifiers, Kotzé and Van der Merwe (2000) identified important personal characteristics such as family size, educational qualifications, occupation and income level. They also looked at social characteristics, such as where the residents did their shopping, as well as level of contact with their neighbours and colleagues. The present and former conditions of the property were also placed under scrutiny. Besides the size of the property, ownership was one of the more important aspects to be considered (Kotzé & van der Merwe, 2000).
From the manipulation of the data collected, the personal characteristics of the type of resident more likely to renovate his/her property was found to be as follows: a person with a tertiary qualification; having a family size of 2.9 people; and occupying a white-collar job (Kotzé & van der Merwe, 2000). That person’s behavioural characteristics indicated a lack of interaction with neighbours, but some contact with colleagues. In terms of property characteristics, the housing unit would previously have been in a dilapidated state, would previously have been occupied by the owner, and would have consisted of an average of 2.6 bedrooms. Kotzé & van der Merwe (2000) used these characteristics to determine whether the renewal process in Cape Town was gentrification or not.

The gentrification characteristics were put together to create a gentrification profile for each of the identified inner-city suburbs. The profiles of these neighbourhoods were then tested against the overall profile of Cape Town (Kotzé & van der Merwe, 2000). Two neighbourhoods, namely De Waterkant and Lower Gardens, showed the closest association with the gentrification profile. The type of urban renewal in these two neighbourhoods was then accepted as being indicative of gentrification (Kotzé & Van der Merwe, 2000). However, in cases where the original residents had been displaced and where greater numbers of middle- to upper-income people had moved in, the residents and the housing stock would correspond more closely with those same aspects in a gentrifying neighbourhood.

The re-vitalisation of Cape Town was kick-started by various events such as the bouyant post-Apartheid economy, competition pressure from other cities in the country, as well as profit-
seeking investors (Pirie, 2007). However, gentrification only truly started after different levels of government formulated various inner-city policy guidelines and programmes for the revitalisation of inner-city neighbourhoods. Indeed, the most important role was that played by the state in the regeneration process of Cape Town through residential property development in the city centre, as well as in the neighbouring suburbs (McDonald, 2008). Various gentrification strategies, such as the conversion of office blocks to residential spaces, were introduced to revive the city centre (Visser & Kotzé, 2008).

The regeneration strategies were made possible by the Cape Town Partnership, also known as the CTP (Visser & Kotzé, 2008). CTP was established in 1999 as a non-profit-making management agency and was a joint venture between the City Council, the Cape Metro Council, the South African Property Owners’ Association, as well as private businesses with their representative organisations (Visser & Kotzé, 2008). One of the most significant office blocks (and probably a pioneer) to be converted into a residential block in the Cape Town CBD was the well-known Art Deco office block, across the road from the Grand Central Post Office. Since that block was altered, there have been many more blocks within the city centre and in the surrounding neighbourhoods that have been converted to perform different functions. In fact, more than forty office blocks have been converted into lavish residential apartments (Pirie, 2007). Another example of an office-to-residential conversion is that of the St George’s Mall (Visser & Kotzé, 2008). Such projects reduced the number of unoccupied buildings and increased the number of rented apartments in the inner city. At the same time, typical gentrifiers, (usually young middle-class professionals) were attracted in, or sought out apartments closer to landmark public buildings (Pirie, 2007).
3.4 Gentrification through Retail and Office Space Development

Trading in Cape Town’s CBD subsequently became rather appealing and lucrative with the arrival of wealthy residents. Thus retail rentals more than doubled in less than ten years (Visser & Kotzé, 2008). This newly-revitalised CBD, with its boutiques and speciality shops, now attracts tourists from all over the world. According to Rogerson and Visser (2007), almost 90% of the visitors in Cape Town enjoyed most of their time shopping and visiting heritage sites in the Cape Town CBD. There are now traces of gentrification in the CBD such as the rising number of art galleries and interior decorating firms. There has been an explosive increase in various creative industries concentrated in the Cape Town CBD, including venues to accommodate/promote literary arts, architectural designs, visual arts, fashion, music and film (Pirie, 2007).

The result was that Cape Town experienced a decline in office space in the CBD during the 1990s. Pirie (2007) found that by 2000, office rentals were about 30% lower than prevailing rentals in the 1980s. However, with the latest developments, there has been an increase in office block construction in the CBD. The now development of office space has attracted financial and business-related services, such as approximately 30 banks, more than 300 registered attorneys and almost 70 accounting firms. The gentrification footprint has also had an impact on the property and design industries, with up to 60 property companies and brokers and a large number of registered architects having established themselves in the CBD (Pirie, 2007). In other instances, many professionals have opted to renovate smaller buildings to accommodate their
businesses. IT technicians, video and other media moguls, and design and engineering consultants, are amongst those involved (Visser & Kotzé, 2008).

3.5 Gentrification: Gay and Lesbian Space

The relationship between space and identity has sparked some attention amongst researchers, with the role of space being the focal point in the expression of sexuality (Visser, 2003). However, the role of sexual orientation in identity and citizenship, gentrification and the construction of urban space, is scarcely recognised among researchers. Identity especially that related to one’s sexual orientation and sexuality has been given very little attention even in the core areas of significant research in South Africa. This comes as a surprise because the country has seen the growth and strengthening of gay and lesbian communities, particularly as a pillar of support to bolster up the acknowledgement of a gay and lesbian identity, its development and consolidation. Thus space and place holds great value in terms of discussions concerning the gay and lesbian community, mostly because expressions of such identities are not often viable in social spaces or public places such as shops, cafés or bars (Visser, 2003).

The majority of South African research on sexual orientation and sexuality, especially in terms of lesbian and gay studies, has come from non-academic writers. Only a few academics, such as Visser (2003), Gevisser and Cameron (1994), have produced important research findings on homosexuality in South Africa. This is not unusual as such findings have been noted in earlier developments concerning this issue in other countries such as the United States of America, where writers recorded their own experiences (Visser, 2003). Research into and the recording of lesbian/gay histories subsequently became inconsistent and difficult to theorise. The South
African context is even more complicated because Apartheid played an influential role in research work on homosexuality (Elder, 2003). This can definitely be substantiated in terms of the huge lack of literature along this theme in social studies. In fact, it was only after the 1990s that studies on homosexuality could be taught at universities in South Africa (Visser, 2003). Even scarcer in South African literature are discussions on the interaction between homosexuality and urban renewal processes such as gentrification. The majority of research conducted on homosexuality has always focused largely on sexual identities (Visser, 2003). Elder (2003), who worked on gay leisure spatial developments in isolated gay centres in Cape Town, was one of the first to investigate homosexual behaviour in a spatial context in South Africa.

