

# THE ROLE OF OPEN STREETS CAPE TOWN STREET EVENTS IN SHAPING EVERYDAY MOBILITY IN SALT RIVER AND OBSERVATORY

towards bridging mobile, spatial and social divide

by Frances Taylor, Master of Philosophy candidate

**Minor dissertation** presented for the partial fulfilment of  
degree of Master of Philosophy in the Department of  
Environmental and Geographical Science.

University of Cape Town

July 2015

Supervisor: Bradley Rink

*The financial assistance of the National Research Foundation (NRF) towards this research is hereby acknowledged. Opinions expressed and conclusions arrived at, are those of the author and are not necessarily to be attributed to the NRF.*

The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.

## PLAGIARISM DECLARATION

I , Frances Taylor, know the meaning of plagiarism and declare that all of the work in this minor dissertation, save for that which is properly acknowledged, is my own.

.....

Frances Taylor

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A thesis can be a torturous time: just oneself and THE PAGE. Many people helped me along the way, and I am really grateful for your companionship and support: Aaaa auntie, Anna, Bertha, Boris, Bradley, Brother, Bubbles, Dad, Ellie, Ferret, Floyd, Fred, Golem, Medium Man, Mom, Muffie, Pippin, Stacey, Sue and Rodion. Bradley of course was the main companion along the way so an extra thanks to you and the time and effort you put into getting the best out of this project.

The project itself deserves thanks. Streets of Salt River and Obs, you have taught me a huge amount. Thank you to the people who shared their time and stories with me, and EVERYTHING that came from that.

Thank you to *Open Streets Cape Town* and your openness to my study. I really enjoyed being a part of your project. Your work is inspiring. I hope you find the research critique useful rather than discouraging and it helps to grow your project.

Good luck thesis! It's all you now.

## ABSTRACT

This study interrogates the role of *Open Streets Cape Town's* day-long street events in disrupting complex systems and hierarchies of everyday street mobility that maintain the mobile, spatial and social divides of Cape Town. The test was whether *OSCT* events 1) bridged the mobile divide by replacing car-dominated streets with people-centred public space; 2) bridged the spatial divide by bringing fluidity to the mobility of people between usually isolated public spaces; and 3) bridged the social divide by replacing practices of avoidance and exclusion with an everyday cosmopolitan sensibility. The investigation used mobile methodologies and an embedded approach. *OSCT* proved to be successful at bridging the mobile divide by creating a shared public space, but had mixed success with bridging spatial and social divides. A greater sensitivity to how existing social and spatial divides can be reproduced during events would improve this.

Sager's (2006) freedom of mobility framework was reworked and proved to be useful in monitoring individuals situated differently in the shifting complex of power, identity and everyday life across a changing mobilities landscape. The underlying mobility framework revealed a need for developing better street navigation skills to create robust and equitable freedom of mobility for street users, necessary for independence from mediators such as cars, private street security and prejudice ideas about people and places that perpetuate division.

*OSCT* events are useful in opening up people's eyes to what could be, but the value is diminished if there are no ongoing interventions sustaining this new understanding. Interventions that tackle the everyday systems supporting the divisions are needed to supplement the interventions of *OSCT* events. This will add substance between events and enhance the value of the events themselves.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents.....	1
Introduction and context.....	3
Mobile dimension.....	5
Spatial dimension.....	6
Social dimension.....	7
Street events.....	7
Literature review.....	10
Introduction.....	10
A mobilities study.....	11
Everyday mobility.....	11
Place and mobility.....	14
Interrupting the everyday mobilities landscape.....	15
Mobile divide: The dominance of the car.....	16
Interrupting the dominance of the car.....	20
Street events: bridging divides through play and spectacle.....	21
Bridging mobile divides.....	22
Street events as interventions of the everyday.....	24
Spatial and social divides.....	27
A history of spatial and social division.....	28
Spatial divides and City Improvement Districts (CIDs).....	30
Social divides and popular discourse.....	34
Social division and everyday interventions.....	35
Summary.....	37
Aims and Objectives.....	39
Methods.....	40
Introduction.....	40
An embedded approach.....	43
Critical urban theory and embeddedness.....	44
Everyday mobilities.....	46
Living in and knowing Observatory.....	46
Getting to know Salt River - Girl, don't go there.....	46
Playing host within Open Streets Cape Town.....	48
Analysing data after the party.....	49

Narrative analysis.....	49
Qualitative data coding and map analysis.....	50
Strengths and limitations.....	51
Findings.....	52
Introduction.....	52
The everyday mobilities landscape in Salt River and Observatory.....	53
Everyday mobility experiences.....	55
Everyday play: creating freedom and owning the street.....	61
Contested mobility and division in the everyday.....	62
The mobile divide: streets dominated by cars.....	63
The spatial divide: Mobility between Observatory and Salt River.....	65
A social divide: between street residents and house-dwelling residents.....	70
The party.....	73
The changing mobilities landscape during OSCT.....	74
Bridging the mobile divide.....	75
Exacerbating the spatial divide.....	78
Bridging the spatial divide.....	79
Covering up the social divide.....	82
After the party conclusions.....	85
References.....	89
Appendices.....	94
Appendix A: Methods   Data collection   Business survey.....	94
Appendix B: Methods   Data collection   Resident survey.....	95
Appendix C: Methods   Data collection   In-depth interview map elicitation prompts.....	96
Appendix D: Methods   Data collection   Encountering everyday socio-spatial boundaries.....	97
Walking through Salt River for the first time.....	97
Walking from Observatory to Salt River.....	98
Methods   Data collection   Defying socio-spatial boundaries at the party.....	99
The Trash Cabaret.....	99
Methods   Data collection   Grappling with everyday socio-spatial boundaries after the party.....	100
I want to ride my bicycle.....	100
Learning street manners.....	101
Appendix E: Methods   Data collection   Iterative method development and decision-making process.....	102
Appendix F: Methods   Data analysis   Map analysis.....	105
Appendix G: Methods   Data analysis   Data consolidation.....	106

## INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT

**TOP: AN  
ORDINARY  
SUNDAY ALONG  
LOWER MAIN  
ROAD,  
OBSERVATORY  
(AUTHOR 2013)**



**BOTTOM: THE  
FIRST OPEN  
STREETS CAPE  
TOWN ON 25  
MAY 2013,  
LOWER MAIN  
ROAD,  
OBSERVATORY  
(BURNELL  
2013)**



*Open Streets Cape Town (OSCT)* organises play-filled car-free street events that celebrate the social potential of streets. Some of the first few were hosted by the suburbs Observatory and Salt River:

“On 25 May 2013, Lower Main Road will become Open Streets! This will be your chance to enjoy your street in a new way by coming out to cycle, skate, jog, walk, dance, paint, act or simply watch Lower Main come to life...(We see) open streets and other public space as platforms for transformation and the creation of a more inclusive city...(We promote) creative activities all over the city to encourage social interaction...Inspired by Bogotá’s Ciclovía, Open Streets are a temporary network of car-free areas and routes throughout the city. The concept has been successfully implemented around the world ...Open Streets Cape Town builds on city and civic efforts, including events like the 2003-2004 car-free day festivals, 2012 Open Streets in Grassy Park and Moonlight Mass bicycle rides amongst others.” (Observatory Civic Association 2014).

Partners include businesses, residents, local and international civic organisations and City Improvement Districts (OSCT 2013, Observatory Civic Association 2014).

The goal of *OSCT* is to move Cape Town away from car-dominated streets towards people-centred public street spaces. Using a network of car-free street events that encourage playful interaction, they aspire to enliven the public space of streets. *OSCT* is about more than enjoyable events, aiming to change the view of the potential of public street spaces to enhance the everyday lives of Capetonians.

In Salt River and Observatory the mobilities patterns are influenced by the material and social form of the place (Simmel 1997). While both are currently car-dominated, both Salt River and Observatory are suburbs constructed before cars directed town planning so they are scaled to pedestrianism with narrow streets and small local shops peppered between houses or in close proximity to housing clusters. This provides the potential for a localised walking culture that is not possible in stretched out suburbs designed for the car. The material make-up of the two suburbs is different in some ways. The wealthier Observatory has larger houses and larger incomes that allowed it to have a City Improvement District before Salt River. Consequently, the streets of

Observatory appear cleaner and safer than Salt River because of the extra security and cleaning services that the CID provides.

As a mobility study this research considers the geography of the movement of people, ideas and things and how they are intimately linked with the struggle and formation of power, identity and everyday living (Cresswell 2012). The mobility of people, ideas and things plays out in distinguishable patterns across the mobile, spatial and social dimensions of Cape Town. Although these dimensions are considered individually in this study, they unfold dynamically and simultaneously in the contested and divided everyday mobility practices of the people of Cape Town.

#### MOBILE DIMENSION

Moving around the city is critical to gaining access to resources and opportunity and being included in the financial and social machinery of the city. In Cape Town a large portion of the population remains moored on the outskirts of the city, a long way from opportunity. Although living close to the city is ideal, a practical way of “making the central city more inclusive for the urban majority is to improve its accessibility” (Pirie 2007: 16).

Coupled with this struggle for access, inclusion and the right to the city is the right of an individual to their local public street space. Individualistic private car ownership interferes with this right and dominates street space, giving car-owners greater freedom and access to the city and local street space, while pedestrians, cyclists and skaters are left marginal street spaces and exposed to threat of life and limb (Dennis and Urry 2009, Mabunda et al. 2008). Private car ownership is exclusionary and elitist creating a highly regulated and car-centred streetscape (Sheller and Urry 2000, Hagman 2006). For this reason, *OSCT* would like to shift away from the culture of automobility towards people-centred public street space, called *shared space* (Hamilton-baillie 2008). During their events they celebrate car-free street spaces filled with activities that stimulate social interaction and play.

Alternatives to the car include skating and cycling which have a growing infrastructure in Cape Town (Pirie 2013) and Johannesburg (Nkosi 2015), linked to local and international city anti-car advocacy groups.

## SPATIAL DIMENSION

The struggle for the right to the city in Cape Town remains a tension between raising the profile of the city amongst global counterparts and providing rights-based entitlements to the poor urban majority (Lemanski 2007, Parnell and Robinson 2012, Parnell and Pieterse 2010 in Huchzermeyer (2014). Pressure for mega events and foreign investment in the city “intensif(ies) uneven competition over scarce urban land and access to strategic, convenient and profitable locations, while depending on well-policed private property regimes” (Huchzermeyer 2014: 45). This has resulted in 'glocalisation' of the property market that caters for young professionals rather than pushing Africanisation for the poor majority (Pirie 2007). Street governance under 'glocalised' market competitiveness affects the management of urban space and the mobility of people through it. This requires expending resources to attract and hold on to a class of people that will service global investment (Turok 2004), and disallowing entry or repelling the poor and those superfluous to this economy (Huchzermeyer 2011).

The exclusionary gentrification trends extend to public space of the street through City Improvement District (CID) street governance. This CID model spread from the city and took root in Observatory in 2008, and in Salt River in 2014. Their heavy-handed 'proactive' cleaning of crime and grime is criticised for paying too little attention to the difference between serious and petty crimes, criminalises the poor and the informal (Nahnsen 2003, Pirie 2007) and leads to exclusion (Miraftab 2007) and marginalisation (Van Blerk 2013) from public space .

Thus, the issue for pedestrians, cyclists and skateboarders is not only whether it is safe to walk (negative freedom) but also whether one is free to walk in the way one wishes and where one desires (positive freedom) . Freedom of mobility (Sager 2006) is uneven throughout public and privatised spaces of Cape Town creating a patchwork of 'public' spaces that are variously welcoming to different parts of the public. Exclusionary historical norms and current street governance practices result in public street spaces that each cater for different groupings of the city population. Public street spaces are, therefore, better thought of as a disparate set of parallel public spaces (Paasche 2012), than as a contiguous network of public spaces that are equally accessible to all. *OSCT* aspires to have their network of welcoming car-free streets stretch across these divided spaces and bridge the spatial division between public street spaces of the city.

## SOCIAL DIMENSION

Larger city-wide trends become messy on a local and individual scale. Freedom in individual mobility practices is hindered through interactions with others and entanglements with the eccentricities of identity. For example, skaters have been working on enhancing their freedom of mobility by breaking misperceptions about their 'anarchist' practices, and finding support for place-making activities such as building skate parks that legitimise their place in the city (CTP 2014). Observatory and Salt River host a cohort of skaters that collect along long steep roads ideal for long-boarding or find their own way across city using tactile feel to exploring the grooves and bumps of city infrastructure. This exploratory mobility practice is playful and expansive, opening up perceptions of their personal limits, and the bounds of their belonging in the city:

“Going somewhere with no limits,...that's the best part about it. When you can be that free in your mind, that's the epitome of being a human being.” (Heins 2015)

Boundary breaking through 'recreational trespass' and 'place-hacking' (Garrett 2014) are examples of play that expands mobility skills and extends the limits of individual freedom of mobility. These are exemplars of what other street users could achieve if OSCT were to free their mobility practices. However, these activities need to be interrogated for race, class, and gender inclusivity: Do these mobile practices enable those with stifled freedom of mobility (not just the mobile elite) to break the limits of their freedom? For example, some groups of people ('black' and 'female' in this instance) are particularly vulnerable to arbitrary acts of street violence (Msimang 2014; 'Bikers in alleged racial attack' 2014), showing the precarious physical and social position they deal with daily. Media that scaremongers only feeds fear of crime and fear of the misunderstood other ('Neighbourhood watches use race profiling' 2014). Social divisions are tied up in these kinds of ways of understanding and interacting with others, and form a less tangible, but very real social divide between people. These post-apartheid contestations too easily become acts of violence and exclusion (Miraftab 2007, Pirie 2007). OSCT is offering itself as an alternative to this script of hostile street engagement; street events that will bridge the mobile, spatial and social divides of the city (Kane and Geretto 2015).

## STREET EVENTS

Healing arts and cultural spaces are exactly what is needed in public life of post apartheid South Africa (Minty 2005). Tactical urban interventions such as the OSCT street festival are desirable but an acknowledgement of the full complexity of the mobile, spatial and social dimensions of street

life call us to caution. Well-intentioned festival spaces may do just the opposite of what they intend:

“contemporary urban festival spaces, while liberating certain social groups, also constrain, disadvantage and oppress.” (Waitt 2008 )

The *OSCT* event was preceded by a decade-long series of cultural festivals hosted in streets and others public spaces in Observatory since shortly after democracy. Observatory is proud of its culture, heritage, art and drama, activist history, bars and restaurants and had previously promoted this part of its identity through *Obsfest* and smaller festivals of various themes (*ObsLife* 2008 - 2014). *ObsFest* was started to celebrate Observatory's creativity and provide the Observatory businesses with a last injection of money before the student population leave for a two month summer holiday (Respondent 1). The festival was welcomed by residents because it was one of the first times people of many races could be seen gathering peacefully publicly in the their streets for ordinary public human interaction – something extraordinary fresh out of apartheid.

The first two *ObsFests* are remembered as the most wholesome. Later events drove residents and families away because they became too large, too commercial and excessive with alcohol consumption. Existing social issues such as noise from bars conflicted with some vocal residence desire for quiet. Drug and alcohol use lead to unruliness. This exacerbated existing tensions between the unruly and the family populations. Businesses making money off the increased trade, including the sale of alcohol, supported the expansion of the event but local family residential support faded (*ObsLife* 2008 – 2014, Respondent 1). The conflict in deciding which businesses should pay what in support of the event resulted in organisers charging an entrance fee, reducing the inclusivity of the event. Predictably, commercial interests took over and the event lost its original sense of togetherness (Pinder 2000).

*OSCT* is different from *ObsFest* in that it is focussed on pleasing the local family residents rather than businesses or people from outside the residential area, as *ObsFest* was oriented originally. To remain inclusive the event has opted to avoid entrance fees and raise funding and support from elsewhere (Thunderfund, City of Cape Town, OBSID and volunteers). *OSCT* is the first festival in the area to extend itself across the entire length of Lower Main Road to include Salt River.

The aim of this research is to develop an understanding of the role of OSCT in bridging mobile, spatial and social divides (Does it build bridges, burn existing bridges or cover up division?), not only during the festival but after 'the party' when all the hype and excitement of the event subsides.

# LITERATURE REVIEW

## INTRODUCTION

*Open Streets Cape Town* hosts street events with the aim of using the events to bridge existing everyday mobile, spatial and social divides.

As a study located on the streets, this study finds its home in the mobilities literature that keeps a keen focus on the movement (and stasis) of people, ideas and things (Cresswell 2012) as an integral part of city and street life. The mobilities literature uncovers the mobile, spatial and social connections and divisions<sup>1</sup> of street activity. These dimensions are used as a framework in this study to gauge the effect of the *OSCT* event on the everyday lives of people.

The car is central to the *mobile divide* which developed as society became dependent on a car-based system of automobility. The car has become a popular but coercive, dangerous and dominant character of street life. During their day-long events *OSCT* shifts the power base within mobility landscape by excluding the car from the streets for that day, creating what is described as

---

<sup>1</sup> Although this study focuses on 'division' within the mobile, spatial and social dimensions (because that is the stated focus of *OSCT*) we bear in mind that 'connections' are important factors to incorporate.

shared space – where people and their social and safety needs are prioritised over the unhindered passage of motorised transport (Hamilton-Baillie 2008).

Streets can be seen as the connective tissue of the city but they are also public spaces themselves, where *spatial divides* can manifest. City Improvement District (CIDs) manages the daily cleaning and patrolling of streets to secure their safety, but this may be a mixed blessing. CIDs are implicated in controlling the movement of people through the streets in a way that discriminates against people by race and class to the extent that CIDs are described as creating racialised public street spaces (Miraftab 2007).

The *social divide* focusses on the prejudiced ideas and information that mediate open and direct engagement between people of different demographic groups, and how this can maintain division between groups even when mobile and spatial divisions are absent and they share the same space (Büscher 2009).

The mobile, spatial and social divides of the street are discussed as manifest in people's mobility practices, affecting *freedom of mobility* differently depending on race, class, gender, class and sexuality (Sager 2006, Sheller and Urry 2006), resulting in very different levels of freedom to use the streets.

Bodies of literature on mobilities (Sheller and Urry 2000, Cresswell 2010, 2012), play (Stevens 2009), mobile (Urry 2011), spatial (Miraftab 2007) and social (Büscher 2009) division are used to describe the everyday streetscape, while parts of the spectacle literature (Debord 1968, Hong 2013, Pinder 2000, Shaw et al 2004, and Tomlinson et al 2011) are used to describe the interruption of this everyday mobility landscape that the *OSCT* events cause. Together, the collection of literature is shaped to critique the role that the temporary street spectacles play in bridging everyday mobile, spatial and social divides of the street space of Cape Town.

## A MOBILITIES STUDY

### EVERYDAY MOBILITY

'Mobilities' refers to people walking, cycling, skating and driving through the streets. Even though this study of 'movement' shares a focus on subjects such as cars and trains with the technical discipline of transport, *mobilities* look at these same subjects through a social lens and considers the broader social implications of movement of people along with movement of ideas, information

and things (Cresswell 2010, 2012; Sheller and Urry 2006). Mobilities is about movement but it is *more than* movement. This study looks at the movement of people, ideas and things in Salt River and Observatory, but it considers more: it includes the identity of people and place and how these social factors shape power dynamics and the uneven landscape of people's freedom of mobility.

This study explores a variety of *everyday* mobile practices, including the walking, cycling, driving and skating strategies of people in Salt River and Observatory and seeks to understand: Who benefits most from these ways of being? Who loses out most? What do the geographic patterns of these mobility strategies tell about Observatory and Salt River? This understanding of the *everyday* mobilities landscape of this place lays down the foundation for understanding the shift that the *OSCT* event brought the everyday mobility practices in these suburbs: barricading cars from the main road of the suburbs and temporarily replacing automobility with playful people-centred non-motorised mobility practices such as bicycle-polo, chalk drawing and dancing.

Mobilities encompasses the movement of ideas, information<sup>2</sup> and things moving along with people (Cresswell 2010, Sheller and Urry 2006). Important social experiences are as likely to take place while dwelling on a pavement as when on the move, so moments of stasis are a part of mobilities too. City life is a hive of movement made up of millions of individual movements and moments of stillness like these. The daily journeys of people to and from work (and elsewhere) and the materials, information and ideas that move around with them (Sheller and Urry 2006, Cresswell 2012) together make up our lives and the social life of the city. Mobility is not an incidental part of city life, but central to it: "People not only observe the city whilst moving through it, rather they constitute the city by practising mobility" (Jensen 2009: 140).<sup>3</sup>

This focus on movement in the social sciences came about in 2006 with the 'new mobilities paradigm' (Sheller and Urry 2006) that foregrounded the key role movement plays in social life, and especially so in the daily struggles for *power and identity* (Hannam et al., 2006; Sheller and Urry, 2006). The 'new mobilities paradigm' was a realisation that

---

2 *Ideas* in this paper refers to conceptual understanding of people and place while *information* refers to the movement of data. *OSCT* presents a different idea about how people could relate and how a place could manifest.

3 Mobilities theory is related but distinct from transport theory. Mobilities is related to transport in that they both describe and theorise around movement of people and goods, but mobility is distinct from transport in that mobilities considers *more than* just movement. Mobilities literature takes "mobility as the central fact of modern or postmodern life" (Cresswell 2010) and considers the consequences thereof. Specifically, mobilities considers the dynamic multi-directional interplay between the social, material, spatial and temporal dimensions of life (Simmel 1997) rather than simply the direct material consequences of a transport system on people.

“mobility (of people, of ideas, of things) as a geographical fact ... lies at the centre of constellations of power, the creation of identities and the micro-geographies of everyday life.” – Cresswell 2010: 551

Opportunities for work, social life and learning all depend on one's ability to traverse the city and take advantage of opportunity. With a clear understanding of mobilities, came an appreciation for the importance of freedom of mobility in influencing quality of life (Sager 2006). Freedom of mobility is not equally available to all street users. It is continuously contested, each person competing against the rest to use the street as they will. Understanding power structures is therefore central to describing the patterns of everyday mobility in this study.

Sager (2006) explores this the theme of freedom *as* mobility, querying whether freedom is captured by the notion of mobility. Freedom in mobility is not a given; it is place and person specific. In this study we move on from freedom *as* mobility to deal with freedom *of* mobility: negative freedom is the amount of hindrance an individual experiences; positive freedom as the amount of autonomy they have in their mobility; process freedom is their ability to access levers of power that govern the space; and opportunity freedom is the amount of access to different mobility options and resources. This determines the scope of geographical space one has access to (opportunity and process freedom), the amount of friction one experiences (negative freedom) and the capacity one has to overcome those resistances (positive freedom) in this space (Sager 2005, 2006). This freedom *of* mobility framework facilitates comparing different experiences of moving through a place, and allows a judgement of the multiple effects a changing mobilities landscape will have on different street users. The dimensions of freedom is a framework useful for describing and analysing the everyday level of freedom different people experience on the streets of Observatory and Salt River, and how this changes with *OSCT*. As with any freedom or right, it is impossible for everyone to experience the fullness of their freedom of mobility without hindering others' freedom. This framework allows a grading of freedom of mobility to gain insight into who is being favoured and how by the transition of the mobilities landscape during *OSCT* events.

Society relies on socially disciplining institutions to balance competing rights to freedom of mobility (Sager 2006). Institutions play a balancing role here, disciplining some in order to free up others, with the potential for this power to be exercised poorly and unfairly. As things stand, traffic regulations and traffic officers, police, security and social norms discipline the free movement of certain groups of people at the expense of others, such that not all people can move around the

city with the same amount of ease. This is a function of their relative access to the levers of governance. Social hierarchies of race, class, gender and sexuality are reflected in the freedom of mobility that people have (Sheller and Urry 2006). For example, along a streetscape, a wealthy white person might have a greater freedom of mobility than other races and classes because social standing and material wealth shield them from criminalisation and racial attacks (Msimang 2014, "Bikers in alleged racial attack..." 2014), and their wealth gives them access to the additional physical protection of a car. Another example is women who are socially disciplined to stay at home (Sager 2006). In a social context where not everyone has equal access to social and material resources to enable them to be mobile, freedom of mobility is not something enjoyed equally by all street users (Ureta 2008).

#### PLACE AND MOBILITY

Place is constituted by flows (Massey 1994) in that people, ideas and things of a place move with a pattern and rhythm that are definitive of that place. Part of the personality of place is seen in the characteristics that emerge from the patterns and rhythms of movement in that space. The everyday mobility of people going to work, school, shops and back home again becomes their life in that place, and through the enactment of daily habitual mobility practices, the place takes on meaning and identity. Movement of people with their ideas and things bring meaning to, and continually create a place.

While this study was confined to the spatial territory of two suburbs, its focus was not squarely on the nature of the physical territory of the suburbs themselves, but on the nature of the mobilities landscape. Before the mobilities turn in the 2000s, there was a 'sedentarist' tendency to define people's identity of by where they were from (Jensen 2009), but having moved on from this, the focus now falls on the how boundaries are defined and contested. It is important to recognise that the cartographic boundaries (such as between the Salt River and Observatory) are 'transgressed' and socially blurred. A mobility lens allows an alternative to the bounded sedentarist view through a focus on mobility and boundary crossing as a means of shaping place.

While focussing on mobility 'deterritorialises' and gives a sense that the form of a place matters less (Jensen 2009), it is also a mistake to think place is completely uninfluenced by its material form or the social demographic of the place. Identity of all street users, relative inequality between those present and the layout of the housing and streets all shape the movement through,

and experience of, a place. It is therefore both the fixed and the fluid that dynamically interact to influence mobility patterns and the mobile landscape of the two suburbs under investigation.

