ANALYSIS OF QUALITATIVE SURVEY ON ACCESSING, HOLDING AND TRADING LAND: SYNTHESIS REPORT

Report prepared for Urban LandMark

March 2008

Warren Smit
197 Ranger Road, Fish Hoek, 7975
Tel: 021 785 2524; e-mail: warren3@telkomsa.net

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As part of Urban Landmark's *Operation of Markets* study on the access, holding and trading of urban land by the poor, 74 in-depth life history interviews were undertaken in nine settlements in Ekurhuleni, eThekwini (Durban) and Cape Town during 2007. This report is based on an in-depth analysis of these interviews.

The reasons why respondents chose to live in specific areas were usually closely linked to livelihoods (for example, proximity to jobs, cost of transport and the cost of rent/services). Livelihoods-related reasons for moving from previous places of residence included unaffordability of rent (for people previously living in backyard rental accommodation) and rural poverty and unemployment (for people previously living in rural areas). Livelihood-related reasons for moving to a specific settlement included good location (close to jobs, shops, facilities and/or transport) and cheaper living expenses (i.e. not having to pay rent and service charges, being able to access food cheaply, or being able to grow one's own food).

The study shows that urban land markets exist in the poorer parts of South African cities and that they are a complex mix of financially-driven processes, including processes mediated by local community-based organisations and those mediated by the state. The study also shows that there is a wide variety of sub-markets in the poorer parts of South African cities. These sub-markets include ownership of a shack in an informal settlement, rental of a shack (or of a room within a shack) in an informal settlement, rental of a backyard shack in a township (or having one's own shack in rented backyard space), rental of a room in a township and ownership of an RDP house (either in an upgrading project or a greenfield project). Each option has various advantages and disadvantages, and respondents usually made conscious choices between different options (except with regards to RDP housing or public rental housing, where choice was limited). Different options are suitable at different stages in the history of households and individuals, and there is frequent movement between options.

The study shows that the key factors upon which people usually base their decision-making on where to stay at particular points in their lives include the following:

- **Adequacy of location (i.e. proximity to jobs, shops, facilities and transport):** Rental accommodation in an established township seems to offer the best location, as older townships are usually centrally-located and have developed transport links and a range of facilities over many decades. Informal settlements can also offer a relatively good location, and this is often the reason why people occupy a specific piece of vacant land. Greenfield RDP housing projects seem, in practice, often to be less well-located than the informal settlements where recipients of RDP houses used to live.

- **Adequacy of shelter:** Rented shacks generally provide the lowest standards of shelter. In the survey, tenants in rented shacks almost always complained about leaks. Shacks that the occupants own themselves are usually of better quality than rented shacks. Rented formal rooms and RDP houses have the highest standard of shelter.
- **Adequacy of space (both indoor and outdoor space):** Rented rooms, backyard shacks and rented shacks in informal settlements generally have the least amount of space. For owner-occupants in informal settlements, the sizes of shacks and sites can vary enormously, from one-room shacks and little private outdoor space in an overcrowded informal settlement to larger shacks and larger sites (with extensive gardens) in less-dense settlements. The sizes of RDP houses and plots are often smaller than the largest shacks and sites in informal settlements, but they obviously have much more space than rented rooms or backyard shacks.
- **Adequacy of services:** Informal settlements have the lowest level of services, usually just a few communal taps and perhaps some portable toilets. Some households may have connections to electricity (either legal or illegal) but many do not. Access to services is better in backyard accommodation, as there will usually be access to water, flush toilets and electricity on the plot. RDP houses have the highest standard of services.
- **Affordability (upfront costs):** In most cases, the upfront costs for getting accommodation are very low. For RDP housing, some respondents had to pay R350 to have electricity installed, and for rental accommodation some respondents had to pay a deposit of up to R300. Buying a shack or the materials for a shack can, however, be considerably more expensive. The materials for a shack can cost up to about R2000. On the other hand, however, some shacks were bought and sold for a few hundred Rand, and one respondent said that he built his shack from scrap material that he found, so it did not cost anything.
- **Affordability (ongoing costs):** Having one's own shack in an informal settlement is probably the most affordable option in the longer-term (even if the higher cost of paraffin, as opposed to electricity, is taken into account), as no rent needs to be paid. Renting accommodation in an informal settlement, renting a backyard shack or renting space in the backyard for one's own shack requires a relatively low monthly rental to be paid (typically not more than R150 per month). For rented rooms and RDP houses a higher monthly cost needs to be paid (ranging from R250 to R300 per month, including water and electricity, for rented rooms and ranging from R200 to R400 per month for water and electricity charges in RDP housing settlements).
- **Physical security:** Shacks in informal settlements have the least security and are easily broken into (or can even be stolen while the occupant is away, as happened in one case in the survey). Renting one room in a multi-roomed shack with a number of other tenants probably provides more security, as there would usually be more people around than in the case of a stand-alone shack. RDP housing also provides more security than a stand-alone shack because the house is more solidly

5

constructed and less easy to break into. Backyard accommodation can provide the most security as there are normally a number of households in the yard and the main house, and there would always be people present.

- **Security of tenure:** Renting accommodation is the least secure form of tenure, as the landlord can evict their tenant at any time (although as long as the tenant pays the rent, the tenant can be quite secure in practice). The one exception is in renting a shack in an informal settlement. As shown by some of the interviews, the local community-based organisation can intervene in cases where the landlords try to evict tenants, and the tenant can end up as the *de facto* owner. Having one's own shack in an informal settlement is considerably more secure than renting accommodation; recognition of one's claim by the local community-based organisation and neighbours (and recognition by the municipality in shack numbering exercises) can result in quite a high security of tenure. RDP houses, of course, usually have the highest security of tenure (for the initial owners; for informal purchasers of RDP houses there would be low security of tenure).

The urban land market can be said to be working well for the poor if households are able to access a variety of different options that reasonably satisfy the above requirements. In other words, urban land markets can be said to be working well for the poor if poor households are usually able to access reasonably adequate shelter, services and physical security in a reasonable location at a reasonably affordable cost and with a reasonable *de facto* security of tenure. This is clearly not the case at the moment. Although people are, for example, able to access relatively good locations and affordable accommodation in informal settlements and adequate shelter/services and secure tenure in RDP housing settlements, they are seldom able to satisfy more than a handful of the above requirements simultaneously, and major trade-offs usually need to be made. Therefore, the land markets in the poorer parts of South African cities cannot be said to be working well for the poor.

Another problem with land markets in the poorer parts of South African cities is that, whereas there are many options available for poor households towards the "informal" end of the continuum (for example, in terms of location, type of accommodation, forms of tenure and affordability levels), there are very few options for poor households towards the "formal" end of the continuum. The only current "formal" option for most poor households is an RDP house, and poor households generally have little or no choice when it comes to RDP housing (i.e. location, type of accommodation, form of tenure and affordability level). Generally, a standardised product is provided in a few locations. Although RDP housing settlements provide adequate shelter, adequate services and adequate security of tenure, in terms of location, affordability and size (indoor space per capita) they are often less adequate.

In order to address these inadequacies and contribute towards the development of land markets in which poor households are able to access a variety of land/housing options with

adequate shelter and adequate services in suitable locations at an affordable cost and with a reasonable *de facto* security of tenure, the following recommendations are proposed:

- Reforming the formal/legal/State-recognised land system to be more widely applicable and useful for the poor;
- Providing a wider range of subsidised housing options for all categories of need;
- Incrementally upgrading informal settlements where appropriate, rather than relocating them (although, of course, in some cases relocation may be unavoidable);
- Stimulating the provision of good quality backyard rental accommodation.

Through the above recommendations it would be possible to ensure that there are more options provided by the land markets in poorer areas and that these options are more adequate. Ultimately, we need to work towards land markets that work better for the poor, where households are able to access a variety of different options that meet their needs, and where more households are able to have legally-recognised tenure towards greater long-term security. Owners of property should also be able to sell their properties at reasonable prices when they wish to.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

1. INTRODUCTION

Urban LandMark is a programme intended to contribute towards making urban land markets work better for the poor, and is funded by the United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID). As part of Urban Landmark's *Operation of Markets* study on the access, holding and trading of urban land by the poor, 74 in-depth life history interviews were undertaken in nine settlements in Ekurhuleni, eThekwini (Durban) and Cape Town during 2007. The initial findings of this survey, together with the findings of a follow-up quantitative survey, were released in October 2007 by Urban LandMark (Isandla Institute, Stephen Berrisford Consulting and Progressus Research and Development, 2007). Due to time constraints, however, there was insufficient time to analyse the 74 life history interviews in sufficient depth for that report, and a more in-depth analysis of the interviews was subsequently undertaken. This report is a synthesis of the key findings of the in-depth analysis of the 74 interviews with regard to the access, holding and trading of urban land by the poor.

A broad definition of "urban land markets" is used for this study. Urban land markets are seen as consisting of the processes whereby claims to land are allocated and re-allocated; these processes may be mediated by various institutions, and the exchange of money may or may not be involved. Land market processes are closely linked to, and framed by, land management processes, which can be defined as the systems whereby land development, land use and land market processes are "regulated" by the state or community-based institutions.

Firstly, the methodology is looked at. This includes how the nine case study settlements were selected, the interview process, the conceptual framework for the analysis of the interview transcripts, and the analysis process. Secondly, the key findings are presented. The findings from the five background analysis reports (informal settlements, backyard rental accommodation, customary communal tenure, RDP housing settlements and public rental housing) are summarised under the issues/topics identified in the conceptual framework. Thirdly, key conclusions are drawn. Fourthly, the findings of the analysis of this survey are compared with two previous studies undertaken for Urban LandMark during 2007 (the *Operation of Markets* study undertaken by Isandla Institute, Stephen Berrisford Consulting and Progressus Research and Development, and the *Voices of the Poor* study undertaken by the Development Action Group). Finally, based on the findings and conclusions, recommendations are made as to how urban land markets can potentially be made to work better for the poor.

2. METHODOLOGY

This report summarises the findings of the survey on how poor households access, hold and trade urban land. The survey consisted of 74 life history interviews in nine settlements. The settlements included the following:

- 3 informal settlements (Somalia Park in Ekurhuleni, Blackburn Village in eThekwini and Enkanini in Cape Town);
- 1 township area with backyard shacks (Wattville in Ekurhuleni);
- 1 peri-urban customary communal tenure area (Adams Mission in eThekwini);
- 3 RDP housing projects (Kingsway in Ekurhuleni, Old Dunbar in eThekwini and Delft in Cape Town); and
- 1 public rental housing area (Manenberg in Cape Town).

2.1 Case study selection

Three metropolitan areas in South Africa were selected from three different provinces, i.e. Ekurhuleni in Gauteng, eThekwini (Durban) in KwaZulu-Natal and Cape Town in the Western Cape. Table 1 compares the three metropolitan areas. All three metropolitan areas are large and rapidly-growing (Ekurhuleni is the fastest-growing of the three). All three metropolitan areas have high levels of poverty and unemployment (Cape Town currently has slightly lower levels of poverty and unemployment than the other two metropolitan areas, but it has a lower rate of economic growth).

Table 1: The three metropolitan areas

Metropolitan area	Population (2005 est.)	Ave. annual population growth (1996-2005)	GVA* as percentage of national total 2004	Economic growth (annual growth in GVA* 2001-2004)	Unemployment rate (Labour Force Survey 2005)
Ekurhuleni	2.5 million	+2.5%	7.4%	+4.7%	27.6%
eThekwini	3.2 million	+1.6%	10.0%	+4.5%	34.4%
Cape Town	3.0 million	+1.7%	12.7%	+2.9%	20.7%

*Gross Value Added
Source: SACN, 2006

One informal settlement, one RDP housing settlement and one settlement of a type regarded as being particularly characteristic of that specific metropolitan area was selected in each of the three metropolitan areas. The informal settlements and RDP housing settlements were selected (in collaboration with municipal officials within each metropolitan area) so as to provide a cross-section of different types and locations. Table 2 summarises the different types of settlement selected per metropolitan area.

Table 2: Case study areas

Metropolitan area	Informal settlements	RDP housing settlements	Unique settlements
Ekurhuleni	Somalia Park	Kingsway	Wattville (backyard rental accommodation)
eThekwini	Blackburn Village	Old Dunbar	Adams Mission (customary communal tenure)
Cape Town	Enkanini	Delft	Manenberg (public rental housing)

2.2 Data collection

Eight or nine respondents were interviewed in each of the nine settlements, using the "life history" technique of interviewing. This approach was adopted because it is "uniquely suited to depicting and making theoretical sense of the socialisation of a person in a cultural milieu" and portrays "actions and perspectives across a social group that may be analysed for comparative study" (Marshall and Rossman, 2006: 115-116).

The fieldworkers who undertook the interviews in the nine settlements were jointly trained in a central venue. They operated in pairs, so that one could take the lead in questioning while the other one wrote notes, did translating if necessary and picked up on particular points where needed. The fieldworkers were provided with a list of key issues as a rough guide to the interviews.

The fieldworkers engaged with councillors and other key role players in each of the case study areas in order to build trust and identify local informants, who worked closely with the researchers in identifying respondents to be interviewed. An approximately equal split of male and female respondents were identified in each case study area.

The interviews were conducted in the home languages of the respondents (isiZulu, isiXhosa, Sesotho, Afrikaans, English), and were then transcribed and translated into English where necessary.

Table 3: Respondents in the survey

Settlement	Number of respondents	Women respondents	Men respondents
Somalia Park	9	ES1, ES2, ES3, ES4, ES8, ES10	ES5, ES6, ES9
Blackburn Village	8	KB1, KB2, KB5, KB7	KB3, KB4, KB6, KB8
Enkanini	8	CE6, CE7, CE8	CE1, CE2, CE3, CE4, CE5
Wattville	8	EW1, EW2, EW4, EW5, EW6	EW7, EW8, EW9
Adams Mission	8	KA1, KA2, KA3, KA7	KA4, KA5, KA6, KA8

Kingsway	9	EK1, EK2, EK3, EK4, EK10, EK99	EK6, EK9*, EK11
Old Dunbar	8	KC1, KC2, KC5, KC6	KC3, KC4, KC7, KC8
Delft	8	CD1, CD2, CD4, CD5	CD6, CD7, CD8, CD77
Manenberg	8	CM2, CM9, CM10, CM11	CM3, CM5, CM6, CM8
Total	**74**	**40**	**34**

*In the interview with EK9 in Kingsway, one of EK9's wives also responded to a few questions.