In 1996, only two years after the new democratic government came into power, gay and lesbian people were granted equality before the law through the new Constitution (1996) (Visser, 2008). The gay leisure scene in large cities such as Cape Town and Johannesburg subsequently grew. However, the expansion of the gay platform is somewhat restricted, or made it more complicated, in smaller cities such as Bloemfontein (Visser, 2008). For instance, a large number of white people (gay or straight) moved out of Bloemfontein during the government’s racial and re-structuring transformation programmes. The result of this movement was a decline in the white leisure market, which subsequently reduced the possibility of developing gay leisure facilities. As Visser (2008) points out, an important factor in the expansion of a viable gay scene is the availability of gay leisure facilities. Gay communities, with the associated lifestyle are more prevalent in larger cities such as Cape Town and Johannesburg and are crucial in generating and maintaining the gay leisure scene. For example many gay residents of smaller
towns migrate to the larger cities, or frequently visit them, to experience the gay lifestyle (Visser, 2008).

It is clear in South Africa that the legal protection of gay communities has caused gay organisations and places of leisure to flourish. That gay people are protected legally has allowed for a certain level of freedom of expression amongst them and has fostered the rapid expansion of services and places (such as gay cinemas, night clubs, coffee shops and bars), where they can openly express their sexuality (Visser, 2003). These facilities attract gay tourists, both domestic and international. Furthermore, more commercial space has been developed to specifically target the gay market for facilities such as restaurants. In some cases, in close proximity to heterosexual entertainment areas (Visser, 2003). This has resulted in high volumes of gay traffic.

The expansion of tourism over the years has also led to an increase in gay tourism. In fact, internationally, the relationship between gay leisure space and tourism consumption has become an interesting research topic (Binnie & Valentine, 1999). In the South African arena, this topic has still hardly been touched upon amongst researchers in spite of gay tourism processes in cities such as Cape Town (Elder, 2003). The expansion of gay tourism has created an important link between tourist accommodation facilities and places of leisure for the gay community (Visser, 2002).
De Waterkant, which is one of the best examples of a gentrified area, is a suburb of Cape Town, where a significant number of properties were put aside as serviced and/or self-catering accommodation for tourists. The majority of these were bought as second homes by individuals who would then rent them out when they were not around (Visser, 2002). This idea was introduced in 1994, with only three properties and very little capital invested. Five years later, though, close to three-quarters of all properties in the suburb underwent some form of renovation and were used for accommodating tourists. In an interview, a manager/owner of a number of accommodation facilities reported that close to, if not more than 90 percent of the bookings issued from gay tourists (Visser, 2002). These upgraded accommodation facilities, favoured for their proximity to the gay leisure spaces, have targeted mainly the wealthy sectors of the international gay market, and have created a platform for urban regeneration propelled by wealthier white gay men (Elder, 2003; Visser, 2002 & 2003).

The property market in some parts of Cape Town has been, therefore, positively affected by the movement of gay-tourism-generated capital (Visser, 2003). Overall, rentals and property sales increased significantly beyond the reach of the former and, in some instances, original white middle-class residents. Thus, a number of gay residents (mostly middle-class) were being pushed out and/or displaced in areas that they had originally created. The displacement referred to in this instance mimics that noticed in gentrification processes internationally and suggests that some form of gay gentrification is in fact taking place.
3.6 Future Trends in South Africa’s Gentrification and Urban Research Literature

There are a number of key trends emerging in the South African gentrification and urban literature:

Firstly, South Africa has experienced a significant change in the cycle of urban decline over the past decades (Visser, 2002). The decay of many of South Africa’s inner cities however, provides opportunities for both the public and private sectors to address the urban regeneration and gentrification processes by creating living spaces in former commercial zones, such as the Central Business Districts of Johannesburg, Cape Town and Pretoria. The Central City Improvement Districts (in Cape Town) and other huge infrastructural investments are being implemented. For example, there are re-development projects at the Victoria & Albert Waterfront and the Foreshore in Cape Town (Wesgro 2002). Similar trends can be noticed in other cities in South Africa, such as the Blue IQ project in Johannesburg. These projects, together with investments of private capital aimed at the upliftment of inner cities and at attracting investors back to the CBDs, have been put in place to counter urban decay and to open up opportunities for gentrification (Wesgro, 2002). Thus, research into urban regeneration and gentrification in South Africa’s inner cities is a significant area for academic research.

Secondly, gentrification in South Africa is currently not taking on the American (USA) form of black-white displacement (Visser, 2002). Unlike the case in the United States of America, where the black working class often fall victim to gentrification, black, Coloured and Indian people in South Africa are also agents of gentrification, owing to the rise of a black middle class.
Furthermore, the emerging black middle class is increasing in size, wealth and mobility. Their migration into former white neighbourhoods, especially lower-income former white residential areas, means that it is the white working-class residents who are being displaced through gentrification (Kotzé & Donaldson, 1998). Racial segregation and political divisions along racial lines have severely impacted upon urban social and economic life in South Africa (Rogerson, 1996; Beavon, 2000). For most of Johannesburg’s history, it was illegal for black, Coloured and Indian people to buy or even rent property in areas classified as white (Carr, 1990). There was a deliberate policy of retaining the most sought-after land, such as land close to the city centre, land with a view or land away from offensive activities, such as landfills, for white people. Thus, white people enjoyed the ‘fruits of the city’ and even today, in the post-Apartheid era, white people still dominate in these areas, with the financial benefits of living close to favourable amenities accruing to them (Bond, 2000). Thus, a second emerging theme in South African gentrification literature is tracking the manner in which racially-segregated space becomes ‘normalised’; that is, although areas are racially mixed, class stratifications still remain. Thus, desirable urban land remains in the hands of the middle class and elite, although the ‘colour’ of the hands has changed in racial terms - from white to black. Tracking this process across the post-Apartheid cities of South Africa is a key research theme.

A third theme in the South African gentrification literature is establishing where displaced working class and poor whites have re-located to. To date, desegregation research in post-Apartheid South Africa often fails to follow up on and establish what happens to these displaced people (Visser, 2002). In particular, a possible research question would be: Does the spatial pattern of displacement of poor white people in South Africa mimic that of the United States of
America, where poor whites live on the periphery, usually in makeshift housing such as caravans?

A fourth theme is that of investigating the rise of a black middle class in the former black townships. Although the townships are often portrayed as impoverished neighbourhoods occupied by struggling black working-class residents, without a doubt some are showing the signs of accommodating an emerging black middle class (Visser, 2002). Considering the dynamics of neighbourhood change taking place in the townships, or particular parts of them, research into gentrification certainly needs to be undertaken in these areas. A fifth theme is that of examining the relationship between gentrification and gay and lesbian space. Visser (2002) and Elder (2003) found that some areas in Cape Town have experienced gentrification by developing as sites for gay leisure and tourism consumption, for example. Little critique has been evoked concerning how white middle-class gay men are being displaced by richer gay men from regions such as the United Kingdom. This, namely that South Africa is mimicking international trends in gentrification, could prove to be a fairly interesting topic for researchers in South Africa to establish (Visser, 2002).