Jensen (2009) called for mobility studies to take the middle ground between completely fluid and completely fixed approaches. While documenting mobility practices, this requires simultaneously maintaining an awareness of the “rhizomic connections” between movement of people, ideas and things and the infrastructure or *moorings*<sup>4</sup> supporting those movements (Hannam et al 2006: 2). For example, even though motorised transport has allowed some to travel faster, further and more at their own convenience, these fast-paced movements still depend on a large network of infrastructure that are grounded in place. Further, the enhanced mobilities that some enjoy, often results in the *immobility* of others (ibid). The mobilities lens consequently requires a reconfiguration of identity and sense of belonging (Jensen 2009) to something that is simultaneously rooted in place and practised on the move. Through this dual focus on mobilities and moorings, mobility research has opened the social sciences to the possibilities of new subjects and sites for cultural production such as streets. Streets, as infrastructure channels and transit spaces of ordinary urban mobility, have become legitimate sites for studying the creation of “flows of meaning and cultures of movement” (Jensen 2009: 139).

#### INTERRUPTING THE EVERYDAY MOBILITIES LANDSCAPE

Every mobility practice – whether it be walking, cycling, skating, train, taxi or bus travel – requires the drivers, roads, petrol stations, tracks, shoes and able bodies to facilitate the movement. Mobility remains dependent on systems and infrastructure such that if these foundational moorings are disrupted, whole systems of mobility practices and the social world built around them could be immobilised or changed. For example, the social systems built around air travel were completely disrupted and immobilised with far-reaching consequences when a volcano eruption in Iceland grounded airports across Europe and beyond (Birtchnell and Büscher 2011). This dependence on mobility systems brings an awareness of the central role that mobility plays in everyday life, and how changes in the mobilities landscape can bring significant changes to everyday life. Mobility is thus “at the very centre of transformations in contemporary urban life” (Ureta 2008: 269). *OSCT* is one such micro-interruption that changes the whole mobilities landscape of Salt River and Observatory by disallowing access to cars, thereby shifting the power

---

4 Mobilities and moorings occur dialectically, mobilities referring to movement, liquidity, and the deterritorialised, while moorings refer to the solid, rooted or territorialised (Hannam et al 2006).

dynamics between road users. This study looks into the temporary and long term consequences of this disruption.

At the heart of *OSCT*'s manifesto is this desire: to bridge the mobile, spatial and social divides of Cape Town. We unpack each of the *mobile*, *spatial* and *social* divides individually, although they operate simultaneously.

#### MOBILE DIVIDE: THE DOMINANCE OF THE CAR

Automobility is about a social dependence on the “mass system of individualised, flexible mobility” that the car provides (Dennis and Urry 2009: 2). Underlying the allure of car ownership is the promise that the car will bring independence, flexibility and an enhanced freedom of mobility in daily life (Sager 2005). The freedom the car brings to some, however, comes at the cost of the freedom of others resulting in inequality and division.

Contestation arises because of the uneven spread of the benefits and harms of car culture. As such, “analysts of contemporary social formations ... equate automobility with inequalities, exclusions, risk proliferation and, of course, environmental degradation.” (Sheller and Urry 2000: 750). Car ownership promises an enhanced freedom of mobility, but this comes at a large cost for everyone else. The profound impact of the car and other motor vehicles on the physical and social integrity of the streets is felt so much more severely by non-car users than car users, creating very different street experiences for car-users and non car-users. A mass shift to car mobility has privatised the use of street space in that car-users are isolated within their private car bubble. Dangerous speeds frighten other road users and stifles the social potential of streets. Cars might enhance the freedom of mobility for the privileged who can afford a car, but they completely change the mobility landscape for the worse for other road users.

There are three significant ways the car plays a role in the mobile divide. First, the car system organises people on the move into *isolated hierarchical social strata*. Collectively the different transport options available to actors on the streets reproduce social hierarchies of race, gender, sexuality, age and class (Hannam et al 2006). At the same time, the road system then divides these different mobility practices by acting as “linear systems for sorting sub-elements in the city and arranging them in sequence” (Shane 2005: 199 in Jensen 2009). As people, ideas and things move around the city they are highly regulated, with each mobility practice (walking, public transport, driving etc.) having its own space on the road, and its own expected rhythm and speed. The

rhythm of each mobility practice means users of a car move in their own time-space relative to other road users (Dennis and Urry 2009), isolating different classes of mobility practice into their own isolated experience of the street. As people move faster in cars they “lose the ability to perceive local detail, talk to strangers, to learn local ways of life, to stop and sense each different place” (Freund 1993: 120 in Sheller and Urry 2006). Add to these rhythmic time-space differences the physical barrier of the car casing, and the result is that the interactive public space of the street becomes reduced to isolated bubbles of socially stratified private space. So while people come to dwell together at speed along the city roads (Sheller and Urry 2000), social encounters with others, and especially those different from themselves, is unlikely.

The second aspect is *inequality*. The car – a symbol of freedom, wealth and independence (Dennis and Urry 2009) – does expand the freedom of mobility for some, but detracts from the freedom of others and the pool of common welfare (Sager 2006). By providing this freedom to many, “automobility (is) a crucial dimension of processes of democratization and reflexive modernization on the one hand, (but is also implicated in) the deeply contested constraints and unintended consequences of modernity on the other.” (Sheller and Urry 2000: 743). The car gives the advantage of a large mobile reach across the city while simultaneously degrading the safety and health of those who cannot afford a car. According to Sager's (2006) freedom of mobility framework, the car provides freedom from the hindrance of inflexible and unreliable public transport and the ability to choose when and where to travel (negative freedom). Waiting in the garage it provides an assurance that the option to travel is available if needed (positive freedom). Quality of daily life improves because the whole of the existing traffic management system is designed to favour the fast passage of the car. In addition, the sheer size, speed and weight of the car means that the car-driver dominates power dynamics in encounters with pedestrians and cyclists (process freedom). The mobile freedom that the car provides includes access to an enlarged choice set of goods and social or economic opportunities (opportunity freedom) (Sheller and Urry 2006). Consequently, Flamm and Kauffmann (2006) describe car-ownership as a form of capital that allows access to greater opportunity such that existing “social inequality is greatly amplified by the social networks and goods that the masterful use of such mobilities enables” (Jensen 2011: 257).

Those that are most affected by the threat of injury or death by cars are those least likely to be experiencing the benefits of convenience, greater capacity to socialise and greater access to the

city that cars can allow (Dennis and Urry 2009). In addition, those outside the physical and social safety bubble of the car there are fatal consequences causing Short and Pinet-Peralta (2010) to question the appropriateness of the neutral term 'accident' in describing the regular violence cars bring to the road. From within the safety bubble of the car, the car driver can come to see the pedestrian and cyclist as mere obstacles in returning to the 'normal' speed of the road (Sheller and Urry 2006) coercing pedestrians and cyclists who can afford it into cars. This leaves the rest to risk the very dangerous spaces alongside cars (Sheller and Urry 2000). Safety on the road has become something one must pay for by buying a car and buying into the car system. On South African roads there are 40 fatalities per day with “nearly half of the deaths that occur on South African roads (being) pedestrians” (South African National Roads Agency 2014). Poor children are especially vulnerable. With a large number of children without biological parents as caregivers, “80% of South Africa's children living in informal settlements (are) highly vulnerable as they roam dangerous environments, often bordering highways, train routes and bodies of water.” Of the children admitted to Red Cross Children's Hospital, road accidents are the biggest killer overall (Bateman 2015: 10).

The third factor of the mobile divide is the injury the car brings to *the social potential and publicness of streets*, affecting car-owners and other road users alike. “The networks of civil society have been fundamentally transformed by mass ‘democratic’ movement into cars such that interaction between people has declined as the public space of the car has shifted into private vehicles” (Sheller and Urry 2000: 742). Mass use of the car has allowed the neighbourhood to decrease in significance of daily life routines (Urry 2011). Privileging the car and its right to a fast passage along the streets means a loss of the public space of the streets that could have been used for other forms of mobility (or stillness, or playing, waiting, watching) that are more conducive to social interaction. The hard body armour of the car keeps the driver and pedestrian isolated from one another, with momentary interactions where the driver sets the rules, having all the power to speed up or wind-up the window and disregard other people on the road. Free from the rigid public transport timetable, the car gives car owners freedom to their own timetable, but this restricts car-users' engagement with the public rhythm of bus and train travel and opportunities for socialising people of a different social status (Sheller and Urry 2000). The social public potential of the streets for meetings of difference is therefore severely hampered by the dominance of the road space by the car and the way it socially stratifies and isolates road users.

In sum, although the car is a seemingly innocuous object of transport, through a mobilities lens it can be seen as a part of the unequal, dividing and isolating forces within the social realm. The way the street is currently dominated by the car continues to reinforce the old dangerous and unequal ways of living and moving together: by desynchronising mobile rhythms between people, by sorting people into social strata, by meting out an unequal share of benefits and dis-benefits and by injuring the social potential of the streets.

By extraditing the car from the road space for a one day event, *OSCT* attempts to revive the social sphere of the streets, and create a *shared space*<sup>5</sup> where people can meet across race, class, gender and other social groupings. By removing the car as the dominant character of the street of Cape Town, *OSCT's* car-free streets become very different places to the everyday mobility landscape. In theory, silencing the noisy, dangerous, elitist dominance of the car goes a long way in bringing street users together – at least physically people are dwelling together in the same time-space. By taking away the privileged position the car usually enjoys, the street theoretically brings people into the same rhythm of gentle, human-sized movements and removes the fear of the danger and intimidation of the car.

But what does a one day car-free event mean to the other 364 days of the year? Automobility is socially embedded and stabilised within a large international steel-and-petroleum car system (Cohen 2006, Urry 2011). Despite a desire to correct the segregations and unfairness that this system perpetuates, the expansive system is overwhelmingly omnipresent and difficult to interrupt (Dennis and Urry 2009). “The absolute key feature of the car is its mundane character, its significance for ordinary, everyday social life.” (Dennis and Urry 2009: 39). Cars have become tied to social needs that are required for full participation in social life (Dennis and Urry 2009). Public transport in comparison “feels inflexible and fragmented, at times it feels dangerous, people experience delays” (Urry 2011: 40). “These 'gaps' are a source of inconvenience, danger and uncertainty, especially for women, children, older people, those who might be subject to racist attacks, and less-abled, those travelling at night and so on” (Urry 2011: 41). The car is now about more than speed and delivery. It has become about the journey along slow pleasurable

---

5 Shared space is a street governance philosophy emerging from Sweden, Denmark, Germany and Holland. It values people-centred public streets spaces over utilitarian car dominated streets and believes that deregulation of the flow of different street users would allow for more natural interaction between users without a loss in “safety, mobility and accessibility” (Hamilton-Baillie 2008: 162).

meanderings. The power of the car culture, John Urry (2011) argues, lies in the fact that the car embodies an idealised way of life, bringing it a cultural allure unlike the train and the bus .

The car has become the dominant character in daily dramas that play out on the street but its right to be there and dominate the public space of the street tends to go on unquestioned in daily life. Alternatives seems overwhelmed by the large and extensive car system of roads, industry and habituated drivers. Even non-drivers suffering the dis-benefits of the car system aspire to one day join the system that caused their suffering and become car owners and drivers themselves. Automobility is so embedded in systems and habits of social life that it has fallen into the background of life – people have become auto-mobile such that alternatives are mentally muted.

#### INTERRUPTING THE DOMINANCE OF THE CAR

In dominating the mobilities landscape beyond question, the car could be described as a manifestation of the society of the spectacle (Debord 1968), the seemingly unquestionable way of life to which there appears to be no alternative. The car has become *the* way to experience street life. The car system advances only one particular form of socio-economic formation of the street as if there is no other: it is almost beyond question that one should pay for a car to have access to freedom of mobility and safety on the road. The hegemony of the car has infused all the idea space around what we conceive of as how street mobility should be practised. The idea that car is king has become part of mobility practice itself. In this historical moment there seems no beginning and no end to the dominance of the car. The car's centrality in the mobility landscape appears out of reach and beyond dispute. This is a tautology that has penetrated the depths of reality passifying modern form (Debord 1968).

"Debord and the situationists were concerned above all with contesting and bringing about revolutionary change in dominant social relations and the social organisation of space" (Pinder 2000: 358). As with any hegemonic socio-techno-economic system, there are always cracks and opportunities to take advantage of. Underneath the normative of automobility there are the broken promises of the car: expectation of unhindered freedom of the car unfulfilled with frustrations of congestion, social and environmental damage that large scale conversion to car travel brings (Hagman 2006). This is the crack that *OSCT* is aiming to pry open. The *OSCT* event is an intervention of this; an interruption of everyday bullish car-dominated streets with a day of quiet joyful social space of a car-free street. Through their events, *OSCT* hopes to pierce the

normative conception of the street and resuscitate the 25-year period of debate at the beginning of the “century of the car” (Dennis and Urry 2009) that Short and Pinet-Peralta (2010) described as “the battle for alternative conceptions of the primary purpose of city streets”.

## STREET EVENTS: BRIDGING DIVIDES THROUGH PLAY AND SPECTACLE

For *OSCT*, the dream is that individual temporary street events will grow and connect into a network of streets that build momentum and rhythm and begin to pulsate on their own, opening the streets to free participation and bringing the streets of Cape Town to life.



Open Streets is a forty year old movement inspired by Columbia's Ciclovía which creates 120 kilometres of car free streets every Sunday. 400 cities around the world now have an Open Streets programme of their own. “OSCT was founded in 2012 by a group of volunteers committed to a more equitable, integrated, safer and vibrant city” working on issues of urban planning, street design, active citizenship, creative expression and debating the role of public street space (*OSCT* 2014).

By hosting temporary street events that prohibit car use and by bringing a significant number of people out on the streets to play together, *OSCT* hopes to shift the mobilities landscape in Cape Town. Their manifesto reads,

“Cape Town’s streets could be much more than they are...By embracing the concept of Open Streets, **all of us** can create **shared places** that embody respect for all and help **bridge the social and spatial divides** of our city.” (OSCT2014)

The manifesto shows a desire to trouble the everyday mobile streetscape and bridge *mobile, spatial* and *social divides*. The mobile divide is bridged by creating “**shared places**” that take back the road from the utilitarian use of the street for the speed and convenience for the car. Instead, shared spaces are people-centred public spaces that prioritise people and their social and safety needs (negative freedom) (Hamilton-Bailie 2008). In shared street spaces the public potential of streets opens up to allow for direct, open social engagement.

By creating public space – space for “**all of us**” – and shared space (prioritising people and their social and safety) OSCT works to bridge the everyday mobile divide that automobility creates. In theory, the negative, positive, opportunity and process freedoms that the car hinders will be liberated by removing the car. A full understanding of the mobile dimension of street life suggests that this change will also interrupt the benefits such as individual freedoms and flexibility that the car brings.

#### BRIDGING MOBILE DIVIDES

OSCT consider *transport* and *play* as the two key mechanisms switching the mobilities landscape during OSCT events. The hope is that through shifting the transport culture away from car use, car-dominated spaces will be taken over by non-motorised transport (NMT) and people will become open to *live* the streets and *feel* the city and its people as fellow citizens more directly than when using cars. Commuting by non-motorised transport (NMT) such as the bicycle is seen as a way to experience the authenticity of the city street and reclaim the street as public space (Pesses 2010). By removing automobility, would-be drivers and passengers no longer sit in isolated private car bubbles opening social potential for connection between would-be car users, pedestrians and cyclists. In theory, removing the mobile divide that car use creates will bring a more place- and people-sensitive understanding of the city for street users (creating positive freedom). In addition, removing the danger of the car from the streets (creating negative freedom) opens the street up to other more exciting possibilities (creating opportunity freedom). Theoretically speaking, by removing the intrusive hindrance of the car on people's freedom of mobility, the social potential of

the streets could open up and the option of social engagement through play on the streets becomes available to a wider public.

The role that the components of the *transport* system play in the social world, it is not simply the transport components and systems that shift with change but also the complicated social systems that are built around the transport system. Social practices are the interstitial tissue that are a part of the mobilities practices and will not simply transplant themselves onto a different transport system without without changing fundamentally. “They will adapt and/or appropriate particular socio-technical developments in complicated ways.” (Dennis and Urry 2009: 91). The full complexity of the *mobility* landscape includes the dynamic social, material, spatial, and temporal dimensions of mobility. One cannot consider a switch in part of the transport system without considering the effects and resistances this has on other dimensions of the mobilities landscape. In other attempts to shift the mobilities landscape, policy and academic literature have insufficiently examined this socio-technical synchronisation process of all these layers of the mobilities landscape (Urry 2011: 123). Changes and interventions need to recognise the *more-than-transport* nature of the shift. This kind of shift in the mobilities landscape requires coming to terms with the the fact that “there is such a thing as society” (Urry 2011: 158) and it cannot be conveniently removed or downplayed when considering change. For *OSCT*'s dream to manifest itself, the complicated intricacies of the social world that maintain the undesirable and uneven mobilities landscape need to be addressed. More complicated than a switch from a motorised transport system to a non-motorised transport system, this requires that many decades of division and inequality are unbundled such that the constrained nature of many people's current street mobility is replaced with a more equitable freedom of mobility.

Play is positioned to unbundle the hierarchical and divided social interactions that usually dominate the street. Play, Quinton Stevens (2007: i) argues, is one of the fundamental functions of public spaces such as the streets. Streets should be a setting for this “informal, non-instrumental social interaction”. By introducing a culture of play to the streets, soulless utilitarian street use will give way to freedom, openness and an embodied sense of adventure that will come to defy existing physical and social constraints. “Urban play is not so much a specific set of actions, places or regimes, but is, rather, a distinctive mode of engaging with people, spaces and built forms, and developing new relationships to them. This mode involves curiosity, a richness of multi-sensory experiences, and active bodily engagement... While some kinds of play have productive outcomes,

achieving them typically involves escaping given social and physical constraints” (Stevens 2012: 1). In this state of play, enabled by a loosening of everyday constraints, *OSCT* aims to open a the possibility to imagine the street anew without the divides we currently live with.

Play is a tool for opening up opportunity. Play is described as a way of living in the streets, a way that every person can come to temporarily claim a part of the street and remake that small piece of the city as they desire – mentally, physically, socially and emotionally. An act of play is a way of the street infrastructure and rules to suit one's desires and therefore a micro act of claiming a right to the street. Playing through the streets with curiosity and a desire to discover is a way to develop one's street navigation capabilities (positive freedom of mobility) and “claim some kind of shaping power over urbanisation, the way cities are made and remade and to do so in a fundamental and radical way” (Harvey 2008: 24). It is a way to prod at the normative and query the usual ways of doing things; a “play of power” and a “play of possibility” (Pinder 2000: 358).

Play is “characterized by liminality: freedom, openness, exploration, improvisation, and transformation.” (Stevens 2012: 1). When play is remaking the rules of engagement of the street (process freedom), the ability to play publicly in the streets is an indication that one has realised a very high level of freedom of mobility. Alternatively, play could also be the means through which a person without freedom of mobility could make moves to claim their freedom of mobility (Butler 2009). Central to play is its transformational potential at the point of liminality<sup>6</sup>, where the old is left behind and the space for the new opens up.

#### STREET EVENTS AS INTERVENTIONS OF THE EVERYDAY

As an event that creates a world apart from the everyday, *OSCT* is creating a street spectacle. Spectacle literature cuts to the very heart of this idea of an event as an intervention on the everyday and considers the appropriateness of a temporary event for dealing with everyday street issues. It critiques events by considering: How different is the event from everyday street use that was present before the event took place? How well does any change that the street event brings about translate into substantive changes of everyday mobility practices *after the party* is over? Do

---

6 **Liminality** (from the Latin word *limen*, meaning "a threshold") is the quality of ambiguity or disorientation that occurs in the middle stage of rituals, when participants no longer hold their pre-ritual status but have not yet begun the transition to the status they will hold when the ritual is complete. During a ritual's liminal stage, participants "stand at the threshold" between their previous way of structuring their identity, time, or community, and a new way, which the ritual establishes. More recently, usage of the term has broadened to describe political and cultural change as well as rituals.[3] During liminal periods of all kinds, social hierarchies may be reversed or temporarily dissolved, continuity of tradition.... future outcomes once taken for granted may be thrown into doubt.[4] The dissolution of order during liminality creates a fluid, malleable situation that enables new institutions and customs to become established.[5] – (Wikipedia 2014)

people acquire new forms of freedom of mobility at the event that they can use in their everyday street use? Are changes to the mobilities landscape during the event positive or negative, and for whom?

Spectacle literature inspired by Guy Debord was critical of the tendency for all social relations to eventually become pale lifeless versions of themselves through dubious mediation of images that are mere caricatures of direct experience (Debord 1968). These images take on diverse forms but accumulate to bring about a single world view that becomes an objective force that gives the sense that there is nothing outside of this hegemonic world view (ibid). Everything outside of work – including news, advertising and entertainment consumption – become infused with this single world view as *the* mode of being (ibid). The hegemonic way of using the streets today could be said to have become unquestionable in this way. It appears as if car use, social hierarchies and spatial and social divisions are beyond question and change. *OSCT* positions itself as an intervention of this hegemonic way of using the street. Interventions themselves are not beyond critique. They are forever in danger of becoming a pale version of themselves, lose zest, and distracting from real change. Spectacle literature queries whether *OSCT* is part of radical and fundamental change necessary bridging mobile, spatial and social divides, or whether it is part of a distraction from this fundamental change.

The spectacle literature has developed into a critique of reimagining place through events and branding exercises that can result in the space becoming a pale lifeless caricature of its former self (Pinder 2000). Driven mad by the desire for capital gain, events that aim to bring togetherness can become a means to attract capital investment and end up glossing over the very social divisions they purport to dissolve, perhaps even exacerbating existing divides (ibid). The spectacle literature does not warn of a single point of contamination for this capitalist ambition, but warns of both diffuse and concentrated forms (Debord 1968). An event could become a market place for individual sellers and lose its original drive by being distracted by many stakeholders' claims to the new market place (Shaw et al 2004) or become sucked into being the marketing toy for tourism and development by property developers or by the concentrated force of government (Hong 2013, Tomlinson et al 2011).

An event is about shifting the image of a place and opening it up to new possibilities and identities, but this opening can bring both constraints and opportunities to enable. Constraints arise where the place of the street event takes on a new identity and way of being through the event, but that

new way simply becomes stuck into a form that remains restrictive and un-chosen by the everyday users of that space (Tomlinson et al 2011). Alternatively, the opening can enable genuine disruption of “dominant ways of seeing urban spaces” (Pinder 2000: 379) and inspire a new form and way of being that open up possibilities in the everyday. If the event does not achieve a genuine shift in thinking and doing, it can be perceived as a deceptive show, disguising old ways of being as something new, pacifying and distracting agents of real change (Pinder 2000).

Similar to mega-events like soccer world cups, *OSCT* events aim to be a moment of togetherness and inclusion that inspire the same in everyday life. But events can also bring about sour disappointments to these promises. Soccer world cups meant as a moment of togetherness have inspired divisiveness through service protests (Fairbanks 2010 in Tomlinson et al 2011), glossed over social divisions they were meant to bridge (Pinder 2000: 358) and have fallen right back into the hegemony they were created to escape. The spectacle is associated with the hollow feeling experienced during or after a dramatic event. A sense that what one was seeking at the event is there in show but not in essence, and remains missing in the everyday after the party. Events can be alluring in that their grandness promises to fulfil a “spiritual ecstasy” of direct unmediated togetherness and oneness (Ross 2013). Ideally the experience is one of genuine connectedness, this redirects people to bring about genuine change after 'the party'. This might be a realisation that fundamental change in the everyday is needed to sustain the fulfilment of this longing for togetherness (Ross 2013).

This discussion of street events leads to a query of *OSCT*: Do *OSCT* events bring people together or divide them further? Is *OSCT* about bringing the substantive freedom of mobility to everyday? Or is it a perpetuation of more of the same divided way of using the street, now disguised as something new? Will it inevitably become a perpetuation of more of the same divided and conditional mobility landscape? How suitable is a string of day-long events to this task of interrupting city streets with a long history of division?

For *OSCT* aims to bridge mobile, spatial and social divides, it needs to aim to bring about equality in freedom of mobility. By removing the car, *OSCT* addresses the mobile dimension of the mobility landscape. By creating a ludic space, *OSCT* is creating a space to query the normative mobilities landscape and to enhance street mobility strategies that are independent of automobility. In addition to creating these shared spaces to bridge the mobile divide, *OSCT* aspires to bridge existing spatial and social divides.

## SPATIAL AND SOCIAL DIVIDES

Two parts of the *OSCT* manifesto point to spatial and social divides of the mobilities landscape:

- By inviting “**all of us**” to participate, *OSCT* is calling for open *equal participation* for all road users in street life. To create an everyday street that is accessible for “all of us” there needs to be greater equality in freedom of mobility. People of all races, classes and genders need to be free of hindrance from crime and criminalisation (negative freedom), there should be equal access to the streets (opportunity freedom), and everyone should have an opportunity to say how the streets are used (process freedom).
- “**Bridging spatial and social divides**” is about considering the streets as a working part of the political organism of the city. A street can either reproduce the social divides, inequality and consequential spatial exclusion of the larger city organism, or choose to *remake the rules of engagement of the streets*. *OSCT* would like to remake street culture in a way that bridging spatial and social divides between peoples and places.