The interview transcripts varied from about 5 to 20 pages per interview, and there were more than 800 pages of interview transcripts in total. The open-ended nature of the interviews resulted in the information collected from respondents sometimes being fragmentary and not always being completely comparable with other interviews. On the other hand, respondents had numerous opportunities in the interviews to raise any issues of their own that they felt were important with regard to urban land, and this has added to the richness of the data that was collected. A vast amount of valuable information was collected that provides unique insights into the accessing, holding and trading of urban land by the poor.

2.3 Conceptual framework

In order to be able to analyse the interview transcripts, a conceptual framework consisting of the following thirteen key issues/topics was developed:

- Choice/ why people moved to a particular place;
- The use of urban land;
- The meaning of urban land;
- The operation of the land market;
- The nature of claims to land;
- Social mobilization;
- The interface with formal/legal/State-recognised processes;
- The relationship between land transactions and access to finance;
- The relationship between urban land and livelihoods;
- The implications of location;
- The relationship between land transactions, urban-rural linkages, household fluidity and extended families;
- Gender differences with regards to urban land; and
- Perspectives of the future.

The guiding concepts and questions for these issues are discussed below.

Choice/ why people moved to a particular place

The reasons why people leave their previous place of residence and move to a particular place are usually a combination of "push factors" (for example, no longer being able to afford to pay the rent) and "pull factors" (for example, wanting to be closer to job opportunities).

The use of urban land

The uses of land include residential purposes (space for family life, eating, sleeping, relaxing) and income-generation purposes (for example, providing space for home-based micro-enterprises or providing the opportunity for generating income through the renting out of rooms/backyard accommodation). Outdoor space can be used for various purposes, such as a recreational garden or the growing of food (for own use or for sale).

The meaning of urban land

Wallace and Williams (2006) have suggested at least five different "registers" within which meaning may be attached to land. These different registers co-exist, resulting in competing meanings for specific pieces of land (Isandla Institute, Stephen Berrisford Consulting and Progressus Research and Development, 2007). The possible meanings of urban land (based on Wallace and Williamson, 2006) include the following:

- **Land for survival:** The land, or access to the products of land, is seen as a way to provide for the basics for survival.
- **Land as a bundle of rights:** Land is seen as subject to claims by various individuals or groups in terms of a particular set of practices, and these claims bestow certain rights and responsibilities on individuals or groups.
- **Land as a simple commodity:** If there are relatively secure rights, land is able to be traded (i.e. bought, sold, rented).
- **Land as an investment asset:** Land is linked to, or forms part of, an investment strategy.
- **Land as a complex commodity:** Land that is linked to abstract financial instruments and corporate entities.

In addition, there are also social, cultural and political meanings that may be attached to land.

The operation of the land market

Land transactions (the transacting of rights/claims to a particular piece of land, for example, the ability to use the land) can be conceptualised as six sequential steps which apply for all

land transactions, whether the transactions are legal/formal/State-recognised or extra-legal/ informal/not recognised by the State (see Table 4).

Table 4: Conceptual model of land transactions

Step	Description
1. Finding others to transact with	In order to be able to engage in a transaction it is necessary to find another person/organisation with whom to transact, e.g. who have a claim to land in a particular location and are willing to engage in a transaction regarding the use of that land.
2. Establishing trustworthiness	In order for a transaction to have meaning it is necessary to establish that the other party has a legitimate claim to the object, or rights to the object, which is to be transacted.
3. Calculating/ valuing	A transaction involves a process of calculating the value of the object or the rights to the object. This value could be expressed either in monetary or non-monetary terms.
4. Making an agreement	A transaction involves some form of agreement, either written or verbal, regarding the passing of all or some rights to an object from one party to another.
5. Holding land	There are two key aspects to the holding of land: - *The nature of the claim to the land:* Claims are socially or legally-based relationships between people in relation to land. - *Procedures for dispute resolution if the claim is disputed:* There are a variety of ways in which disputes can be resolved, ranging from formal/legal processes to local/community processes.
6. Terminating	The holding of land can be terminated in various ways, depending upon the nature of the claim.

Source: based on Isandla Institute, Stephen Berrisford Consulting and Progressus Research and Development, 2007

The nature of claims to land

Claims are socially or legally-based relationships between people in relation to land. There are, in practice, four main types of claim to land (Isandla Institute et al, 2007):

- "Ownership" (in the broader sense of the term);
- Rental (leasehold);
- Sharing; and
- Temporary borrowing.

Social mobilization

Community-based organisations (CBOs) or individual leaders can play an important role in land processes, especially in informal settlements. The strength or weakness of CBOs or

individual leaders may have an impact with regard to the ways in which land is accessed, held and traded in particular settlements.

The interface with formal/legal/State-recognised processes

Interaction with formal/legal/State processes can include engagement with the following:

- Formal land registration and land administration processes;
- Local government officials and councillors;
- The Housing Subsidy Scheme; and
- The "formal land market" (for example, estate agents or private developers).

The relationship between land transactions and access to finance

The forms of finance of potential relevance to land include the following:

- Household savings;
- Mortgage loans from banks;
- Micro-loans from retail lenders;
- Loans from informal money-lenders;
- The Housing Subsidy Scheme; and
- Rebates/indigent grants for rates and services.

The relationship between urban land and livelihoods

The sustainable livelihoods approach, which dates back to the work of Robert Chambers in the 1980s and 1990s, is a way of thinking holistically about poverty and development (Chambers, 1995). A livelihood comprises "the capabilities, assets (including both material and social resources) and activities required for a means of living. A livelihood is sustainable when it can cope with and recover from shocks and stresses and maintain and enhance its capabilities and assets both now and in the future, whilst not undermining the natural resource base" (Carney *et al.*, 1994: 4). The nature of the claim to urban land and the location of that land can obviously have a major impact on households' livelihood strategies, in terms of access to physical/natural assets, economic opportunities and social networks.

The implications of location

Key questions about location include the following:

- What do households regard as "well-located" or "poorly-located" land?
- What is the relationship of land transactions and location?
- To what extent does location impact on the livelihoods of households?

The relationship between land transactions, urban-rural linkages, household fluidity and extended families

Key issues include the following:

- Rural-urban migration;
- The persistence of urban-rural linkages (e.g. the existence of extended families with both urban and rural homes);
- The fluidity of household composition (as members of households move between urban and rural homes or between different urban homes);
- The concepts of the "extended family" and "family ownership" of land (and, for example, what this means for inter-generational and other inter-family transfers of land).

Gender differences with regards to urban land

The key issue is to determine the extent to which women heads of households are disadvantaged in terms of accessing and holding land (with regards to both legal/formal/State-recognised and extra-legal/informal/non-State-recognised processes).

Perspectives of the future

People's views of the future of their claims and/or rights to land are important in assessing perceived security of tenure and the extent to which their current access to land meets their needs (for example, in terms of location and affordability).

2.4 Data analysis

The interview transcripts were analysed in terms of thirteen key issues identified in the conceptual framework (see next section).

Text of relevance to each issue/topic was identified in each transcript, and then all the relevant text from all the interviews in each settlement was collated together. Patterns, categories, similarities and differences were then identified for the respondents in each settlement for each topic.

Five analysis reports were written up:

- Informal settlements (Somalia Park in Ekurhuleni, Blackburn Village in eThekwini and Enkanini in Cape Town);
- Backyard rental (Wattville in Ekurhuleni);
- Customary communal tenure (Adams Mission in eThekwini);

- RDP housing settlements (Kingsway in Ekurhuleni, Old Dunbar in eThekwini and Delft in Cape Town); and
- Public rental housing (Manenberg in Cape Town).

The findings of the five analysis reports were then summarised and synthesised for this report. This was followed by the following:

- Drawing conclusions about the accessing, holding and trading of urban land by the poor;
- Comparing the findings with the findings of the *Operation of Markets* study and the findings of the *Voices of the Poor* workshops previously undertaken by Urban LandMark;
- Making recommendations.

3. KEY FINDINGS

The findings of the analysis of the 74 interviews in the survey are discussed in the following fourteen sections:

- Context;
- Choice/ why people moved to a particular place;
- The use of urban land;
- The meaning of urban land;
- The operation of the land market/ how land was accessed;
- The nature of claims to land;
- Social mobilization;
- The interface with formal/legal/State-recognised processes;
- The relationship between land transactions and access to finance;
- The relationship between urban land and livelihoods;
- The implications of location;
- The relationship between land transactions, urban-rural linkages, household fluidity and extended families;
- Gender differences with regards to urban land; and
- Perspectives of the future.

For each of these sections, the findings from the informal settlements (Somalia Park, Blackburn Village, Enkanini), backyard rental area (Wattville), customary communal tenure area (Adams Mission), RDP housing settlements (Kingsway, Old Dunbar, Delft) and public rental housing area (Manenberg) are discussed.

3.1 Context

The nine case study areas are all unique. The different local contexts have helped shape the nature of land market processes in each settlement in different ways. The most important factor is probably location; the settlements vary from ones that were generally regarded by respondents as very well-located, such as Somalia Park and Wattville, to ones that were generally regarded as very poorly located, such as Kingsway. The different roles of the state in the different settlements are also important in determining land market processes, varying from the greenfields RDP settlements, which were almost entirely shaped by the state, to informal settlements such as Somalia Park and Enkanini where the role of the state is more limited (although it still has a real impact).

Informal settlements

The three informal settlements vary enormously. Somalia Park is a well-established informal settlement that is close to job opportunities, shops and facilities. Most of the residents seem to have lived in Gauteng in a number of places over a long period of time, and moved to Somalia Park in order to have a place of their own, live more cheaply and be closer to job opportunities.

The other two settlements are located on the urban periphery, and are not as well located as Somalia Park, but they still have certain locational advantages. Blackburn Village is located on the periphery of Durban ("in the middle of the canefields", as KB6 put it), but the settlement is near an area of rapid urban development (including the Gateway Mall, one of the largest shopping centres in South Africa), and there are said to be many jobs, especially in construction, in the area. Many of the residents of Blackburn Village seem to be migrants from rural areas in the Eastern Cape and KwaZulu-Natal who have moved to Blackburn Village to seek work.

Enkanini is a recently-established informal settlement (established in 2003) on the periphery of Cape Town, adjacent to Khayelitsha where many of the residents of Enkanini seem to previously have lived. The settlement is on state-owned land that was earmarked for low-income housing development and for which an extension of the Khayelitsha railway line was planned.

It is noticeable that all of the respondents' households in the three informal settlements had low-incomes. All of the households that supplied information (all except three) had incomes of less than R2500 per month. The median household income in Somalia Park and Blackburn Village was R1200 per month, while in Enkanini it was less (R800 per month).

Backyard rental

Wattville is a township in Ekurhuleni established in the 1940s, with a large number of people staying in backyard rental accommodation. Some tenants are staying in rented rooms, while others are staying in backyard shacks. Many landlords in Wattville seem to have a number of tenants each. Wattville is well-located, and this has resulted in a high demand for rental accommodation in the area.

The households in backyard rental accommodation in Wattville were generally smaller (from one to three people) than households in the other settlements in the survey. The median household income category was R1200 to R1799 per month.

Customary communal tenure

The Adams Mission area (or Sobonakona Makhanya) is a communal tenure area on the southern periphery of Durban. The area was incorporated into the eThekwini Municipality area in 2000, but traditional authorities (a chief and indunas) are still responsible for certain administrative functions. Families with rights to land in the area have been sub-dividing their sites and selling off rights to pieces of land (these rights are then usually formalised in the form of a Permission to Occupy certificate issued by the chief). It is essentially a peri-urban area, with a low level of service provision and with agricultural activity as an important source of food provision, but it is within commuting range of urban centres such as Isipingo and Amanzimtoti.

The sizes of respondents' households varied from 4 to 10 (with a median of 6.5 people), and the median household income was R1200 per month.

RDP housing

The three RDP housing settlements differ considerably. There is, in particular, a major difference between, on the one hand, Old Dunbar and, on the other hand, Kingsway and Delft. Old Dunbar is an upgrading project where people had previously lived in informal settlements in the same area before getting RDP houses there (although some of them had to temporarily relocate for a few years while the houses were built). Kingsway and Delft were greenfield projects (or in the latter case, a number of different greenfield projects implemented since the early 1990s), on vacant sites, and involved the relocation of households from a number of different areas (in the case of Kingsway, from a few specific informal settlements that required relocation, and in the case of Delft from the housing waiting list and from a number of different informal settlements). The net result of this seems to be that the residents of Old Dunbar have maintained the relative proximity to jobs, shops, facilities and transport that attracted them to settle in the area in the first place, whereas Kingsway and Delft were located on sites that residents generally regard as being far from jobs, shops, facilities and transport (whereas the settlements they lived previously were generally regarded as being fairly well-located). Interestingly, and perhaps not coincidentally, the incomes of the households interviewed in Old Dunbar were generally considerably higher than those of households in Kingsway and Delft (a median household income category of R1800-2499 in Old Dunbar as opposed to median household incomes in the R800 to R1200 range for the other two settlements).

Public rental housing

Manenberg is a township in Cape Town that predominantly consists of public rental housing. Manenberg was established in the 1960s, and Coloured people from other parts of Cape Town, such as District Six, were relocated there as part of the Group Areas Act removals.

The sizes of respondents' households were generally quite large, varying from 4 to 15, with a median of 8.5 people. The incomes of respondents varied enormously: half of the households who supplied information had incomes of less than R400 per month, while the other half of households had incomes in the R800 to R4999 range.

3.2 Choice/ why people moved to a particular place

The various reasons why respondents moved from their previous residence were very clear in the case of movement between "informal" land/housing options such as informal settlements and backyard rental accommodation, and it has been possible to categorise these reasons. People usually made very conscious decisions regarding whether to move and where to move, based on factors such as location, affordability and privacy/independence.

For movement to RDP housing or public rental housing, however, less choice was usually involved and it was therefore not possible to identify clear reasons. In most cases, people applied for housing (either through the general housing waiting list or for a specific project), either proactively or because they were told to, and then were allocated a RDP house or rental house/flat with little or no real choice as to location, house type or affordability level. In some cases, where people were relocated from a informal settlement to a greenfield RDP housing project, there was an element of compulsion involved.

Informal settlements

The reasons why people moved to the three informal settlements are a mixture of "push factors", which encouraged people to leave their previous places of residence, and "pull factors", which attracted people to that specific area.

The reasons why people moved to these settlements vary from settlement to settlement, but easier access to job opportunities, being able to have a place of one's own (as opposed to renting or sharing accommodation) and cheaper living costs in informal settlements were usually among the main reasons. However, the push factors and, to some extent, the pull factors, differ between rural-urban and inter-urban moves (see Table 5).