A sixth theme to emerge is that of academics questioning the desirability of gentrification, as it certainly has the potential to result in the destruction of South Africa’s historical architectural legacy. Historical buildings that are culturally and politically significant to various people are often under threat through urban development (Visser, 2002). This raises questions pertaining to issues concerning the relationship between gentrification, urban renewal and conservation. In
the South African context, though, the issue of historical architectural conservation is not as simple as in the international context. In South Africa, restored historical sites are significant tourist attractions in Cape Town, Johannesburg, Durban and Pretoria, for example (Visser, 2002 & Rogerson, 2002). Thus, there is a need to explore the cost benefit ratio of gentrification and urban renewal within a broader economic debate, a path some South African gentrification researchers are sure to tread.

Lastly, there is an emerging theme concerning rural gentrification. This is where wealthy urbanites, usually white South Africans, purchase second homes or move to much smaller rural towns after retirement (Visser, 2002). Displacement becomes an issue once again and raises the question as to whether more impoverished rural towns can benefit from the new incoming migrants (Visser & Kotzé, 2008). In fact, the movement of these residents, be it permanent or occasional, could perhaps be the only activity taking place in such communities (Hoogendoorn & Visser, 2004) and be deemed uncompetitive in the global economic arena (Visser & Kotzé, 2008).

### 3.7 Conclusion

This chapter focused on the local literature on gentrification and its associated processes. Work concerning the historical background of gentrification in South Africa was given attention. Outlines were given of case studies of gentrification processes in Cape Town through the perspectives of conversions and the modernisation of retail and office space. Investigations were conducted into gentrification, also in the context of gay space in South Africa, and the chapter was rounded off with a look at the development of Johannesburg as a host city for the study area,
Parkhurst. Chapter 4 focuses on the study area, Parkhurst, and its development as a suburb of Johannesburg.
Chapter 4: Data Analysis and Interpretation

4.1. Introduction

This chapter deals with the interpretation and analysis of the data that were collected in Parkhurst. Information on the methods used for collecting the data, is presented in Chapter 1. A number of variables were examined to determine whether gentrification has taken place in Parkhurst or not. These variables include social and personal characteristics such as educational levels, the degree to which careers can be deemed professional, household size and socio-economic status. Some additional shortcomings that need to be acknowledged in terms of this analysis. When data from the Parkhurst Survey (2011) were compared with various data sources such as Census 2001 and Census 2011, it was not a simple one-for-one comparison. This is because Census 2011 recorded household income at the national level but not at the provincial level at the time of analysis. In other cases again, at the time of analysis, Census 2011 recorded level of education at the provincial level but not on the national scale. These shortcomings have led to slight inconsistencies in terms of data comparisons.

4.2 Demographic Profile of Respondents

Internationally, the characteristics of a typical gentrifier are: young, white, single, educated and occupying an elevated profession, with a middle- to upper-class income (Badcock, 2001; Lees et al., 2008). Furthermore, international studies also show that gentrifiers are often in the creative professions or are employed in white-collar occupations (Cameron, 1992; Kotzé, 1998; Lees et al., 2008). Thus, the section that follows next starts by examining the socio-economic characteristics of the respondents in the suburb. The characteristics in question include age,
gender, ethnicity, marital status, educational level, household size, occupation and income level (see Table 4.1). These characteristics give a clear indication of the type of residents that reside in Parkhurst.

**Table 4.1: Overall socio-economic and demographic profiles of Parkhurst residents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>&lt;30</th>
<th>31-40</th>
<th>41-50</th>
<th>51-60</th>
<th>&gt;60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Co-habiting</th>
<th>Married</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Coloured</th>
<th>Other/no answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational levels</th>
<th>Completed high school</th>
<th>Some post-school education</th>
<th>Diploma</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income per month</th>
<th>&lt;R20000</th>
<th>R20001-R30000</th>
<th>R30001-R35000</th>
<th>R35001-R40000</th>
<th>R50001+</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.1 Age profile

The majority of respondents (58%) are below the age of 40, making it a suburb of younger people. Most people fall into the age categories 31 to 40 or 41 to 50 years (see Table 4.1). From this, it can be noted that Parkhurst has experienced a change in the age composition of residents over time. The transition is clear if the ‘below 30 years’ and the ‘30-40 years’ categories are examined. According to the census data of 2001, the majority of Parkhurst residents were recorded as being below the age of thirty (see Figure, 4.1). In 2001, the 31-40 years age group made up only 25% of the population in the suburb (Census, 2001). The age group above 50 years has declined since 2001 whilst the groups between the ages 31 to 50 have increased. Thus the suburb has witnessed an increased influx of younger people.

Figure 4.1: Age profiles of respondents: 2001 vs 2011 (Census, 2001; Parkhurst Survey, 2012)
### 4.2.2 Gender profile

In terms of gender composition, the majority (54%) of the residents of Parkhurst are male (Parkhurst Survey, 2012). It was found that the gender composition of the suburb has changed since 2001. A decade ago there were more females living in Parkhurst than males (Census, 2001). There is also a mismatch between Parkhurst’s gender ratio and South Africa’s. The South African Census of 2011 found that females make up 52% of the country’s population, whereas the female population of Parkhurst constitutes only 46% of the suburb’s total population (Figure 4.2). Thus, it can be concluded that this gender ratio is highly unusual for South Africa; that is, it is unusual for a suburban residential area to be dominated by men.

![Figure 4.2: Gender ratios of respondents: 2001 vs 2011 (Census, 2011; Parkhurst Survey, 2012).](image)

### 4.2.3 Marital status

Approximately one third (36%) of the respondents are married couples, another third (32%) are single and 18% living together. Widows/widowers and divorcees are at very low levels, namely
7% and 6% respectively. The majority of people, who reported that they are single, were female. The Parkhurst Survey revealed that there is a significant proportion of males living in the same house whereas very few females reported to be living in the same house as another female. More men recorded themselves as married than women, perhaps an indicator of gay marriages. However, as the subject of homosexual marriages was not directly examined in this study, this is speculation. Overall, the marital status of the residents of Parkhurst correlates with that of Johannesburg as a whole, that is, there are more single people in the Johannesburg region than married couples (see Figure 4.2).