Across the contemporary urban landscape of Cape Town there is a struggle between those who benefit from combating crime through fortressing city space within privatisation (in this case through CIDs) and those who are unfairly discriminated against and excluded by these practices. *OSCT* chose to partner with a CID as their strongest local partner in Observatory while simultaneously working towards bridging social and spatial divides and open access to street use. This is a questionable choice of partner for *OSCT* given that everyday CID practices are described as discriminatory and implicated in creating an everyday street scape that is racially exclusionary (Miraftab 2007). But due consideration needs to be given to the “local third ways” (Didier et al 2013) of OBSID, and the nature of the engagement between *OSCT* and OBSID before that critique is valid.

In some ways Cape Town has moved on from a history of spatial and social exclusion (laws like Group Areas Act 1950 and Pass Laws ... have been replaced with democratic rights that promise prosecution for unfair discrimination based on race, religion, gender and sexuality), but in many ways the past lives on in spatially and socially divisive street governance. The significance of this issue for South Africans comes through with an understanding of the layers of history that made the streets unequally accessible and divided in the first place (Cresswell 2012). As was the case in the past, freedom of mobility through the streets remains contested and divided. People

continue to live in residential areas that are distinguishable by race and there continue to be strong differences in opinion between local governance authorities and street users as to who should be permitted freedom of mobility through which residential and business spaces. Race, class and gender still play a role in determining freedom of mobility and disagreements between agents of the street continue to be marked with violence as they were in the past (Msimang 2014, "Bikers in alleged racial attack" 2014).

#### A HISTORY OF SPATIAL AND SOCIAL DIVISION

In contrast to this ideal of equality in freedom of mobility, the apartheid era was one of extreme inequality and control. Through the Group Areas Act, the apartheid government sliced up and colour-coded residential living space so that each race was designated a contained living area (Maharaj 1994, 1995). The prime cuts of the city reserved for the white population had to then be defended. So although our history is not always told in a way that emphasises contestation of mobilities, "the spatialities of social life presuppose, and frequently involve conflict over, both the actual and the imagined movement of people from place to place, event to event" (Hannam et al 2006: 4). The control of apartheid government extended its control over mobility into how and where people could move and dwell through influx control regulations, pass laws (Hindson 1987) and segregated and unequal transport systems (Rose 1989, Sey 2008). Segregation was part of a strategic means of oppression through a system of separate unequal spatial development programmes for different race groupings (Sey 2008). The terror of this time was not only that people could not move as they liked but also the spirit-breaking tactics of repetitive daily harassment moving people back 'into place' (Platzky and Walker 1985). Tensions from tightened control over where people lived, how and where they moved and how they developed economically erupted into street, train and bus boycotts in several waves throughout oppressive rule (Stadler 1979).

Constraints on people's freedom to move became unbearable. For the oppressed, freedom (including freedom of mobility) was worth fighting for despite violent retaliation. An effective way to do that was to grab control of the infrastructures of movement, such as entering white only bus carriages or disrupting public transport with bus boycotts (Stadler 1979). Grabbing hold of the infrastructure that controlled movement was often a very effective way of talking in the language of power (Butler 2009). In contrast, *OSCT* is using an alliance with city government to take control of the streets for an event of its liking. As such, it is staking a claim in how the streets operate by

taking control of the inner workings of the mobilities landscape and defining its limits. Is this claim to the street something that opens the streets to a greater part of the public to use or does the change suit only a few? Is an event the most effective way to bridge the deep history of mobile, spatial and social divides in the everyday mobilities landscape?

A large part of the current differences, disagreements and divides between people of different race, gender and class groupings is rooted in the way the country was governed with segregation and unquestionable control during apartheid. The city was divided into separate spaces for different race groupings that meant public space such as streets were never truly inclusive and that each race had its own parallel public space (Paasche 2012). White people enjoyed a more comfortable freedom of mobility within a white area, while “coloured” and “black” others were closely monitored in white space as well as in spaces assigned to their own race group (Paasche 2012). A bombardment of seductive economic entitlements and fear-fuelled exclusionary ideas (Maharaj 1995, Rich 1980) about who belonged in what place and how “black” and “coloured” race groups could move – only to serve whites (Platzky and Walker 1985) – maintained a divide between a complicit class of supporters and the dis-empowered. Although in no way a perfect public and inclusive space before apartheid, over time apartheid governance further perverted spatial and social relations between people of different state-determined race, gender and class groupings (Eales 1987, Maharaj 1994). All this was regulated and controlled by the state (Hart 1988, Pinnock 1989) and correctable by law (Savage 1987). While apartheid was by no means homogeneous and universally applied within and across cities (Bozzoli 1987), the terror manifested in daily life through an omnipresent sense of control that extended into the intimate everyday movement of “coloured” and “black” people and their relations with “white” people, as well as between different genders and sexuality groups.

Through a reading of the mobilities landscape of the past, and understanding the contemporary mobility landscape in the context, it becomes clear that inequality of the past is reproduced in in the present configurations of the mobility landscape. This can be seen in placement of people in everyday circulation through the streets:

“The rhythms of people in everyday circulation becomes an indicator that ‘people are placed by power’ (Allen, 2003, p. 188 in Jensen 2009: 147) ...Such ‘placement’ has to do with the profound relationship between the social and the material. The relational geography and the understanding of place as constituted by flow have obvious

repercussions for the understanding of the city. The city in this perspective becomes a 'whole series of circulating networks of command and control' (Amin and Thrift, 2002: 92 in Jensen 2009: 147)

South African history was not only spatially divided, but also marked by a deep and persistent contestation over freedom of everyday mobility. The struggle for freedom and against segregation is as much about where one is permitted to live relative to prime spots in the city, as it is about how free one is to move *through* the city as one desires (Fero 2013). Creating freedom of mobility for all by creating people centred-public space where everyone is free to participate, like *OSCT* aspires to, is exactly what South Africa needs; it is also hugely challenging considering how different true open public shared space would be from the suppressed street life that has existed for a large part of South African history.

By the time apartheid was abolished, the city's people and production had been moulded into isolated spaces maintained by social, spatial and also mobile divides. Some of this lives on in the mobile, spatial and social dimensions of the mobilities landscape, affecting ways of being in and moving across the city that make up Cape Town's mobilities landscape. It is in these everyday jostlings for freedom of mobility that contemporary struggles re-enact past struggles; on either side of the struggle we have parties for and against the hegemonic ways of using the street.

#### SPATIAL DIVIDES AND CITY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICTS (CIDs)

In post-apartheid South Africa, segregated residential areas remain, and Contemporary CID networks of command and control are described reproducing exclusionary spaces, as evidenced in that patterns of people in public street space (Miraftab 2007). Practices such as privatisation of the public space of the road in the name of crime prevention brings safety for the upper and middle income residents but remains in tension with the ideology of democracy and freedom of mobility for the very poor in public street space (Landman 2004, Miraftab 2007, Van Blerk 2013). Through constricting the freedom of mobility of criminalised racial groups these practices perpetuate racially segregated public spaces (Miraftab 2007). Observatory established a CID called OBSID in 2008 (*ObsLife* 2008 to 2013). In 2013, when the *OSCT* event was hosted in Observatory and Salt River, OBSID was used as a local partner and primary organiser of the event. If the typical CID exclusionary crime prevention tactics of CIDs are applied by OBSID in their everyday operations, using it as a local partner could be in conflict with bridging spatial and social divides.

City Improvement Districts (CIDs) are land-owner funded organisations that provide extra safety and cleaning services for particular spaces in a city. The model was adopted and adapted from the cities of the global north, in order to allow for business districts to defend their business enclaves from streets users that defaced the image of safety and cleanliness they wanted to promote, to attract investment and customers (Didier et al 2012, 2013). In South Africa this model of street governance is described as reproducing the racialised spaces of apartheid by criminalising homelessness and informal street trade and 'pro-actively' excluding people that are racially profiled as dangerous from these areas (Miraftab 2007). This local governance structure is described as a serious obstacle to freedom of mobility for those bearing criminalised identities. On the other hand, South Africa has never had public space where all parts of the public are equally free to move and dwell (Paasche 2012):

"Rights might concern both opportunities and process, such that rights pertaining to mobility can therefore be about the choice of staying or moving, but also about procedures preventing unduly control or surveillance of travellers." (Sager 2006: 468)

CIDs interference with freedom of mobility (Rink and Gamedze 2015) is not just about being able to move and stay as one wishes (negative and positive freedom), but also about having a say in the governance practices of the public space one uses (process freedom) and therefore the opportunity to use all 'public' spaces that one should have an equal claim to use (opportunity freedom).

The core tension that CIDs create in street governance has to do with conflicting needs and asymmetrical power dynamics at play. Faranak Miraftab (2007) links CIDs to the elite fantasy of a world-class city. In preparation for development through branding and marketing, sanitising and regulating public space, the space becomes privatised, and a challenge to inclusive citizenship. The 'clean up' process mobilises a team of cleaners and security officers on foot, bicycle and car patrol, 24-hour CCTV cameras, and an intimate relationship with the local police. Through the use of apartheid era by-laws that still criminalise homelessness and poverty, management is coordinated in a control room with radio contact between officers, resulting in a very effective grip on the movement of people labelled as undesirable within the managed space. This can result in the sometimes violent eviction and regulation of informal traders, people sleeping on the street and others who do not fit the image of the elite fantasy.

The stark difference between the elite fantasy and local reality brings tension: “CIDs are challenged from both within and outside of their managing structures by contentious local issues, and in particular by vast social inequalities and citizens’ historical struggle for inclusive citizenship and the right to the city” (Miraftab 2007). Even when CIDs are instituted with a pro-development focus, this neoliberal policing model is described as heavy-handed and imprecise.

Tony Samara (2010a, 2010b) argues that this form of policing is reproducing racialised spaces in post-apartheid South Africa. The *favouritism* of CIDs works against people of particular identities but also in favour of particular spaces earmarked for development and consumption, and often at the expense of urban integration and cohesion (Miraftab 2007). On a landscape level it also leads to a displacement of crime and a concentration of resources for crime to poorer areas fighting in areas that can afford the additional services fees rather than where the need is greatest. Ultimately informal traders and other criminalised identities resent this criminalisation while property owners resent the extra cost they bear for supplementing cleaning and security that their tax money should cover (ibid).

To escape pitting CIDs against freedom of mobility and blanketing all CIDs as the enemy of public space, the mobility literature is coupled with the concept of *parallel public space* to open a more nuanced theoretical understanding of the kind of public space CIDs might create:

“The publicness of space is (not necessarily) suppressed by the presence of private actors, but ...they can in fact foster it. For the geography of the post-apartheid city, [‘parallel public spaces’] suggests a much more complex cartography that does not categorise the inner city in public space and different forms of private gated space, but also different forms of public space as well. The question that remains is what forms of parallel forms of public space exist.”  
(Paasche 2012: 56)

Instead of a binary patchwork of ‘true’ public spaces taken over by privatised commercial spaces and governance, Till Paasche (2012) breaks from the public/private dichotomy. South Africa has never had public space in the sense that all parts of the public were represented in public space, even before Group Areas Act. Currently, spaces that are ‘open’ (as in without private security) could have high crime rates and consequently empty of more vulnerable parts of the public that fear crime such as children, women and the elderly. From a gender angle, the presence of private security might make a space more public in the sense that more women feel comfortable there

and so a better representation of the whole of the public sphere is present. While public space under CIDs governance remains dysfunctional, rather than thinking of this in terms of – 'public governance is open'/'private governance is closed' – think of the difference in public spaces as unique 'parallel public spaces'. Looking at the local adaptations and changes that each city improvement district undergoes, Didier et al (2013) calls for a more nuanced understanding of “local third ways” and the effect of local ways of governing a space has on freedom of mobility.

In coming to understand the everyday mobilities landscape of Salt River and Observatory it is therefore important to understand the dimension of street governance and what effect that has on the publicness of public street spaces and the underlying freedom of mobility of different street users and residents. Using a CID as a local partner for day-long events is challenging in that CIDs are reputed to divide, exclude and discriminate, but CIDs also hold the potential to bring the resources and energy of change to the everyday mobilities landscape that they are embedded in.

CIDs have changed over time. Since its inception the CCID (Central City Improvement District) has become kinder to the poor, employing social officers for softer engagements with vulnerable people (Miraftab 2007). Paasche (2013: 264) remains sceptical of this development considering this outreach a tactical move within a greater strategy of exclusion of those labelled as undesirable. Interventions carried out by CID staff on people sleeping on the street are statistics driven and "no longer an entirely voluntary act". These social services are employed only as a precursor to more harsh tactics of removal, and as such they should be considered a form of policing similar to neighbourhood watches and CIDs.

Through the use of mobilities theory, Lorraine van Blerk (2013) developed an understanding of the implications of the city improvement district's soft and hard tactics on the mobility practices of street youth within the city bowl. She found the CCID 'clean up' tactics of patrolling, picking up, identifying and registering forced counter-tactics of mobility in the youth that render the youths invisible. The mobile governance practices of CIDs force *dispersal*, *localisation* and *spatial marginalisation* – street geographies of survival. This public space governance in this particular space excludes the poor and makes the already marginalised more vulnerable to abuse; "creates a false impression that the 'problem of street youth' has been 'solved'" while the underlying social issues remain; and makes it harder for security and outreach services to find youth and for youth to access services when they need them (Van Blerk 2013).

The social and spatial practices and hierarchies we inherited from previous governance regimes are tied up in the infrastructure, available mobilities options and governance regimes that control street culture today (Miraftab 2007, Lemanski 2006, 2007). However, “the legacies of apartheid should not be considered as the seminal factor shaping geographical movements throughout neighbourhood space. Rather, it should be positioned alongside a range of different concerns, such as the mobility of baboon troops, domestic ‘guard’ dogs, traffic and family composition” (Benwell 2009: 77). As such, this research remained open to the multifarious forces that might shape the mobility practices within Salt River and Observatory. While it is important to note, as Benwell (2009) has, that individuals are not driven towards and away from places for reasons captured by post apartheid discourse, collectively it *does* matter if whatever is driving that pattern of movement results in a reproduction of our old segregated living and moving patterns. Shared public spaces are essential for developing an understanding and reconciliation of our daily lives across race, gender and sexuality lines – to bridge spatial and social divides. Segregation during apartheid boxed and labelled public and private living space by race and class but recovery from segregation will not result in an even and homogeneous city. Freedom of mobility through the public space such as neighbourhood streets and a freedom to explore public streets space in neighbouring suburbs would open space for reconciliation and recreation of healthier public engagement.

#### SOCIAL DIVIDES AND POPULAR DISCOURSE

A significant part of the way streets are shaped is fought over in the local media in the way that people and places are spoken about, especially when the prize is prime real estate for development. CIDs play a role in promoting places for development by ensuring spaces look and feel clean and safe but at the same time they must ensure their services continue to be demanded. It is in their interest to talk in hyperbole about crime while at the same time positioning themselves as *the* solution to the threat of crime. OBSID uses *Obs Life*, a community newspaper, to communicate on the crime in Observatory and promote itself. Without accurate and up-to-date crime statistics from the police, it is a central source of information on crime. In this way, CIDs (like Obsid) and fear of crime gets caught up in capitalisation of spaces, “in urban scenes, landscapes, and stage sets presented for visual consumption; (in) spaces associated with display and show; and in the efforts to re-image places, to attract capital investment” (Pinder 2000: 357)<sup>7</sup>. Considering

---

<sup>7</sup> Guy Debord (in Pinder 2000) used this term in a dramatic sense, but it is useful in thinking of large promotional events; capitalist creep into realms of leisure and everyday life and the opening up new spaces for sweeping capitalist colonisation and exploitation. Debord described the hollowing effect of capitalism and

how important the discourse about people and places is in shaping the freedom of mobility; “how movement is made meaningful, and how the resulting ideologies of mobility become implicated in the production of mobile practices” (Cresswell 2006: 21), discourse around places, streets and how and where people should be permitted to move is as much the terrain for *OSCT*'s battle for freedom of mobility for all as the streets themselves. For example, websites such as *Suburban Fear* ('Neighbourhood watches use race profiling' 2014) have picked up in the way media mediates the perceptions of street users using race profiling and increasing fear of the 'other.'

## SOCIAL DIVISION AND EVERYDAY INTERVENTIONS

*OSCT* is an attempt to develop a city wide shift in mobility landscape but there is a lot of potential in everyday mobility practices that happen between events because “much of what goes on in the everyday spaces of the city is not about participation in politics with a conventional capital P. Rather, it is about new kinds of molecular politics which vie for public attention, sometimes succeeding in creating wider social and political effects” (Amin and Thrift, 2002, p. 158 in Jensen 2009: 148).

Place-hacking and street play in everyday mobility practices is a means to expand individual freedom of mobility for some (Garrett 2014, Heins 2015). This everyday opportunity for change can be found in challenging the normative. On a quest for their own freedom of mobility from within the stronghold of the hegemonic everyday ways of doing and being, people can act 'out of the ordinary' and 'out of place' in the cracks between the overwhelming mobile, spatial and social divides:

“In the quest for freedom, the main point is not necessarily to cross borders, but to exploit the ambiguity of the border zone....Escape means to exploit the possibilities, weaknesses, and uncoordinated control found in the gaps between the systems. ... Escape for some groups in some settings is as incredibly easy as walking out a door. For others, formal restrictions, deep-seated habits, or internalised conventions raise almost insurmountable barriers in matters of mobility. (Gerzina, 2001 in Sager 2006: 473, emphasis added)

---

consumerism as leaving a trail of alienated, mesmerised and bewildered spectres in its wake, left to passively live out the life allotted to them by the administration of the city through its sleuth of media and images (Pinder 2000).

On the uneven mobilities landscape in everyday life, it is important to note that the ability to play – to remake the mobile landscape to suit one's own needs – is not equally available. Freedoms of mobility remains conditioned and regulated by the inequalities of our past and present.

Street play exploits the performative nature of identity through the often overlooked opportunities to choose to act against norms of one's personal and collective identity and the norms of a place. In any given space, the individual encounters the collective, the place and fields of power that are applied as moving disciplining codes, such as social norms or local governance, such that negotiation of space depends on “individual sense of place, self and collective identities” (Butcher 2011). For the most part people are acted upon in certain ways and respond by performing in a way without being fully aware of how they have been acted upon (Butler 2009). The everyday is repetitive in that performing one's identity more often than not “reasserts boundaries of social order extending from subjective understanding of space and place” (Butcher 2011: 251) leading to a reproduction of social order (Butler 2009, Butcher 2011).

Marcus Stephenson (2006) found that even with a desire to explore cosmopolitan places, encounters are racially constructed such that preconditions of racism prevent full enjoyment of cosmopolitan mobile experiences. Expectations about a racial experience in a space shapes mobility through or away from that space. However, in describing the Delhi Metro, Melissa Butcher (2011) chose to emphasise the fleeting but significant challenges to social boundaries such as the micro-acts of claiming 'sanctioned' space like placing one's body *out of place* by claiming an unpaid-for place in first class. In this place cosmopolitanism was a “desired urban imagination” and a tool to manage change, unfamiliarity and inequality such that an “everyday cosmopolitan sensitivity” guided mobile navigation positively.

By thinking of an everyday cosmopolitan sensitivity in conjunction with the four dimensions to freedom of mobility it becomes apparent that what is required for subverting everyday landscape is not just awareness of the normative, a sensitivity to difference and a desire to change, but also the freedom to act on that desire. In this study an *everyday cosmopolitan sensibility* is used instead of sensitivity because a sensibility has the awareness of sensitivity but also the agency and ability to respond to that awareness in everyday mobility practice. Sensibility describes attitude to difference with an awareness of the power of 'out of place' play to disrupt the everyday space.

## SUMMARY

*Open Streets Cape Town* aspires to bridge the mobile, spatial and social divides of the city through play-filled car-free street festivals.

The main character in the **mobile divide** is the car. The dominance of this loud, dirty and aggressive form of mobility on street life suppresses the social potential of the street, exacerbates inequality in freedom of mobility and increases isolation between social strata. Through a safe car-free street space, *OSCT* aims to create a people centred public space called *shared space* (Hamilton-Baillie 2008). Shared space is *OSCT's* alternative to the mobile division caused by car-dominated streets. Centring the needs of other street users such as walkers and skaters instead of the needs of car-drivers is a clear interruption of automobility but does it intervene with the inequality of power and freedom of mobility? The car mediates interaction between people in public causing division but also provides opportunity for connection to wider city life. How does disrupting this affect people dependent on car travel for mobility and connection with others?

**Spatial divides** are a legacy of apartheid planning and governance. Residential spaces are divided and isolated from one another fostering isolated street cultures that are foreign to one another. These isolated sets of public space exist as parallel public spaces (Paasche 2012), each hosting different sections of society with their own ways of being and doing. This divided spatial dynamic is maintained by differences in public space cultures, demographics, incomes; favouritism and exclusion by street governance structures such as CIDs (Miraftab 2009). Bridging these spatial divides would require creating a *fluidity between parallel public spaces* and *equality in freedom of mobility* such that different publics could freely share public space. Does the *OSCT* event create such a bridge? What does it mean to create such a bridge while partnering with a CID? What does the *OSCT* intervention do to existing relationships and practices that bridge the parallel public spaces or people existing in contentment without fluidity between public spaces?

Within the mobile dimension of street life, the car mediates open interaction between people. Within the spatial dimension, historical socio-economic legacies and governance structures mediate direct interaction. Within the social dimension it is ideas and discourses about the other and convention that mediate unhindered interaction creating **social divides**. Shared space that bridges social divides would be about openness, flexibility and accommodation of the 'other' instead of encounters marked by avoidance, marginalisation, exclusion and displacement. In

addition to the openness to difference, mobility practices that bridge social divides require a robust freedom of mobility. For *OSCT* to bridge social divides, it is required to foster mobility practices guided by this – an *everyday cosmopolitan sensibility*. Is that what *OSCT* fosters? Or do people remain dependent on the structures of mediation (like cars, CIDs, exclusionary social practices) in their everyday mobility practices and encounters with difference?

## AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

The aim of this research is to understand the role of *Open Streets Cape Town (OSCT)* events in shaping mobility in Salt River and Observatory. More specifically, this research explores how *OSCT* events contribute toward everyday mobility practices that may bridge social, spatial and mobile divides.

This aim is broken down into four objectives:

1. Describe everyday mobilities in Salt River and Observatory from multiple viewpoints (everyday mobility)
2. Understand how an *OSCT* events works in Salt River and Observatory (hosting the party<sup>8</sup>)
3. Describe the experience of *OSCT* events from multiple viewpoints (the party)
4. Understand what has changed in the mobilities landscape after *OSCT* events – if anything – towards bridging mobile, spatial and social divides (after the party).

---

8 In this paper 'the party' is used to make a clear distinction between the everyday streetscape and the 'spectacular' event that is *Open Streets Cape Town*. It is important to keep in mind the spectacular nature of a street event and how jubilant, exaggerated and exciting it is compared to everyday. 'The party' is used to remind the reader of that. The members of the organisation would not refer to the event as a party themselves as they would like to discourage the event from becoming too spectacular and stray *too* far from the everyday. 'The party' is also used to refer to the larger events that *Open Streets Cape Town* hosts to distinguish them from other smaller events they host such as *Talking Streets*.

# METHODS

## INTRODUCTION

The methodology for this study were designed to capture an understanding of the everyday mobility practices in Salt River and Observatory, including their reasons, social rules and ideologies (Friedman and Rogers 2009). This served as a base to compare how such mobile practices were affected by the *Open Streets Cape Town (OSCT)* events. The approach required a visceral embodied understanding of everyday mobility practices (Büscher and Urry 2009, Cresswell 2012), and an understanding of the methods, motivations and experience of the *OSCT's* event. To this end, I embedded myself within the everyday happenings of the mobility landscape of Salt River and Observatory, taking up new mobility practices (walking and cycling) to better understand the variety of perspectives that different mobility practices create. In addition, I embedded myself within *OSCT* and participated in meetings, events and other planning activities to understand the event and their perspective. This gave rich detailed insight into the social structures driving everyday mobility in Salt River and Observatory, and the workings and motivations behind the *OSCT* intervention. From my embedded position I employed qualitative methods in the form of:

- short semi-structured interviews with 36 business owners (see *Appendix A*) and 14 resident families (see *Appendix B*) in Observatory and Salt River;
- more in-depth mobile ethnography and map elicitation (Merriman 2014, Vergunst 2011) with six business owners and residents (see *Appendix C*);

- 11 semi-structured interviews with core members of *OSCT* and their CID partners in Observatory (OBSID);
- Participant observation within Observatory and Salt River as a resident and with *OSCT* as a member for 2013/2014<sup>9</sup>.

The group of six key resident and business owner respondents purposefully became the core of the research so that the day-long *OSCT* event was put in perspective of their everyday experience of Salt River and Observatory. Rather than centralise the organisation of *OSCT* in the methodology design, Adger et al (2003) suggests 'backsolving' from the users (everyday street users) and determine the value of *OSCT* within the context of the long-standing and socially embedded patterns of everyday mobility. Prioritising the residents and business owner voices made the feedback more meaningful as feedback for *OSCT* because these voices were difficult for *OSCT* to capture. Respondents were selected from informants from the short semi-structured interviews. Respondents were chosen for their different everyday mobilities practices and experiences (levels of freedom of mobility; race, gender, income, time living or working in the area, perception of their street) and because they had experienced *OSCT*. Qualitative coding (Hay 2005) and narrative analysis (Czarniawska 2004) was used to analyse their responses.

In order to achieve the objectives set out, this research was carried out as follows:

Objective 1: Describe everyday mobilities in Salt River and Observatory from multiple viewpoints

I used my previous year (2013) living in Observatory and expanded this through observation of daily mobility patterns; semi-structured interviews with residents and business-owners, supplemented with mobile ethnographic techniques of mapping exercises and walk-alongs, to suit each respondent (Cresswell 2012, Gabriel 2013). Although the plan was to do photo diaries with respondents, trials proved technically difficult. Vergunst (2011) validates this calling for a shift of emphasis from technology to research 'technique', emphasising validity of data over newness of technology. Written accounts of the experiences of the event in the news were taken as equally valuable as 'live-ness' captured at the event direct experience (Vergunst 2011).