In rural-urban moves, poverty and the lack of employment opportunities in the rural area is the most important push factor, and having a contact person in a particular place (a relative, a friend or someone from the same rural district) is an important pull factor. In Blackburn Village, for example, a number of the respondents were fairly recent migrants from rural areas, and issues such as the difficulty of finding work in rural areas played an important role in moving from the rural area to the city. Having relatives or friends in Blackburn Village also

played an important role in attracting people to that particular settlement, as they could provide a temporary place to stay while the person looked for a job and found their own place to stay. It is important to note that people did not simply move to Blackburn Village because they had relatives or friends there and wanted to live with people they knew, but because they had heard good things about the place (for example, that it was easy to find work in that specific area).

In inter-urban moves, issues such as the unaffordability or inadequacy of alternative accommodation seem to be the most important push factors, and affordability and location seem to be the most important pull factors. In Somalia Park, for example, the respondents had generally lived in a number of places in Gauteng over a long period of time, and factors like the unaffordability of the rent at their previous place of residence or lack of privacy in a backyard shack were important reasons as to why people had left their previous place of residence. In terms of pull factors, Somalia Park was seen as a desirable place to move to for three main sets of reasons: its location close to schools, shops, factories and transport; it was seen as being a cheap place to live (both because there would be no rent or service costs, and also because food was seen as being cheaper in the area and there was scope for growing your own food); and respondents wanted a place of their own and Somalia Park provided an opportunity to have a place of one's own in a relatively pleasant environment.

In Enkanini, although the reasons why people left their previous place of residence were similar to those of respondents making inter-urban moves in the cases of Somalia Park and Blackburn, the reasons for moving to Enkanini were somewhat different because Enkanini was a newly-established informal settlement. The main factor reason attracting people to Enkanini was that it was a rare opportunity to get a place of one's own, due to the almost complete lack of control of land access during the initial formative stage of the settlement. In addition, many respondents saw Enkanini as a way of getting RDP housing more quickly than they would as backyard shack dwellers. Almost all of the respondents had previously been living in backyard rental accommodation in nearby Khayelitsha. For example, CE2 said that he had been advised by people he knew (who had previously moved into another informal settlement and had rapidly received RDP houses afterwards) that "the place could be developed soon". CE1 said that the strategy of residents in Enkanini was: "Firstly, get a place to stay, secondly, get a house from the government, then we will seek for titles".

Table 5: Reasons for moving (based on the three informal settlements)

Reasons for moving from rural area to informal settlement in urban area	Reasons for moving within urban area to an informal settlement
Push factors: • Rural poverty and unemployment • Political/personal conflict	Push factors: • Unaffordability of rent • Lack of privacy/ independence (in rented/shared accommodation)

Reasons for moving from rural area to informal settlement in urban area	Reasons for moving within urban area to an informal settlement
	• Loss of employer-provided accommodation • Displacement by informal settlement redevelopment/relocations • Political/personal conflict
Pull factors: • Availability of jobs • Relatives/friends in urban area who are able to provide temporary accommodation	Pull factors: • Good location – close to jobs, shops, facilities and/or transport • Cheaper living expenses • Can get a place of one's own • Lack of control of land access • Possibility of getting RDP housing • Availability of customer base (for informal business)

Backyard rental

All of the respondents come either from small towns/rural areas in South Africa, or from other African countries (Mozambique and Malawi). The reasons why people moved to rental accommodation or between different rented places are very similar to the reasons why people moved to specific informal settlements (with one notable exception: wanting cheaper living expenses).

A distinction needs to be made with regards to the reasons why people moved from another type of accommodation to rental accommodation and the reasons why people moved between different types of rental accommodation (see Table 6). The most common reason for moving to rental accommodation in Wattville was Wattville's good location (especially its closeness to job opportunities), whereas the most common reason for moving from one rental place to another was conflict with the landlord.

Table 6: Reasons for moving (based on the Wattville interviews)

Reasons for moving from another type of accommodation to rental accommodation	Reasons for moving from one rental place to another
Push factors: • Inadequate living conditions • Lack of privacy/ independence (e.g. in employer accommodation)	Push factors: • Conflict with landlord • Unaffordability of rent • Inadequate living conditions
Pull factors: • Location/proximity to job opportunities	Pull factors: • Greater privacy/independence

Reasons for moving from another type of accommodation to rental accommodation	Reasons for moving from one rental place to another
- To get adequate shelter/access to services - Greater privacy/independence - Friends/relatives in area - Greater security (than informal settlement)	

Customary communal tenure

The main reason for moving from previous places of residence was, overwhelmingly, violence, and the main reasons for moving to Adam's Mission were its relatively good location, the fact that some respondents had relatives in the settlement, and the political affiliation of the community (it was regarded as ANC-aligned). KA6 was an extreme example of someone having to move because of violence. All three houses where he had previously lived before moving to Adams Mission "were burned because of political riots".

Some of the respondents in Adams Mission were fairly recent arrivals to the settlement, for example, KA4 arrived in 2004, KA2 arrived in 2005 and KA3 arrived in 2006. The respondent who had lived there the longest was KA1, who had arrived in 1988. The median length of time the respondents had lived in Adams Mission was about 7 years.

RDP housing

Whereas all of the respondents in Kingsway and Old Dunbar had previously been living in informal settlements, most of the respondents in Delft had come from the general housing waiting list and had previously been living in rental accommodation in various parts of Cape Town.

There are basically three main ways in which people ended up living in these three settlements (the other, less frequent, ways are discussed in the section on the operation of the land market):

- **Relocation from an informal settlement that had been earmarked for relocation**, such as for all respondents in Kingsway and three respondents in Delft who had been relocated from Joe Slovo. In some cases, the relocation was because the site of the informal settlement was unsuitable for development (such as Emlotheni and Emandleni) or because the site was to be redeveloped for other purposes (as in the case of the Apex and Joe Slovo informal settlements). In some cases, an element of compulsion was involved. For example, EK2 said "we were compelled [to move]... I did not even know there was a Kingsway". EK6 of Kingsway said "what forced me to come and stay here is because we were staying at Apex and they moved us here",

and CD8 said he was "chased" from Joe Slovo because he was living under the power lines. In many cases, however, people registered voluntarily and were eager to get houses and services. For example, EK9 of Kingsway said "they never forced anyone [to register], if you like you would and if you do not like you would not. I liked to because I saw it better to go and stay at a place which had water, rather than staying badly at a place which had no water". In most cases, people were not familiar with the area they were being relocated to.

- **Allocation from the housing waiting list**. Most of the respondents in Delft had previously been living in rental accommodation in different parts of Cape Town (and some were forced to move from place to place quite frequently, for example, because of difficulties in paying rent). After applying for housing, they were eventually allocated houses in Delft. As with the relocations above, most respondents were unfamiliar with the area, but moved there because they were able to get a house there (and they did not have a choice of other areas).

- **Upgrading of an informal settlement**, as is the case of all the respondents in Old Dunbar. Although many of the respondents had lived in more than one informal settlement in Cato Manor, and although some respondents had to temporarily relocate for a few years while houses were being built, people's RDP houses ended up in more or less the same area as where they previously been living in informal settlements.

In the case of the upgrading of an informal settlement (Old Dunbar), it is clear that residents had made a conscious choice of where to live and the upgrading had confirmed that choice. In the case of relocations from informal settlements to a housing project, people had little choice as to whether or not they wanted to move and no choice as to where they were to be moved to. In the case of allocation from the housing waiting list, people did proactively make a choice that they wanted to move from where they previously lived and that they wanted a house of their own, but they also had no real choice as to the location of that house. As will be discussed in the section on location, people who moved to greenfield projects (Kingsway and the projects in Delft) were often disadvantaged by the move, as transport became more expensive and jobs became harder to access. In the case of the upgrading of Cato Manor, however, people had settled there because it was relatively close to central Durban, and they have been able to continue to benefit from this relatively good location.

Public rental housing

As with the respondents in RDP housing settlements, there was often limited choice involved with regard to moving to public rental housing. In most cases, people applied for council housing and then, after many years of waiting, were allocated a place in Manenberg (although in some cases there was a limited choice of different locations, and in some cases people specifically chose Manenberg). In the case of people relocated during the 1960s as

part of the Group Areas Act removals, they were forcibly relocated with no choice of where to stay.

All the respondents were born in Cape Town and had always lived in Cape Town, and the respondents had generally lived in Manenberg for a long time. In two cases it was not clear when they had first moved to Manenberg, but five of the other six respondents first moved into Manenberg between 1969 and 1980, and one moved there in 1994. The median length of stay in Manenberg was about 20 years.

3.3 The use of urban land

Although backyard rental accommodation appeared to be used solely for residential purposes, and residential use was also the main use in the other settlements, land is generally used for four main purposes across all settlement types:

- Residential use (eating, sleeping, relaxing, family life); this largely occurs within the dwelling, but private outdoor space may also be used.
- Use of private outdoor space for fruit, vegetable and flower gardens.
- Use of dwelling and/or private outdoor space for income-generating activities (for example, running a *spaza* shop or crèche).
- Provision of rooms/shacks for tenants or relatives.

Informal settlements

Land in informal settlements is mainly used for living space, but some residents also use it for income-generating activities (mainly *spaza* shops). Some respondents have greatly enlarged their shacks over time, initially starting off with a one-room shack but then subsequently extending it into a two-room, three-room or even four-room structure. All the informal settlements face the prospect of relocation or redevelopment in the future, however, and this has obviously prevented some people from making major improvements to their dwellings. In the case of Blackburn Village, there seem to be rules enforced by the municipality and committee to prevent improvements being made to structures. One respondent (KB1) said that "you are not allowed to change anything. If you live here, you are going to stay in that house the way it is, until you decide to move elsewhere".

In Somalia Park, most of the respondents are using their outdoor space for growing fruit and vegetables, and some are growing maize. One respondent was growing and selling tomatoes as his livelihood. While some respondents in the other settlements expressed interest in being able to grow fruit and vegetables, there seemed to be little productive use of outdoor space in Blackburn Village and Enkanini.

Backyard rental

Many of the tenants are staying on plots where there were many other tenants. For example, one respondent (EW9) said of the backyard that he previously stayed in that the number of shacks had greatly increased from when he first moved in: "There were only two shacks in that place. But now, there are about five of them. The place is full now". On the other hand, however, in one case there was only one tenant on a plot.

Some respondents were renting formal rooms, while others had shacks in the backyard. In all cases of backyard shacks in the sample, it was the tenant's own backyard shack (which they had moved with, and had put up in the backyard).

Some tenants said they had made minor improvements to their rooms and shacks (especially those living in backyards in their own shack). More usually, however, respondents had not made improvements. When asked questions such as what improvements had they made, a typical response was like that by EW7: "Nothing much, because I am only a tenant".

Customary communal tenure

Respondents were using their sites for residential purposes and for growing food for themselves. Most respondents said that they had moved onto a vacant, undeveloped site that had to be cleared of bush in order to build a house and start growing food. For example, KA3 said that when she arrived there, "it was just a forest; I called the tractor to level the place".

All respondents were growing food on their sites (maize, pumpkins, potatoes, carrots, spinach, bananas and pawpaw).

RDP housing

The residential plots in the three settlements are occupied by RDP houses. Respondents were generally pleased to have secure tenure, access to services and a permanent, solid house, but there were complaints about the size of houses and plots and the quality of the houses. A fairly common view of RDP houses was expressed by EK2 in Kingsway: "What was done here is not good, but we are still grateful because it is better that nothing".

Many respondents had undertaken major extensions and improvements to their RDP houses, and some respondents were using their houses and plots for income-generating purposes.

With regard to outdoor space, only respondents in Kingsway had developed gardens. Residents in Old Dunbar and Delft generally do not seem to have developed gardens (in Old Dunbar, in fact, one respondent had to cut down all the bushes and trees that were on his plot when he moved in, whereas the sandy and windswept nature of Delft has probably discouraged many people from developing gardens).

Public rental housing

The properties seem to be used exclusively for residential use. None of the respondents mentioned using their house for income-generation purposes (which is probably not allowed by the municipality) and only one of the respondents mentioned gardens/backyards. Some of the respondents lived in flats and did not have any private outdoor space).

3.4 The meaning of urban land

Across all settlements, the main meanings attached to land included the following:

- **Land as a means for survival:** Land is seen as a way to provide for the basics for survival (for example, as a place to live close to work opportunities, and as a place for family life).
- **Land as a bundle of rights:** Land is seen as subject to claims by various individuals or groups in terms of a particular set of practices (and these claims bestow certain rights and responsibilities on individuals or groups).

In addition, it appears that land is also sometimes seen as a commodity to be bought, sold and rented (for example, in the backyard rental market in Wattville, in Adams Mission, and on a small scale with the informal buying and selling of RDP houses).

Over and above these meanings, it is apparent that land also has very strong social meanings. Having *de facto* security of tenure on appropriately located land is commonly regarded as an essential part of a happy life and as a source of fulfilment and personal self-worth.

Linked to the livelihoods and social meanings of land, it is clear that crime can have a major impact on how people perceive quality of life in specific areas. Many respondents in Blackburn Village, Adams Mission, Enkanini, Delft and Manenberg highlighted crime as a major concern. In Old Dunbar, on the other hand, many respondents spoke about how community action was able to end the reign of terror by a gang of criminals in the area, and how this had resulted in a much better quality of life for residents.

Informal settlements

The respondents in the three informal settlements clearly regard access to land as an important part of life. Through living in informal settlements, people have been able to get a place of their own with a reasonable *de facto* security of tenure. For example, ES2 in Somalia Park said: "I will never go find another place because I am satisfied about this place. I am staying here because I am happy... Although there were registrations for [RDP] houses, I did not go, because I am happy where I am". KB6 said that the advantage of having her place in Blackburn Village is "to be free to do whatever you want in your own house. To cook whatever I want, to have my own visitors without consulting anybody... We all need to have our own houses to do private things and the freedom of that you have there, everyone needs that". There are, however, concerns about the inadequate living conditions in informal settlements, such as the high fire risk, the inadequate water supply and sanitation. In addition, in Blackburn Village and Enkanini there were serious concerns about crime. KB8 said: "There are bad things about this place... we struggle for water and we don't have electricity and it's dark, that's why crime is so high, because they just hit you in the dark you can't even see them".