Table 4.2: Marital status by gender in Parkhurst

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living together</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow/widower</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.4 Race

Race is a very controversial issue in South Africa owing to the legacy of Apartheid. That said, it is standard practice to record race, firstly to see if changes have been made to rectify past wrongs and, secondly to discern current patterns. Parkhurst, historically, was a designated white space under the Apartheid regime and this is still impacting on the suburb today, with 86% of the respondents recording themselves as white. However, the suburb is starting to de-racialise, with some six percent recording themselves as black and one percent as Coloured. However, this de-racialisation is still at a low level compared to the national level (see Figure 4.4). Unfortunately, some seven percent of the respondents did not elect to identify themselves by race.
4.2.5 Level of education

As opposed to ten years ago, the majority of Parkhurst’s residents are well-educated with many (63%) reporting that they hold university degrees (see Figure 4.5). A minority (14%) had only completed high school. Respondents holding technikon and college qualifications were also in the minority, at five percent and nine percent respectively. Educational levels have improved significantly since 2001 as residents either improved their education levels or more educated people are moving into the suburb. According to the sample of the South Africa Census of 2011, Parkhurst’s educational profile is radically different from that of the rest of Johannesburg. The majority (68%) of Johannesburg dwellers only have a high school qualification. Only a minority (8.7%) of Johannesburg’s residents are in possession of a degree, with slightly more (11%) holding a diploma and/or a post-matric certificate.
4.3. Socio-economic Status

4.3.1 Employment types and levels

For Parkhurst, 85% of the respondents are employed. Once again, this differs radically from Johannesburg as a whole, which records only 54% employment (Census 2011). Those who are employed in Parkhurst hold down a variety of jobs: accountants, bankers, doctors, entrepreneurs, estate agents, farmers and interior decorators (see Table 4.3). The majority of respondents listed themselves as entrepreneurs. What is also clear is that most households rely on dual incomes. Spouses or co-habitants listed their occupation as designers, IT technicians, fitness instructors, human resources managers, photographers, television presenters, lawyers, researchers and sales
managers. Thus, it is clear that the majority of residents are either professionals, creative professionals or part of the managerial class. The categories in table 4.3 were adopted from Powers et al., (2003) and used to classify the jobs that were listed by the respondents. The respondents listed the jobs that they and their spouses occupied and these were then categorised accordingly.

4.3.2 Household income

The majority (48%) of Parkhurst residents earn over R520 000 per annum (see Figure 4.6). Only ten percent of the households indicated their household income to be between R280 001 and R360 000. Fourteen percent of the residents have household incomes of R450 001. A significant proportion indicated that they earned below R200 000 per annum. Furthermore, 12% of the respondents chose not to disclose their income. In terms of individual incomes, some 40%, said they earned R50 000 or more per month (see Figure 4.7).
### Table 4.3: Job types recorded by Parkhurst respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Powers et al’s Classification of Jobs</th>
<th>Job Types: Respondents</th>
<th>Job Types: Spouse/co-habitor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Engineers, healthcare professionals, accountants, lawyers and architects</td>
<td>Engineer, geologist, strategic planner, asset manager, financial manager, accountant, IT technician, lawyer, project manager.</td>
<td>Engineer, strategic planner, insurer, asset manager, financial manager, accountant, IT technician, lawyer, project manager.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial/Technical</td>
<td>General managers, educators, nurses, local public officials</td>
<td>Sales manager, insurer, teacher, brand manager.</td>
<td>Director, sales manager, insurer, brand manager.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled (non-manual)</td>
<td>Clerks, cashiers, sales personnel, secretaries</td>
<td>Distributor, cashier, sales personnel, secretary, TV presenter</td>
<td>Distributor, data capturer, sales personnel, freelancer, secretary, TV presenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled (manual)</td>
<td>Skilled construction workers, electricians, plumbers, craftsmen, technicians</td>
<td>Fitness instructor, skilled construction worker, electrician, plumber, craftsman, technician</td>
<td>Artist, fitness instructor, tourist guide, healer, fashion designer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partly skilled and Unskilled</td>
<td>Domestic workers, machine setters/operators, protective servicemen, waiters</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After Powers et al., 2003
Surprisingly, a significant proportion of the respondents indicated that their earnings could be classified below the R15 000-per-month category. This number could perhaps be associated with students or tenants who are renting a flat or cottage while still in the early stages of their careers. Ten percent indicated that they earn between R35 000 and R40 000. Once again, a significant number, 23%, of the respondents chose not to answer this question. However, it is clear that the majority of Parkhurst residents, with their high incomes, display characteristics similar to those of gentrifiers. The study found that the male respondents in Parkhurst earn much more than the females (see figure 4.8). Because this research found that there are more males than females in Parkhurst, it can be accepted that there is a higher income per household in the suburb - further strengthening the notion of the presence of gentrifiers in Parkhurst.

![Figure 4.6: Annual incomes of respondents (Parkhurst Survey, 2012)
This research further established that there is a relationship between the level of education and the income status of the Parkhurst residents. Figure 4.9 below indicates that the residents with higher educational qualifications, such as university degrees, tend to earn much higher salaries.
than those with slightly lower qualifications. Although there are some outliers in the data such as some residents with only high school qualifications falling within similar income brackets as those with university degrees, it is very clear that the educational level of Parkhurst residents broadly determines their income levels.

![Figure 4.9: Incomes by qualification of respondents (Parkhurst Survey, 2012)](image)

In line with the gentrification characteristics indicating that gentrifiers are often young individuals with high income levels (Kotzé, 1998; Bletterman, 2010), this research also examined which age group in the suburb earned the most. Figure 4.10 shows that the younger adults (31 to 40 years) earn the highest incomes on average. The age group falling into the second-highest income bracket is between 41 and 50 years old.
Although Census 2011 found that the average household income for the country had more than doubled over the past decade, the national average income is still relatively low. The national household income average rose from R48 385 in 2001 to R103 204 in 2011. Furthermore, it was recorded that Black African household heads still earn the lowest incomes, namely around R60 613; Coloureds are slightly higher at R112 172; and Indian/Asian household heads earn an average of R251 134. The highest earning household heads were white people, with an annual average of R365 134. As indicated above, this research found the average household income to be much higher as opposed to the national averages; and this is true even for white people. Thus, even on being compared to white households at a national level, the households of Parkhurst are wealthy.
4.3.3 Household size and dependency

In general, the typical Parkhurst household consists of only two people (56%). A further 24% live alone. Only one respondent indicated that the household consists of five adults (see Figure 4.11). This should clearly indicate that the majority of Parkhurst residents either do not have, or do not live with their children or dependants. Only nine percent indicated that they have only one child, while eight percent indicated that they have two children.