This larger sample of short semi-structured interview across Salt River and Observatory included a variety of perspectives from which the respondents for the in-depth interviews were chosen. This

---

9 Standard ethics clearance for dealing with human subjects was granted by UCT and guided the interview process

enabled me to capture a variety of street users: residents, business owners and visitors. This included a range of races, genders, income brackets and freedom of mobility.

Objective 2: Understand how creating OSCT events works in Salt River and Observatory

A well-rounded perspective of mobility landscape grew while embedded in *OSCT* organisation, walking and cycling in addition to established daily commuting routines by bus and car. The variety of mobility practices provided insight into how these practices are a part of local politics and social relations (Vergunst 2010). See *Appendix D*.

Within *OSCT*, I participated in meetings, organising events, attending community engagements, planning exercises ('talking streets') and took on the role of bike marshal at an event. Semi-structured interviews post-events with *OSCT* members and people from partner organisations (including local CID and groups that organised activities at the events).

I had an experience of the event before it became a research project, and after data gathering closed, temporarily withdrawing from the organisation to reflect the position within and how it affected my understanding. See *Playing host within OSCT*

Objective 3: Describe what is it like experiencing the *OSCT* events from multiple viewpoints

Playing host and attending *OSCT* several times myself as a participant, bike marshal and member of *OSCT* shaped my initial understanding of the event and organisation. I added more perspectives to this through interviewing residents, business owners. Initial interviews were a short survey of businesses and residents throughout Salt River and Observatory, from which a range of people with different opinions on *OSCT* became key informants.

The combination of embeddedness in the organisation and the suburbs in question, and enacting new mobilities contributed towards the "overall goal (of) collect(ing) the richest possible data and by rich data, we mean a wide and diverse range of information collected over a relatively prolonged period of time in a persistent and systematic manner." Such data enables a grasp of meanings associated with actions study subjects and contexts in which those actions are embedded (Loftland et al. 2006: 15 in Babbie 2011: 203). 'Hanging out' in Observatory and Salt River and with *OSCT* brought a deeper understanding of what *OSCT* means as an interruption of everyday life.

Objective 4: To understand what has changed in the mobilities landscape 'after the party' – if anything – towards bridging mobile, spatial and social divides (after the party)

This objective was achieved by synthesising all the data and considering the cumulative evidence and is therefore a product of the analysis of all that data. Details of data analysis come at the end of this chapter.

#### AN EMBEDDED APPROACH

This project takes contextual and organisational sensitivity as primary requirements for ensuring the quality of the research. The quality and rigour of this embedded research ran with the following criteria as guidelines as set out by Reason (2006) and Eden and Huxam (1996) as summarised in Coghlan and Brannick (2010: 14 - 16):

#### Quality research

- reflects cooperation between researcher and members of the organization
- shows iterative reflexivity and concern for outcomes
- includes a plurality of knowing to ensure conceptual-theoretical integrity, that ways of knowing are extended, and that methods are appropriate
- engages with significant projects
- results in sustainable change
- make these choices clear AND explicit to those involved

#### Rigour requires the researcher shows

- how she was engaged in cycles of constructing, planning, action and evaluation. How this was recorded is important.
- How she challenged and tested her own assumptions and interpretations continuously so that familiarity and closeness are exposed to critique
- Access to multiple views on an event or issue

- Interpretation is grounded in scholarly theory, rigorously applied and outcomes evaluated against theory.

Once established in the context (Observatory and *OSCT*) and the purpose of the study was defined, the process of embedded research was continuously theoretically constructed with 1) the sum of the knowledge I had at that stage, 2) then planned accordingly, 3) then acted upon (through gathering data or participating in a new role) and 4) evaluated as per the meta learning process of David Coghlan and Teresa Brannick (2010: 11- 13). This cycle was repeated several times, continuously adding layers to the ideas and constructions of the situation, through my own experiences or those of respondents, as critical urban theory demands.

The four objectives were not carried out independently but simultaneously informed one another. The details of the process appear in *Appendix E*.

#### CRITICAL URBAN THEORY AND EMBEDDEDNESS

Critical urban theory requires a close, porous relationship between theory and practice; both grow in-sync. Theory is one view of the “meaning and possibilities of the world practices” taking place (Marcuse 2009: 185) and therefore must be held against empirical data such that the theory brings meanings and insight to practice and becomes part of “the conscious and articulated aspect of practice, or action” (Marcuse 2009: 185), and not an subconscious norm of practice.

Embeddedness is one way of bringing critical theory into a relationship with the nuances and particularities of practice. To know inner workings of *OSCT*, I become a part of the organisation, observing its development and experiencing the organisation in a few different roles. Over time a sense of belonging in Cape Town developed through the constructive contribution I was providing towards the well-being of the city through *OSCT*.

Embeddedness has the advantage of closeness to the object of study but has to be constantly balanced with getting distracted, over-involved, swept away with the momentum of the organisation and resisting being blinded by ties to the people of the organisation. From the perch within the organisation I was able to see into the everyday working of the organisation but with a bit of temporary withdrawal I would have the space to be critical of it. Both *OSCT* and myself are aware of some looseness required for critical distance and both appreciate the value of critical feedback and worked towards that end.

As an urban study this research sits at “the intersection of everyday life (and) the socially created systemic world around us” (Marcuse 2009: 185). By moving my whole self into the streets of Observatory and Salt River and employing varying mobile methodologies I aimed to re-centre the body as an emotional way of sensing (Sheller and Urry 2006) the everyday mobilities of these spaces. My role as a researcher was to observe and enact the happenings of *OSCT* and also use my senses and understandings as barometers for collecting data on the organisation and the street happenings. While reflecting upon the data of 'my experience', my job is to find where the organisation fits in this socially created world around us (Marcuse 2009) and be critical of what role it plays.

If critical urban theory aims to implement the goal of the right to the city, a right to a piece of the streetscape that belongs to all members of the public, then through my research I needed to come to understand, in the instance of *OSCT*: Whose right is being catered for, what right is that and for what kind of city? (Marcuse 2009). To do this I took on many roles and enacted them as both part of *OSCT* and as an observer of how that changes my perspective and relations to others.

Interviews were approached with Friedman and Rogers (2009) positivist psychological approach, where “the process of (research) becomes understanding the world as the participants have come to understand it”. For this research I was looking for meaning in and through movements, mobility practices and moorings for an understanding of *how* the organisation *OSCT* effects change through the city streets, but also gain an understanding of the effect of these events on everyday mobility to frame the appropriateness of the changes *OSCT* brings for other street users with equal rights to claiming the street space.

Part of understanding the role of *OSCT* and other factors affecting everyday mobilities requires “empirically discerning the effects of real underlying structures (be they social or cognitive), [which] necessarily starts with the understandings that people hold about their social world. We find philosophical support for this position in the writings of critical realists (e.g., Bhaskar, 1975, 1998 in Friedman and Rogers 2009), who argue against the positivist notion of cause as a flat sequence of observable events.” As a researcher I searched for “*reasons, social rules and ideologies*” (Friedman and Rogers 2009), which served to link individual experiences with the broader structures and logics of place.

## EVERYDAY MOBILITIES

### LIVING IN AND KNOWING OBSERVATORY

As a resident of Observatory I had a preliminary understanding of one end of the Lower Main Road where OSCT was hosted. To supplement this, 7 years worth of back-copies of the local newspaper *ObsLife* described the political and organisational dynamics of the area, including some pages of advertorial from OBSID weekly.

Being a resident in the area brought challenges negotiating boundaries with people sleeping on the street and maintaining their anonymity. Thought and sentimentality are harder to separate and the reality of encounters with people I share space with, and will continue to share space with, are not easy to detach from. On the other hand, the meaning that 'home' has for me is also an indication of what this space might mean for others too, and our interactions and exchanges are examples of the very culture that this study seeks to understand. What better position to understand that than from the inside?

My preliminary understanding and routine in Observatory was useful but only one limited way of knowing and using the space. To compensate, a sample of houses chosen from a map throughout Observatory and Salt River. Particular individuals I knew prior to the research added perspectives that were otherwise missing. The sample was measured against the local demographics of the suburbs to ensure a proportional sample.

### GETTING TO KNOW SALT RIVER - GIRL, DON'T GO *THERE*

Salt River was a very challenging area to research. The fear-filled local discourse and lack of factual representation of it in the newspapers blocked my free movement into the area. This fear informed what later become the 'spatial divide' because a similar fear prevents freedom of mobility between Observatory and Salt River.

#### Experiencing the spatial divide

The spatial barrier keeping me from Salt River had to be overcome to conduct the research, but then further understood to inform the research. The data gathering process was reshuffled so that instead of following the random sample of houses I had initially mapped out, I followed a snowball sampling technique, progressing further into Salt River as I became familiar with some of the residents and streets. The delicate negotiation process of developing trust with these individuals

speaks to the process of creating shared space and bridging mobile, spatial and social divides. Encountering Salt River residents required me to give up car travel (mobile divide), and forced me to learn appropriate street manners and capabilities (social divide) to cross into an area outside of where I belong as a 'white' 'non-Muslim' woman (spatial divide). See *Appendix D*

Sensitivity to scaremongering in the media is a significant differentiator between those that experience a freedom of mobility between the two areas and those that do not. This mediated knowledge is junk food for the anxious soul but it is inferior to embodied knowledge of the street because it is hyperbolic, out of date and dangerous in that it perpetuates ideas about people and places that are fixed and divisive. This can be addictive because it perpetuates stories we are used to. An antidote to this is first hand experience of the street, which put the scaremongering in perspective, and created a sense of how hyperbolic news reporting of incidence can be. Information relayed in news tended to give particular places in the suburbs a reputation, a permanent labelling of safe or unsafe. In real time, the safety of a place is constantly in flux, and a street users has the agency to interact with that potential for danger – avoid or prevent an incident.

#### Experiencing the mobile divide

Street manners are distinct between areas and a very important part of social engagement on the street. Standing out as an outsider, people immediately offered directions. Being out of place initiated engagement with Salt River residents within a street culture was unfamiliar with. Learning social and spatial navigation through trial and error, I developed an appreciation for the greeting culture and the modest dress expectations for women. Jogging and cycling through Observatory requires a different dress-code to Salt River. A white women in stretch-pants in Observatory is unnoticeable while a white women in stretch pants in Salt River, a group of residents warned me, might be mistaken for a prostitute!

#### Experiencing the social divide

Regular social engagement while on the move developed into a safety network between streets creating a sense of freedom in Salt River. This safety network requires regular engagement as a pedestrian. Shifting into cycling mode, required learning new routes, negotiating the expected speed of the road and the danger of cars. Cycling was too fast and dampened social engagement. Recognising that mobility is more than movement, that it includes the feelings, experiences and

social interactions that happen while on the move, as well as the skills and knowledge to negotiate these physical and social challenges en route, I had to re-learn what was required to find freedom of mobility in walking, cycling and driving with each new area I explored.

Everyday mobile, spatial and social divides like these need to be renegotiated between parallel public spaces to bridge isolated parallel public spaces.

#### PLAYING HOST WITHIN *OPEN STREETS CAPE TOWN*

in June 2013 I was inspired by *OSCT's* first event, and become regularly involved in planning meetings and activities after attending a community engagement meeting in Observatory. In October 2013, I extended the role by acting on behalf of *OSCT* as a bike-marshal at an event.

The dual role of academic and civic actor rattled the focus of the research. Academic literature is necessarily critical of the past and present situation and therefore problem-focussed, whereas civic action projects like *OSCT* are fuelled by optimism that generates the inspiration in volunteers, tirelessly searching for gaps and openings in underutilized parts of the city. Playing observer and commentator *within* an organisation requires developing sensitivity to the amount of energy needed to take the risk of being hopeful for the future, and dedicating time to acting on that hope, *despite* the way the past has been told.

My loyalty to *OSCT* was challenged when I realised how much more *OSCT* and partners engaged with Observatory compared to Salt River. The reproduction of spatial and mobile division and inequality (Miraftab 2007, Sheller and Urry 2000) heightened my sensitivity to the need for even engagement, causing me to question my loyalty to *OSCT*. Later, I understood the uneven engagement to be unintentional and a result of partnering with *OBSID*, which showed favouritism for its paying customers in Observatory. *OSCT* did want to understand Salt River business and residents, and as an embedded researcher, I had to be sensitive to that and respond in a way that was appropriate for the research project and *OSCT*. As a result the focus turned to gathering these missing perspectives to inform *OSCT's* understanding of the next event.

The idealism that academic research generates is tested by the bureaucratic hurdles one must overcome to realise those ideals through civic action. The process of applying for an events permit process is a point of tension for *OSCT* because the long demanding processes and regulations stifles the momentum of the events. At the same time *OSCT* need to make sure the event remains

free entry and without commercial interests, leaving them reliant on government for funding and with little negotiating power.

## ANALYSING DATA AFTER THE PARTY

### NARRATIVE ANALYSIS

Narrative analysis was used to make sense of the secondary data: local newspaper articles, local organisation meeting notes and my own notes on my experiences as a researcher. Czarniawska (2004) describes this as separating out the internal and external stories of a place. What is the structure of the story people use to describe themselves, the events and their place of living? The narrative people use with insiders and outsiders are different because they serve different functions. Usually outsiders are told the promotional and ideological narrative about a place while an insider tells the everyday struggles and internal workings of a place. As an embedded researcher I was privy to the internal narrative of Observatory, Salt River and *OSCT* that are otherwise beyond the reach of researcher.

Sources included newspapers, listening to local meeting discussions, interviewing local representatives, residents, business owners and visitors to the areas and through my own experience living there.

For example, Observatory, identifies as liberal, tolerant, creative and “cosmopolitan” (diverse) and known to be more tolerant to people living on the street. The identity of *tolerance* is played out as a social rule of acceptance of people sleeping on the street and acts of adapting to their presence. People living in Observatory choose to attach themselves to one or more aspects of this identity in forming living in that place. This is the external story.

Internal tensions and misunderstandings arise with living with difference. People sleeping on the street in Observatory are a challenge to share the street with. For many Observatory residents a lot of energy goes into negotiating the shared use of space with street residents. Tolerance is not unlimited or equally valued and tensions arise over how to manage sharing space with people sleeping on the street. This is the internal story for housed Observatory residents. Tolerance is valued but challenged by daily tensions and demands.

## QUALITATIVE DATA CODING AND MAP ANALYSIS

Qualitative data-coding and map-analysis was used to make sense of the the semi-structured interviews and map elicitation exercise with the six key respondents. See *Appendix F* . Maps assisted the eliciting daily mobility patterns and helped understand drivers of patterns of mobility. Points of tension and pleasure were good indicators of potential mobile, spatial or social divides. The narrative analysis gave me an understanding of how the respondent was moving with or against the narrative of the place. Points of avoidance, points causing a change in mobility strategy points of interest suggested divides if they were not individual but collective.

### Identifying divides and bridges

After coding interviews with themes, 'fear' and 'freedom' were often paired, as was 'tension/intrigue' and 'adjacency'. Points of difference were therefore likely points of tension and potential divides to come and likely place for that to be collective rather than individual divides. Semi-structured interviews informed the coding of maps: Shifts in usual mobility patterns and avoidance of particular areas or groups of people were coded a 'divide' if they were shared rather than individual, while reaching out across difference despite existing fear and tension was a coded a 'bridge'.

### Understanding everyday mobilities

Because freedom came out as such a strong theme in individual's mobility practices, I re-looked at the mobilities literature for an analytical tool. Sager (2006) provided this tool and their mobility practices were categorised as per the categories Sager (2006) provides. Respondents' freedom of mobility in their everyday practice was compared to their freedom of mobility during *OSCT* to make sense of the meaning of the event for them. This also shed light on how the event could mean very different things to people with very different levels of freedom of mobility in their everyday life.

### Understanding the role of *OSCT*

The change in the 'bridges' and 'divides' during *OSCT* was an indication of the shifting mobilities landscape and hit exactly on the research question of whether *OSCT* helps bridges mobile, spatial and divides. The shorter but more widely asked business and resident survey gave an indication of what the general experience of the event was and how similar individual respondent experiences

were to the general changes in the mobilities landscape. A general consensus that businesses and residents returned to their everyday practices meant that the effect of the event lasted only for the day.

## STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS

The downside of being an Observatory resident was the difficulty of trying to moving through Salt River with the fear-filled understanding of an Observatory resident. Residents described outsiders as walking more freely through Observatory and Salt River because they are less aware of the accepted norms of avoiding those spaces labelled as dangerous by local media. It was difficult to see the narrative of Observatory as something separate from myself or to escape being part of the internal tensions that run across race and class lines in Observatory and between Observatory and Salt River, an actor in the scenes of the story I was trying to describe.

The strength of the embedded approach is the amount of empathy one develops for a number of different perspectives and the amount of hard-to-reach data it permits. The cost of this is the amount of time and energy it takes to disentangle this from one's own identity, experience and sense of place.

People are less likely to talk about how they fail to live up to the shortcomings of their ideology to someone who would not understand and shape that so it was very useful to be embedded in Observatory and *OSC7* to have the experience of the challenges myself. This went some way to preparing me to ask the right questions for respondents. Being embedded put me in the position of being one of them for a while and developing a kind of empathy for their position. For example I can say as an Observatory resident I know the amount of energy it takes to share street space with people sleeping on the street who can be messy, needy and sometimes anti-social. *OBSID* justifies excluding them from the area with the need to prevent their messy public living, the potential for them to be dangerous and their refusal of help. I can also say from spending a lot of time talking to a number of people sleeping on the street that if they knew how and the right services were there, they would very much like to make a better life for themselves off the streets. This is a good position to be in as a researcher to grow a sense of trust with respondents. Being embedded I understand their position from the inside and can give an account of the reasons, social rules and ideologies (Friedman and Rogers 2009) that are integral to the happenings of street mobilities.

# FINDINGS

## INTRODUCTION

*Open Streets Cape Town* set out to bridge mobile, spatial and social divides through their play-filled car-free street events. This research has found the event to be well-received by a wide variety of participants, yet mixed in its effectiveness in bridging divides. During the event, the mobile divide was bridged, while spatial and social divides were partially bridged, burned and temporarily covered up. Once the event was over, the changes in the mobilities landscape brought about by *OSCT* event, collapsed back into itself and the everyday mobilities practices of people returned to their divided everyday state.

During the everyday, frustration of living with inequality and difference and the pressures of productive demands dominate. Mobility in the everyday is about utility and fighting for relief from constrictions to freedom of mobility. For many, a playful transcendence of the physical and social boundaries restricting their freedom of mobility is not available. During their *OSCT* experience, the change in participant freedoms ranged from a relief from severe everyday hindrances to mobility (Elsie, Irene and Helga), a more social but similar experience to everyday freedom of mobility (Ridwaan), to an unpleasant and contested constriction (Achmat).

Those liberated from everyday hostilities during *OSCT* revelled in a sense of freedom to explore new parts of public street space (Irene and Helga). Boundary crossing was facilitated during the event by alleviating everyday constrictions on negative freedom of mobility. This, however, remains dependent on the infrastructure and mediation of *OSCT* to persist. Expanded freedoms,

that allowed people to cross mobile and spatial divides during OSCT event, reverted to their previous state after the party when the harshness, difficulty with difference and inequalities of the everyday mobilities landscape returned.

Exclusion from planning exercises leading up to the event, and during the event itself (process freedom), fell along spatial patterns of everyday inequalities and exclusions, exacerbating everyday tensions inherent in living with difference and inequality. The affect of togetherness reached all who were included in the event but levels of participation brought favour to those already privileged socially and spatially.

## THE EVERYDAY MOBILITIES LANDSCAPE IN SALT RIVER AND OBSERVATORY

Although many types of mobility are present, the streetscape of Salt River and Observatory is automobile dominated. Patches of congestion caused by narrow roads and on-street parking stifle the freedom of mobility of cars, allowing other forms of mobility to exist, but only in the cracks of the automobile hegemony.

Lower Main Road is a workhorse for a diverse collection of commuters, traders, local residents and business owners, security officials, maintenance officers and people who sleep on the streets – all moving within and through Salt River and Observatory. Lower Main Road bleeds off car traffic coming from town, foot traffic coming from the train stations and taxi and bus stops. Although both are largely residential, Salt River contains an industrial segment and Observatory contain dense offices parks and schools that feed pedestrian and motor traffic. A mix of train, bus, taxi, car, bicycle, skate-board and pedestrian commuters weave between the streets to meet the demands of work and school. Cars enjoy pride of place and dominate the main arteries displacing cyclists, pedestrians and skateboarders to the smaller secondary streets, while security-in-car patrols force criminalised pedestrians to stay within the high traffic commercial zones. Bicycle lanes are available on one of the roads through this area and are being expanded and upgraded to link up this cluster of middle-income suburbs with town.

On most days the Observatory end of Lower Main Road is congested with cars bringing in visitors to the shops, restaurants and bar area, a bohemian arts and cultural hub that attracts a large student population and visitors from outside this cluster of suburbs. At the Observatory end of Lower Main Road, traffic is slow enough and the roads narrow enough for pedestrians and skaters to walk between cars and trucks as they frequent shops and restaurants.

The section between Observatory and Salt River is more open and exposed than the Observatory end. It has less parked cars and less foot traffic so drivers can move faster through this section. Pedestrians feel less protected in this mid-section because the side-walks are without colonnades. Taller industrial architecture, greater frequency of truck use and car movement, closed shop fronts and side-walks empty of chairs and tables, and shops set back from the road creates a sense of isolation and exposure and abandonment.

At the Salt River end of Lower Main Road the shops and businesses are less entertainment-oriented and less open and welcoming in aesthetic to the onlooker. Although this introverted aesthetic seems unwelcoming to outsiders passing through, many local residents describe the area with affection, strengthened by a strong sense of connection between established locals. Trucks from local industry, and traffic from a main road out of town have a strong presence on main roads of Salt River, while many of the side streets have a lively pedestrian culture with children playing, skating and cycling in the streets. Some side streets are affected by the aggressive speed and size of trucks and cars bleeding off Lower Main Road, although narrow streets congested with on-street parking prevent drivers from exercising their main street speeding liberties. The pavements here are not built to protect pedestrians like in Observatory, and there are fewer of the inviting sitting spaces. Shops that do open onto the street are heavily protected with security bars and remain fully contained and introverted within themselves. The shops down Lower Main Road in Salt River cater for more established largely Muslim 'coloured' Salt River residents. Other shops along main roads of Salt River cater for a growing local population of residents from other African countries (respondent 12, 16) although gentrification is changing this. The trend of gentrification street governance by CIDs is creeping up towards Salt River from town and is affecting the nature and rhythm of mobility practices. The Biscuit Mill and surrounding high-end businesses bring heavy high-end Saturday morning car traffic, such that, there is temporarily a wealthier pedestrian population from outside the immediate residential area (respondent 11).

The heterogeneous mobilities landscape is testament to the fact that mobility itself is not freedom, not even for private car owners. Freedom within mobility is not a given; it is place (including people that make up that place) and person specific. Sager's (2005) thoughts on freedom *as* mobility are adapted here to deal with freedom *of* mobility, which depends on the range of geographical space one has access to (opportunity and process freedom), the amount of friction one experiences in that space (negative freedom) and the capacity one has to overcome those

resistances (positive freedom)<sup>10</sup>. This freedom of mobility framework captures the individual experience of mobile, spatial and social divides and facilitates comparing different experiences of moving through a place. This allows a comparable measurement of the multiple effects a changing mobilities landscape have on different street users, forefronting fairness in the transition from the everyday mobility landscape to the *OSCT* landscape.

## EVERYDAY MOBILITY EXPERIENCES

Contrary to the notion of freedom as the ability to escape from a place, or move without resistance, freedom of mobility is about *mastering* place: “linking places” and “creating a pattern, a tapestry of familiar places, in order to gain knowledge of, master, and feel at home in a larger geographical space” (Sager 2006: 471). Six key individuals in Salt River and Observatory exemplify the impact of social status, belonging, gender, inequality in income and street navigation capabilities have on freedom of mobility through mastering place, as is particular to Salt River and Observatory. The respondents described below are divided into those living or working in Salt River (Ridwaan, Achmat, Razeena) or Observatory (Irene, Helga, Elsie) and ordered from the one with the most freedom of mobility (Ridwaan<sup>11</sup>) to the one who has the least freedom of mobility (Elsie).

### Ridwaan

Ridwaan has never felt scared or hindered by fear, even when crime levels were high. He has a sense of liberty, a freedom from hindrance (negative freedom) that is built-in to his social standing, identity and experience in the area. This is enhanced by a wide variety of available transport choices (opportunity freedom): Ridwaan lives with enough transport options to suit his budget (access to train, bus, car, bicycle, skateboard, walking options) in an area scaled to pedestrianism that allows him access to the public space of local streets and greater Cape Town, as evidenced by his rich detailed description of residential streets and easy with which he moves inside and outside Salt River.

His sense of liberty is not a given but thanks to a robust set of social moorings and street navigation capabilities (positive freedom). His secure family base and extended local social network is an invaluable support and is only enhanced by his identity (adult able-bodied 'coloured' male)

---

10 Adapted from Sager's (2005, 2006) enquiry into freedom as mobility

11 Names used are pseudonyms

and his social position as a social insider. He maintains a wide net of social connections throughout the suburb with regular enjoyable street encounters. Although part of his freedom is birth luck (being born male), there is a large set of capabilities and skills he uses daily for navigation, including: a positive attitude to difference in others; a sensitivity to local manners street; careful choice in immediate friends; knowledge of the street geography; skills in anticipating, avoiding and dealing with danger.