It is clear that land is generally not regarded as a commodity in any of the settlements. Although shacks, or shack materials, are seen as a commodity and are bought and sold, access to land is seen as dependent on getting permission from the local community-based organisation. Land is primarily seen in terms of survival (living space, space for income-generating activities, proximity to employment opportunities) and in terms of a network of rights and responsibilities regulated by local community-based organisations. The one exception is in Blackburn Village, where the rental of shacks or rooms within shacks still persists (although there have been attempts to prevent it). This is perhaps evidence of land, to some extent, being seen as a commodity, although it could be just the shack that is being rented, and not necessarily the land it is on. In addition, it should be noted that some of the respondents in the RDP housing settlements referred to previously having "bought" vacant sites for a few hundred Rands in informal settlements such as Cato Crest and Joe Slovo, so it appears that in some informal settlement land may be regarded as a commodity. However, insufficient information was collected on these transactions for it to be conclusive.

Over and above land being seen in terms or survival and rights and responsibilities (and sometimes as a commodity), it is clear that land has an important social meaning, with "having a place of one's own" seen as being an essential part of life.

Backyard rental

Respondents were generally happy living in rental accommodation in Wattville. For example, EW1 said: "it's a nice place" and EW4 said: "the place is quiet and I am relaxed, I am at home". Respondents had made a conscious decision about which location, what sort of

accommodation and what affordability level was suitable for them at this particular stage in their lives, and living in rented accommodation in Wattville was a suitable option at this time, although it is likely that none of the respondents intend staying in rented accommodation for the rest of their lives.

Land is seen in terms of survival (living space, proximity to employment opportunities) and in terms of a network of rights and responsibilities (which seem to be set by some form of consensus, as the rental amounts and obligations of tenants seem remarkably consistent throughout the area). Unlike the other settlements in the survey, however, land/housing/services (it is difficult to disaggregate them) are clearly seen as a commodity by tenants, and probably even more so by landlords. A room or a backyard space and access to electricity/water/toilets are seen as commodities that can be charged for and which should be paid for. This is well-expressed by EW2 who, when asked if she has to pay rent, replied: "of course, we can't live for free". The landlord-tenant relations in Wattville seem to be very much commodified, with tenants being very aware that they will be evicted and replaced by another tenant if they do not pay the rent.

Respondents expressed their satisfaction with the better standard of accommodation (for those renting rooms), better access to services, greater sense of physical security, and their perception that the cost was reasonable. For example, EW2 said: "it's good compared to other places, I mean when you compare to other places we've been staying, we feel much better here". EW5 said: "the things which I like about this yard is that when you come from work you just close your room and do your own things in your room. If you want to go anywhere they give you the room and gate keys". EW6 is happy where she is: "I have my own space, it's a proper township and my room is beautiful, as you can see". EW6 repeated that "I like the room, it is big and beautiful", and added that "it's secure and safe, the floor and walls are plastered, the room was cheap". EW7 is also happy there: "we live peacefully and we respect one another... It is very well-priced and we all get along with the other tenants". EW7 said his life has improved as a result of moving to Wattville, because he has found it easy to find work in the area: "when I moved here I had nothing but since I arrived here I have more things, bit by bit". EW9 said: "the benefit about this place is to be safe, more especially when I am on my own because my wife is always not here as she frequently goes home. I have an advantage by staying under someone's roof because my belongings are safer than staying in the squatter camp. The other advantage is the infrastructure available (toilet, water, etc)".

The disadvantages of living in rental accommodation were expressed by respondents as being that the place is not one's own, so there is not much freedom as to the use of the room or backyard space, and that there is also little likelihood of ever getting a RDP house.

Customary communal tenure

The respondents were generally happy to live in Adams Mission, although three respondents raised concerns about the increasing amount of crime in the area.

As with the other settlements in the survey, land is seen in terms of survival (living space, space for income-generating activities, proximity to employment opportunities) and in terms of a network of rights and responsibilities (although regulated by indunas and chiefs rather than community-based organisations or the municipality). Unlike typical informal settlements, however, it does appear that rights to land are a commodity that is bought and sold. People are able to purchase the right to occupy and use specific pieces of land from the current rights holders, and, then, through certain payments to the indunas/chiefs and holding a community gathering, legally-recognised written proof of the claim to the land can be obtained. Although one respondent claimed that just the dwellings, and not the land, is bought and sold, many of the respondents purchased rights to vacant pieces of land from the current rights holders (typically a portion of the rights holder's existing piece of land). It should also be noted that the cultural meaning of land appears to be very important in Adams Mission. For example, KA8 said of the family that owns the house he is currently staying in (and who live elsewhere) "it wouldn't be easy for them to sell this house because it's where they do their rituals and family gatherings".

RDP housing

From the respondents' comments it is clear that an RDP house is perceived as a bundle of many different desirable things: a proper house as opposed to a shack, ownership as opposed to rental or tenure in an informal settlement, adequate individual services as opposed to inadequate communal services, and something that can be bequeathed to one's children with pride as opposed to something that respondents in informal settlements were often half-ashamed of. RDP houses are usually (but not always) regarded as better than shacks, and it is something that many people have waited a long time for. EK10 of Kingsway compared getting an RDP house to finally getting on board a train that has suddenly come after a long wait: "it's better here in the small houses, we have water inside. There in the shacks we used to fetch water with our heads, that place was just for waiting like when you are waiting for a train. You wait a while and then the train comes to take you, just like that".

The main benefits of RDP housing were seen as the following:

- **There was no capital cost** (unlike, for example, getting a shack in an informal settlement). For example, CD6 of Delft said: "the house was given to me free and I dearly appreciate it... I now thank God and the government for the house". EK4 of Kingsway said that the only thing he liked about his house was that "I got it free of charge".

- **The benefits of (legally-recognised) ownership**, i.e. greater privacy, independence and long-term security. This was especially the case for people who had previously been tenants and who now also no longer needed to pay rent. For example, EK2 of Kingsway said: "it was not nice to be a tenant. It is nice to have your own place". EK10 of Kingsway said: "at Apex I was paying rent, so it's much better here at Kingsway... I'm happy I'm not a tenant here". CD1 of Delft said: "the advantage is that I can do whatever that I want to do and I do not have to be scared or consider anybody because I am the owner of the house".
- **Happiness with the actual house**. For example, KC8 of Old Dunbar said: "when you go away you are not afraid that the candle will burn the shack or when it is raining you are not scared that the water will enter the house". Similarly, KC3 of Old Dunbar said: "the benefits are that I can now sleep in my house that was given to me by the government with no problems... In the shacks the rain came in, you knew that whenever it rained you had to have a spade because there'll be water in the house, everything will get spoiled, even your clothes".
- **Access to services.** For example, EK10 of Kingsway said: "since I arrived here I've been living happily… It's not the same as living in shacks. [We have] lights, we have electricity and we have water and toilets inside the houses". Similarly, CD7 of Delft said: "when I arrived here, we became all satisfied because we have water and toilets are inside the house. Because when we were staying at Joe Slovo, we didn't have toilets".
- **Development of the area as a whole.** For example, CD1 said that she was happy to move to Delft because "I saw that a lot of development was going to happen in this place".

Over and above these very tangible benefits, there was also a hard-to-express sense of fulfilment and self-worth that some respondents had as a result of getting their RDP houses. For example, EK1 of Kingsway said: "I felt that I was now human and I exist in this life, all along... The fact that I have my own place, I have self-confidence and am proud that I became a woman who fought and found her children a home".

On the other hand, some respondents had complaints about the size and quality of their houses, the unaffordability of service charges and, for households which had been relocated, the high cost of transport for accessing jobs, shops and facilities from the new area in which they now lived. For example, KC4 of Old Dunbar said that the shack he used to live in was better than his RDP house, and a member of EK9's household in Kingsway said: "I see life as worse. Yes, we are struggling a lot. This place is difficult".

The way respondents in the RDP settlements view land seems to be very similar to the way respondents in the informal settlements view land. Land is primarily seen in terms of survival (living space, space for income-generating activities, proximity to employment opportunities) and in terms of a network of rights and responsibilities (although in the RDP settlements

these rights and responsibilities are regulated by the state rather than by local community-based organisations). The widespread awareness of the restrictions on the sale of RDP houses means that land and housing are generally not seen as commodities. Although some RDP houses are being informally bought and sold, this is clearly happening on quite a small scale, and none of the respondents had any direct experience of this.

Public rental housing

Some respondents liked staying in Manenberg while others did not. Many respondents mentioned crime and gangsterism as major problems in the area.

Land is primarily seen in terms of survival (living space, proximity to employment opportunities) and in terms of a network of rights and responsibilities (and, as in the early stages of RDP housing settlements, the state is responsible for regulating these rights and responsibilities). Although rentals are charged, the rentals vary considerably (probably depending on household income) and do not seem to be market-related, since the rent for a house/flat in Manenberg can be less than the rent for a room in Wattville. In addition, two respondents were not paying their rent and one had accumulated substantial arrears. It cannot, therefore, be said that land is regarded as a commodity.

3.5 The operation of the land market/ how land was accessed

Three different types of land market processes seem to be represented in the case studies:

- The three informal settlements have market processes in which access to, and use of, land is usually mediated by local community-based organisations. Although shacks are bought and sold, it is essentially just the shack structure or shack materials which are being bought and sold. The actual land or claim to the land is usually not bought or sold; in all three settlements, permission to occupy the site needs to be sought from the community-based organisation by the purchaser of the shack. Some respondents in the RDP housing settlements did refer to the buying and selling of "sites" in informal settlements such as Cato Crest and Joe Slovo for a few hundred Rand each, so it is possible that sometimes land is traded as a commodity in some informal settlements.
- Wattville has a rental market that is driven almost entirely by money (the desire of landlords for rent, and the ability and willingness of tenants to pay for accommodation). In Adams Mission, the sale of rights to land is also largely driven by money, but social networks play somewhat more of a role than they do in Wattville (although it is still possible for a stranger with no contacts in Adams Mission to purchase the rights to a piece of land there and make a payment to the traditional

leaders in the area to be recognised as the rightful occupant). The rental of rooms in Blackburn Village is similar to the situation in Wattville.

- The RDP housing settlements have market processes that are in some ways similar to those of informal settlements, but with councillors and officials responsible for controlling access to, and use of, land (especially during the initial establishment of the settlement and the period during which the restrictions on the sale of RDP houses are applicable). As with the informal settlements, there also seem to be some cases in which land/housing is traded as a commodity (the informal buying and selling of RDP houses), but this seems to be on a relatively small scale.

Informal settlements

There are essentially three major ways in which land has been accessed in the three informal settlements:

- **Occupying a vacant site and erecting a shack.** If there is a committee in place, permission is usually required from the committee (either before or after the fact). The Somalia Park committee generally requires payment of a nominal registration fee (of up to R50). All committees seem to require some form of identification (e.g. an ID book), and the Enkanini committee is even trying to ensure that all new arrivals bring reference letters from their previous place of residence. Where there is no committee in place (as in the early days of Enkanini), permission from neighbours is sought. Getting permission to occupy a vacant site is usually very quick, not taking more than a few days and sometimes taking only one day.
- **Purchasing a shack.** Some respondents heard through word of mouth about someone wanting to sell their shack, and negotiated to purchase the shack. The committee is usually involved in this transaction is some way, in granting permission to the seller to occupy the site, in witnessing/issuing a receipt, and/or even in facilitating the sale by linking up a prospective purchaser with a prospective seller. It is important to note that it is clear that it is the shack that is being bought and sold and not the claim to the use of the land. The seller usually needs to get permission to occupy the site (and, obviously, all of the respondents in this survey had been granted this permission). For example, although ES3 said that she would sell her shack materials, with regards to the site she said: "I won't sell it; I will give it to a person and put that person under my name. I can take the individual to the [community] office where I got the receipt and write down the signature". Purchasing a shack in an informal settlement generally takes longer than occupying a vacant site, as payment has to be made to the seller (which might necessitate paying in instalments) and the seller has to wait for the purchaser to leave before taking occupation of the shack.
- **Renting.** Renting out shacks or rooms within shacks generally seems to be frowned upon in the three informal settlements. It is not allowed in Somalia Park, and in

Blackburn Village there have also been attempts to prevent renting (although it is still occurring). No instances of renting were encountered in Enkanini, but it does not seem to be specifically disallowed there. It should be noted that in one case where a respondent (KB8 in Blackburn Village) had been renting an entire shack from an absentee landlord, intervention by the committee resulted in the former tenant becoming the *de facto* owner of the shack.

Enkanini demonstrates the evolution in the process during the early stages of an informal settlement. There are three distinct ways in which people occupied sites in Enkanini, depending on the particular stage in the history of the settlement:

- **Stage one:** The first arrivals heard about the establishment at Enkanini and came to erect a shack without having to ask permission from anybody. For example, CE8 said: "you needed no permission; you just came and built your shack... You would just spot a site then come place your shack. There was no committee and nobody to report to, you just placed your shack". Some people heard about the establishment of the site and joined in immediately (for example, CE7 said "I heard through the rumours, that people are building their shacks here, so I also decided to build my shack here too"), whereas others were more cautious (CE4 said he monitored the settlement for two months before deciding to move there: "I did not move immediately after I heard about this place, because I didn't know what kind of place is this. I use to come here just to check out the place and to see if any people have started moving in, and if there was water available, and how far is it").
- **Stage two:** Once the area was fairly densely settled by the first people to arrive, later arrivals asked permission from neighbours before erecting a shack. For example, CE4 said: "When I got here, there were a couple of shacks around this area; I asked [the neighbours] if I could also build my shack here... They said yes, I could".
- **Stage three:** After a committee was formed, new arrivals had to get some form of permission from the committee. CE7 said that new arrivals (for example, the purchaser of a shack), must now bring a testimonial to the committee to get permission. The testimonial must be "From where he/she lived before, the committee of that place must vouch for him/her". CE8 elaborated on the testimonial letter: "Currently you have to come with a letter from where you are coming from to the committee. That letter would say what kind of a person you are and why are you moving away from where you would be coming from".

Somalia Park had the most maturely developed set of processes. In Somalia Park, the key steps in the process of occupying a vacant site were:

- Finding out "who is in charge" in the community.
- Coming to an agreement with someone from the committee about occupying a vacant space

- Paying a fee to the committee and getting a receipt
- Occupying the site, i.e. being allocated a site and erecting a shack
- Maintaining the claim through participation in community life, through following community rules and through participation in official registration processes

For where an existing shack was purchased in Somalia Park, the order of steps was usually slightly different (in most cases, the purchaser found a seller through chance and subsequently approached the committee, although in one case the purchaser first approached the committee and was put into contact with a seller through the committee).