During the period 1996 to 2001, Parkhurst was also a neighbourhood of small household sizes (Census, 2001). This tendency has increased, with households of two people or less increasing by seven percent in the last ten years. Bigger households have decreased by almost 20% in the same period of time (see Figure 4.12). Such a decline in large households is typical for Johannesburg as a whole (Census, 2011) (see Figure 4.13).
Figure 4.12: Household sizes for Parkhurst: 2001 vs 2011 (Census, 2001; Parkhurst Survey, 2012)

Figure 4.13: Household sizes for Johannesburg (Census, 2011)
### 4.3.4 Summary

The following deductions can be made from the analysis of the socio-economic and demographic data above:

- The average age of the Parkhurst residents is between 30 and 40;
- The gender ratio is skewed in favour of males;
- Approximately 50% of the residents are single and/or just living together;
- The population is dominated by white people;
- The levels of education and employment of the Parkhurst residents are exceptionally high; and
- The majority of households earn well above the average annual income of ordinary South Africans.

### 4.4 Conclusion

This section looked at the demographic and socio-economic status of the residents (respondents) of Parkhurst. The data collected was analysed by comparing previous data sets to track the changes that have occurred in the suburb. The research found that there has been a significant change and the suburb has thus undergone some form of transformation. Amongst some of these changes are the gender and age profile of the suburb. Research found that there are now more males in Parkhurst than females as opposed to the ratio a decade ago. Unlike the findings for the early 2000s, where the majority of residents were below the age of thirty, this research found that most of the residents are currently between the ages of 30 and 40.
Some of the data were also compared to those of the regional and national levels to track the development of the suburb in relation to the country. This research found that the majority of Parkhurst residents have a much higher household income than the representative sample of the country (Census, 2011). In conclusion, it can therefore be accepted that the characteristics recorded from the Parkhurst respondents indicate some level of improvement or upliftment in their lifestyle. This trend was also found by Kotze (1998) to prevail in his study of Cape Town. Judging from the demographic characteristics, it can be accepted that gentrification is taking place in Parkhurst. The following chapter looks at the physical character of the suburb to examine the physical changes that have taken place.
Chapter 5: Changes to the Built Environment of Parkhurst

5.1. Introduction

The previous chapter examined the socio-economic and demographic characteristics of Parkhurst. This chapter examines the data collected on the housing units of Parkhurst. It looks at the ownership of the homes, the condition of the houses, the property size and the period of time that the residents have been staying in the houses. Data were also obtained regarding the properties in the area, such as the property size (number of rooms per house), ownership and whether any renovations had been undertaken on the property or not. The data were obtained through self-reports from the residents rather than through an independent audit.

5.2. Background

The typical Parkhurst house is a relatively comfortable middle-class home with a garden and often an extra car port in addition to a double garage (Rule, 2006). The stands are characterised by high walls, topped with electrical fencing (Figure 5.1) and sometimes CCTV security equipment. In addition, typical of many northern Johannesburg suburbs, residents have opted for the restriction of access into certain portions of the suburb through road closures (Figure 5.2). Ostensibly, this is in response to increased crime levels (Landman, 2002). These closed-off roads are manned by security guards controlling access to the area via boom gates. However, as these measures put pressure on other roads and disrupt the flow of traffic, they are now opposed by the Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality.
Figure 5.1: High walls with electrical fencing

Figure 5.2: An access-controlled suburb
The demand for property in Parkhurst is considerable as the available units require low maintenance. In addition, the central location of the suburb is preferred by many prospective home-owners (Rule, 2006). Furthermore, the housing units offer the convenience of lock-up-and-go lifestyles (Beavon, 1998). According to Rule 2006, it was the afore-mentioned factors that led Parkhurst home-owners to renovate their properties and to resell them at much higher prices. For example, in the late 1990s, the average price of a house on sale in Parkhurst was R355 000. Almost ten years later, in 2000, the asking price for an unrenovated house was still at that same level, but a renovated one was fetching R600 000 (Rule, 2006). Currently, in 2012, the sale price of houses in Parkhurst ranges from a low of R1.8 million to a high of R3.3 million (Property24, 2012; Kings Real Estate, 2012; Geraldine Lewis Estates, 2012; Vered Estates, 2012; Sotheby’s, 2012; and Pam Golding Estates, 2012). This is because most of the houses have been renovated. The difference in the current prices can be accounted for in terms of the number of bedrooms a house has, and whether the house has been completely renovated or only partially renovated. The rest of this chapter is devoted to a discussion of the results of the Parkhurst Survey (2011).

5.3. Home Ownership

One of the features of a gentrified suburb is an increase in home-ownership. In the Parkhurst Survey of 2011, an overwhelming majority (74%) of the respondents indicated that they own the property on which they live, while only 15% are tenants. The remainder chose not to disclose whether they are renting or whether they own the property or not.
5.4. Renovations of Properties

Respondents were asked to indicate what condition the house was in when they first moved in. Only 14% claimed that the property was in a poor condition at the time of purchase. Many said that the property was in a moderate condition (38%), and a large percentage (39%) felt that it was in a good condition. Some nine percent declined to answer the question. It was clear, however, that renovations must have ensued post-purchase, because only two percent rated the current state of their house/property as poor, while only 23% rated it as moderate. The overwhelming majority (66%) felt that their house/property was in a good state of repair.

When asked about renovations, some (64%) said they had undertaken some renovations on their house, with only 32% not doing so. A few people (4%) refused to answer this question. Painting the interior and exterior of the property (19.4% and 18.9% respectively) seems to be a common practice. The remodelling of the bathrooms and kitchens (13.9% and 12.9% respectively) is also a popular trend. Total renovations, such as painting, the remodelling of kitchens and bathrooms, the building of walls (see Figure 5.3) and the addition of rooms were undertaken by 11.4% of the respondents. Wall and entrance upgrading, as presented in Figure 5.3, are common improvements undertaken in the neighbourhood. Figure 5.4 below illustrates the type of renovations undertaken.

Almost all of the respondents (98%) indicated that they have noticed some form of renovation taking place in the area. Figure 5.5 presents evidence of renovation taking place, with building equipment and waste material strewn across the sidewalks along one of the many streets of the
suburb. Figure 5.6, also shows evidence of renovation. Overall, it is clear that the renovations are strategic in that they are designed to increase the value of the property (e.g. the renovation of bathrooms and kitchens) and to enhance the property in order to attract interest in the rental market.