His street navigation capabilities developed as a child through free exploration of the streets while running errands for his parents and grandparents. A deep understanding of place and up-to-date knowledge of local happenings inform decisions about how to navigate different street spaces. Free navigation extends into Observatory, informed by newspaper coverage there. His social knowledge and network, capabilities and life-long moorings free him up to physically move as he likes. His rootedness in place (sense of belonging) plays a central role in this:

“This is a very safe area but if I didn't know people I would drive... I always feel safe and I have never felt I have to stay inside to feel safe. This is a very friendly place (where) a nice person brings nice outcomes.” (Ridwaan)

The reputation of Salt River as dangerous and his identity as a adult 'coloured' male bring unwanted attention from police and private security. While he feels safe enough from crime to relax and play games on the street corner, criminalisation by street governance officials offends full realisation of this liberty (negative freedom). In Observatory the business area of Lower Main Road is the only space navigable on foot due to harassment by police when wondering into the residential space visit friends.

Ridwaan is proud of the local cultural mix, describing it as “One big breyani pot of Rasta people, Muslims, Christians, Indians, Pakistani and Somali people.” He has developed an everyday cosmopolitan sensibility, enjoying walks through his neighbourhood, visiting local shops, bars and restaurants as a social pass-time. His fondness for different cultural spaces is enabled by a robust freedom of mobility. Different people and cultures are intriguing rather than fear-inducing experiencing little of the social and spatial divides others describe.

The positive freedom (capabilities) that he uses to navigate the streets with the amount of ease he does stands out from the other respondents who are more reliant on opportunity freedom (a car) or a relief from pressure on their negative freedoms (CID patrol) to achieve the same level of

freedom in their movement. His individual sense of place and self within collective identities (Butcher 2011) is a comfortable fit that originally galvanised and continues to support his freedom of mobility. Respondents without this firm mooring are not as free, or in some cases immobilised. Mastery of local mobilities and moorings enable him to transcend inevitable challenges to immobilities (Hannam et al 2006).

#### Achmat

Achmat, like Ridwaan, has a sense of liberty in walking the streets alone (negative freedom). His capability navigating dangerous street situations himself (positive freedom) does not come from a deep interconnectedness with local residents but a knowledge of what the distinct Salt River mobility landscape demands, and being brought up as a male. He fears for outsider people walking with their jewellery out and for women walking at night through the streets of Salt River with broken lights.

He has a variety of available transport options (opportunity freedom) and enjoys walking but the nature of his business and the distance that his extended family lives from him means he commutes mostly by car. Although not hindered by fear, his leisure walks are tainted with bitterness and resentment because of inequality in the maintenance of the street infrastructure. On the Salt River end of Lower Main Road the side-walk is dirtier without the extra cleaning OBSID provides to Observatory. This favouritism (Miraftab 2007) adds to the already apparent difference in wealth that the well-groomed Observatory houses and the dishevelled buildings of Salt River express. Broken street lights are another marker of inequality and tension in living adjacent to wealthier Observatory. The Salt River end of the street is darker than the Observatory end of the road that OBSID maintains. A lack of community cohesion and effective policing and intervention of drug issues frustrates Achmat. Being unable to do something about important local street issues is a sign of a weakness in his sense of autonomy (process freedom).

#### Razeena

In contrast to Achmat and Ridwaan, Razeena feels minimal sense of liberty due to an acute fear of crime (negative freedom). Being without sufficient support as a single mother, and feeling insufficient to protect and support herself weakens her sense of autonomy (process freedom). Razeena's financial status limits her ability to change her situation or feel like this is what she has chosen (opportunity freedom). She would move out of Salt River if she could afford to live

elsewhere. Gender plays a big role in her hindered movement. She feels marked as particularly vulnerable by her single mother status and feel unskilled in the area. Although connected to her neighbours and local shop owner, she worries incessantly about crime. Her neighbours do not provide the sense of comfort that Ridwaan gets from his. The combination of feeling isolated, unsupported and particularly vulnerable would leave her completely immobilised if it were not for her car – her mobile security blanket.

Razeena is trapped in a catch-22, feeling too new to Salt River to develop the street navigation capabilities (positive freedom) needed to enjoy street-life while her fear of crime keeps her from developing these capabilities. Instead of feeling like her house is a base to return to between adventures through the neighbourhood, Razeena's home is prison-like. With any positive freedom she is trapped in her car and house, and an everyday cosmopolitan sensibility is not available to her at all. Fortressed in, she relies heavily on dramatic incident-focussed crime reports in newspapers to understand the streets. This distorts her understanding of crime because very little directly relevant information about the streets of Salt River is contained in local newspapers or given out by police. In contrast, Ridwaan's embodied experience of the street lead him to think Salt River and Observatory are relatively safe and that crime is going “down, down down every year”, aided by the double patrol of OBSID and police. Residents of Salt River lack the local crime information through newspapers like (*ObsLife*, *MowbrayRosebankLife* etc. because Salt River is less wealthy, and because Salt River is mentioned less in others (People's Post 2014, Tatler 2014).

Irene and Helga

Irene and Helga<sup>12</sup> have similarly strong but patchy freedom of mobility profiles, partially dependent on car-access which allows them a wide geographical reach outside of their suburb, and skill in navigating public street space, which allows them a freedom of mobility in their residential suburb.

Both are securely moored in Observatory where they live with a sense of belonging, partial autonomy and pride in where they live (process freedom). Their freedom to move through the public space of the streets is constrained by fear of cars and crime (negative freedom) and confines them to Observatory on foot, but these hindrances are navigated using pedestrian street navigation capabilities (positive freedom)

---

12 Two unrelated women with similar profiles living in Observatory

Irene and Helga have an environmentally and socially sensitive preference for walking so they have learned to navigate fears and threats to their pedestrian-selves: crime, unpredictable people, “shitty and dirty” streets, “funny people in funny places”, congestion of people and cars, tension and aggression and dirt. While both have pride in living in an area known for its multiculturalism and “tolerance to the odd bods”, they navigate a fear of aggression from, and association with, people living on the street:

When I walk my dogs I avoid congested areas, the people and the cars, so I use Florence Road. Also, it would be terribly embarrassing if my dog poohed in front of a shop. Like a bergie. (Irene)

Access to resources (opportunity freedom) relieves restrictions on their negative freedom: a home, family, car, money, able bodies and multiple alternative mobility strategies to choose from. Cars and other sources of danger are navigated by using specific walking routes that carefully avoid space they feel uncomfortable in. Alternatively they use a car:

I don't like Lower Main Road. If I have to, I drive instead....More threatening is Station Road with hooting and (aggressive) drivers. It is congested and threatening. The cars are in charge there. The homeless and drunks are there. That is not a problem but it changes the vibe. They call out, ask for money and hold your kids. (Helga)

They have lost freedom to move through some parts of Observatory and Salt River due to security fences, unwelcoming street architecture, a sense of isolation and unkempt grass. In one space fencing and high grass has completely taken away Irene's ability to use her street navigation capabilities to navigate the presence of “funny people”. The restrictions that fears and threats place on their freedom of mobility is partially relieved by the presence of security guards and police, but this remains in tension with their knowledge of the controversial relationship between security and people living on the street.

While not without hindrance, Irene and Helga hold a sense of autonomy (positive freedom) over their movement, walking and driving with an independence that is not constrained within a gender framework and financial limitations to the extent that Razeena is. This contrasts with the freedom of mobility that the men mentioned above (and other men interviewed) display, wondering the streets of both suburbs freely, expressing a pride in their street navigation knowledge that is independent from car and security access.

Elsie

Elsie finds least freedom of mobility relative to other respondents, being confined to Observatory and severely restricted within this space. All dimensions of Elsie's freedom of mobility are completely stifled. She lives in near complete social and spatial exclusion that suffocates her freedom of mobility to the extent that she scurries between fragments of unwanted and unguarded street space and lives literally on bits and pieces of the margins of the street. In stark contrast to Ridwaan, she describes her experience of the street as complete suffocation within a door-less windowless bubble:

“I *really* wanted to leave ...Road (her 'home' section of the street). I am losing my mind. I feel like I am in a bubble that I can't escape. Are there windows? Are there doors? No. No way out.” (Elsie)

Severe restriction to her movement (negative freedom) are the result of financial, racial and gender pressures: physical weakness due to hunger and treatable illnesses; spatial and social exclusion and marginalisation by OBSID, poverty and bouts of depression. Without a house to anchor her, she reports being exposed to theft from OBSID ('confiscation' with a 0% return rate) and other street residents, criminalisation and the threat of rape. **Financial** constraints and lack of security keep her within walking distance of her possessions and only once or twice a year she can afford to get a taxi ride to the adjacent suburbs or a train ride beyond the suburbs.

OBSID and hostile residents are the greatest hindrance to her autonomy (positive freedom), applying constant pressure for her to leave without providing an alternative (local social worker 1). Under pressure from some house-dwelling residents, OBSID use minor transgressions to 'move her along'. Sleeping space and hustling turf is highly competitive and must be defended fiercely while balancing this aggression with a dependence on other street residents for safety. Elsie cannot walk as she wants because she relies on the 'eyes' of a network of friends and acquaintances throughout the suburb to keep her safe from thieves and rapists.

Having no alternative but to leave home as a teenager she has very limited financial capabilities (opportunity freedom): no education, no home and no support beyond others similarly socially immobile. She is in a trap with little freedom of mobility in Observatory on one side, minimal chance of finding shelter and making a living elsewhere, and constant pressure to leave the space on the other.

She counteracts this with her exceptional social capabilities (positive freedom): charm, skills for building relationships and attentiveness to socially accepted behaviour, skills in 'hustling' the flows of pedestrian and automobile people, skills for avoiding association with dirt, crime and criminalisation. This has been key to her successful mooring in the area for a number of years. But this does not do enough to lift her out of the deeply entrenched immobility that marks the other dimensions of her freedom. A robust mooring (housing and social inclusion) is key to escaping her immobility (local social worker 1).

Because Elsie lives without any firm moorings, she has little access to the levers of power (process freedom) and is kept tirelessly on the move by OBSID. She has no comfortable place for her to dwell, even as she sleeps. This is consistent with racialised exclusion described in by CID governance strategies (Miraftab 2007). Her gender exacerbates this racial oppression through exposure to fear of violence and rape. Being particularly skilled at engaging with people and very attentive to her cleanliness (setting her apart from other people living on the street), she has developed a substitute mooring through developing relationships with local liberal residents that act as guardians against OBSID and support her in small ways, a common strategy for people living on the street in Observatory (local social worker 2).

#### EVERYDAY PLAY: CREATING FREEDOM AND OWNING THE STREET

Positive freedom of mobility is the freedom to do. It should be decoupled from the materials that support this freedom, such as a car, because materials are merely a means to an end. Freedom is not the car, and it is not a car-free mobilities landscape either, but rather the ability to exploit the ambiguities and cracks in the current system (Sager 2006). In this way, positive freedom is liberation from social and material constraints of the mobility landscape. Play can also bring a liberation from social and material constraints (Stevens 2007) and free people to engage in public street space temporarily, but this play needs to provide the particular capabilities needed to deal with resistance in the everyday mobility landscape for that freedom to last.

The forces that shape the current mobilities system regulate and hinder (negative freedom) the mobility of individuals in the mobile, spatial and social dimensions of everyday life. The wide range of freedom of mobility experienced by respondents reflects the deeply unequal experience of the social reality (Hannam et al 2006). While some can quite easily overcome these resistances and can master a large extent of contiguous public space with a strong sense of autonomy (positive

freedom), such as Ridwaan and Achmat, others use resources (car), carefully chosen walking routes (opportunity freedom) and access to CID protection (process freedom) to piece together a smaller patchwork of public places they can navigate, such as Irene, Helga and Razeena. Elsie is trapped within Observatory and therefore has access to the smallest extent of public street space (low access to opportunity freedom - a car or train ticket, low access to process freedom to have a say in street governance – cannot pay for rent/home ownership), and her use of this space is highly regulated such that she occupies only the margins of the physical street.

Navigating the streets for Ridwaan is an essential part of his everyday social play. His social street repertoire has been built on an adolescence of non-instrumental social wandering and explorations that expanded his bounds (Stevens 2007) of freedom from the home to the wider suburb and beyond. In Contrast, for Elsie, playful interaction for her is not an escape from utility of mundane everyday life but necessary to charm and soften security or develop relationships with people to support her without room for escaping physical or social constraints, enjoying unmediated socialising for enjoyment's sake or creating a public space that suits her needs.

For Ridwaan *OSCT* is only a minor, slightly more exotic extension of his rich everyday encounters with difference. The mobilities landscape of *OSCT* did not enhance his freedom of mobility or match the radical play of “transgression of social constraints, the exploration of the social world, one’s own body and imagination” (Stevens 2007: 25) that his youth allowed. It did, however, bring some variety to the local public street space, outsiders from Observatory and other suburbs finding comfort in his public street space. For others without access to this liberating teenage experience, *OSCT* took people to places they had never been (Helga and Irene), or let them dwell and enjoy social inclusion for a while where that is not normally an option (Elsie). Razeena was unsettled by talk of closing the road to cars for *OSCT*, because if the street were blocked she would be immobilised.

## CONTESTED MOBILITY AND DIVISION IN THE EVERYDAY

The “mobility (of people, of ideas, of things) as a geographical fact ... lies at the centre of constellations of **power**, the creation of **identities** and the micro-geographies of **everyday life**.” (Cresswell 2010: 551). Identity of people and place play a role as either resisting or enabling individual freedom of mobility, and is therefore tied-up with the power dynamics of everyday mobile, spatial and social divisions. In the case of Salt River and Observatory, divides come about

despite a collective ideal that is largely about tolerance and inclusivity. The variety of cultural identities, collective practices and ideas about place amount to a many different ideas about the primary purpose of the street. There is a tendency to resolve these differences by exclusion (Miraftab 2007), marginalisation (Van Blerk 2013), regulation and avoidance. Differences and tensions become divides when people exclude themselves physically by retreating to the safety of their car; avoid 'problem' areas altogether; or have unwanted people removed. Those excluded, avoided and marginalised resist with mobile tactics of their own. As such, divisions here describe bordering spaces of unrelenting contestation over power. The mobile, spatial and social divides define the everyday relations of Lower Main Road. *OSCT* aimed to bridge these divides with their day-long event down this street.

#### THE MOBILE DIVIDE: STREETS DOMINATED BY CARS

The mobilities landscape of Salt River and Observatory is dominated by cars, the main roads working tirelessly to deliver people and goods to their destinations without them directly interacting with the public street space. The mobile divide describes unequal access to (private) benefits of automobility, unequal exposure to the dis-benefits of car-dominated streets (Urry 2011) and the consequential inequality and contestation over access to safe and unhindered mobility along the streets (Sager 2005). The car can be a tool of empowerment that some depend on for freedom (Urry 2011), as exemplified by Razeena, Helga, Irene, Achmat, but is simultaneously a hindrance to the the freedom of pedestrians and other non-motorised transport users (Irene and Helga, Achmat, Elsie). The effect of the car is unevenly spread over the geographical landscape and its affect differs depending on individuals' ability to overcome the resistance it offers (Ridwaan being best at the group describe previously).

Motorised transport is considered vital to business owners and those vulnerable to crime but are a hindrance to the freedom of pedestrians (particularly children and elderly), skaters and cyclists (Sager 2006). Children no longer use the streets dominated by cars to play on and pedestrians are at the mercy of the physical threat and pollution of cars. Trucks and people driving fast have killed children and residents in Salt River and Observatory (Respondent 1, Respondent 23). Cars therefore injure the social potential of public streets space, shunting social interactions off the fast-paced main roads and dampening social potential along secondary roads. Even in Observatory's business district, where car congestion limits the freedom of mobility of cars, moves to changed parking bay configurations and pedestrianise streets are hotly contested by those who have grown

their social and business life around the car-dominated mobilities landscape (Obs *Life* 2008 - 2014). There have been a number of proposals to pedestrianise this part of the road but it has met firm opposition and failed (Respondent 1).

Cars can divide street users into isolated hierarchical social strata (wealthier in private cars, less wealthy public transport etc.) such that social encounters with others outside of one's own demographic is unlikely (Hannam et al 2011). This is partially the case in Salt River and Observatory in that wealthier residents have access to opportunities for shopping, recreation and jobs outside of the suburbs (opportunity freedom) that other residents do not, and their access to mobility enables them to avoid crime, danger and dirt more effectively (Irene, Helga and Razeena but not Elsie). However, a level of disregard for class distinction, narrow streets and short distances to amenities encourage even the relatively wealthy to walk. Values that reject class structure encourage walking as an identity despite wealth and the mixed class social structure of the suburb, loosening the prestige factor of driving.

Despite the threat of the car, narrow roads, on-street parking and *OSCID* signage encouraging slower speeds in residential areas (decreased positive freedom for people-in-cars) allow for pedestrians and skaters to find some freedom of mobility on secondary roads. A few houses off the main road of Salt River it is full of pedestrian movement of children, teenagers, parents and groups of people talking and interacting familiarly. The main road is dominated by cars, but cars slow down in the narrower roads of the residential areas allowing the streets to host an interconnected community of people. The traffic is not slow enough to allow children to skate and walk without caution, but the interconnected social life between houses allows children to dart between different houses and play together in public street space. Skaters and cyclists tend to use these secondary routes to avoid encountering cars and trucks.

Shifting between different mobilities is a strategy to navigate different challenges the mobility landscape poses. This can lead to dependence on car mobility if no alternative is created or provided. Adaptable mobility strategies is similarly important for navigating different people and parts of an area, as describe next, where social structures play an important role in shifting the freedom of mobility of different street users.

The governance practices, norms and values in Salt River and Observatory create semi-permeable public space, keeping the entire range of residents and street-users from fully participating in the public street life of each other's suburb. The spatial divide describes an isolation of different public spaces from one another. This is created by differential ability for people and information to move between particular public street spaces in an area, impeding residents from incorporating these places in their geographical tapestry of places of familiarity, understanding, safety and belonging (Sager 2006). Paasche (2012) describes these isolated spaces as parallel public spaces because each has their own set of street governance practices (affecting opportunity and process freedom) and norms and values (affecting negative freedom). These two factors, coupled with one's capacity to overcome these resistances (positive freedom), shape one's experience of freedom of mobility within a network of public spaces (Sager 2005) and the total amount of geographical space one can master.

#### Street governance practices

Both Salt River and Observatory have struggled with drugs and crime that has kept residents from fully enjoying the social potential of public spaces, but their approach to the issue has been different, affecting the freedom of mobility and use of public street space in the two areas accordingly. In 2008, OBSID, a privately funded improvement district, was introduced to bolster municipal policing and cleaning services in Observatory. In five years the “cleaner, safer, smarter” streets increased the sense of safety for many residents (Respondent 1, *ObsLife*, 2008 – 2013), in line with Paasche's (2005) contention that private actors can increase access of public spaces for certain people.

While street spaces and other public spaces have become more comfortable for family-oriented residents, CIDs are not fully equipped or motivated to solve crime themselves. As such, drug-dealing has not been resolved but displaced and concentrated into bars and other less visible spaces. Drug use remains very high with 71 overdoses in 2014 (Respondent 1). Despite the improvement in freedom of mobility it offers some, the CID model remains contested. The tension is rooted in an underlying disagreement between 'wild', creative and liberal part of the community, fundamentally displeased with crime prevention tactics that are understood to discriminate by race and class (Miraftab 2007), and ambitious business owners and family/village-oriented

residents that desire a higher level of safety and gentle street culture (Irene, Achmat, Ridwaan, Helga, Respondent 1 and *ObsLife*, 2008 – 2013).

A parallel experience of improved crime prevention in the public spaces of Salt River was achieved with a different approach:

(In Salt River) crime has gone down. Every year it goes down. It used to be evil in this place. PAGAD (People Against Gangsterism And Crime) was here....If they hear of drugs and corruption they kill... (Drug-dealers were) burnt alive by PAGAD. That is why criminals go to Observatory. But PAGAD was mainly for drug dealers. If you deal drugs it is a big thing. Gangsterism is seen as a good thing because it brings discipline but drugs are just for money – dirty money. (Ridwaan)

Relative to the radical, violent and drug intolerant group PAGAD, OBSID is seen as having a softer approach to crime. And because Observatory is wealthier, theft from Observatory residents by Salt River residents is seen as safer and more acceptable; an act of stealing from the rich and giving to the poor (Ridwaan, Respondent 1).

Despite this, Observatory is perceived as being safer, partly because its aesthetic is wealthier and cleaner (with suggestions of race biases) aided by OBSID cleaning services. Down Lower Main Road, OBSID's cleaning services stop where Salt River starts, such that the Salt River stretch of Lower Main Road appears visibly dirtier than Observatory.

To Achmat, Observatory's privileges create resentment. His leisure walk from Salt River to Observatory is marked by this sense of injustice and inequality:

“There are nice things happening just here (on the border between Obs and Salt River) but it is dark and dirty down the Salt River section of the street. Is it not the same street?” (Achmat).

This dark and dirty perception has safety implications for perceptions of women's safety in Salt River:

“There is a lot of darkness here. Further down in Obs you have light. Think especially from a woman's perspective walking home from work late. It costs someone nothing to wait on the corner and grab a woman” (Achmat).

In addition to the dynamics created by different street governance practices, norms and values of each area has developed its own distinct historical and context specific characteristics over time (Paasche 2012), influencing the dynamics of freedom of mobility between the two suburbs.

#### Norms and values

Observatory and Salt River are each living with a tension between their values (open, family-oriented and tolerant) and everyday realities of the discomfort of sharing space with different cultures, inequality, and people lost to narcotics or alcohol (Irene, Achmat, Ridwaan, Helga, *ObsLife*, 2008 – 2013). The scales of the struggle fluctuate between understanding their public space as safe, shared family space on the one hand, and as dangerous criminal space one must hide from on the other.

Outdated and hyperbolic crime discourse creates a skewed perception of street safety in Salt River for Observatory residents, while stereotypic ideas about safety in a poor 'coloured' area, and misleading aesthetics corroborates this perceptions, keeping Observatory residents from Salt River. In Observatory, there is a perception that Salt River is an intriguing place but it is dangerous and gang-ridden beyond the commercial shop spaces. This contrasts with the perception of Salt River by its own residents, who are troubled by drug use and people sleeping in parks, but who also enjoy a lively family-centred street culture and community-run soccer for young (mostly) boys. There is risk walking Salt River, as there is anywhere, but there is very little information about the enviable parts of the street culture, maintaining isolated and divided norms of the past. With little newspaper coverage of Salt River and little to encourage the mobility of 'vulnerable' pedestrians (women, elderly and children) through Salt River, this outdated understanding of the space prevails. OBSID makes Observatory appear the cleaner, wealthier and safer looking area but it remains the space where drug dealing is easier (Respondent 1, Ridwaan).

#### Overcoming resistances

Despite the governance practices, norms and values that keep some parts of the populations in their own area, people from both Salt River and Observatory hold a curiosity for one another and some have developed strategies to reach across into each others' suburbs. Others cannot overcome the resistances (fear of crime, discriminatory policing, inequality and resentment etc.) and remain trapped in their house or in the public space of their own suburb. A desire to move

through each other's streets by foot is supported by town planning that pre-dates automobility and is therefore scaled to pedestrianism: narrow roads, limited spaces for parking and houses that open directly onto the street (opportunity freedom).

Those with the most freedom to explore were the men in this study, describing and showing little discomfort in crossing between Salt River and Observatory, a space that women respondents described as too intimidating, cold, industrial, and dangerous-looking (hindering negative freedom). The men show no shift in mobility practice here on their map while women shifted to the safety of the car or avoided the space altogether. A strong rootedness in the area or sense of confidence in dealing with crime (carrying a gun, knowing how drug dealing works - positive freedom) seems to underlie this freedom to overcome resistance. They showed no hesitation in moving and explore the streets freely and leisurely, knew the details of the streets well, and indicated no change in their mobility practice through public street space of neighbouring suburb.

Reports from respondents fit with race and class-based criminalisation of pedestrians by police and security, which stifles this freedom. Young coloured men described random arrests. Despite the threat of arrest, Ridwaan maintains feeling safe and free to walk where he likes. A black man described sticking to the commercial Lower Main Road to avoid the residential area where police and CID patrol harass him. Another young black man described his tactic of walk with shopping to show his belonging in the area and keep security and police patrol from harassing him. The white men in this study did not report this issue although there is an news article of one shocked white man being harassed five years ago (*ObsLife*, 2008 – 2013).

For two Observatory women in this study, fear and misunderstanding encourages mobility strategies of avoidance of the public street space of Salt River. Because Observatory is cleaner and lights are better maintained, Salt River appears darker at night and dirtier. The piece of streetscape between Observatory and Salt River is described as open, exposed, industrial, dirty, intimidatingly dark, noisy, hosts a flow of drugs at night, and has a flow of fast vehicles including trucks during the day. Its neglected aesthetic seems proof of its reputation shaping the daily mobility strategies of Observatory residents:

I don't walk Lower Main often. I don't like walking from the Magnet (Theatre) onwards (towards Salt River). It becomes industrial feeling and there are few people around.

While Helga and Irene have friends and business in Salt River, they avoid uninviting “shitty and dirty” public street space in between and shift from walking in Observatory to driving through Salt River, even though they prefer walking.