In Blackburn Village, the relocation of households to RDP housing in Waterloo has sometimes resulted in some shacks becoming vacant, which are then sometimes reallocated by the committee free of charge, as in the case of KB2 (although in most cases it appears that shacks vacated by people relocated to Waterloo are demolished). Although previous newcomers to Blackburn Village could directly buy a dwelling from a seller and only then approach the committee, it appears that the committee is trying to prevent the selling and renting out of shacks, and the current approach is for a newcomer to first organise temporary accommodation in the area, then to be introduced by the person they are staying with to the committee, and then to continue staying in the temporary accommodation until when (or if) allocated a vacant shack by the committee.

It is clear that local community-based organisations play a very important role in controlling access to land in informal settlements. The establishment of the settlement would often occur before there is an organisation in place (as in Enkanini), but once there is a local residents' committee in the area they are generally regarded as the authority from whom permission needs to be obtained when moving into the area, either before or after the move. In some cases, committee members seem to have played a proactive role in finding people places to sell and rent, and linking up prospective purchasers and sellers and prospective tenants and landlords. In all cases, proposed redevelopment or relocation projects mean that the committee (with varying degrees of success) are trying to prevent new arrivals from entering the settlements and, in the case of Blackburn Village, are trying to ensure that shacks are demolished as residents are gradually relocated to RDP houses in Waterloo.

Municipalities do not seem to be directly involved in controlling access to land in the three informal settlements, although there is active monitoring of Blackburn Village by the municipality. However, attempts of municipalities to limit the growth of settlements (which committees are required to play a role in enforcing), and the registration of shacks, has clearly played an important role in shaping the nature of access to and allocation of land in these settlements.

Backyard rental

Of the nine case studies in the survey, the rental processes in Wattville come closest to the conventional definition of a market, i.e. land/housing/services are regarded as a commodity and are allocated almost exclusively on the willingness and ability of people to pay.

In some cases, people got access to rental accommodation through an intermediary who knew both parties, but in many cases there was no prior contact between the tenant and landlord at all until the prospective tenant knocked on the door asking for a place to rent.
The rental market in Wattville has two distinctive sub-categories: renting rooms (including the use of services such as electricity) and backyard shacks. In the case of backyard shacks, in all examples in the survey the tenant put up their own shack in the backyard, and was thus renting space in the backyard and the use of services. The rental for rooms was R250 to R300 per month, including water and electricity, and the rental for where someone came with their own backyard shack was R150 per month, also including water and electricity. Some respondents mentioned having to pay a deposit (approximate equivalent to a month's rent).

All respondents had good relationships with their current landlords, although many respondents had had conflicts with landlords at previous places they had rented. Some respondents said that as long as they paid the rent on time (or else informed the landlords in advance of any potential problems with payment) the relationship was smooth.

Customary communal tenure

There are three ways in which the respondents got access to land in Adams Mission:

- **Buying the right to a piece of land.** It appears that the most common way of getting a site in Adams Mission is to purchase the rights to a piece of land. Many families in the settlement have large pieces of land that they have a claim to, and that it is fairly common for them to sell the rights for portions of their land to people who are looking for a place to stay in Adams Mission. KA6 said that houses are frequently bought and sold in Adams Mission: "yes, you are supposed to buy a house here. They sell them for about R2000, it all depends to the size of the place". KA3 said that in order to get a place to stay in Adams Mission, "you need to have money, because places are sold here... there are people who have huge places here". The purchaser then has to pay an additional amount of money to the indunas/chief (about R600 plus, usually, a bottle of brandy), and organise a public ceremony for community members to witness the granting of rights. The indunas/chiefs come and demarcate the piece of land and later provide written proof of rights (a Permission to Occupy certificate). KA2, KA6 and KA7 had all bought the rights to pieces of land, had paid the indunas/chief and been issued with a PTO certificate (for example, KA2 paid R800 to the seller of the

rights and R600 to the chief). KA5 had bought the rights to a piece of land six years previously for R3000, but had not yet gone to the indunas/chief and did not have a PTO certificate. In some cases, purchasers had found a seller through relatives or a landlord, but in other cases the purchaser had just asked around until a seller had been found. In most of the cases of purchasing rights to land in the survey, the land was vacant and unused (the only exception was KA5, who purchased the rights to a piece of land with a shack on it, which he then demolished and replaced).

- **Being given a place to stay by relatives.** This is where someone's relatives give someone rights to a piece of land for no cost. KA3 and KA4 had been allocated the rights to pieces of land by their relatives but had not yet been able to afford to pay for the recognition of their rights by the indunas/chief.
- **Renting of a house/ piece of land.** KA8 was "renting" a house – he was staying in it in return for maintaining it and paying the service charges. KA1 and her husband had been renting from someone who had now died, and they were continuing to stay on the same site, but without recognition from the indunas/chief.

RDP housing

The three key issues emerging from people's experiences of getting access to land and housing through the housing subsidy scheme are the following:

- People are generally happy to get a free house, to get security of tenure and to get better access to services.
- The process generally does not require people to do anything other than register and then collect the keys and sign a form. Although there are People's Housing Process projects, in which residents are meant to play a more active role in the project, very few respondents played an active role in any of the three case study projects (for example, EK11 in Kingsway).
- The amount of time it takes to access an RDP house varies enormously (ranging from CD2, who received an RDP house 28 years after applying to the municipality for a house, to KC3 in old Dunbar who got a house in a few months because the section he had been living in burned down).

As discussed in the section on "Choice/ why people moved to a particular place", there were essentially three ways in which respondents obtained RDP housing:

- **Relocation**, from an informal settlement that had been earmarked for relocation, to a greenfield project, such as for all respondents in Kingsway and three respondents in Delft who had been relocated from Joe Slovo. In these cases, a certain number of RDP houses appear to have been set aside for residents of these specific informal settlements, and residents of the informal settlements were then told that they could apply (or, in some cases, that they had to apply) for houses in a specific project (i.e.

Kingsway or Delft). After a period of waiting, they were then allocated their RDP houses. Some respondents were temporarily relocated to wait for the RDP houses to be built while the sites where they had previously lived were redeveloped (for example, some of the Kingsway respondents waited at a transit area called Lindelani; EK10 said of Lindelani: "It is a place of waiting... People there are still waiting for a place to stay").

- **Allocation** from the housing waiting list: Most of the respondents in Delft had previously been living in rental accommodation in different parts of Cape Town and they applied for housing from the municipality. After many years of waiting on the housing waiting list, they were eventually offered houses in Delft (the Delft South RDP housing projects were explicitly allocated 50% to people from specific informal settlements and 50% to people on the housing waiting list).
- **Upgrading of an informal settlement**, as is the case with all the respondents in Old Dunbar. Various shack numbering processes took place in the informal settlements of Cato Manor and households were allocated numbers. The area was then gradually upgraded, and residents were allocated houses based on their numbers (i.e. the length of time they had stayed in the area). Most of the respondents had to temporarily relocate for a few years while the houses were being built. The names of people to be allocated houses were publicly announced in community meetings to help ensure that the people being allocated houses were long-standing members of the community.

The process of getting a RDP house usually consisted of the following key steps:

- Registration/application.
- Waiting for approval. Temporary relocation might sometimes be necessary.
- Getting the keys and moving in.
- Disposing of the shacks which people previously lived in (this either involved demolition of the shack, leaving it for relatives to stay in or, in at least one case, taking the shack with to add on to the RDP house).

In all three settlements the informal buying and selling of RDP houses was said to be occurring (for example, when the owner of an RDP house died or moved away), and one respondent said that moneylenders were taking over houses from people who owed them money. None of the respondents had any direct involvement with the buying and selling of RDP houses, however, and it did not seem to be occurring on a large scale. Some respondents said that the informal sale of RDP houses usually involved the drawing up of affidavits at police stations to record the sale, and one respondent mentioned R6000 as the typical purchase price of an RDP house. Some respondents (such as CD6 in Delft) were aware that informally purchasing an RDP house was risky, as the purchaser has no legal security of tenure and is vulnerable to the seller subsequently claiming the house back. One respondent (EK99 of Kingsway) felt that it was unfair for people who could afford to buy

houses elsewhere to buy RDP houses: "if you buy this house you're limiting the opportunities of the poor who are staying in the shacks, who can't even afford to buy any house. These houses are built for the poor who won't afford to buy houses for themselves, but people who can afford also rush to buy the same houses. So people who are buying these houses should stop it, they must go to Sandton because they have lots of money. These houses are for the poor people from the shacks to better their lives".

Some respondents also referred to some legal transfers occurring, specifically in Old Dunbar where registration of title has not yet occurred, so it would be possible to legally reallocate houses if necessary. However, no information on this was collected. In addition, some owners of RDP houses seem to be renting out rooms to tenants (or planning to do so).

It should also be noted that one respondent in Delft had purchased a three-bedroom house in the older part of Delft (not an RDP house) through formal land market processes (i.e. consulting an estate agent and getting a mortgage loan). CD5 and her husband regret doing this, because they are struggling to pay the bond while their neighbours do not have to pay anything.

Public rental housing

The allocation process for public rental housing in Manenberg is controlled by the municipality. For example, CM10 said that in order to get a house in Manenberg, "they have to go to the council and then the council will tell them in which houses they must live". The municipality then determines the rental based on affordability (rents varied considerably, from about R50 per month to over R300). Even in cases where people have obtained housing through "illegal occupation" or through inheritance, they have only been able to continue to occupy their houses through being recognised by the municipality as the legal occupier.

There seem to be five ways in which respondents got access to the public rental housing in Manenberg:

- **The conventional process:** i.e. applying at the municipality for a house and then waiting on a waiting list until a house/flat is allocated (as in the case of CM2, CM5, CM9 and CM11). The waiting period is typically more than 10 years (for example, 11 years in the case of CM2 and 12 years in the case of CM9). CM2 said the process for getting a house is to "put your name on the waiting list for a place. They send you letters. You just keep in touch with them. You need to go back every time". CM2 said: "they just phoned to notify me that there is an empty place, so I can move in... I needed to sign that I am going to rent the place, and that's it".
- **Forcible relocation as part of the Group Areas Act removal**s: CM10 was forcibly relocated from Kensington to Manenberg in 1969 or 1970.

- **Transfer from other public rental housing:** CM3 had previously been living in a council flat in Hanover Park, but requested a move to Manenberg because his children were involved with gangs in Hanover Park and he had relatives who lived in Manenberg. CM3 said: "I went to the Rent Office to get a transfer to Manenberg… They told me I must wait. I waited nearly 2 years before I got the transfer to Manenberg".
- **"Inheriting" the right to occupy public rental housing:** When CM6's mother died, council officials met with the three adult children and decided to register CM6 as the new occupant.
- **Illegal occupation that is eventually recognised as legal:** In the case of CM8, he and his wife started off as illegal occupiers of the house (they had been staying with the previous legal tenant, who had moved away), and the municipality asked them to leave, but through demonstrating a willingness to pay the arrears on the house accumulated by the previous tenant, they were eventually recognised as the legal occupants.

3.6 The nature of claims to land

The two major categories of claims to land found in the survey are the following:

- **Ownership/ occupation:** Although legally very different, formal individual ownership in RDP settlements (where the restrictions on resale are still applicable) and "occupation" of land in an informal settlement are actually very similar in practice. There is a right to occupy and use the plot and there is the right to bequeath the claim to land to one's relatives in the event of the death of the main occupant, but there are restrictions with regard to selling or renting out the plot. In practice, it seems that tenure in informal settlements can be fairly secure where residents' claims to land are recognised by the local community-based organisation and their neighbours. Most of the respondents were aware of the benefits of formal/legal/State-recognised tenure, however, and aspired to eventually have a title deed that showed that the property they stayed in was theirs. Tenure in customary communal tenure areas (as in Adams Mission), although technically not ownership (people are granted Permission to Occupy certificates which grant the right to use a specific piece of land), can actually offer more rights in practice than ownership of an RDP house. For example, rights holders in Adams Mission have (in practice) the right to subdivide and sell or rent out their rights to land, with few restrictions.
- **Rental:** The tenant occupies accommodation owned by the landlord on condition of the regular payment of rent and compliance with certain other requirements. Backyard rental accommodation is similar to formal rental, but there are not any written agreements or any legal recourse against arbitrary eviction. Public rental housing appears to have greater security of tenure than backyard rental

accommodation - in addition to written agreements and legal protection against arbitrary eviction, a certain amount of non-payment seems to be tolerated, and public rental housing can even be "inherited" by adult children in the event of the main occupant dying. However, eviction for non-payment of rent (or eviction for other reasons) appears to be stricter and more frequent in backyard rental accommodation. Although backyard tenants can be evicted at the whim of the landlord, in practice, however, as long as the rent is paid and no conflicts arise, backyard rental can be fairly secure.

Informal settlements

While people may call it "a place of my own" and "my site", it is generally recognised that the land is not owned. A typical view is that of KB6 in Blackburn Village: "no one owns this place, it's just a place to look for a job and stay while working. You can't own it".

The nature of the claim usually involves being able to use the site for residential purposes. The claim also usually includes the ability to bequeath the shack and the claim to the site the shack is on to relatives if the main occupant dies. In the event of the occupant moving away, they typically either take their shack with them (and their claims to the site lapse) or they sell the shack *in situ* to someone, who has to get permission from the committee before or after occupying the site, and this may require paying a nominal registration fee, as in the case of Somalia Park. The fact that testimonial letters from prospective purchasers are sometimes required by committees (as is now the case in Enkanini) suggests that this permission is not automatic, although in some of the cases of shacks being bought and sold it does appear that permission to occupy the site was more-or-less automatic for the purchaser of the shack. Therefore, although shacks are being bought and sold in the three informal settlements, it appears to be just the actual shack structure (the materials) which is being bought and sold (either *in situ* or dismantled) and not the land it is on. This is best captured by CE3 in Enkanini: "people do sell when they move out... They only sell material if it is still in good condition but not the site because we also didn't buy the sites". As mentioned before, however, some of the respondents in the RDP settlements indicated that vacant sites may sometimes be being bought and sold in some informal settlements (but there was insufficient information collected to substantiate this).

There are also sometimes restrictions about renting out the shack (e.g. in Somalia Park), the use of the shack (in Somalia Park, where shacks cannot be used for business purposes by absentee business owners) or extending the shack (in Blackburn Village). In Blackburn Village, residents are gradually being relocated to RDP housing in Waterloo, and the municipality is demolishing the shacks vacated by people, so these shacks cannot be sold. However, where people are moving for other reasons, it appears that shacks are still being sold. It should also be noted that although the renting out of shacks is usually not allowed, getting a relative to look after one's shack while one has to be away seems to be accepted.