![Image of wall and entrance upgrade in Parkhurst](image)

**Figure 5.3: Wall and entrance upgrade in Parkhurst**

Some renovations in the form of office or business conversions are also evident along Fourth Avenue. The renovations of the business areas on Fourth Avenue are increasing at a rapid pace, in tandem with the tempo of home renovations in Parkhurst (see Figure 5.7). From this figure, it is clearly evident that older houses along Fourth Avenue are being converted into retail spaces.
Figure 5.4: Types of renovations (Parkhurst Survey, 2012)
Figure 5.5: Property renovation in Parkhurst

Figure 5.6: Visible renovations in Parkhurst
5.5. Property Size

Residents were asked to report on the number of bedrooms, living rooms and/or bathrooms in the house. Forty-three percent claimed that their houses only had one living room, while 40% indicated that they had two living rooms. Three percent of the respondents indicated that their homes had as many as four living rooms (see Figure 5.8).
Figure 5.8: Number of living rooms in houses of respondents (Parkhurst Survey, 2012)

The majority (50%) of houses have three bedrooms, 30% have two bedrooms, whilst only 10% percent have four bedrooms. Only two people indicated that they have five or more bedrooms. Thus, the typical house in Parkhurst has three bedrooms, while many are small, with only two bedrooms. The study found that only 14% of the houses have only one bathroom, whereas 56% have two bathrooms, 23% have three bathrooms, and three percent have more than three bathrooms. Considering that older homes would be unlikely to have so many bathrooms, it is clear that many of the renovations that have been undertaken have resulted in the building of additional bathrooms. A trend that emerged from the research was that the greater the number of bedrooms in the house, the greater the number of bathrooms. However, generally, a typical house in Parkhurst has three bedrooms and two bathrooms (see Figure 5.9).
5.6. Length of Stay

The majority of residents (53%) have been living in Parkhurst for five years or less. Thus, the residents are mostly newcomers to the area. A further 27% have resided in Parkhurst for between six and 10 years. It is clear that many of the residents have moved out of the suburb, as only three percent have lived there for 20 years or more\(^1\). According to a local real estate agent, Parkhurst attracts young professionals who want a type of “European” lifestyle. The estate agent maintained that the average stay is low (4.5 years) as residents usually move to much bigger houses in areas such as Dunkeld or Parktown North once they start families. This estate agent noted that these couples are often replaced by same-sex couples, who are buying their first home together.

\(^1\) although one person has been living there for 39 years
### Table 5.1: Length of stay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10 years</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 15 years</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 20 years</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20 years</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.7. Home-to-business conversions in Parkhurst

The study also explored the rate at which homes are converted into business units. One real estate agent indicated that the majority of housing units converted into business and office space were to be found along the suburb’s main streets, namely Fourth Avenue and Sixth Street. This is mainly due to city zoning permits. In general, only these streets are allowed business developments (see Figure 5.10 indicating business/retail use). Overall, corporate and office-like conversions are prevalent on Sixth Street, while restaurants and retail conversions are common along Fourth Avenue. These conversions can easily be spotted by their corporate signatures, as well as the conversion of sidewalks into customer parking bays (see Figure 5.11).
The development of a commercial ribbon is clearly driven by the intersection of the two main roads within the suburb. Sixth Street becomes Seventh Avenue once it leaves the suburb in an easterly direction. It passes through Parktown North and eventually leads to a popular upmarket and commercial area, namely Rosebank. To the West of Seventh Avenue and Six Street is Victory Road which passes Barry Hertzog in Greenside. Fourth Avenue links the suburb to another commercially vibrant suburb, Greenside, to the South. This suburb is well known for its vibrant night life and array of upmarket and stylish restaurants and boutiques.

Figure 5.10: Map showing the commercial ribbon of development in Parkhurst
Data were collected on the number of home-to-business conversions that have been undertaken along the main commercial streets. A measuring wheel was used to measure the total length, in kilometres, of business developments/conversions on both the main streets. The streets were measured in their entirety in order to capture the spatial extent of the commercial development. A total of 1.5977km of commercial development was recorded. Along Fourth Ave, the total length of commercial conversions was found to be 822.5m, where 67.7% of the business conversions are for retail functions such as clothing shops (“Hip-hop”, “Christina Marina” and “Paul Smith”), supermarkets (“Parkhurst Paint”, “Urban Spaza” and “Polly Porter”) or bookstores. Restaurants (such as “Peroni”, “Georgies on 4th”, and “Possum’s Bistro and Deli”) occupy 17.2% of the commercial space, with the majority of restaurants in Parkhurst being located along this street. Fourth Avenue is also home to some office conversions such as lawyers’ offices and estate agencies (see Table 5.2).

Table 5.2: Types of businesses found along Fourth Avenue in Parkhurst

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Number of businesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>540.1</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>157.05</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office blocks</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Providers</td>
<td>67.15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parkhurst Survey (2012)
In terms of property conversions along Sixth Street, a total spatial extent of 775.2m was recorded. Some differences between the commercial operations located along this street as opposed to those on Fourth Avenue became apparent. The business developments on Sixth Street were found to be mainly for retail space and for the offices of service providers, the latter including day spa’s, offices and premises for events management and for designers - in total occupying 57.1% of the commercial area. Once again, retail space occupies a significant portion of the area at 28.9% (see Table 5.3). Office conversions stand at 7.2% while there are very few restaurants in this area.

Table 5.3: Types of business conversions along Sixth Street in Parkhurst

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Number of businesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Providers</td>
<td>443.6</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>223.55</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office blocks</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>26.95</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parkhurst Survey (2012)
Overall, then, the commercial sector of Parkhurst is dominated by retail outlets, followed by service providers. Contrary to popular perception restaurants, office blocks and other commercial spaces account for only a fraction of the total commercial space in Parkhurst.

Table 5.4: Overview of commercial operations in Parkhurst

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>763.65</td>
<td>47.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Providers</td>
<td>510.75</td>
<td>31.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>11.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office blocks</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>5.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parkhurst Survey (2012)
Figure 5.11: A home-to-office conversion

As shown in Figure 5.12, a significant proportion of the commercial developments are in the form of double storeys. This could be an indicator of the premium that commercial buyers are prepared to pay for being located in such an area. Double-storeys are usually associated with high land values. In this case, the allocation of plots for business in this sought-after suburb is low - hence, the high price for erven.

Figure 5.12: A home-to-office conversion
The prevalence of upmarket restaurants, located along Fourth Avenue (see Figure 5.13), has added to the popularity of Parkhurst as a residential suburb. However, as the number of home-to-restaurant conversions has reached a ‘tipping point’, residents, especially the older ones, are starting to view them as a nuisance. Unlike office blocks, restaurants are open for longer hours - into the night, as well as on the weekends - causing increased traffic and high noise levels (see Figure 5.13).

![Figure 5.13: An upmarket restaurant conversion in Parkhurst](image)

### 5.8. Property Values

According to local real-estate agents, a typical house sells for between R1.5 million and R5 million. The lower end of the market is dominated by unrenovated homes, which are valued between R1.5 and R1.8 million (in 2000, such a house was valued at R250 000), although on the current property market most are unlikely to achieve this price. Renovated houses sell for
approximately R2.5 million to R3.5 million (Saturday Star, 2012; IOL, 2012), while a newly-built house (that is an old house that has been demolished with a new one built from the foundation) could be sold at approximately R5.9 million (Property24, 2012). According to Property24 (2012), a three-bedroomed house in Parkhurst can sell for more than R2.2 million, whereas a similar-sized house in the area could have been sold for R276 000 in its unrenovated state in 1996. There has been a rapid increase in property values over the last ten years in Parkhurst, although this is generally true for the whole of Johannesburg. The average South African would not be able to afford a house in Parkhurst considering these high property values. Depending on the prime rate and the lending rate, one would need to earn well above R520 000 per annum to qualify for a bond. Thus, there is a direct correlation between the incomes of the Parkhurst residents and the average price range in terms of property values. With such expensive real estate, only the wealthy can afford to live in Parkhurst.