Elsie is knowledgeable about Salt River, and knows how to navigate the area well but she was very cautious in the routes she took us. She and her partner do not travel to Salt River because the distance to is too much given they must bring all their possessions, are usually hungry and partially disabled. Elsie would not go alone fearing violence from people there. They have been socially excluded from family in the area and avoid trouble from people they know in the area. Under bridges and parks are too rough and associated with crime putting them in danger of being arrested. Two other women respondents would not use Lower Main at all as a pedestrian, citing drug issues reported in the newspapers as their fear. Razeena will not leave her house at all without a car.

In Observatory there is a persistent racialised stereotype about the gender relations one should expect between the men of 'coloured' Salt River and the women of 'white' Observatory playing a part disciplining women from walking there (See *Appendix D* for more details). The groups of men and women I encountered were open to conversation and nothing but respectful. Adaptation: norms and values, inequality so dress and modest is important - Ridwaan

Depends on mobility practice...

Passing by on a bike or in a car, Salt River appears dirty and dilapidated but a pedestrian can experience the softer details of Salt River. A sense that crime has dropped over the last five years; a displacement of some of the drug dealing activity to Observatory, and a long established sense of community for many means this outwardly decrepit looking suburb has many satisfied residents.

The earlier discussion on everyday mobility experiences suggests that part of freedom through the streets is developing capabilities in negotiating the streetscape. This section on the spatial divide suggests the other part is the material cues of the street that symbolise and exacerbate existing differences and tensions and frighten women into cars and encourage dependence on men, keep criminalised men identities from residential areas. For these women the lack of accurate information and necessary indicators of safety encourage a switch to automobility adding to the heavy traffic in the space between Observatory and Salt River.

In this mobilities study, social divides describe the inability to relate and share public street space successfully with others, particularly people significantly different from each other. Part of successful encounters of difference is a cosmopolitan sensibility: an urban imagination and set of “everyday competencies of negotiation and flexibility designed to manage change, unfamiliarity and inequality” (Butcher 2011). In a diverse and hierarchical city people require these skills “to manage new interactions with difference” across the city (Butcher 2011) as part of managing friction and negotiating belonging (Massey 2005). In this study we argue that a cosmopolitan sensitivity must be coupled with a robust freedom of mobility to allow for playful acts such as recreational trespass (Garrett 2014, Heins 2015, Stevens 2007) that transcend social and spatial bounds (Stevens 2007) and open up the possibility of convivial encounters with difference that *OSCT* seeks.

#### Relating and sharing public space

In the everyday mobilities landscape there is a social divide between residents (who live in houses) and the population of people who sleep on the streets (street residents). Street residents encroach on negative freedom of housed residents. Part of the house-dwelling population respond with flexibility and accommodate the presence of people sleeping on the street, believing in their right to be. Other house-dwelling residents use their autonomy (process freedom) to hinder both positive and negative freedoms of the street residents to lessen the hindrance that street residents pose to their own negative freedom.

Although many people have been sleeping on the streets for years and have strong bonds with long terms residents and the large student population, they are excluding from restaurant space and their resting places are made hostile and unwelcoming with spikes. The street residents remain socially 'out' and spatially 'out of place'. They are kept tirelessly mobile as a 'safety management' practice by security officers. OBSIDs tactics of mobile regulation, marginalisation and exclusion are geographical expressions of the social tension between conflicting desires for what the streets should be used for. Street residents who avoid exclusion and form bonds with homeowners can stake a claim to a sleeping space but they are highly regulated and marginalised in their use of street space. The pressure to go an unspecified 'elsewhere' strains these weak

anchorings and does not allow the stability, resources and sense of belonging that street residence need.

Everyday cosmopolitan sensibility

Observatory is known for being liberal, and many residents identify with its acceptance and tolerance for street residents. It has an urban imagination that embraces difference and inequality but struggles with the everyday reality of living with these tensions. Despite many house-living residents knowing and engaging with street residents, they are talked about as 'bergies', a word associated with anti-social behaviour: criminality, mental illness and unpredictability; dirt and a poor and unpolished aesthetic; a desperate 'harassment' for money.

Despite liking Observatory for its tolerance, Irene and Helga design their pedestrian mobility to avoid encountering and associating with this group of people. The street residents and aggressive begging is part of the cacophony of movement and noise in congested streets they avoid. Irene and Helga prefer walking but avoid areas where street residents dwell or drive if they have to pass through.

Below the railway line there is no sense of danger for kids and dogs. More threatening is Station Road with hooting and agro drivers. It is congested and threatening. The cars are in charge there. The homeless and drunks are there. That is not a problem but it changes the vibe. They call out, ask for money and hold your kids. - Helga

It is not just the presence of 'bergies' but the association with them that must be avoided.

When I walk my dogs I avoid congested areas, the people and the cars, so I use Florence Road. Also, it would be terribly embarrassing if my dog pooped in front of a shop. Like a bergie. - Irene

OBSID is the mediator between the street residents and some house-dwelling residents, regulating, marginalising and excluding them to open the streets for housed-residents.

The (street residents) drink and make a noise. Sleep on people's stoep. Then we get complaints. We don't allow begging at robots or shops. (The social worker) gets them IDs and everything needed to go home. We pay for the ticket...Most homeless don't want help. The best we can do is make sure they behave. And don't drink and don't stay in one place too long. - OBSID staff member

OBSID's "cleaner, safer, smarter" Observatory means house-dwelling residents walk the streets, and might momentarily encounter street residents, but this is not the same as sharing street space. Despite a generosity from the liberal house-dwelling residents and a 'destruction of class' in the area, people's attitudes and mobile practices demonstrate a desire to separate and dissociate from the 'bergies' in subtle ways.

(Residents) are concerned with people sleeping on the streets but they think they are better than you. Rather uplift them. Encourage them, uplift them. Everyday, people are concerned - Elsie

The sense of exclusion is coupled with dependence on others and constant torturous shuffling of her and her goods and constant pressure to leave. Because of this, belonging is not something she experiences. She worries incessantly about being uprooted from Observatory and so her relations with housed-residents are about a need for food and shelter rather than sharing:

Usually in Salt River we get wet from the rain so we sleep here. The other day we were making our bed and security came. Called their friend on the radio. We didn't have our tent yet so we told the security off. The (owners of a business on this road) give us permission (to sleep here). They give us food sometimes. A few weeks ago OBSID woke us up at 5am! - Elsie

The presence of people sleeping on the street is unavoidable in lieu of a working government social support. Many on both side have the skills to manage the tension this brings, but will remain a constriction on the satisfactory freedom of movement for both housed residents and people sleeping on the street, given that their needs from the street space will continue to conflict. Street residents using the space as private space and housed residents wanting it to function as public space. The social incongruity between the two groups manifest as mobile practices of avoidance by house-dwelling residents and practices of exclusion, marginalisation and regulation of street residents by the CID. Street residents use counter-tactics of avoidance and weak social anchoring. Elsie is enclosed within Observatory but lives in dependency and fear on the margins and scraps of public street space, making social relations difficult. The poor live in the shadow of the middle income space owners, and as such, street residents might be physically present but they are socially excluded and the fine details of their mobile practices show them to be ghostly orphan figures in the public street life; effectively non-residents within the material and social structures of Observatory.

## The divides

Three divides have been examined: the mobile, the spatial and the social. The mobile divide describes the effect of car dominance on the social integrity of street. Automobility brings inequality in road use, division and elitism that quashes the social potential of main roads and stifles the social potential of the side streets. While socially destructive for everyone and physically dangerous for non-car drivers, a car has become an essential part of navigating difficult social situations and avoiding confrontation and danger – for those that can afford them.

The spatial divide describes a stifled flow of people between Salt River and Observatory. The two adjacent suburbs show interest in one another and reach across to one another but differential ease of movement between the two areas creates parallel public spaces (Paasche 2012) that are very different despite their common family values, an appreciation for their different but diverse street user populations and close proximity.

The social divide talks to the everyday social realities of shared space. Even though pockets of Observatory and Salt River are people-centred as opposed to car-centred, social divides manifest themselves as finer grained mobile practices of regulation, exclusion and marginalisation that curtail the free movement of both housed residents and street residents.

All three divides talk to everyday flows of people and things in Salt River and Observatory. The *OSCT* intervention – a complete shift in the regular rhythm of the main street through these suburbs – changed the flow of people and things along the everyday mobilities landscape. Did *OSCT*'s intervention on the everyday mobilities landscape bridge mobile, social and spatial divides? Or did it temporarily exacerbate or cover-up everyday tensions?

## THE PARTY

*OSCT* created a car-free space by barricading a stretch of road through Observatory and Salt River, and adding activation points with playful activities such as capoeira, dance, chalk-drawing and water slides.

'The party', that is the *OSCT* event, was a day apart from the everyday mobilities landscape. The party spectacularised the mobilities landscape of Salt River and Observatory in that the personality of Observatory and Salt River and their everyday traits and challenges remained, but these characteristics were morphed; exaggerated or down-played to different degrees (Pinder 2000). The

mobile, spatial and social divides were in some cases **bridged**, but in other cases the delicate beginnings of connections across divides were **burned**, or existing divides were **covered-up** temporarily by the event structure only to be re-exposed after 'the party' was over (ibid).

#### THE CHANGING MOBILITIES LANDSCAPE DURING *OSCT*

The *OSCT* team stimulated play through organised events such as dance and aerobics giving those included a greater freedom in their street use options (increased positive freedom) while a different mobilities landscape facilitated different means of social interaction. According to Hamilton-Baillie (2008), dampening the presence of cars should allow social interaction to flourish, and according to Stevens (2012), play should allow social and spatial barriers to be overcome. By removing cars and introducing play, *OSCT* aimed to create the circumstances under which everyday social barriers and divides that usually mediate everyday interaction are broken by immediate, first-hand and direct social interaction, bypassing everyday constraints. Given the immobilising effect of everyday constraints have on some street users, this required a fundamental shift in street user's freedom of mobility (Sager 2006) such that people with very little freedom in the everyday become free to move and engage in unmediated social interaction.

*OSCT* event creates a space that allowed some people to test and transcend social boundaries (Stevens 2007). In this way play is a *means* to escapes social limits and expectations and temporarily create more freedom. What Quentin Stevens (2007) and Bradley Garrett (2014) are describing as freedom in relation to play is the enhancement of positive 'capability' freedoms to further ones existing freedom. What Stevens (2007) definition does not include is recognition of the foundational freedom (strong negative and positive freedom and strong moorings) that one needs to have in order to enjoy testing social boundaries in the first place.

Elsie, Helga and Irene experienced a decrease in their usual restrictions on mobility (increased negative freedom) in that everyday threats and fears were dampened. *OSCT* created a family environment by managing crime, begging, alcohol and car movement. While Elsie and other street residents were prevented from 'hustling' (begging) and drinking (decreased negative freedom). This compromise allowed them to be socially included in the event and therefore increased their sense of autonomy and sense of belonging within the event space. Car-drivers also experience a restriction in their usual freedom of mobility during *OSCT* but reacted differently depending how dependent they are on automobility for their overall freedom of mobility.

That takes nothing away from the enjoyment of the event and connections that might have been enjoyed but points to the suitability of the event for creating freedom of mobility in everyday life. The important distinction here is that *OSCT* is removing hindrances (increasing negative freedom) from people's freedom of mobility but not developing their street capabilities (positive freedom) so that the freedom of mobility they experienced during *OSCT* does not translate to everyday life after the party. There is a qualitative difference between the kind of freedom that *OSCT* facilitates (from decreased hindrance to negative freedoms) and the kind of capabilities that allow everyday freedom in mobility like Ridwaan's everyday social play (increased positive freedom of mobility).

*OSCT* was a threat to Razeena's freedom of mobility because her freedom depends on open access to her car. Razeena missed both *OSCT* events despite living 20 metres from the event because she is so restricted to her house and cut off from the social 'grapevine'. This was an opportunity for her to become comfortable with using the street with the security blanket of her car and expand her street navigation capabilities (positive freedom). Restrictions on her negative freedom of mobility prevent her from expanding her freedom at all. Razeena is immobilised by fear of crime and does not have the foundational negative freedom to allow her to grow her positive freedom through street play such as opportunities to do so at *OSCT* events and will continue to rely on her car, house and isolation for a sense of safety and mobility.

#### BRIDGING THE MOBILE DIVIDE

*OSCT* aimed to be an intervention of the mobile divide. That is, poke a hole in car hegemony, question the unquestioned, and open up the freedom to choose an alternative (Sager 2005). More than a technical transition from cars to NMT, this shift interferes with dominant social relations of the street (Debord 1968) by creating shared space (Hamilton-Baillie 2008). This alternative aims to centre the needs of people over the car, breaking down the car's isolated hierarchical social structure, and improving access to public street for those usually excluded by the elite private car use. By shifting the street rules to favour NMT, the freedom of car-drivers is curtailed, simultaneously reducing hindrances to NMT's freedom: free of the speed, noise and pollution of the car, the street should open up for other mobility practices that are more conducive to social interaction.

A car-free street immediately improves the opportunity freedom of the mobilities landscape, because the danger posed by the car (that hinders the negative freedom of all other street users) is

removed, increasing realistic alternative options of travel such as walking or skating. It also removes the advantage of having a car by removing the rights of car-driver in the space (decreases car-driver positive freedom). During the event, the soft-shelled users of the streets, that had been displaced to secondary streets, found freedom to move and dwell in primary street space, shifting the power from elite private wealth of individual car owner hegemony to people-centred *public* space, where private car access was no long a barrier to participation.

By tipping the power balance from private to public, from car to NMT, from isolated car bubbles to open street space, it was not only the kinds of people that participated in street life that changed, but the nature of the movement and interaction too. Businesses along Lower Main Road from Salt River to Observatory describe everyday Lower Main Road as a busy business-centred street, but during *OSCT* the work drive relaxed without the dogged flow of cars. The mood of the place lifted from relief as freedom for leisurely mobility opened up. Businesses describe seeing more people on foot (10 000 is an estimate, Respondent 1), but instead of a sense of weariness of the danger of the car and keeping up with the hast of productivity, people strolling and “hanging”. People were playful, more interactive with an interest in the people that had come from elsewhere.

The dominance of fast pace automobility erodes the possibility for (s)low-mobility lifestyles (Sager 2006). *OSCT* presented a show of the lifestyle we lose by favouring automobility. A gentle rhythm and pace of the flow of people contributed to a sense of safety and containment that reduced stress, a key factor in creating safe people-centred public space conducive to social interactions. Beyond the pace of strolling speed the ability to think coherently deteriorates as the effort of the mind is directed towards the demand of keeping up the uncomfortable pace. As such, shifting to a comfortable moving pace for the body allows a different state of mind more conducive to challenging social interactions (Kahneman 2011: 1-11) such as engaging with people different from oneself. A safer street space shifted the social composition in that children and the elderly were out in noticeably larger numbers than normal. The elderly, children and people sleeping on the streets felt safer and were afforded more tolerance, with more emotional energy available for engaging with the vulnerable. The street space that is usually dominated by a demand for speed switched to value family, togetherness and tolerance. The visual spectacle of people playing, engaging and embracing jovially created a sense of openness, freedom and togetherness that held those who participated. The bubbling up of social effervescence – this sense of lightness and rush

of energy when people experience togetherness (Chayko 2002 in Büscher & Urry 2009) lasted for a few hours post the event, after which the pace returned to its serious everyday business march.

Although the event removed the isolated private capsule of the car, the hierarchical social structure persisted through inequality in access to flows of people with money, which continued towards the lively entertain strip in Observatory. Eighty-two percent of businesses (n=34) said they noticed more pedestrian movement in front of their shops but this was not evenly distributed as the shops in the last fifth of Lower Main Road in Salt River reported having less customers and having their regular clients blocked from reaching the shops. People usually driven by car were replaced with people on foot flowing towards Observatory. The visitors brought an extra influx of cash from outside of the area to the highly competitive business district of Observatory. This relieved a bit of tension between some Observatory businesses, but not every business in Observatory did better, depending on how the flow of people was changed past their business (some reported foot traffic slowed past their shop); whether their type of business was favoured by this event (restaurants and bars); and the amount of experience the business had in adapting to large flows of customers (stocked up, ran specials and increased staff).

Shop owners who did experience the crowds and action knew that the event was about community and togetherness. The crowds of people and their interaction, emotion, sense of togetherness – the 'vibe' – spreads the idea of OSCT along the street. An understanding of the values and value of OSCT, and a sense of inclusion in the event, did spread beyond Observatory into Salt River, but the reach was patchy at the Salt River end of the road.

This slower pace affected side streets off the main roads of Salt River because cars could not flow freely through the area. A regular street-skater and his brother enjoyed the change:

“I want (OSCT) to be here again. I can take the whole Chatham Road. Usually there is always a car or a truck coming – then you'll be dead!” ...The street was more quiet during Open Streets. Chatham was quiet. (Ridwaan)

Despite loss of business for some, most businesses want events like these to continue because valuing community above business is acceptable, but only 4 per year. It is understood as an event, and not seen as something that would fit with everyday life. did not inspire a different kind of interaction between existing relationships of shop owner. OSCT relieved of the danger and dominance of the car, the socially embedded nature of the car system (Dennis and Urry 200) begs

the question: what kind of impact can a one day spectacle make on the car-dependency that keeps everyday streets divided? Reflecting back on the complete (Razeena) or partial (Irene, Helga, Achmat) dependence some have on cars for their mobile freedom and for protection from fear and crime, it appears that interventions directed towards the social root of the problems that keep people driving even when they prefer to walk (fear of crime, fear of criminalisation etc.) are needed to truly bridge a car-centred mobile divide. *OSCT* is a good showcase of the quality of public street space without cars but does not intervene in the social root of the mobile divide.

#### EXACERBATING THE SPATIAL DIVIDE

The spatial divide describes the parallel public street spaces of Observatory and Salt River (Paasche 2012), created by different street governance practices, norms and values, between which the flow of people and information is stifled. In everyday life this hinders residents' freedom of mobility and impedes them from incorporating the public space of adjacent suburbs in their geographical tapestry of places of familiarity, understanding, safety and belonging (Sager 2006). To bridge this divide, requires disrupting everyday power play and opening the possibility for the disaffected to have some sort of shaping power (process freedom) over urban processes that shape freedom of mobility. In this case, the planning of the event (Harvey 2008, Sager 2006).

#### Governance

class, resentment with inequality, race – affecting opportunity and process freedom)

*OSCT* choice to partner with OBSID meant that the louder, wealthier Observatory was engaged with more than the already neglected Salt River side of the street. Favouritism through better cleaning, patrolling and general maintenance services (Miraftab 2007) of the Observatory side of the street in everyday life was replicated during the *OSCT* event in that OBSID favoured engagement with Observatory business district. Salt River turned itself inwards and shied away from the hype and ended up participating less in shaping the *OSCT* event than Observatory. A lack of experience in presenting itself to the world and relatively more factional leader structure than OBSID, resulted in Observatory's street culture became louder and bolder than Salt River and drowning it out.

Although most businesses in Salt River accepted the *OSCT* event, in partnering with an Observatory organisation OBSID, *OSCT* facilitated an exacerbation of existing divides that resulted in some businesses in Salt River missing out on notifications of street closure and losing business.

Reduced opportunity freedom, and excluded people from decision making process offending their process freedom, adding to existing inequality and racial tensions and created a sense of exclusion:

I didn't know what *Open Streets* was about. I had a fight with the police because they wouldn't let cars in and out and residents to their houses. They didn't inform us nicely. If the road is closed my customers won't come through. ... how can we participate if we don't know about it? It was a fun day. I would have participated. (Achmat)

Another irate business owner, forced to closed on the day of *OSCT*, experienced slow business the whole of the week that followed. Keeping cars out took away his negative freedom of mobility and offended his sense of autonomy. He was unimpressed that he was left out of the planning process and unacknowledged as legitimate business with customers to maintain. This added to existing racial tensions between white and black business owners in the area (respondent 27) adding to the insult of exclusion and a sense that there was no space to represent his voice

I could see they had been planning this for a long time and I hear on the day! It was a parade of cultures from elsewhere colonising this street.

This owner experienced a 'thieving' of the street by *OSCT*. Without correcting enough for *OBSID*'s favouritism, the *OSCT-OBSID* partnership exacerbated existing tension rather than building bridges and denied these businesses a chance to have their say in whether or not the event happened at all.

#### BRIDGING THE SPATIAL DIVIDE

Perceptions of- and differences in norms and values in neighbouring suburbs affect the everyday mobility landscape, creating resistances for mobility between Salt River and Observatory. These perceptions created a sense of isolation and suspicion hindering negative freedom. Women in this study, particularly poor women, were least able to overcome these resistances (positive freedom) and were therefore excluded from making the public streets of Salt River part of their places of familiarity, understanding, safety and belonging (Sager 2006).

*OSCT* created a streetscape that replaced the isolating and suspicious perception of the space between Salt River and Observatory (that usually keeps them from engaging with this public street space) with an environment of familiar norms and values for two Observatory respondents. *OSCT* created an environment where their current set of mobility capabilities (positive freedom) and

their identity felt catered for in parts of Salt River that they are usually excluded from. Part of this was that cars were not present. Other factors include the material aesthetic of the street and the enchanting play-filled atmosphere, which enabled them to bridge their everyday divide with Salt River.

Crossing boundaries - danger is a playful obstacle

A playful setting encouraged “transgression of social constraints, the exploration of the social world... and imagination” (Stevens 2007: 25). The game was such that Irene dared to cross it.

We walked all the way to Bijou (2-3 blocks past where she usually shifts to driving) because we had to see the wire and wooden dinosaur (Lizzy). We really enjoyed the first one. All along the road there was yoga, dancing, boys playing soccer with a football club. I remember the chess too - Irene

Moving spectacles such as a giant mechanical dinosaur on wheels drew people out of their comfort zones by enticing them to move. The streetscape was an invitation to explore beyond and claim new territory. Within a crowd that made her voyage unnoticeable, she followed her curiosity and ventured leisurely into spaces she is not usually comfortable. Play turned something dangerous into something 'dangerous', something to revel in the defiance of. The place in-between Observatory and Salt River lost the sense of danger because there was a real sense of safety through a controlled environment and a sense of togetherness.

Automobility was turned on its head during *OSCT*. Attendees revelled in having taken the street from the car and really enjoyed the lack of urgency while claiming the street back from the car and being relieved of the usual pace and timetable of demands.

It was nice to see people physically active, not driving. People had more time so they could talk. They had more time and not in this rush, rush rush mode. It was really pleasant watching people, seeing people having fun. A lot of people pulled couches on to the street and were relaxing in the middle of the road with their feet on the coffee table! (Irene)

The game was claiming back the space usually designated for utility, for leisure and putting feet up on the table in the face of productive demands. In this way, spaces that were cold and intimidating became comfortable as the backdrop of people relaxing signalled a space of safety.

During Open Streets I loved Lower Main. I didn't feel unsafe and it was child-friendly. Everyone wanted to be in the area - Helga

The street during *OSCT* became a safe space for the growing family population in the area. The street that in the everyday space is described as “shitty and dirty” became safe.

(In the everyday use of Lower Main Road) the place (between Salt River and Observatory) is open and people feel unsafe when it is open. Filling it with people helps this feeling (Respondent 11)

It was fantastic! It felt fresh. There were Obs families around and that unsafe feeling wasn't there. Part of that section of Lower Main is usually deserted. It felt less deserted as Obs spills over along that part of the road. I could walk there in the day light - Helga

The playful atmosphere was fresh and signalled time for play and something new, allowing the everyday mobility practices to be abandoned. There was a change in the norms and values of the street, an extension of Observatory further down Lower Main Road that allowed the mobile capabilities (positive freedom) that Irene and Helga have already to be usable in a new space. Rather than giving a new understanding or ability that would better overcome these resistances that will return in everyday life.

The event was widely appreciated in Observatory and Salt River, removing resistances to freedom of mobility and allowing many to enjoy a taste of a (s)low-mobilities lifestyle.

People were welcoming. I could walk in the middle of the road.... I was walking as usual but socialising, meeting a lot of new people. They came from Obs side with bikes and prams all the way to this end. They moved in a friendly way. They would greet, we would greet back and then we would chat. (Ridwaan)

As an intervention of everyday street relations, *OSCT* aimed to contest and change “dominant social relations and the social organisation of space” (Pinder 2000: 358). In part this was achieved by the change in the street manners and mannerisms – a cosmopolitan sensibility – that was inspired by the event. But, the structures that opened these freedoms and signalled a space of new norms and values were packed away, with nothing left to indicate that this new way of engaging with others on the streets – the new type of social and spatial relation – would continue.

To Ridwaan this is a safer option: “People were taking a chance coming down here.” People from wealthier areas like Observatory walk with their phones and jewellery hanging out are like sitting ducks in Salt River. The dress-code for women in Observatory is very different from conservative Salt River, where exercise clothes in liberal Observatory could get one mistaken for a prostitute in Salt River. In this way, walking (and perhaps cycling and skating) requires a sensitivity of place that driving does not. Walking without a sensitivity for differences in income, norms and values of different spaces can be dangerous. In this way, new kinds of positive freedom, bought about by learning everyday competencies particular to place (Butcher 2011) are necessary for maintaining the bridge across the spatial divide that the event, by the process of creating a safe play-filled streetscape (softening the hindrances of negative freedom), does not showcase.

#### COVERING UP THE SOCIAL DIVIDE

In everyday life, street residents and housed-residents have incompatible desires for the street. This tension is mediated by OBSID who regulate and marginalise (Van Blerk 2013) street residents mobility and use of street space to lessen their hindrance on housed residents' freedom of mobility. Some housed residents' urban imagination has no space to accommodate for difference and inequality and push for the exclusion of street residents (Miraftab 2007), while others show a desire for their inclusion, showing everyday competency in dealing with difference (Butcher 2009) through a flexibility in their mobility practice, avoiding the spaces in which street residents are seen as a threat to their safety. Neither housed residents nor street residents are fully satisfied with their freedom of mobility, but manage friction by co-existing in separate parts of the same street. This contestation over street space and freedom of mobility is a fight for a sense of belonging (Massey 2005), but for the most part, demonstrates and furthers the social exclusion of the street residents.