The strength of the claim generally depends on recognition/permission by the committee and by one's neighbours. Having a piece of paper signed by the committee and/or previous occupant seems to be regarded as desirable (but not essential). Having an official number on one's shack and being on official municipal registers are also seen as being desirable ways of strengthening one's claim, but this is also not seen as essential (some of the people who are not on official registers do not seem too concerned by this).

In Somalia Park and Blackburn Village, maintaining a claim to land seems to require the following:

- **Following the community/committee rules**, which are generally about what one can and cannot do on one's site, behaviour towards other residents, informing the committee of new arrivals and attending community meetings. For example, KB6 said one must "report to the committee and they give you the rules... all you have to do is to abide with those rules". There seem to be sanctions for those who do not follow the rules. For example, ES2 said that "you had to follow the instructions of that place. If you do not follow the instructions they will chase you out of the place".
- **Ensuring that other members of the community recognise your claim**, through social interaction and through participation in community meetings. For example, when asked what a person can do to make sure other people know that the place is theirs, ES9 replied: "we normally meet at community meetings".
- **Having an official house number provided by the municipality** sometimes seems to improve the perceived security of tenure (although whether or not a shack is numbered does not seem to make any real difference in practice).

In Enkanini, on the other hand, as the committee seems to have a tenuous grip on what is happening in the area and as there is no stable house numbering system, making oneself known to one's neighbours seems to be the main way of maintaining one's claim to land.

Backyard rental

The nature of the claim to land in the rental market in Wattville is very clear – tenants have the right to use a place as long as they pay rent on time, but if they do not pay rent on time (or do not make alternative arrangements with the landlord) they can be evicted and all their claims to the place will lapse. EW2 defined rental as: "you're allowed to use the place and if you don't pay rent anymore then they kick you out just like that". EW7 said: "when you are a tenant, you have no say, as the landlord owns the place".

A very noticeable distinguishing feature of the rental processes in Wattville (as opposed to the processes in the formal rental market, and even the informal buying and selling of RDP

houses) is that nothing is written down. There are no written rental agreements and there are no receipts issued for the payment of rent.

None of the respondents had written agreements, but in all case there was a verbal agreement relating to when the person can move in, which room/space they would have and what the rent is (and any other obligations the tenant might have, such as sweeping the yard or cleaning the toilet).

Tenants are generally very aware that the place that they are living in does not belong to them. Some respondents were also very aware that by choosing to live in rental accommodation rather than informal settlements they were virtually giving up the chance of ever getting RDP housing. For example, EW4 said: "if maybe I did move to the other side, at the squatter camp in Lekwape, maybe I should have been owning a house now. The years I have spent here is more than the years they have spent there. Presently I have nine years here".

Customary communal tenure

Although technically not the same as ownership (as KA6 noted, "the land belongs to the king"), in practice the rights that people in Adams Mission have with regard to land are very similar to full ownership. These rights include the right to use the land for residential use and agricultural purposes, the right to bequeath the land to relatives in the case of death and the right to rent out or sell the land (either the whole site or a portion of the site). The only practical limitations on the right to sell or bequeath the rights to the land is, firstly, that the purchaser needs to pay cash (KA2 noted that one needed a title deed to be able to sell land through a bank) and, secondly, the purchaser or inheritor ideally needs to be able to afford to pay the induna/chiefs and pay for the costs of a public ceremony to mark the allocation of rights (although it appears that in many cases people avoid doing this because they cannot afford it).

The Permission to Occupy (PTO) certificate is the written proof of official recognition of rights to a piece of land in customary communal tenure areas such as Adams Mission. KA6 said: "this land belongs to the king, so if you want to build a house here, you should have a letter of permission that you get from the king". KA2 said that after making the required payment to the Chief through the Induna, the Induna gives the purchaser "papers which say the place is rightfully yours, even if you die it will be transferred to you children". KA6 described the PTO certificate: "this letter is just written that you are a citizen here and it has a stamp from the king. This serves as proof that you live here... it's like a slip, sometimes it is hand written and sometimes it is typed. But it always has a stamp from the king". PTO certificates are regarded as important, as attempts to dispute rights to land seem common. KA2 said: "after you get papers the place becomes rightfully yours, even if someone else comes and say the place was his you just take out the papers".

In the same way that some people had certificates from the chief recognising their rights to land and some did not, some people had written proof of purchase of the right to the land from the previous rights holder and some did not. KA7, for example, did have written proof of purchase of the site. She said: "when he sold me the site we wrote the agreement and I paid the deposit and I signed, even when I paid the last instalment I signed". KA5, on the other hand, did not have any written proof of purchase. He said that when he purchased the place, "there were no documents written and there was no receipt but it was just a word of mouth". KA6 noted that where people had purchased rights to land without any written proof there had sometimes been problems later on: "it would happen that you get the place and pay money. But there might be a risk when you give money to the former owner and you will find out that after a while he would want to chase you away from his place so that he could sell that place again... It's easy to scam you because the owner after selling you a place, can just go to the king and pay money and you would be asked to leave, that happens a lot around here".

Most respondents intend leaving their place to their children if they died. For example, KA7 said: "if I die I'll leave my kids here, it will be up to them whether they move or they continue staying here". When asked how she would leave the house to her children, KA7 said: "I can make a will, contact my attorneys and speak to them". On the other hand, KA7 said that she "heard people saying that if you leave the area you must report to the Chief and Induna to say that you're selling to someone else or giving it to him and that person will pay again... Let's say if I give this place to [my daughter], I must report to the Chief and tell him that I'm leaving my place to my daughter then she must pay and buy the brandy and all that again".

RDP housing

Four key issues regarding the nature of the claim to land in RDP housing settlements emerged from the interviews:

- People are generally aware that formal ownership is more secure than the forms of tenure they had before.
- Documented proof of ownership was seen as important. Some respondents had title deeds as proof of ownership, and many respondents saw these as being very important. For example, EK1 of Kingsway said: "we went to get them ourselves, because we saw that others had them, so we also went to get them... I saw that it was important to have a title deed, because that is what confirmed that this is my house. Because being told verbally that the house is mine does not definitely guarantee that the house is mine. So that is why it is important, because the house is written in my name in the title deed. Because it happens in some cases that you think the house is yours, only to find out that it is written in somebody else's name". Many respondents (including all the respondents in Old Dunbar) did not yet have their title

deeds, and relied on letters or bills from the municipality as their proof of ownership. For example, KC3 of Old Dunbar said that if he died, he thought his children could use the letter from the municipality which he received when he got the house as proof of ownership: "I think they could use this paper because the title deed has not yet arrived, even though this is just a letter from the municipality".

- Many respondents were aware of the restrictions on the sale of RDP houses (in fact, in some cases, people did not even seem aware that the restriction was for a limited period of time only). One respondent (CD1 of Delft) also said that it was also not allowed to rent out RDP houses during this period: "we are not allowed to sell the house before a period of 5 years. We are also not allowed to make profit out of the house by renting it. If you do that before 5 years, there is a possibility that you might lose the house".

- Respondents generally said that they would leave their houses to their children. Many respondents said that when they had to apply for RDP houses they had to say who their heir was, and this meant that their heir would automatically inherit the property if they died (it is, however, not clear if that would be the case; it is likely that the registration of the heir was only in case of the main beneficiary dying before occupation of the house or before transfer of title). Only one respondent (CD2 of Delft) specifically said that they intended getting a lawyer to draw up a will so that their child could inherit their house (but they had not done so yet).

Somewhat unexpectedly, it appears that the *de facto* tenure in RDP housing settlements is very similar to owning a shack in an informal settlement: the house and the claim to land can be bequeathed to relatives in the case of the death of the owner, but there are (initially, at least) restrictions on the sale and renting out of the house/plot, as is often the case in informal settlements. The major difference between informal settlements and RDP housing settlements, though, is that whereas in informal settlements security of tenure depends on recognition by the local committee and one's neighbours, in RDP housing settlements security of tenure depends upon documented proof (and on the computer records behind that documentation, as one respondent noted).

Public rental housing

The respondents were clear that their houses or flats did not belong to them, but were owned by the municipality, and that they were tenants. For example, CM5 said: "this house doesn't belong to us; it's the Council's property. The moment we move out, the Council will put someone else, and this is not my house. I only pay the rent to the Council". Similarly, CM10 said: "I am not allowed to sell this house, it is the Council's property. I have to give the keys back to the council if I move".

Some respondents mentioned that it is the responsibility of the municipality to fix problems in the houses, but that they are often slow in doing so.

All the respondents seemed to have documentary proof that they were the legal occupants of their houses/flats, either via the form that they signed when first allocated the house/flat or the monthly rent statements they get sent by the municipality.

When asked about what would happen to the place if they died or moved away, most respondents said that it would be up to the municipality to reallocate it, but some said that their children (or other relative) would "inherit" it if they died (which is what actually happened in the case of CM6). For example, CM8 wants to be able to leave the house to his son ("he's getting married now so he can use it"), but was not sure if that would be possible ("I don't know, I must still find out").

3.7 Social mobilization

The role of community-based organisations with regard to land varied considerably, ranging from playing the most important role in controlling access to, and use of, land in the three informal settlements to being practically non-existent in Kingsway and the backyard rental market in Wattville.

Informal settlements

Community-based organisations are very active in all three settlements. They seem to be widely recognized as legitimate authorities, responsible for controlling access to land and ensuring safety and security. The important role of the local community-based organisation in Somalia Park is summed up by ES6's response to whether, besides the committee, there is anyone that is involved with this place: "I do not think so, I only know of the committee".

Forming a community-based organisation/committee in a new informal settlement was seen as essential. For example, when asked why they decided to form a committee in Enkanini, CE1 replied that "committees have always existed, even where we stayed before. When we came here we knew that is was vital for us to have committees".

At least two of the committees seem to be affiliated to the South African National Civic Organisation (SANCO). It is important to note that there are hierarchies of committees, ranging from street committees to settlement-wide committees. The settlement-wide committees seem to sometimes also be subject to higher committees, such as the Blackburn Village committee, which is subordinate to a committee based in Waterloo (where many of the previous residents of Blackburn Village had been relocated to).

The Somalia Park committee seems to be the best organized. Its level of organization is evident in that, in most cases, it charges a registration fee (of up to R50) to register new

arrivals in the settlement. This fee is used to cover the expenses of the committee, for example, transport costs to go to meetings with the municipality. The Blackburn Village committee does not charge a fee for registration, but charges a R10 fee for conflicts brought before it to be resolved. The Enkanini committee seems to be struggling to maintain control in the large and rapidly growing settlement.

The committees are involved in various activities, such as controlling access to and use of land in the settlement, tackling crime in the settlements, solving intra-community conflicts and engaging with the state regarding development and crime. It also seems to be common for committees to co-ordinate donations for the funeral expenses of community members who die. The committees have rules that community members are required to follow. In Blackburn Village, for example, the rules relate to access to and use of land, general behaviour, conflict resolution, the monitoring of visitors and keeping the area clean, and some of the respondents in the various settlements referred to examples where people were forced out of the community for various infractions of the community rules (for example, attempted rape). Attending community meetings also seems to be required. For example, CE7 of Enkanini said: "here one is forced to attend the meetings".

At least two respondents in each of the three settlements were members of a committee, which tends to suggest that the local community-based organisations had a relatively broad base and were not just fronts for individual leaders.

Backyard rental

None of the respondents in Wattville mentioned anything related to social mobilisation. While there may be an active community-based organisation in the area, tenants do not seem to have much (or any) involvement with it. It is even possible that landlords do not encourage participation by their tenants in community life, because that could strengthen the claim of tenants to the area and perhaps constrain the ability of landlords to evict their tenants. It should be noted that in some areas there are organisations formed by backyard tenants to protect and promote their interests, but such an organisation does not seem to exist in Wattville.

Customary communal tenure

Traditional leaders play the sort of role that is played by elected committees in informal settlements. The chief and indunas still seem to play the dominant role in terms of mediating access to land and resolving disputes in Adams Mission, but it appears that there is also a community-based organisation which is playing an increasing role in the area (mainly in terms of development and tackling crime).

RDP housing settlements

Local community-based organisations are not involved in controlling access to land and the use of land in RDP housing settlements (at most, they play a liaison role in this regard with the councillors or municipal officials). The strength of community-based organisations varied enormously across the three RDP housing settlements, from relatively strong in Old Dunbar to virtually non-existent in Kingsway, where none of the respondents mentioned it, although there presumably is a local community-based organisation in the area.

The local community-based organisation in the Old Dunbar area seems to continue to be active, and seems to play a liaison role between the municipality and residents in the upgrading process, whereas the level of social mobilization in Kingsway and Delft seems to have declined considerably compared to the informal settlements where residents previously used to live. This is undoubtedly because Old Dunbar was an upgrading project, where the residents had previously lived in an informal settlement on (more or less) the same site. In Kingsway and Delft, on the other hand, residents from a number of different areas have been relocated to these two areas and they seem to have been mixed in a fairly random way, thus breaking down the social organisation that had existed in the settlements where people previously lived. In Delft, however, there does seem to have been an emergence of organisations to tackle poverty and crime in the area.

Public rental housing

Only one of the respondents mentioned a local community-based organisation. CM10 said that she works as a volunteer (cleaning the streets and public open space) for a local organisation, the Manenberg Peace Centre. CM10 said: "we just go there and they tell us where it is dirty so we can go work there".

3.8 The interface with formal/legal/State-recognised processes

The activities of the state essentially frame land market processes in virtually all of the settlements (and the state plays the most important role with regard to controlling access to, and use of, land in the RDP settlements, and it plays the only role with regard to accessing and using land/ housing in the public rental housing sector in Manenberg). The main exception to this is the backyard rental market in Wattville, where there is no direct interaction by tenants with state processes related to land (although the landlords do interact with the state, for example, around services and service charges, and this obviously indirectly impacts on tenants).

Informal settlements

In all three settlements the interaction with formal/legal/State-recognised process has been similar, consisting of the following:

- **Involvement by some government body** (the councillor, the municipality, or, in Enkanini, the Khayelitsha Development Forum) in attempting to prevent the growth of the settlement. For example, ES3 of Somalia Park said that their councillors had told them in a meeting in the settlement that no new people were allowed to come into the settlement. There has also sometimes been engagement with these government bodies regarding proposed development or relocation. In Blackburn Village the process of relocating residents to Waterloo seems fairly certain (although residents do not know when it will happen), but in Somalia Park and Enkanini there was enormous uncertainty about whether there would be development or relocation and when this would be.
- **Registration processes**. The numbering of shacks by the municipality and the registration of people to apply for housing subsidies. Although many respondents had applied for subsidised housing, there was some scepticism about this. For example, CE2 of Enkanini, who applied in 2003, said that the last time he checked where he was on the housing waiting list, "I saw that I am number 11 000".