5.9. Summary

In terms of the physical characteristics of Parkhurst, the data revealed the following:

- Home improvements are undertaken once the new residents have moved in;
- The majority of residents (64%) have undertaken some form of renovation;
- The painting of interiors and exteriors is common;
- Fifty percent of the houses in Parkhurst have three bedrooms;
- The more bedrooms a house has, the more bathrooms it has;
- The average length of stay in the neighbourhood is relatively low (4.5 years);
- The home-to-office conversions are located along the main routes of the suburb;
- Renovated house values have increased significantly to well over R3 million; and
- There are now more businesses in Parkhurst than when the residential area was
5.10. Conclusion

Chapter 5 dealt with the housing and property development in Parkhurst. The subject of home ownership was unpacked by investigating the number of homes that are owned by the individuals occupying them. Current and previous home conditions were analysed to assess the number of renovations taking place. The respective levels of renovation on properties were assessed to determine the extent to which the houses are being improved. This section also looked at property size and the length of the period in which the residents have been occupying a particular house. Finally, the section took a brief glance at the way in which properties have been converted from housing units to business and/or office spaces. Chapter 6 is a summary of the findings of the research results.
Chapter 6: Conclusion

6.1. Introduction

This chapter serves to evaluate the study and its findings. The main focus of this study was to establish the demographic and socio-economic patterns of the suburb, as well as to determine the physical character of the housing stock. A brief assessment of a typical gentrifier was undertaken to enable the researcher to make a comparison between the run-of-the-mill residents of Parkhurst and the gentrifiers, the latter having been characterised in the subject literature. Finally, recommendations are provided for future studies on this topic.

As mentioned previously, gentrification is defined as a process that is driven by the demands of production and the desire for profit (Fyfe & Kenny, 2005). It should be kept in mind that, owing to its complex nature, gentrification can be defined as a set of processes that involve the physical improvement of the housing stock, housing tenure change, property value increases, as well as the displacement of working-class residents by middle-class ones (Bridge & Watson, 2000). The gentrification processes can be explained in terms of production and consumption theories, the former focusing on the relationship between capital flow and the production of urban space, with the latter placing emphasis on the characteristics and consumption patterns of gentrifiers.

In the South African context, gentrification may involve other forms of neighbourhood change but not necessarily residential succession or the displacement of the original (often lower-class) residents (Kotzé & Van der Merwe, 2000). Furthermore, in South Africa, the consumption-side
explanation of gentrification has been the more dominant one as opposed to the production-side theories (Garside, 1993).

6.2 Research Questions

The results from the survey show that there are some remarkable similarities between the profile of residents of Parkhurst and those typically found in gentrified suburbs. The residents are young. The gender ratio is skewed in favour of males. This may be because men earn more than women and so are more likely to be gentrifiers (Lees, 2000). But it may be that the suburb is popular amongst gay men. Smith and Holt (2005) found that gay couples tend to be stronger gentrifiers than heterosexual couples. Furthermore, it was found that the majority of residents are unmarried. This correlates strongly with international literature which identifies gentrifiers as unmarried people generally (Bletterman, 2010). Furthermore, international studies have found that traditionally, gentrification is linked to race - that is, gentrifiers are often white people (Ley, 1996). As Parkhurst was found to be dominated by white people (86%), it can be concluded that in this respect it also correlates with the international profile. The limited number of households with children is also in line with international studies (Bletterman, 2010).

In terms of economic characteristics, Parkhurst was also found to correspond with the international experience (Bletterman, 2010; Florida, 2003 and 2005) and that of South Africa (Kotzé, 1998; Visser & Kotzé, 2008); that is, that most have high levels of education (63% have university degrees) and occupy managerial positions. The suburb is home to graphic designers, photographers, brand managers, human resource managers, financial managers and geologists. With respect to income (household or individual), the residents of Parkhurst can be characterised
as gentrifiers as the household income for most residents is in excess of R520 000 per annum. This is in line with international studies that show that gentrification is associated with high-earning individuals (Hamnett, 2003 and Hackworth, 2002). To sum up: the socio-economic and demographic profiles of Parkhurst are typical of those characterising suburbs that have undergone gentrification.

Home-ownership is one of the significant characteristics of a gentrified suburb (Kotzé & Van der Merwe, 2000). The majority (74%) of residents in Parkhurst own their houses. In terms of the physical property characteristics of a gentrified suburb, the former condition of the housing would have been in a dilapidated state (Kotzé, 1998; Kotzé & Van der Merwe, 2000). Although the previous condition of the properties in Parkhurst could not be classified as completely dilapidated, it is more than likely that most buyers would have started renovations soon after purchase. This was confirmed by other residents, who indicated that they have noticed signs of renovation around the area. Renovations range from complete (that is, the entire house), to kitchen and bathroom re-modelling. Many new owners tend to paint, while others go as far as adding on rooms. The erection of high walls, a quintessentially South African phenomenon, has proved to be extremely popular in Parkhurst. One of the consequences of the renovations is, obviously, a rapid rise in property values.

Signs of the gentrification process are normally reflected in the restoration of residential properties along with the overall rehabilitation of the specific area in question (Kotzé, 1998). Parkhurst definitely shows signs of property restoration. Renovations are likely to continue for a
few more years, but will eventually stall since the majority of houses have already been upgraded. It should also be kept in mind that the majority of houses in gentrified areas are usually small, with an average of only 2.9 bathrooms (Kotzé, 1998; Visser & Kotzé, 2000). This phenomenon was found to be true for Parkhurst as the average house in the suburb has three bathrooms. The most likely scenario is that there will be a shift towards the further conversion of homes into business units. The spreading of restaurants and retail shops is already showing signs of growth further down on Fourth Avenue. This is in line with the characteristics outlined by Visser & Kotzé (2008), who looked at gentrification through the perspective of retail and office space development in Cape Town. To sum up: the original physical character of Parkhurst has changed significantly on account of building renovations.