During *OSCT*, street resident and house-dwelling residents were able to overcome incompatible desires for the use of street space and share the space amicably. The streets were overwhelmed with a sea of families through which residents found safety and freedom to move. The skittish street residents agreed not to beg or 'party too hard' in exchange for a chance to join in. During *OSCT* the street residents came to rest 'in place' as part of the social for a few hours. Residents were more tolerant to the street residents and had more time for children having taking a break from pressures that usually keep them on the move.

On a day like that (during *OSCT*) there is more tolerance, to the odd-bods and to children. The bergies were partying, and that was okay (Irene)

Elsie (a street resident) described the difference in her experience of people during the event, a sense of social inclusion

It feels like you are from a different place and saw it for the first time. It's awesome. We were excited. It is what people can do with their feet and hands. People are very nice at *Open Streets*. It always people that gives food....(*OSCT* was) Nothing like: "I don't like you ... this and that". There was friendliness. (Elsie)

*OSCT* event meant that the usual income that Elsie derives from the flow of people down a particular street was disrupted. Despite this loss of the usual source of income and food for the day, she enjoyed the event.

(The street) was closed. We were so excited for it. They had everyone's attention. The parking was closed (her income) but that's no problem. We always enjoy. (Elsie)

Being exposed to the elements and to dangerous people of the street day and night, Elsie knows the everyday streets as unpredictable and unsafe. She describes the sense of safety that bringing people out onto the streets brought her:

On the streets you don't know when you are safe. You can trust no one. You must be alert. *OSCT* was to prevent dealers, robbers, rapers and dealers. It was something to look at to take people's attention (Elsie)

OBSID and *OSCT* mediated the inclusion of some local street residents through employment as security marshals:

A few homeless people were employed during *Open Streets*. They were sober, clean and given a bib to wear. They were employed for a few hours and paid for that work where they would ordinarily have been drinking and misbehaving. OBSID communicates with the homeless before the event and lets them know about it. Lets them know there will be law enforcement there. (local social worker 1)

For some street residents it was very meaningful to be included in the event where they are usually marginalised

For them it is a big deal to be recognised, to be counted, to feel loved and included, especially that they are paid for the job and thanked at the end. It's not the money so much as the recognition ... To be a part of something. ... Long after the event they will have excellent behaviour. ... They will remind me of that day, the day they were working, "it was so nice." They don't want to be forgotten. Everyone wants to be recognised and valued (local social worker 1)

In lieu of the provision of basic social services, the power of the event as an inspiration for genuine change is minimised because neither street residents nor housed residents are positioned to resolve their different needs for streets space, and conflict will continue.

It is usually drugs and unemployment that brings a person to the street. We don't have a plan B for homelessness and unemployment. What they will need is a lot of support, a place to stay and employment. They will need counselling throughout the process of working and living in a house to assist reintegration. We don't have that kind of support to give them. *OSCT's* role is upliftment in the same way that sport uplifts people and brings them together (local social worker 2)

*OSCT* did bring a shift towards a sense of belonging and social inclusion during for street residents, something missing in everyday life. Their efforts to dwell are usually tirelessly harassed, but during the event they were tolerated, even welcomed. For some employed by *OSCT* they felt included and proud to have been able to contribute. The delightful atmosphere of an event like *OSCT* amidst the heavy and under-serviced everyday needs was light relief for street residents, but, this inclusion is in danger of becoming tokenist, there in show but not in essence (Ross 2013), if the event only borrows their broken lives for a few hours occasionally to showcase inclusion but in no way critiques the city and the everyday *OBSID* operations that favour harsh tactics of removal and harassment over substantive financial support for the rehabilitation of the street residents back into society.

That is not to say the only value in the event is as a means to an end. The sense of oneness and togetherness that these events facilitate is valuable in itself, but if there is no engagement and critique of everyday issues that create the everyday divisions in public space, *OSCT* could become something that pacifies and distracts real agents of change (Pinder 2000), rather than facilitating change.

## AFTER THE PARTY CONCLUSIONS

*OSCT* events are useful in opening up people's eyes to what could be, but the value of this is diminished if there are no ongoing interventions sustaining this new understanding.

A divided way of being manifests in many forms in post-apartheid Cape Town, maintaining a rigidity in human encounters. This at a time when political dissatisfaction and global environmental pressures demand rapid transition to equitable and sustainable socio-technical mobility systems. Cities require an alternative to car-dependency that is sensitive to the consequences these changes will have on social hierarchies and power dynamics of everyday street users. *Open Streets Cape Town* uses play-filled car-free street events to poke fun at the normative domination of street life by car-use. The event is a showcase of the social potential of streets when the noise, danger and elitism of private car ownership is not present. Through these temporary interventions on everyday street mobility, *OSCT* aimed to help bridge these divides.

This study interrogated the role of day-long *OSCT* events in disrupting complex systems and hierarchies of street mobility that maintain the mobile, spatial and social divides of Cape Town.

The mobile dimension of street mobility is divided by car-dominance that brings inequality and stifles the social potential of the street (Urry 2011). As an alternative, *OSCT* aimed to provide shared space where the needs of people are centred social exchange is stimulated through play.

During the *OSCT* event, this mobile divide was successfully bridged by removing the car from the space and creating people-centred public space.

The spatial dimension of street mobility is marked by a divisive apartheid history that isolated residential communities into parallel public spaces (Paasche 2012) where City Improvement District (CID) governance, norms and values are said to perpetuate divided and exclusionary public space use (Miraftab 2007). This discourages fluidity and sharing of public street space between adjacent residential areas. *OSCT* would have succeeded in bridging these spatial divides if its events promoted a fluid mobility between adjacent public street spaces. During the event the spatial divide was partially bridged by a shifting flow of people between parallel public spaces. However, a predisposition to festivals and the favouritism of Observatory and CID resources brought a concentration of money, activities and people to the Observatory end of the street. This exacerbated everyday tension of inequality and widened this spatial divide.

The more subtle social dimension of street mobility is marked by division in that encounters of difference are marked by avoidance, marginalisation and exclusion. where street users approach difference with the curiosity and a sense of adventure of place-hackers and urban explorers (Garrett 2014, Heins 2015). A sense of togetherness across difference was achieved at the event but faded immediately after 'the party' because it was dependent on the infrastructure of the event. Developing robust freedom of mobility for street users would allow them to continue an everyday cosmopolitan sensibility into their everyday life.

Everyday mobility practices can seem grey, flat and mundane when compared to the sparkle of bold street events such as *OSCT*. The everyday has a sense of being a long string of non-event days that happen by rote without a beginning and without end. In contrast, an *OSCT* event – 'the party' – is understood as something apart from this. It is a special bleep on the radar; something different from the usual. Street events could be are bold, colourful, dramatic and emotive – but *OSCT* was understated in this regard. Even without being dramatic and bold, it is still purposefully different from the everyday; a performance that requires staging, props and coordination to exist. The spectacular mobilities landscape of the *OSCT* events folded away the moment the show is over and Salt River and Observatory collapsed back into the divided everyday mobility practices from before the party. The *temporality* of the event is its strength in that it allows a powerful concentration of creative energy into dressing-up the street as something different. This can snap the onlookers and participants into querying the usual way of being. It can open the imagination (as Guy Debord and

the Situationists would have appreciated) to dare to dream of a different present and a different future. The weakness of an event-style intervention, on its own, is that, once the show is over, there is nothing left of that wonderful place – a sense that the event was a world apart from everyday life and not yet enough for a fundamental shift and lasting change in the mobilities landscape.

Things that sparkle with the magic of the spectacular can distract from-, and lead one to overlook, the importance of opportunities in the everyday. There is also a lot to be said for the micro-acts of playful re-purposing of everyday mobility landscape that gradually changes the landscape over time without being induced, constructed or coordinated. Interventions that build on existing everyday mobility practices that break boundaries, such as skaters and urban explorers, and gradually build more robust freedom of mobility for more parts of the public (especially for those most immobile), would escape a dependence on a car and private security. This would prevent aspects of the mobile and spatial divides from reforming when *OSCT* is not present. Mobility practice of skaters and commuter cyclists – practices that encourage an attitude of delight in the city and its heterogeneity and surprises – would add the everyday cosmopolitan sensibility needed to encourage a desire for- and positive attitude towards encounters with difference while on the move. This is needed to prevent social division within the shared space NMT mobility culture has the potential to foster.

Sager's (2006) freedom of mobility framework was reworked and proved to be useful in monitoring individuals situated differently in the shifting complex of power, identity and everyday life across a changing mobilities landscape. This theoretical framework allowed for comparing qualitatively different mobility practices and monitoring the fairness of changes in a shifting mobilities landscape.

The underlying mobility framework helped identify a need for developing better street navigation skills (positive freedom) and a more robust and equitable freedom of mobility for under-skilled street users that are either car and private security dependent, or immobile. Positive freedom of mobility is necessary to escape a dependence on mediators such as cars, private street security and prejudiced ideas about people and places that perpetuate division.

Through an examination of the details of the changing mobilities landscape before, during and after the party, the role of *OSCT* in changing the mobilities practices of Salt River and Observatory

was described. Before the event, the mobility landscape of the streets were divided. During the event the mobile divide was lifted, but the spatial and social divide were only partially relieved. *OSCT* was successful at the role of enabling parts of the public to move into spaces they do not in their everyday mobility practices. *OSCT* exacerbated some everyday social and spatial divides through using existing street governance structures implicated in creating everyday division without adjusting for this. After the party their successes proved temporary. Direct interventions working at the heart of tension and division in the everyday mobilities landscape could address this. This would be the appropriate everyday force for shifting the mobility landscape between events for this popular civic organisation.

Escaping the division tied up in socially-embedded mobility infrastructure (including cars and private security) requires system-wide changes. The opportunity for this change is starting to open up under environmental and political pressure. Ever present is the danger of failing to identify how one is tied up in the system of division and reproducing the very divisions one trying to undo, but *OSCT* has the potential to play the role of a positive civic body, facilitating the kind of inclusive change that brings environmentally sustainable and equitable mobilities landscape, if it can bring its successes into the everyday mobility culture of Cape Town.

## REFERENCES

- Adger, W. N., Brown, K., Fairbrass, J., Jordan, A., Paavola, J., Rosendo, S., and Seyfang, G. (2003). Governance for sustainability: towards a “thick” analysis of environmental decisionmaking. *Environment and Planning A*, 35(6), 1095–1110.
- Babbie, E. 2011. *Introduction to Social Research*. Wadsworth, Cengage Learning. Belmont, USA.
- Bateman, C. (2015, February). Child alone. Noseweek, 10. Retrieved from <http://www.noseweek.co.za/article/3375/Child-alone>
- Benwell, M. C. (2009). Challenging Minority World Privilege: Children’s Outdoor Mobilities in Post- apartheid South Africa. *Mobilities*, 4(1), 77–101.
- Bikers in alleged racial attack caught on camera (2014). *News 24*. Retrieved December 2, 2014, from <http://www.news24.com/SouthAfrica/News/Bikers-in-alleged-racially-attack-caught-on-camera-20141202>
- Birtchnell, T., and Büscher, M. (2011). Stranded: An Eruption of Disruption. *Mobilities*, 6(1), 1–9.
- Bozzoli, B. (1987). *Class, community and conflict: South African perspectives*. Johannesburg: Raven Press.
- Büscher, M., and Urry, J. (2009). Mobile Methods and the Empirical. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 12(1), 99–116.
- Butcher, M. (2011). Cultures of Commuting: The Mobile Negotiation of Space and Subjectivity on Delhi ’ s Metro. *Mobilities*, 6(2), 237–254.
- Butler, J. (2009). Performativity, precarity and sexual politics (No. 4) (pp. i – xiii). *AIBR*: Berkley.
- Cape Town Partnership (CTP). (2014). Gardens Skate Park: roll with it. Retrieved September 16, 2014, from [http://www.capetownpartnership.co.za/2014/08/gardens-skate-park-roll-with-it/?utm\\_source=TouchBasePro-Email:Cape+Town+Partnership&utm\\_medium=TouchBasePro%20Email%20Campaign&utm\\_term=franplays@gmail.com&utm\\_content=8%2F28%2F2014&utm\\_campaign=TouchBasePro-Email:The+multiplIcITY+of+our+African+home](http://www.capetownpartnership.co.za/2014/08/gardens-skate-park-roll-with-it/?utm_source=TouchBasePro-Email:Cape+Town+Partnership&utm_medium=TouchBasePro%20Email%20Campaign&utm_term=franplays@gmail.com&utm_content=8%2F28%2F2014&utm_campaign=TouchBasePro-Email:The+multiplIcITY+of+our+African+home)
- Chen, G. (2010). Road traffic safety in African countries - status, trend, contributing factors, countermeasures and challenges. *International Journal of Injury Control and Safety Promotion*, 17(4), 247–55.
- Coghlan, D. and Brannick, T. (2010). *Doing action research in your own organization*. Third Edition. Sage Publications: London.
- Cohen, M. J. (2006). A Social Problems Framework for the Critical Appraisal of Automobility and Sustainable Systems Innovation. *Mobilities*, 1(1), 23–38.

- Cresswell, T. (2006). *On the move* (p. 327). New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Cresswell, T. (2010). Mobilities I: Catching up. *Progress in Human Geography*, 35(4), 550–558.
- Cresswell, T. (2012). Mobilities II: Still. *Progress in Human Geography*, 36(5), 645–653.
- Czarniawska, B. (2004). *Narratives in Social Science Research* (p. 168). London: Sage.
- D'Andrea, A., Ciolfi, L., and Gray, B. (2011). Methodological Challenges and Innovations in Mobilities Research. *Mobilities*, 6(2), 149–160.
- Debord, G. (1968). *Society of the Spectacle: summary* (1994 ed.). New York: Zone Books.
- Dennis, K., and Urry, J. (2009). *After the car* (1st ed., p. 224). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Didier, S., Peyroux, E., & Morange, M. (2012). *The Spreading of the City Improvement District Model in Johannesburg and Cape Town: Urban Regeneration and the Neoliberal Agenda in South Africa*. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 36(5), 915–935.
- Didier, S., Morange, M., and Peyroux, E. (2013). The Adaptive Nature of Neoliberalism at the Local Scale: Fifteen Years of City Improvement Districts in Cape Town and Johannesburg. *Antipode*, 45(1), 121–139.
- Eales, K. (1987). *Patriarchs, Passes and Privilege: Johannesburg's African Middle Classes and the question of night passes for African Women, 1920 – 1931*. Johannesburg: Wits History Workshop.
- Flamm, M., and Kaufmann, V. (2006). Operationalising the Concept of Motility : A Qualitative Study. *Mobilities*, 1(2), 167–189.
- Friedman, V., and Rogers, T. (2009). There is nothing so theoretical as action research. *Action Research*, 7(1), 31 – 47.
- Gabriel, N. (2013). Mapping urban space: The production, division and reconfiguration of natures and economies. *City*, 17(3), 325 – 342.
- Garrett, B. L. (2014). Undertaking recreational trespass: urban exploration and infiltration. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 39(1), 1475–5661.
- Hagman, O. (2006). Morning Queues and Parking Problems . On the Broken Promises of the Automobile. *Mobilities*, 1(1), 63–74.
- Hamilton-Baillie, B. (2008). Shared Space : Reconciling People, Places and Traffic. *Built Environment*, 34(2), 161 – 181.
- Hannam, K., Sheller, M., and Urry, J. (2006). Editorial: Mobilities, Immobilities and Moorings. *Mobilities*, 1(1), 1–22.
- Harada, T., and Waitt, G. (2013). Researching Transport Choices: The Possibilities of “Mobile Methodologies” to Study Life-on-the-Move. *Geographical Research*, 51(2), 145–152.
- Hart, D. M. (1988). Political manipulation of urban space: the razing of District Six, Cape Town. *Urban Geography*, 9, 603–628.
- Harvey D. (2008). “The Right to the City”. *New Left Review* 53. pp. 23–40.
- Hay, I. (2005). *Qualitative research in human geography* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heins, S. (2015). Roaming The Forbidden Zones With NYC's Young Urban Explorers. Retrieved March 28, 2015, from [http://gothamist.com/2015/03/24/urban\\_explorers\\_nyc.php#photo-1](http://gothamist.com/2015/03/24/urban_explorers_nyc.php#photo-1)
- Hindson, D. (1987). *Pass Controls and the Urban Proletariat*. Johannesburg: Raven Press.
- Huchzermeyer, M. (2011). *Cities with Slums: From Informal Settlement Eradication to a Right to the City in Africa*. Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.

- Huchzermeyer, M. (2014). Invoking Lefebvre's "right to the city" in South Africa today: A response to Walsh. *City*, 18(1), 41–49. doi:10.1080/13604813.2014.868166
- Hong, S. (2013). The displacement of sport: media spectacles of street support in the 2002 World Cup. *Sport in Society*, 16(6), 735–748.
- International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI). (2015). EcoMobility World Festival 2015. Retrieved from <http://emwf2015.iclei.org/about-the-festival/>
- Jensen, A. (2011). Mobility, Space and Power : On the Multiplicities of Seeing Mobility. *Mobilities*, 6(2), 255–271.
- Jensen, O. B. (2009). Flows of Meaning , Cultures of Movements – Urban Mobility as Meaningful Everyday Life Practice. *Mobilities*, 4(1), 139–158.
- Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking Fast and Slow*. In Thinking Fast and Slow. (pp. 1–11, eBook). UK: Penguin.
- Kane, L., & Geretto, M. (2015). Pure magic as people connect. Retrieved from <http://openstreets.co.za/news/pure-magic-people-connect>
- Knowles, C. (2011). Cities on the move: Navigating urban life. *City*, 15(2), 135–153.
- Landman, K. (2004). *Gated communities : A review of the relevant policies and their implications*. Cape Town: CSIR.
- Lemanski, C. (2006). Spaces of exclusivity or connection? Linkages between a gated community and its poorer neighbour in a Cape Town Master Plan Development. *Urban Studies*, 43(2), 397–420.
- Lemanski, C. (2007). Global Cities in the South: Deepening social and spatial polarisation in Cape Town. *Cities*, 24(6), 448–461.
- Liminality. (2015). Retrieved from Wikipedia: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liminality>
- Maharaj, B. (1994). The group Areas Act and community destruction in South Africa: The struggle for Cato Manor in Durban. *Urban Forum*, 5, 1–25.
- Maharaj, B. (1995). The local State and residential segregation: Durban and the prelude to the Group Areas Act. *South African Geographical Journal*, 77, 33–41.
- Marcuse, P. (2009). From critical urban theory to the right to the city. *City*, 13(2-3), 185–197.
- Merriman, P. (2014). Rethinking Mobile Methods. *Mobilities*, 9(2), 167–187.
- Massey, D. (1994). *Space, place and gender*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Massey, D. (2005). *For Space*. London: Sage
- Nkosi, M. (2015). How Johannesburg is turning into a cycle-friendly city. Retrieved March 25, 2015, from <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-32046765>
- Minty, Z. (2005). Breaching Borders: Using Culture in Cape Town's Central City for Social Change. *Isandla Dark Roast Papers*, 2(8/9).
- Miraftab, F. (2007). Governing Post Apartheid Spatiality: Implementing City Improvement Districts in Cape Town. *Antipode*, 39(4), 602–626.
- Msimang, S. (2014). How to use a sjambok and other lessons from the South African frontlines. Retrieved November 12, 2014, from <http://africasacountry.com/how-to-use-a-sjambok-and-other-lessons-from-the-south-african-frontlines/>
- Neighbourhood watches use race profiling: report. (2014). Independent Online. Retrieved November 30, 2014, from <http://www.iol.co.za/news/politics/neighbourhood-watches-use-race-profiling-report-1.1788494#.VYcOXbyli1E>
- ObsLife. 2008 – 2014 Eds. Barry Terblanche. Cape Town. Retrieved from <http://obslife.weebly.com/>

- Observatory Civic Association (OCA). (2014). What shall we play on open streets 26 october. Retrieved August 19, 2014, from <http://obs.org.za/what-shall-we-play-on-open-streets-26-october/>
- Open Streets Cape Town (OSCT). (2013). Open Streets in Cape Town 2013. Retrieved August 19, 2014, from <http://us4.campaign-archive1.com/?u=07b6cf160feebbc474e3da1bc&id=9950ae7466&e=0eed6a2264>
- Open Streets Cape Town (OSCT). (2014). Open Streets Manifesto. Retrieved April 29, 2014, from <https://files.acrobat.com/a/preview/2be9f080-8801-43a0-bad5-1e5020431173>
- Paasche, T. F. (2012). Creating parallel public spaces through private governments: a South African case study. *South African Geographical Journal*, 94(1), 46–59.
- Paasche, T. F. (2013). “The softer side of security”: The role of social development in Cape Town’s policing network. *Geoforum*, 45, 259–265.
- Pesses, M. W. (2010). Automobility , Vélomobility , American Mobility : An Exploration of the Bicycle Tour. *Mobilities*, 5(1), 1–24.
- Pirie, G. (2007). Reanimating a Comatose Goddess’: Reconfiguring Central Cape Town. *Urban Forum*, 18(3), 125–151.
- Pirie, G. (2013). Transport Geography in South Africa. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 31, 312–314.
- Pinder, D. (2000). “Old Paris Is No More”: Geographies of Spectacle and Anti-Spectacle. *Antipode*, 32(4), 357–386.
- Pinnock, D. (1989). *Ideology and urban planning: Blueprints of a garrison city*. In W. James and M. Simons (Eds.), *The Angry Divide: Social and Economic History of The Western Cape* (pp. 150 – 168). Cape Town: David Philip.
- Platzky, L., & Walker, C. (1985). *The Surplus People: forced removals in South Africa*. Johannesburg: Raven Press.
- People's Post. Eds. Mandy King. Cape Town: Media 24.
- Rink, B. M., and Gamedze, A. S. (2015). Mobility and the City Improvement District: Frictions in the Human-capital Mobile Assemblage. *Mobilities*, (July 2015), 1–19.
- Rich, P. B. (1980). Administrative ideology, urban social control and the origins of apartheid theory, 1930-1939. *Journal of African Studies*, 7, 70–82.
- Rose, M. M. (1989). *Transportation and dependency: The case of Southern Africa*. University of Notre Dame. Michigan : Ann Arbor.
- Ross, C. (2013). Spectacle, Ecstasy, and Music Festivals: The Spiritual Longing of the Lost Generation. *Liturgy*, 28(3), 42–50.
- Sager, T. (2006). Freedom as Mobility: Implications of the Distinction between Actual and Potential Travelling. *Mobilities*, 1(3), 465–488.
- Samara, T. R. (2010a). Order and security in the city: producing race and policing neoliberal spaces in South Africa. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 33(4), 637–655.
- Samara, T. R. (2010b). Policing Development: Urban Renewal as Neo-liberal Security Strategy. *Urban Studies*, 47(April 2007), 197–214.
- South African National Roads Agency (SANRAL). (2014). SANRAL Pedestrian Road Safety Strategy. Retrieved September 23, 2014, from [http://www.nra.co.za/live/content.phpSession\\_ID=917e3aec01ea1039e353984cb5fbc039&Category\\_ID=111](http://www.nra.co.za/live/content.phpSession_ID=917e3aec01ea1039e353984cb5fbc039&Category_ID=111)
- Savage, M. (1987). An Anatomy of the South African Corporate Economy: ownership, control and the interlocking directorate. *Industrial Relations Journal of South Africa*, 7(2), 4–29.
- Sey, J. (2008). *The People Shall Move!* Johannesburg: The City Of Joburg Department of Transport.
- Shaw, S., Bagwell, S., & Karmowska, J. (2004). Ethnoscapes as spectacle: reimaging multicultural districts as new destinations for leisure and tourism consumption. *Urban Studies*, 41(10), 1983–2000.

- Sheller, M., and Urry, J. (2000). The City and the Car. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 24(4), 737 – 757.
- Sheller, M., and Urry, J. (2006). The new mobilities paradigm. *Environment and Planning A*, 38(2), 207 – 226.
- Short, J. R., and Pinet-Peralta, L. M. (2010). No Accident : Traffic and Pedestrians in the Modern City. *Mobilities*, 5(1), 41–59.
- Simmel, G. (1997) *Simmel on Culture*. Eds Frisby, D and Featherstone, M. London: Sage.
- Stadler, A. (1979). *Birds in the cornfield: squatter movements in Johannesburg, 1944-1947*. In B. Bozzoli (Ed.), *Labour, Townships and Protest* (Vol. 6). Johannesburg: Raven.
- Stevens, Q. (2007). *The Ludic City: Exploring the Potential of Public Spaces* (p. 238). Oxfordshire: Routledge.
- Stevens, Q. (2012). The how and where of Urban Play. Australia: Vimeo. Retrieved from <https://vimeo.com/54131664>
- Stephenson, M. L. (2006). Travel and the “Freedom of Movement”: Racialised Encounters and Experiences Amongst Ethnic Minority Tourists in the EU. *Mobilities*, 1(2), 285–306.
- Tatler. 2014. Eds. Chantel Erfort. Cape Town: Independent Newspapers Western Cape.
- Tomlinson, R., Bass, O., & Bassett, T. (2011). Before and after the vuvuzela: identity, image and mega-events in South Africa, China and Brazil. *South African Geographical Journal*, 93(1), 38–48.
- Turok, I. (2004). Cities, regions and competitiveness. *Regional Studies*, 38, 1061–1075.
- Urry, J. (2011). *Climate change and society*. Cambridge: Polity press.
- Van Blerk, L. (2013). New Street Geographies: The Impact of Urban Governance on the Mobilities of Cape Town’s Street Youth. *Urban Studies*, 50(3), 556–573.
- Vergunst, J. (2010). Rhythms of Walking: History and Presence in a City Street. *Space and Culture*, 13(4), 376–388.
- Vergunst, J. (2011). Technology and Technique in a Useful Ethnography of Movement. *Mobilities*, 6(2), 203–219.
- Waite, G. (2008). Urban Festivals: Geographies of Hype, Helplessness and Hope. *Geography Compass*, 2(2), 513–537.

# APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A: METHODS | DATA COLLECTION | BUSINESS SURVEY

1. Are there more/less/the same amount of customers during Open Streets?
2. Do different kinds of customers come into your business during Open Streets? Yes ... No ...
3. Is your turnover more/less/the same during Open Streets? ... %
4. How was the movement of people past your shop different during Open Streets? (follow up interesting ones)
5. How was the movement of your goods different during Open Streets?
6. Did you relate differently to other business owners customers during OS?
7. Do you operate or manage you business differently during the event?
8. Does any of this change remain after the event is closed?
9. Yes ....What? .....
10. No ....Why?
11. What is Open Streets about for you? When you look at the street activities do you get a sense of why they are doing Open Streets?.....
12. Did you enjoy the event?
13. Yes ...
14. No ...
15. Why?.....
16. Would you like it to happen again?  
Yes ... How often? .....Why?.....  
No ... Why? .....

## APPENDIX B: METHODS | DATA COLLECTION | RESIDENT SURVEY

1. Did you attend Open Streets in May? October?
2. Where/from whom did you here about Open Streets?
3. What about it made you want to /not want to go?
4. What do you think the message or meaning of the event is?
5. From what you heard, was it what you expected?
6. How was the event different to other street festivals you have attended down Lower Main?
7. How would you describe your interaction with people at Open Streets? How is that different from everyday/usual?
8. How would you describe your engagement with activities?
9. What do you feel were the main differences between everyday streetscape and Open Streets streetscape?
10. How was your experience of Lower Main and some surrounding streets being blocked off to cars?
11. Would you describe the event as an unpleasant/neutral or enjoyable experience? Why?
12. Would you like it to happen again? Why? How often?
13. Describe your sense of belonging to Observatory/Salt River. Part of who I am | Irrelevant to me | I feel excluded
14. Rate your sense of connection between 0 – 10
15. 0=no connection 5=feel included but not vital 10=part of who I am
  - street residents (friends, street committee etc.)
  - suburb residents
  - local organisations. Which?
  - local media (newspaper etc.)
  - Cape Town history
  - Cape Town future
  - local police/security
  - other ...
16. Sense of permanence: permanent, owner, resident, temporary
17. How long do you think the effect of this event lasts? Are any of the changes to the street seen to last after the event is over?

## APPENDIX C: METHODS | DATA COLLECTION | IN-DEPTH INTERVIEW MAP ELICITATION PROMPTS

### A. Everyday mobility map

1. \*Please draw a map of Observatory and/or Salt River and links to areas outside of the suburb that are relevant to you. (e.g. Draw your house, work, school, shops, entertainment and leisure spots and anything else that you use in the area. Add in the route you take to get there and how you get there - walk, jog, wheelchair, cycle, skate, car - and whether you take companionship with or travel alone.)
2. Add to the map the areas that are not to your liking (e.g. dangerous, dirty, derelict, unkempt etc.)
3. Draw in the areas that are to your liking (e.g. attractive, valuable, pleasant, safe and other things to your liking. How did you come to know about these parts of your living space?
4. How did you come to know this about each place (exploration, friends, family, newspaper)?
5. How does the police or security presence make you feel?
6. How do the aspects you like and don't like, your feeling of safety, cleanliness and beauty, the police or security presence affect the route you take? Describe how each affect how you feel along the route you take on your map.
7. Describe everyday street interactions along the route you take (e.g. culture/politics of the street: Who is there? Do you know them? How do they make you feel? How does it affect you and your use of the street?)
8. How would you describe the different groups of street users or cultures and the differences they have? How are they dealt with?

### B. Open Streets Cape Town mobility map

1. \*Either start a new map or add to your existing one. Draw the route you took to Open Streets in May/October last year. How did you get there (e.g.foot, bike, car etc.).
2. What was happening on the street on the way there and when you got there? How did it feel?
3. Did you use the street differently? (e.g. sitting, walking, talking different from the usual.)
4. Did you use different parts of the than usual or in the same way? Did you travel to parts of the street or living residential area that you don't usually? Did you travel in a way that you don't usually? (e.g. Use a road you don't usually or travel further down a street than usual?)
5. How did you feel there? (e.g. Sense of safety, freedom to use the street, sense of community, detachment from work stress, ability to use the *method*street as you want to, sense of ownership of the street? Is it a place you felt like comfortable in? Is it a space you felt you belonged?)
6. Describe the street culture/politics of the street along the route you took to Open Streets on that day. Who was there, who was in charge, how does it affect you (make you feel/act)?
7. How would you describe the difference of that Saturday to any other Saturday? Is it different at all? If so, in what way?
8. Do you ever think of that experience ever? If so, what do you think about? Has the experience of the street had any affect on how you think of or use the street?
9. How would you describe the different groups of street users at Open Streets and the differences they have? How were they dealt with?

## APPENDIX D: METHODS | DATA COLLECTION | ENCOUNTERING EVERYDAY SOCIO-SPATIAL BOUNDARIES

### WALKING THROUGH SALT RIVER FOR THE FIRST TIME

Saturday 2 August 2014

I drove to Salt River and parked my car just off Lower Main Road. I sat for a while because I was petrified of the area. The first thing I noticed was that there was rubbish on the road – unlike in Observatory. The buildings look more derelict. There are people walking with trays of food between houses and walking home with shopping. There are children playing outside their houses. The walls are low and the front doors are open. There is tagging on the buildings and plaster coming off some walls.

The real estate agent had told me the area was full of gangsters and not suitable for a young white woman. The local newspaper editor publishes newspapers of other surrounding areas but leaves Salt River out of this chain of communication because the demographic here does not generate enough from advertising. The other residents I know in Observatory don't walk here either so I don't have any direct information on Salt River. All I have to go on is what people say. Residents and shop owners had told me I should not walk through the area on foot or I would most certainly be robbed – or worse. From conversations with local officials I had heard about a stabbing and two rapes in the last year.

I could have walked or biked in 5 minutes but I drove instead. My car is a safe haven. A giant mobile metal security blanket. An island of safety I can cart around the city and run back into when I need to. I know it's there so I can take a little walk and run back to it if gangsters come for me. I am also scared of the new culture because Islam practice in this area was described as strict for women and not something I would be comfortable with. I have been advised not to go alone. I have doubts about doing this myself but I really want to. I don't know what to expect and that is worrying. Am I getting out of the safe haven into the drug-ridden gangsters' paradise?

It took me a really long time to get out the car even though I could only see woman walking between neighbours' houses and kids running in the street. There were occasionally male pedestrians walking past. Usually, I make a point of riding fast on my bicycle to get through the Salt River section of Albert Road (the main road on one side of the suburb) because I am terrified of the area. Even though I am comfortable cycling in other surrounding suburbs, I am really scared of Salt River in the day. It took a lot for me to get out the car and walk that day. Bare-bodied and with out the advantage of speed I am taking a leap of faith here. A white woman is taught to feel very vulnerable in a 'coloured gangsters paradise'. I feel like a 3 year old vulnerable little girl. I feel robbed of my freedom to explore the city. I feel mollycoddled and deeply frustrated. I haven't been this frightened to do something in a number of years.

I park at the business security man that one resident said was attentive. He had warned her of an attempted break-in of her car. She is a single mom at home 'alone' so she takes great comfort in having a man around looking out for her.

Two blocks up and kids are using the container of a bakkie as a play pen. Most, if not all, are girls that look under 10 years. A rope is an additional prop in their game. I would love to watch to see more but I don't want to be seen standing still. I must look on a mission and comfortable a friend told me. Look like a local (impossible! I'm white in a coloured area!). Don't look like you are lost or wondering. Be on a mission. I also don't want to be seen staring. The community is Muslim and I don't know what the etiquette is yet. I hear they are strict and conservative so I will play it safe until I know. As I walk away I hear a smaller girl address the elder of the group matter of factly, "You're too old to believe in mermaids". I'm too old to believe in gangsters, aren't I?

I walk to the end of the road up an incline and then reluctantly change direction. I am showing my lack of direction here. Gangsters could be watching my mind says. After walking down the road a man standing smoking greets me. "This is the second time I am seeing you today" he says. Caught! He knows I am an outsider. He knows I don't know

where I am! “Yes well, I am doing research on the area.”, I say “What it's like to live here and that...”. After chatting and doing a set of questions with the man smoking on the stoep of his house, I felt better. He knew I was an outsider and vulnerable, and he not only greeted me but gave some of his time for my research.

I felt a lot better after a number of greetings along the surrounding streets and some of those ended in conversations towards my research. A few hours later I was walking down the street and I am starting to shed the preconceived ideas about the area. I suspect most people are well meaning around here. I see more men standing on their stoeps smoking. Maybe it is rude to smoke inside? How considerate. Maybe it is a religious thing. In any case, I like the men standing smoking on the pavement. They are friendly and usually greet me which invites a conversation. They seem open to engaging with others. Even me who they definitely don't know. It occurs to me that they must have family of sorts inside that are being considerate of. The threatening onlookers have become sentinels for me. A part of my safety on the street.

I walk back past the bakkie but the girls aren't in it any more. There is a group of girls playing behind locked gates in the school now. Singing happy birthday without concord or tune. It is adorable (but not for more than 5 minutes).

Further down the street it starts to feel quiet and my nerves start acting out. There is a bit of a derelict wall near by. Is this the sign I have entered the gangsters lair? Have I just walked into a trap!!? A group of pre-teen boys are wondering the street with guns. The playful young voices calm me. Kids are here so it can't be the gangsters lair, right? Their bee-bee guns are petrifying me. They are flinging them about like they are toys! They are toys. Yes. They are toys. “The boy leading the wondering pack widens his eyes, locks his eyes on a target on the ground and lurches forward. It must be a few coins I presume. “A bee-bee pellet!” he declares. He leaps to another just ahead, and scurries to peck at the treasure trove all around him. His companions scramble from behind a row of cars and join him. I recall a similar experience from my youth. The absolute delight this kind of fortune of bee-bee pellets brings. For the rest of the day they'll be in high spirits from winning the street lotto. They'll be scouring the streets for more treasures feeling like the blessed chosen ones. The street walkers that fortune shone upon. They own this street today. Enough of these delightful experiences and they will grow up to keep that feeling.

I walk past a number of men and women waiting in the car for the man of the house to drive them. To me, the woman looks sedate waiting there in her head scarf. I wonder if she minds that she must wait for the man to drive her? I would feel frustrated. All this scaremongering and the woman and children get herded in doors and behind fences. From my experience that is where the danger really is – behind the walls.

Safe at home, I thought back on the day. Salt River has a greeting culture that relies on the pace and openness of walking. Walking and looking like an odd-(white)ball helped with my research. For the residents it must be such a nice thing to have a greeting culture, and really important for building and maintaining a sense of connection with one another.

## WALKING FROM OBSERVATORY TO SALT RIVER

Sunday 3 August 2014

Today I was nervous but felt comfortable enough to walk because I talked to neighbours the day before and I feel like in all likelihood I can trust the people I see. Even the groups of young men on the corner were so lovely. Men hanging out on a street corner have such a bad rep. These ones I was scared of at first but decided to cure my curiosity and see how they would react to my approach. They were very helpful and respectful and sent me to the right man in the neighbourhood with a lot of knowledge of the area. Their neighbour was familiar like an uncle to them. Maybe it was his uncle.

As I walked through Observatory towards Salt River I see neighbours using neighbours' property, moving freely through it. They are chatting to one another. A young girl on a tricycle tugging her granny along and delighting in breaking away

from her. She was in a sweet pyjama suit and slippers to match. I saw three cyclists, one in racing gear. They were wearing helmets. There was a very serious looking lady speed-walking her dog. The parks are fenced I noticed.

In Salt River I saw kids under 3 playing in groups in the streets. A few men were smoking like the day before. Others were fixing their car in the street. Children run from one house to the shops and then to other houses.

That was all below Main Road. Above Main Road is very different. There was not one person outside at first. Cars were parked in silent rows along the street. I saw one pedestrian but other than that it was still. Later on, I saw 2 pedestrians and kids playing. One man was smoking outside. One loud motorbike sped through. I chatted to the one skateboarder. He was alone. Near Hopkins it had an industrial feel and it was very quiet. Uncomfortable.

Back in Lower Main in Observatory I see a teenage skater almost dancing as he skates along listening to his music. The road feels clean and familiar. I feel safe again. Socially at ease. Familiarity feels like knowing, and knowing makes me feel at ease, something like safety. Walking is something one has to learn again every time one enters a new neighbourhood. They really feel like parallel public spaces (Paasche 2012) in this respect.

## METHODS | DATA COLLECTION | DEFYING SOCIO-SPATIAL BOUNDARIES AT THE PARTY

### THE TRASH CABARET

The pique of the *OSCT* experience for me was after a long day as a bicycle marshal at one of the events. I took off my bib, got off my bicycle and joined some friends for lunch. Afterwards, quiet walk up the road towards Observatory where the action was. I could hear a brass band playing. With some focus I could make out a ball of ten to 15 people being conducted like a bouncing ball down the street to the rhythm of the music. The brass band was the heart of the huddle of people. A whisp of the trumpet to one side and the ball bounced rhythmically. It was approaching us – energise and frenetic. Dahda dahda da dah. Dahda dahda da DAH. More people were being drawn into the ball which was looking more like a possessed swarm to me now. With a determination of its own the ball kept coming, demanding the centre of the street. Time to join it or scramble. The individual elements of the bundle of people became discernible – friends! Someone grabbed my hand and we go! Dahda dahda da dah! One-two-three – JUMP. One-two-three – JUMP. Dahda dahda daa JUMP! Dahda dahda da JUMP! Dahda dahda daa JUMP! Dahda dahda da DAH! Dahda dahda daa DAH! My legs are sore but I can't stop.

All the way up the street. This is exhilarating. We enter a denser crowd of people in Observatory and the tight bundle of people merge with the crowd. The brand continues to conduct the enchanting rhythm. Dahda dahda daa DAH! More and more join in. The street is packed tight between the restaurant walls on both sides and people on the balconies above add another level.

A car slowly rolls in – OBSID. It's closing time. The pedestrians have had their time to play. The streets must get back to work. The sense of ownership was just a game. Not for real. Over the loud hauler the women in uniform announces with the same authority that her car pushing into the crowd suggests: "The event will close in 5 minutes. Clear the streets. The streets are opening up to cars now". The energy of youth, the boldness of student residents taking ownership of *their* public space (and a few drinks after lunch) give the crowd a mood of boldness. The crowd makes little concession to the car and continues to chant louder and bounce in defiance. Dahda dahda da dah! One-two-three – JUMP. One-two-three – JUMP! A women on stilts sends a seductive yet defiant kiss gently down to the OBSID woman in the car. The width of the street is packed. I am aware slightly shorter than the rest. Squished in. The crowd refuses to move. This is their street and they are having fun. You can't give us the streets and then take it back! This is where we play now. The metal car casing seems t not match for the crowd. The OBSID women may as well have wrapped herself in a roll of tinfoil. The is no match for a hundred bare-bodies emboldened by the music and defiant. Without speed the car poses little threat. We, the pedestrians, the youth, we have the power now.

The OBSID officer in the drivers seat is not bold but seems to assure herself of her power and position by announcing the road opening for the fifth time. The band responds in defiance by playing louder. Dahda dahda da dah! Dahda dahda da DAH! The car edges forward a centimeter. The tension is too much. I tug on the arm of a musician plead for the brass player to stop with no effect.

A few more agonising minutes later and the band dispersed into the crowd, a last few toots to end the day on a note of defiance. The flashing lights and loud-speakers of the *OBSID* vehicle breaks the seal, and a sense of pedestrian safety and ownership of the street shrinks. Cars could edge there way through now. Over the next few hours the crowds thinned and receded into the safety and solitude of privately owned shops and privately owned cars and privately owned houses to live according to their own private rhythm. That is where they will stay as their everyday lives resume.

But now I own the road. I feel it. Me and my bicycle, we deserve a place in the streets. Cars hoot and swear at me, the hindrance to the free flow of cars. But I feel the streets are mine too, and I will continue to defend what is mine, on my bicycle, everyday.

## METHODS | DATA COLLECTION | GRAPPLING WITH EVERYDAY SOCIO-SPATIAL BOUNDARIES AFTER THE PARTY

### I WANT TO RIDE MY BICYCLE

I ride my bicycle nearly every day now. The city has gradually become smaller and smaller for me in that more of it has become territory that my bike and I know. But its not just about knowing where to go. It's knowing what to with people encountered. Without the giant security blanket that the metal and glass of the car, one has to engage:

A group of teenagers, half on long boards and the rest walking. Not I problem I thought. They're just kids:

"Hey lady! I'd like to be your bike so you can ride me!"

middle finger

"Hey!"

Crude but necessary to express my distaste. To reassert the fact that I also have a right to the street and a right to express myself. If the only language that is understood in is crude, the crude I will speak. How else will he know unless someone communicates this to him.

Smiling, a middle aged man walks up to me unchaining my bike. "I hope you have dental insurance"

"Huh?"

"You are going to fall with your shopping"

"I have done this many times. I will be fine thanks"

"Jah Jah"

Sitting

"Hi"

"Hi"

"Where are you from?"

“That side.”

“Can I have your number?”

“I have a boyfriend”

“I'll be your prince, prince charming”

“I have a boyfriend – a husband”

“I'm going inside now - bye”

“I'll wait for you”

## LEARNING STREET MANNERS

Sitting is opening up an invitation. If you sit, be prepared to have visitors. Men do not read body language or subtlety well apparently. Be clear, rude if all else fails. Be cautious. Street dress – no bling, cover up, greet, have people you know as sentinels for the spaces between.

I know this space only in an embodied sense but this limited understanding is useful in this case because it is telling of a wider silence about the place, part of what contributes to it being misunderstood by passer-byers and neighbours. A barrier to taking on the more exposed forms of mobility such as walking, cycling and public transport requires a skill set to negotiate the physical and the social landscape. Ways of relating in Cape Town's public space are not fully accommodating of people to the extent that a simple weaning off motorised transport would bring about the opening up of the publicness of the street. From a perspective as a woman, men that I have encountered need to learn to relate to women in a way besides through sexual advancement. I have come to understand that that is not always what is meant, but primed by media to believe that I am in danger in public (and the statistics of murder, rape and robbery to back it up) anything but a polite and friendly encounter is intimidating. Occasionally comments are far from polite, and a re-education of young men and ways to relate to women is needed. The different publics of the street are unfamiliar with one another, so it would be useful to encourage an attitude of being polite while slowly following a healthy curiosity about the unfamiliar 'other'.

Ideas about place, the identity get stuck into pre-scripting encounters. Movement was shaped by my own identity and whether that found a suitable fit within the local public social scheme. This played as important a role as automobility and governance regimes present. It became more important when there was less known about the place when I first set out to explore Salt River. In unbundling social and spatial divides it one would have to address stereotypic ideas about identity and certain mobilities (particularly gender), identity belonging and place (particularly race). What will it take to develop an expectation of a sense of welcome in a place one does not fit in in terms of race? Or believing one can be safe to move without the car or private security? For women to be able to move around the city with independence?

APPENDIX E: METHODS | DATA COLLECTION | ITERATIVE METHOD DEVELOPMENT AND DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

Start date	Data gatherings process	Method [mobile perspective]	Subjects of interest (objective)
Feb 2013	started living in and getting to know Observatory	deep hanging out provided context sensitivity [driving, Jammie, walking]	Movement of people; What shapes daily mobility in Observatory and Salt River? (everyday mobility)
May 2013	Attended <i>Open Streets Cape Town</i> event down Lower Main Road in Observatory as a 'guest'	Observation and participation from the perspective of an attendee [walking in a new place]	What is different about mobility at an <i>Open Streets</i> event from everyday mobility for an attendee? (attending the party)
June 2013	started associating and playing a role in <i>Open Streets Cape Town</i> , taking notes at meetings. <u>Evaluation</u> : My sense of belonging and useful contribution to this organisation affects my sense of belonging and value in the City of Cape Town. I feel more ownership of this city in one year than 26 years in another – interview others about value of belonging to the organization and other associated fraternities.	Dual researcher-member role for in depth understanding of an organisation that was still settling into itself [bought a bicycle] (Coghlan and Brannick 2010: 15)	Movement of ideas; How does <i>Open Streets Cape Town</i> work? (throwing a party)
Oct 2013	Attended <i>Open Streets Cape Town</i> event down Lower Main Road in Observatory as a 'bike marshal' clearing cars out the road and monitoring the event. <u>Evaluation</u> : Biking and official responsibility affect my sense of ownership of the street. Inquire after what it does for other members.	Observation and participation as an <i>Open Streets Cape Town</i> official [first use of bicycle unaccompanied – vulnerability overcome <i>Appendix D, E, F</i> ] (Coghlan and Brannick 2010:)	What is different about mobility at an <i>Open Streets Cape Town</i> event from everyday mobility for a bike marshal? (throwing a party, attending the party)
June 2014	I started systematic short questionnaire of businesses down Lower Main Road. <u>Evaluation</u> : movement of ideas about <i>Open Streets Cape Town</i> are disjointed, uneven and broken – explore movement of ideas more	structured interviews [walking – vulnerability encountered <i>Appendix D, E, F</i> ]	Movement of ideas, people and money; How does business work routinely, and how does that change during <i>Open Streets Cape Town</i> ? (everyday mobility, attending the party)
June 2014	I started formally interviewing <i>Open Streets</i> founding members and other contributors. <u>Evaluation</u> : movement of ideas depends on distribution of ObsLife, WoodstockLife and	Semi-structured interviews with key informants within <i>Open Streets Cape Town</i>	Movement of ideas; mobilisation of people; How does <i>Open Streets Cape Town</i> work? (throwing a party)

Start date	Data gatherings process	Method [mobile perspective]	Subjects of interest (objective)
	social media. Analyse these to track movement of ideas. <u>Evaluation</u> : engaging with a full representation of the residents in the area is a time consuming a challenging task and has been difficult to break beyond the easiest form of community meetings. Businesses and organisations were engaged with. The knowledge gap for the organisation is with the residents. Therefore my research will invest a lot of the rest invest energy with in-depth resident interviews.		
June 2014	started reading the back-copies of local newspaper ObsLife and checked distribution patterns and to understand the most spoken about issues and running of the organisations in the area. <u>Evaluation</u> : Fear of crime, surveillance and foggy facts dominate description of place – how do residents use this information?	secondary data sources [knowledge of crime and security comforted me]	Movement of ideas; How do the local governance structures of Observatory work in the background and out of mind of most residential daily mobility? (everyday mobility, after the party)
July 2014	started a random short questionnaire to residents throughout Salt River and Observatory. <u>Evaluation</u> : residents are unevenly affected by fear of crime spread by newspapers depending on social connectedness and established ease of use of streets – how do informants know about place and how does that shape their mobility?	quota sampling [walking - vulnerability encountered, car used to overcome at first <i>Appendix D</i> ] (Babbie 2011: 179-181)	What has <i>Open Streets Cape Town</i> (the concept and the memory of the event) become? Movement of ideas and people; interchange between modes of mobility Knowles (2011); influences; How does daily residential mobility take shape? How does movement of ideas influence daily mobility? (everyday mobility, attending the party, after the party)
Aug 2014	selected informants from respondents to build up a deeper understanding of the daily mobility of the place from their perspective through more regular and more casual visits.	purposive or judgemental sampling [walking – vulnerability overcome with familiarity and knowledge of people and routes] (Babbie 2011: 179-181)	More ethnographic detail on the above (everyday mobility, attending the party, after the party)
Aug 2014	Spent more intense time talking, describing, mapping and participating in the use of Salt River and Observatory with informants. <u>Evaluation</u> : multiple concerns, levels of awareness, mode of mobility and personal	mapping and walk-alongs [walking – vulnerabilities with cultural disjunctures encountered <i>Appendix D</i> ]	Capture the embodied experience and daily life of informants (everyday mobility)

Start date	Data gatherings process	Method [mobile perspective]	Subjects of interest (objective)
	habits determine knowledge and use of place using established modes of mobility	(Knowles 2011)	
Sept 2014	read the other newspapers that respondents refer to as significant in informing them of the goings on of the area, especially drug and crime activity. <u>Evaluation:</u> This information in turn shapes how they move through the space and talk about it to others.	secondary data sources	Movement of ideas especially about how Salt River and Observatory are promoted and commonly understood inside and outside the area (everyday mobility, after the party)
Sept 2014	interview other key informants such as those from associated organisation as their role and my understanding thereof evolves	Judgemental sampling, Snowball sampling	What is <i>Open Streets Cape Town</i> (the organisation) growing into? (throwing a party, attending the party)
October 2014	Identified divides in the mobile, spatial and mobile landscape	Using Iain Hay's (2005) qualitative coding approach	Data synthesis and interpretation of all themes



## APPENDIX G: METHODS | DATA ANALYSIS | DATA CONSOLIDATION

Map showing the movements of people, ideas and things as described by 36 businesses during The Party along with the points of interests for 6 respondents.