In addition, in Blackburn Village the committee was also involved in ensuring the demolishing of (some of) the shacks vacated by people moving to Waterloo, and interaction with the police and councillor about crime was also important.

Only one of the respondents in the three informal settlements (CE2 of Enkanini) had any experience of formal land market processes (and even this was not personal experience, but just his observations of the area where he previously stayed). Other than this, none of the respondents in the three informal settlements seems to ever have had any significant encounters with formal land market processes.

Backyard rental

Residents in rental accommodation in Wattville have virtually no interaction with formal/legal/State-recognised process relating to the area in which they live. The only exception was that some respondents had applied for RDP housing. For example, EW2 said that she and her husband had applied for, and were waiting for, an RDP house: "we have registered even where we were still at the informal settlements, so we are still in waiting for an RDP house to come out for us. Some people who we registered with have got theirs so we are still waiting patiently for our house".

Customary communal tenure

Residents of Adams Mission are, through the indunas and chief, able to (eventually) get legally-recognised Permission to Occupy certificates, and residents are provided with services from the municipality (and must pay for these services at municipal offices).

Three respondents mentioned the role of the councillor in bringing development to the area and finding jobs for some people (the councillor had found jobs for two of the eight respondents).

Only one respondent mentioned housing subsidies or RDP housing. KA1 was offered a RDP house, but turned it down: "about 2 years ago a letter came saying that they were going to build two roomed houses for us. I didn't go because I have children, we can't live in a small house. I am used to this community, I live a good life now".

RDP housing

Residents of RDP housing settlements clearly have more interaction with formal processes than residents of informal settlements. The main ways of interaction are the following:

- In order to get an RDP house and title deed, people had to register with their documentation at municipal offices and had to sign various forms and their details were captured on various registers.
- Residents are provided with services by the municipality and are billed for these services. In the areas where the billing for water and other services had already started, some respondents were unhappy with the frequency and accuracy of these bills (and some households had already accumulated large arrears).
- Councillors often played a key role in getting people access to RDP housing, and they have generally thereafter continued to play a key role in controlling access to land and housing (and thus, to some extent, play the role that local community-based organisations play in informal settlements, although obviously the role of councillors in this regard is limited by the constraints of the Housing Subsidy Scheme).

Only one respondent in the survey (in Delft) had engaged with the formal land market (contacting an estate agent, getting a mortgage loan and purchasing a property). This encounter with the formal land market was not a positive one – the respondent was unhappy at having to pay R1100 per month for what others were getting for free, and she and her husband had tried (unsuccessfully) to subsequently apply for a RDP house.

Public rental housing

Every aspect of accessing, holding and exchanging land and housing in the public rental housing sector in Manenberg is controlled by the municipality and involves interface with municipal officials at the local rent office. Monthly statements are sent to tenants, and one respondent mentioned that officials occasionally come to check up on tenants.

3.9 The relationship between land transactions and access to finance

In formal land market processes, large amounts of money are usually required to get access to land and housing, and land market processes are closely linked to housing finance (e.g. getting a mortgage loan from a bank). In the land market processes in the poorer parts of South African cities, however, the amounts of money required for accessing land and housing are generally very low. The highest upfront cost for accessing land in the survey (with the exception of the respondent in Delft who purchased a house/plot with a mortgage loan) was R3000 for purchasing the rights to a piece of land in Adams Mission, and the highest amount for accessing land in an informal settlement was a R50 registration fee in Somalia Park. The highest cost recorded for a dwelling was R2000 for a shack structure (in two cases, one in Wattville and one mentioned by a respondent who now lives in Kingsway). These amounts are able to be financed from household savings or through paying in instalments or through loans from friends, relatives or employers, so none of the respondents needed to access formal housing finance (with, of course, the exception of the respondent who purchased a house in Delft with a mortgage loan). Both of the two respondents in the survey who had had any encounter with mortgage loans (one directly and one indirectly) said that the experience was negative.

Informal settlements

The purchasing of shacks/shack materials usually involves fairly small amounts of money. A one-room shack typically costs from R100 to R350, although one respondent said he had built his shack for free with scrap materials he had found. However, large shacks can cost up to R2000, the highest shack price mentioned by respondents in the informal settlements being R1450, but respondents in backyard rental accommodation and RDP housing settlements mentioned paying up to R2000 for shack structures. People finance the cost either from their savings or through borrowing from a friend, relative or employer. Most respondents were realistic about the fact that the deterioration of materials through use meant that they would not be able to make a profit when they sold their shack/shack materials. It should also be noted that transporting shack materials can be relatively expensive; in one case in Somalia Park (ES3), the cost of hiring a truck for transporting the shack materials (and furniture) from their previous place of residence was R300.

It appears that costs for occupying land were only charged in one of the settlements (Somalia Park) and these fees were only nominal registration fees (R50 at the most) intended to contribute towards the administrative costs of the committee (although, as mentioned previously, some respondents in the RDP settlements referred to "buying" sites for a few hundred Rand each in other informal settlements).

Renting only occurred in Blackburn Village, and the amounts were also relatively small (although considerably more expensive in the long-term than purchasing). Rents ranged from R50 to R400 per month. In some cases entire shacks were rented and in other cases rooms within multi-roomed shacks were rented.

Backyard rental

As discussed previously, the rent for rooms in Wattville was R250 to R300 per month (including water and electricity) and the rent for backyard shacks, where the tenant had put up their own shack, was R150 per month (also including water and electricity). In some cases, deposits of a month's rent also had to be paid. These rentals are generally regarded as being reasonable.

In addition to paying rent, some respondents had bought their own shacks which they put up in landlords' backyards. EW8 and EW9 bought shacks specifically for using to stay in backyards (for R2000 and R1800 respectively).

Customary communal tenure

Of all the settlements in the survey, Adams Mission is the one with the highest upfront costs. The only purchase prices recorded were that of KA2 (R800) and KA5 (R3000), for vacant sites. KA2 said that most sites in Adams Mission cost "about R2000 and some R1 500". Similarly, KA3 said: "they sell them for about R2000, it all depends to the size of the place". In addition, the chief needs to be paid R600 to demarcate the site and issue a PTO certificate (plus there is also the cost of purchasing alcohol and meat for the associated public ceremony). In addition, a house then usually needs to be built. Acquiring land and housing in Adams Mission therefore requires considerably more upfront expenditure than, for example, acquiring a shack in an informal settlement. In the case of one respondent, the purchase price was paid in instalments, but no information on how other purchasers financed or paid for their sites was collected.

RDP housing settlements

There is not much relationship between RDP housing and end-user finance. In the three settlements in the survey, the RDP houses were free and required no payment by the respondents. For example, when asked if she had to pay anything for her RDP house, KC5

of Old Dunbar replied: "nothing, not even a cent". The only upfront payment necessary was in Old Dunbar, where residents had to pay R350 if they wanted electricity installed in their house (whereas in the other two settlements the installation of electricity seems to be free). The RDP houses that people are living in are thus generally the cheapest accommodation they have ever lived in.

Getting ownership of a RDP house does confer responsibility to pay for services, however, and although most respondents were happy to pay for services (with the typical monthly cost for electricity and water varying from R200 to R400 per month), some respondents were struggling to afford to pay the service charges. For example, EK99 of Kingsway said that the electricity and water bills are too high and they have been unable to pay (and are thus in arrears): "How did they expect us to pay for it? They said they built these RDP houses for people who aren't working, which were poor and we didn't have to pay for water. The statements we receive says that we owe over R5 000 and R10 000 others owe more that R50 000 and R20 000".

There were only two cases in Delft where respondents were required to pay for a house – a R1100 per month mortgage payment in the case of CD5 and a R675 monthly payment in the case of CD1 (which was possibly payment for the cost of transferring a state rental house to individual ownership). In the case of the former, they have struggled to pay this amount (being left with only R500 per month after the loan repayment and other deductions), whereas CD5 has given up and gone into arrears, saying it is "too expensive and I cannot afford it".

Public rental housing

Only nominal upfront costs had to be paid to access the houses (R20 in the case of CM11, back in 1980). The monthly rent that respondents had to pay for their houses varied considerably, from about R50 to more than R300 (probably depending on household income). The rentals do not seem to be market-related. The rent for a house/flat in Manenberg can be less than the rent for a room in Wattville. Nonetheless, some respondents had difficulty in affording the rent and were in arrears, for example, CM11 had arrears of R7000.

3.10 The relationship between urban land and livelihoods

The reasons why respondents chose to live in specific areas were usually closely linked to livelihoods (for example, proximity to jobs, cost of transport and the cost of rent/services). For example, many respondents moved to Somalia Park because there were a wide range of jobs and facilities within walking distance and nothing would need to be paid for rent or service charges. The example of Kingsway clearly shows the negative impacts of relocating people from a well-located informal settlement, close to jobs, shops, facilities and transport,

to a settlement that is far from jobs, shops, facilities, and where transport costs are much higher. In Kingsway, for example, whereas people had been able to walk to shops when they lived in their previous places of residence, a trip to the shops now costs R12 in taxi fare, and residents of Kingsway have to spend R20 to R50 per day on transport to get to places where there are jobs. By contrast, in Old Dunbar, which is an upgrading project, residents have been able to maintain the benefits of the relatively good location of the site (which is why people had established informal settlements in the Cato Manor area in the first place).

Using land for urban agriculture can also be an important part of a livelihoods strategy. Virtually all of the respondents in Adams Mission and many respondents in Somalia Park were growing food for themselves (and in one case in Somalia Park, was growing food to sell).

Informal settlements

Access to urban land is closely linked to livelihoods. Livelihoods considerations seem to play a big role when people choose a place to live (mainly in terms of proximity to job opportunities and/or transport, but also in terms of access to schools, shops and other facilities). A number of respondents in Somalia Park and Blackburn Village said that it was through moving to those particular settlements that they were able to get jobs or earn incomes (whereas in Enkanini, the residents had generally previously been living fairly nearby before moving to Enkanini, so access to jobs did not emerge as a major issue in that settlement). For example, KB1 in Blackburn Village said: "my life has improved [since moving here], because, with the money I make, I am able to take my child to school, as schools are not very far from here... We have jobs, people here are employed, they are free, they start their own businesses. This place is really nice to live in". Similarly, KB2 said: "[my life] is better now because I earn money I've worked for and send it home and I leave some to buy my own food, unlike when I was still in Flagstaff we only thought of food, now I'm able to send money home and leave some for myself". ES1, as a result of living in Somalia Park, is able to combine an income-generating activity (collecting and selling scrap metal and cardboard) with child care: "I am close to the source and market of scrap metal and cardboard boxes. I don't need transport to take my stuff to the scrap yard. I wake up early in the morning and get to the scrap yard before they open and put down what I have, go back home collect another load return to the scrap yard. When I get back I cook for my kids and go out fetch more scrap".

The cheaper cost of living in one's own shack in an informal settlement (i.e. not having to pay rent, and usually not having to pay for water) is also extremely important, and this is often one of the reasons why people who previously lived in backyard shacks have moved to informal settlements. Even in Enkanini, where many respondents were renting electricity and the use of water and toilets from nearby houses, the total cost (typically R130 per month) was still sometimes much cheaper than the rent they had previously paid (for example, CE3

had previously been paying rent of R800 per month). Interestingly, legal and illegal electricity connections seem to cost more or less the same (typically about R100 per month), but the legal connections are presumably more effective and reliable.

The case of Somalia Park, where many respondents are growing fruit and vegetables (and where one respondent was growing and selling tomatoes as his only source of income) highlights the potential importance of urban agriculture. Paradoxically, urban agriculture was only occurring in the most well-located settlement and not in the two peripherally-located settlements.

Backyard rental

Many respondents had chosen to live in Wattville for very clear livelihoods-related reasons. For example, EW5 and EW8 moved to Wattville because they had obtained work nearby, EW7 and EW1 moved to Wattville because they thought it would be easier to get a job if living in Wattville, and EW2 moved to Wattville because she knew the transport costs would be less than in other places. In EW6's case, the only reason she has ended up in rental accommodation in Wattville is so that she can work and send money back home to her family in Malawi. EW7 said it is easy to find work if one lives in Wattville: "even though you might leave your job, there are many places where one can find work". As a result, EW7 said his life has improved as a result of moving to Wattville. EW2 said that they had lots of options as to which area to move to, but they specifically chose Wattville: "I can say there are lots of places we would have gone to but places are too expensive and we also thought of transport when we go to work because transport is not that expensive from here when you go to town and the train station is very close by, it's in walking distance".

One respondent (EW2) said that the cost of living in rental accommodation in Wattville is fairly cheap. EW2 and her husband are paying rent of R250 per month for a room (including electricity and water) and this works out cheaper than renting a shack in the informal settlement which did not have electricity, "because paraffin is expensive".

Customary communal tenure

The main livelihoods issues emerging from the interviews in Adams Mission were the following:

- **The provision of (and payment for) services:** The provision of services (especially electricity) has a big impact on households' everyday life, and payment for electricity and water was also the only regular housing-related expenditure that respondents were required to pay.
- **Growing food:** The large sites and fertile soil in Adams Mission mean that people are able to grow their own food, and this forms an important part of household

livelihood strategies. For example, KA1's livelihood strategy is a combination of getting a government grant and growing fruit and vegetables. She said: "when I'm hungry, I go to the garden, I have everything - bananas, pawpaw, potatoes, etc. I plant curry leaves here... I have food because government gives us the grant, we plant and eat". KA4's livelihood strategy in Adams Mission is a combination of getting occasional piece work and growing food: "I think when winter comes and the job had finished, I could take my hoe and plant cabbage near the house".

- **Access to jobs:** A number of respondents said that it was relatively easier to get a job in Adams Mission than the areas they lived in before (because Adams Mission is unusually well-located for a customary communal tenure area).

RDP housing

The main livelihoods issues that were raised by respondents in the RDP housing settlements were the following:

- **Use of the house/plot for livelihoods:** Having electricity and a clearly defined plot has enabled some respondents to use their RDP house and plot for income-generation purposes.
- **Services and the cost of services:** Having access to water, sanitation and electricity are real, tangible benefits, but getting an RDP house also confers the responsibility of having to pay for services. While most respondents are happy to pay for services (and, indeed, for people who used to be tenants, they might be spending less per month than they used to), some are struggling to pay for services.
- **The high cost of transportation** was raised as an issue in all the RDP settlements (although it is less of an issue in Old Dunbar, as some respondents said that they can walk to central Durban if they had to).
- Two of the RDP housing settlements (Kingsway and Delft) were seen by some respondents as being characterised by **poverty and unemployment**. It is probably not coincidental that poverty and unemployment were raised as major issues in the two greenfield projects (where people had moved to from elsewhere), but not in the upgrading project where people had already been living prior to getting RDP houses in the same area.