The displacement of the original and working-class residents is a crucial and defining characteristic of gentrification (Kennedy & Leornard, 2001; Wyly & Hammel, 2004). The data showed that the residents of Parkhurst are relatively new to the suburb, that is, 53% have only been staying in the suburb for five or fewer years. This indicates that the suburb has relatively new residents living there that may have displaced the original inhabitants. An estate agent also revealed that the average length of stay in Parkhurst is around four-and-a-half years. The residents who initially moved in as young childless couples would soon move out once they had decided to start a family. The difference with Parkhurst, however, is that a significant proportion of the displaced residents were not displaced as a result of financial pressure, as has been observed in other gentrified areas such as the inner city of London and elsewhere (Lees et al., 2008). Parkhurst residents have moved voluntarily in search of larger home units. To sum up:
The original residents of Parkhurst have been displaced. They have either been displaced through commercial ribbon development or through the sales of their homes to younger people.

6.3 Shortcomings of the Study

A number of challenges were encountered during the data collection process. The questionnaire had to be piloted twice. Many residents were unavailable and there was a high refusal rate. The method of placing questionnaires and an explanatory letter in post boxes had to be abandoned as none was ever completed and returned. Interviewing residents during weekdays was almost impossible save for the late afternoons or early evenings. Late evenings were problematical as many residents would not open their doors for security reasons. Obtaining data on weekends proved fruitless. Ultimately, only 109 questionnaires were collected. Conducting individual interviews with business-owners and estate agents was also challenging. Business-owners were seldom available and preferred to be contacted via the e-mail. Their responses, if any, were often delayed or inadequate.

6.4 Recommendations

Now that this study has been completed, a few recommendations can be made. In the process of its gentrification, the suburb of Parkhurst has clearly lost its original residents, a typical occurrence internationally. Thus, a recommendation would be to track down the whereabouts of the original residents, who have re-located or been displaced, and to establish their reasons for having left the suburb. Of particular interest, would be to determine whether these original residents were able to move into a similarly-priced suburb or not. Did they need to downsize or
not? Furthermore, in order to gain a fuller understanding of gentrification in South African cities, more surveys of this kind need to be undertaken in other suburbs of Johannesburg, especially Braamfontein, Melville and Westdene to name but a few, as well as in other major cities such as Pretoria and Durban.

What is also clear from this study is that Parkhurst is a suburb emerging from the end of the gentrification peak. It would be useful to determine why the process of gentrification has stagnated. Will Parkhurst see a fourth or fifth wave of gentrification in the future, when its favourable location close to the city centre becomes an even more valuable consideration? Furthermore, it might be worthwhile to conduct additional research to establish whether the process of demolishing older properties and erecting new structures, or renovating the old ones, does in fact follow the property value cycle - that is, as property prices rise, especially for newly-built houses, so the value gap between the older houses and the new ones widens. Perhaps it is into this ‘value gap’ that gentrification falls, as a means by which profit can be generated between the stage of buying an old house and renovating it to sell in a few years’ time and of purchasing a new home.

6.5 Conclusion

Although there are some remarkable similarities between Parkhurst and typical international cities that have undergone gentrification, there are also some significant differences. The typical displacement found in international cities is associated with a large number of upper-income residents replacing the original lower-income residents. In the case of Parkhurst, most
displacement must have occurred at least a decade before this study was conducted. The current form of displacement now found is a type of voluntary re-location as residents move out of the suburb in pursuit of larger housing units. It is evident from the research that Parkhurst will continue to gentrify, although at a much slower pace, as most houses have already been renovated. It is speculated that additional homes, especially along Fourth Ave, will be converted into office and retail space, although strict zoning by-laws are likely to keep this trend under tight control.

Furthermore, the residents of Parkhurst differ from those in many other city suburbs of Johannesburg. These residents strongly correlate with those of international gentrifiers, as well as with those found in Cape Town’s inner-city suburbs (Kotzé, 1998). They are very wealthy, young, often unmarried and in possession of high qualifications. In conclusion, it has been demonstrated that the demographic (age, gender, marital status and race) profile of Parkhurst has changed significantly through the years, with wealthier residents moving into the neighbourhood. The amount of restoration and renovation conducted in this area has resulted in the physical character of the suburb changing into an upper-class suburb with higher property values.
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Appendix A

Mark with a small x where applicable

1. Age:
   - Under 30 years
   - 31 – 40 years
   - 41 – 50 years
   - 51 - 60 years
   - Over 60 years

2. Gender: Male ☐ Female ☐

3. Ethnicity:
   - Black
   - Coloured
   - Indian/Asian
   - White

4. Marital Status:
   - Single
   - Widow/Widower
   - Married
   - Divorced
   - Living Together
   - Separated

5. Education:
   - High School
   - College
   - Technikon
   - University

6. Employed Yes ☐ No ☐

7. Occupation of:
   a) Yourself…………………………
   b) Your spouse………………………

8. Household income per year:
   - Below R200 000
   - R200 001-R280 000
   - R280 001-R360 000
   - 450 001-520 000
   - Above R520 000

8.1. Household income per month:
   - Below R15 000
   - R15 001-R20 000
   - R20 001-R30 000
   - R30 001-R35 000
   - R35 000-R40 000
   - Above R50 000

8.2. Household Size:
   - Adults
   - Children
   - Dependants

9. School Attendance:
   - Name of School
   - Annual school fees

Housing Information

10. Ownership:
    - Owner
    - Tenant
    - Other

11. Number of rooms:
    - Living areas
    - Bedrooms
    - Bathrooms
    - Garages

12. Condition of house:
    - Total renovation of the property
    - Painting the exterior of the property
    - Painting the interior of the property
    - Remodelling the kitchen
    - Remodelling the bathroom
    - Building of garden walls
    - Adding rooms
    - Other

When Purchased/Occupied
   - Good
   - Moderate
   - Poor

Currently

13. Has the property been renovated since purchased/Occupied? Yes ☐ No ☐

14. If yes to 13, state the type of renovations:
15. How long have you been living in this house (in years)? ........................

16. Where (suburb/town) did you live before you occupied this house? ........................

17. Have you noticed any signs of upgrading/renovations in the suburb?  Yes ☐  No ☐
Appendix B

Business owners: Questionnaire

1. How long have you run your business in Parkhurst?

2. Where was your business located/started before you moved it to Parkhurst?

3. What factors attracted you to move your business to this suburb?

4. Is there any competition?

5. Have you renovated your premises?

6. How does your Parkhurst rental compare with that at your previous business location?

7. Do you face any pressure to improve/change your product owing to developments within the suburb?

8. For what type of people (in terms of class, race, gender) does your business cater?

9. Do you see your business remaining in Parkhurst in the future?
Appendix C

Estate Agents: Questionnaire

1. How long have you been running your business?

2. Over the last five years, what type of buyers (in terms of race, class, gender, etc.) have you encountered?

3. Have these buyers bought for the purpose of living here or for selling their property at a higher price?

4. How often do people buy houses to convert them into business premises?

5. What is the average price range of property in the suburb?

6. How do house prices (question 4) compare with prices about 10 years ago?

7. To your knowledge, how long a period, on average, do residents stay in Parkhurst?