The negative impact of the relocation from informal settlements such as Emlotheni and Emandleni to Kingsway on livelihoods was particularly highlighted by respondents. Most of the respondents said that they had to spend a lot of money on transport because Kingsway is relatively far from jobs, shops and facilities. For example, EK1 said that the cost of living in Kingsway is "expensive" because of the need to catch a taxi to go to shops, the library, the police station and so on. She said: "whatever you do, you must catch a taxi". She added: "my kids are still at school and expenses are high. They travel to school R14 return and I need to give them pocket money". A woman member of EK9's household, comparing

Kingsway with Emandleni, where they used to live, said: "this place is difficult because, you see, if you have R5, I would not be able to eat, I must have transport money, R12 in order to get to shops, [whereas] at the place we were at [Emandleni], I will walk on foot to the shops to buy food". EK2 said: "there are none [job opportunities] whatsoever that is why we are complaining so much. It is difficult to do job hunting here. Where can you get R20 per day [for transport]? To look for a job in Randburg you need R50 [for transport]. There are so many unemployed people around here. It is a sin". Similarly, EK3 said: "it is difficult staying here, I used to be able to find temporary work but now I can't even find small change". EK2 said that adjusting to the location of Kingsway was difficult: "Everything is far away from here, from us. In the first three years it was very hard, we were bothered by hunger and poverty, but we got used to the situation as time went by".

Public rental housing

The two main livelihoods issues emerging from the interviews in Manenberg were the rent and service charges (which at least two of the respondents were not able to pay) and access to jobs (Manenberg is not close to job opportunities, and one respondent mentioned that there was a stigma attached to living in Manenberg that made getting a job harder). In addition, one respondent (CM6) mentioned the importance of his social networks in Manenberg: "I have lots of relatives staying in Manenberg [and] I just don't want to move from this place. I could ask them if they don't have a room for me. I would rather stay here because I'm not working and my wife is not working but there's always a piece of dry bread, there's always something to eat. What if I stay in another place now and I don't know the people there, it will be very hard for me, but here the neighbours [help me], one will give me a little bit of sugar and the other one a little bit of milk, because they understand me".

3.11 The implications of location

Location is a crucial issue. Access to land in a relatively good location (i.e. close to jobs, schools, shops, facilities and transport), as in the case of Somalia Park, can result in more likelihood of getting a job or earning an income in other ways, less time and money spent on transport and in a better quality of life for all members of the household. On the other hand, access to land in a poor location (i.e. far from jobs, schools, shops, facilities and transport), as in the case of Kingsway, can have a very negative impact on the quality of life. This impact is summed up well by EK3, who was relocated from the informal settlement of Emandleni to the Kingsway RDP housing settlement: "It is difficult staying here, I used to be able to find temporary work but now I can't even find small change". From the interviews, it appears that respondents often made conscious decisions about location, weighing up the advantages and disadvantages of different locations before choosing where to stay (and even in settlements where there were some locational disadvantages, such as Blackburn Village and Enkanini, there were still certain real advantages to the locations of those

settlements). In relocations to greenfield RDP housing projects, however, the recipients generally had little or no choice as to the location, which is probably why greenfield RDP housing projects are often poorly-located in terms of the needs of residents (as is the case with the two greenfield RDP housing projects in the survey).

Informal settlements

The three informal settlements highlight the complexity of the issue of location. Although two of the settlements (Blackburn Village and Enkanini) are located in the urban periphery, the responses of the respondents highlighted that there are certain locational advantages to all of the settlements, and that there are usually good reasons for why people are where they are. It is noticeable, however, that the respondents in the two peripheral settlements were more willing to move if this was required in order to get access to RDP housing, whereas the respondents in the best-located settlement (Somalia Park) were reluctant to move because they suspected that they would be moved to somewhere less well-located.

Somalia Park is clearly very well-located, close to job opportunities, shops and transport, and this is why many of the respondents moved there and why they like living there (and Somalia Park is even close to an area of agricultural smallholdings, where items such as eggs can be purchased cheaply). The views of the respondents on the location of Somalia Park were unanimous. For example, ES8 said: "everything is close by; we do not use public transport". ES5 said: "it is better here because everything is closer, like the schools, and transport. So there are many things that make us like the place". ES2 said: "the only reason we stay here is because everything is near to us the clinics, and the schools. There is no need for us to catch a taxi, we just walk". ES1 said: "we have a school, clinic, and police station. I walk to all these places. Even if I don't have the R7 transport fare I can walk to any of these places". ES3 and her family moved to Somalia Park specifically because "the schools that our children were attending were near and they could walk from Somalia Park to school". ES3 added: "the thing that I like about Somalia Park is that it is near the shops, transport, schools".

Blackburn Village is located on the urban periphery of Durban, and is less obviously well-located, but it is close to a rapidly developing area and there seem to be jobs available relatively close by, and many of the respondents moved to Blackburn Village specifically to be able to get work (and to be able to walk to work). For example, KB1 said: "the positive thing [about Blackburn Village] is the jobs available, 100% there are jobs". There are, however, certain problems with the exact location of Blackburn, as the only way to walk to anywhere else from Blackburn Village is through the cane fields (where criminals are said to hide out) or along a busy freeway (where people either get knocked over or get arrested by the police for walking on a freeway). There is a primary school nearby (which was also an attraction for one respondent to move there, as her children can now walk to school), sports grounds and a mobile clinic that comes once a week, but shops are 30 minutes walk away

and the nearest high schools also seems to be relatively far away (some respondents were paying from R50 to R100 per child per month for taxi transport to school).

Enkanini is also on the urban periphery, but is adjacent to Khayelitsha, where most of the respondents previously used to stay in backyard rental accommodation. Although two of the respondents did not think Enkanini had a good location, most of the respondents regarded it as being close to shops and transport (it is near taxi routes and the railway line, and the railway line is being extended, with a new station planned for Enkanini). For example, CE7 said "I like this place because the railway station is much closer now, and the taxi route is nearer". There is a shopping centre nearby, which respondents walk to, where "everything is available" (as CE4 put it). There is also a school close by.

In many cases it appears that a conscious choice was made with regard to location. For people moving from rural areas, it seems this choice was sometimes limited to settlements in which the person had a contact of some form and had some information about, but for inter-urban movements to informal settlements it appears that very clear choices about location and the impact of location on livelihoods were usually made. In a few cases, however, people did seem to end up in a particular settlement not necessarily because they wanted to, but because they felt that they had no other choice.

Backyard rental

Many respondents moved to Wattville specifically because it is close to job opportunities (and therefore it is perceived to be easier to get a job if living in Wattville, and the cost of transport to work is also less). EW1 specifically moved to Wattville "so I could be able to look for another job", EW4 was advised by her family to move to Wattville because it "nearer to work places" and EW7 said that it is easy to find work if one lives in Wattville: "even though you might leave your job, there are many places where one can find work".

Some respondents also moved to Wattville because of the good transport links, and that one can walk to town if necessary. EW8 said: "here, what is easy is going to town, because taxis are closer" and EW9 said that "it's a walking distance from the Boksburg or Benoni town at no cost".

Customary communal tenure

Adams Mission is unusually well-located for a customary communal tenure area. Some respondents specifically moved to Adams Mission because it was perceived as being better located than the areas where they had previously lived. For example, KA5 said: "the good thing [about Adams Mission] was that transport was very reliable for all surrounding places like Durban, Isipingo, Amanzimtoti and all other places". KA4 said that he was advised to

move here by his sister because she said it was closer to work opportunities: "She said to me it is better for me to come here so that I could be nearer to work places".

On the other hand, transport is required to get from Adam's Mission to the nearest CBDs (for example, Amazimtoti and Isipingo) and some facilities, and many respondents saw transport as being expensive. In addition, the state of the road network within Adams Mission can make getting to the main road to take a taxi problematic. KA7 said that when one needs an ambulance, "they must take you with a wheelbarrow to the main road".

RDP housing

Location was a major issue in Kingsway and, to a lesser extent, in Delft. Residents had been relocated from elsewhere, and a common perception was that the places they had been located from had been closer to jobs, shops, facilities and transport than the places they had been relocated to (this was especially so in Kingsway). Typical comments of respondents in Kingsway about the location of the settlement were: "I do not think anyone in his senses would have voluntarily agreed to come to this place, which is wild" (EK2) and "the difference is, here you need to use public transport to get to the shops, and at Emandleni you did not need to use public transport, you could walk to the shops" (EK11, who also added that at Emandleni "we walked to work... It was near"). Comparing Kingsway with Emlotheni, the informal settlement where they lived before, EK2 said transport in Emlotheni "was cheap. You could even walk on foot to town, although a slight distance. Now, you cannot walk all the way to Benoni. You can collapse on the way". EK2 said that at Emlotheni, "there were a lot of [shops]" and "we were walking to the factories to seek for employment". Similarly, EK4 said of Emlotheni, "it is close to all amenities such as hospitals, police stations and shops, unlike here". Respondents relocated to from Joe Slovo (in Langa) to Delft had similar comments about Delft. For example, CD77 said: "the bad thing about this place [Delft] is transportation. There are no trains, only taxis or buses are used". When asked to give advice to someone wanting to live in Delft, he said "transportation is hard". CD7 said that whereas to travel (by taxi) to central Cape Town from Delft is R8, taxis from Langa to central Cape Town were only R4. CD7 said that transport was very available at Langa: "trains, taxis and buses were there". CD8 also said of Langa that "most of the things were close by, including the train station".

In contrast to Kingsway and Delft, Old Dunbar was an upgrading project, where people had previously been living for up to 17 years in the area before getting a RDP house in the same area. Respondents had generally chosen to settle in the area specifically because of its relatively good location. This is summed up well by KC5, who said she likes the area "because it's close to town... That's why we fought so much for this place, people walk to town".

Public rental housing

Location did not emerge as a major issue in Manenberg. It appears that Manenberg is regarded as being neither particularly well-located nor particularly badly located. There are some shops ("tuckshops" and "mobile shops") and facilities within walking distance, but taxis are required to do major grocery shopping, and transport to places of work can be expensive (in the case of CM6, he spent more than 40% of his income on getting to and from a particular job).

3.12 The relationship between land transactions, urban-rural linkages, household fluidity and extended families

The rural links of respondents' households varied greatly, from households with no rural links at all to currently urban-based households (or members of households) that regarded the rural home as their real home and who had very strong links to the rural home. These links included building/owning a rural home, having family members at the rural home, sending remittances to the family members at the rural home, regular visits to the rural home and/or an intention to return to one day to permanently live in the rural home.

Many of the respondents with the strongest rural links seemed to live in backyard rental accommodation, which seems to suggest that rental accommodation does hold certain advantages for people with strong rural links (although none of the respondents in public rental housing had any rural links).

Issues of household composition and fluidity were not adequately addressed in the survey, but it does appear that some families are stretched across more than one location (typically a rural home and an urban home, but in some cases families seem to be split between more than one urban home as well).

Informal settlements

It appears that the residents of the three informal settlements largely have their origins outside the metropolitan areas where they currently live (only one respondent in each settlement had been born in the metropolitan area where they currently lived, the rest had all moved from rural areas or small towns). So the residents of the three informal settlements are largely migrants. There is, however, a major difference between Somalia Park, on the one hand, and Blackburn Village and Enkanini, on the other hand. The respondents in Somalia Park had generally lived in Gauteng for a long period of time and had lived in a variety of different urban areas and types of accommodation within Gauteng (including other informal settlements, renting rooms or backyard shacks in townships, staying in domestic workers' quarters, and living in hostels) before moving to Somalia Park. Blackburn Village and Enkanini, however, seem to have a lot of recent migrants from rural areas.

Blackburn Village appears to be an entry point for migrants from rural areas to Durban. Four of the eight respondents (KB1, KB2, KB3 and KB8) had a similar movement pattern: a move from the rural Eastern Cape to a major town or secondary city in KwaZulu-Natal (e.g. Port Shepstone) and then a move to Blackburn Village in Durban. In all cases, relatives, friends and people from the home district played an important role in providing information about Blackburn Village, advising people to move to Blackburn Village and, in some cases, providing a place to temporarily stay.

Most of the respondents in Enkanini were recent migrants from rural areas who had previously lived elsewhere in Khayelitsha before moving to Enkanini. Only one of the eight respondents was born in Cape Town (in Langa). The other respondents were all born in the Eastern Cape, and they moved from the Eastern Cape to Cape Town in the period between 1999 and 2005. CE8's account is a typical example of how most of the respondents ended up in Enkanini, by first moving from a rural area in the Eastern Cape to live with relatives in Khayelitsha, and then moving to Enkanini: "I came to stay with my relative [in Makhaza in Khayelitsha] and when time went by I decided to look for a place of my own".

Although questions about rural linkages were not specifically asked in any of the interviews, it does appear that some of the respondents in the three informal settlements regard their rural home as their real home and perhaps intend returning there (although CE1 of Enkanini said that if he died, his wife and children would remain in Enkanini, because "there is no way that she will want to go back to the Eastern Cape, because there are no jobs there").

Backyard rental

All of the respondents in Wattville originally came from rural areas/small towns outside Gauteng and many still had very strong linkages with their rural home (such as frequently visiting it, or sending home money to family members at the rural home). The ongoing rural linkages of the respondents in rental accommodation in Wattville were much more explicit than those of people in the three informal settlements in the survey (and, in fact, two of the respondents in Wattville said that they lived in rental accommodation specifically so as to make it easier to go back to their rural home more often)

The places of origin of the respondents in Wattville were very diverse:

- Limpopo (EW9)
- Mpumalanga (EW4)
- Free State (EW1, EW7)
- KwaZulu-Natal (EW2)
- Mozambique (EW8)
- Malawi (EW6)

In most cases, people moved to the Ekurhuleni area in search of work. Having relatives who they could temporarily stay with, or who could assist them with finding accommodation or a job, played a big role in the migration process. For example, EW5 said: "when I left home [in KwaZulu-Natal] I did not know where to stay and my aunt [in the Ekurhuleni area] said I may come. I did first write a letter to her to inform her that I want to stay with her. She said there was no problem. Then I came to stay with her". EW1 and EW4 initially stayed with relatives when they moved to the Ekurhuleni area, and EW5, EW6 and EW8 were all assisted by their brothers in finding jobs or accommodation in the Ekurhuleni area.

Some respondents said that they frequently visit their rural home. EW1 said that she goes home to the Free State at the end of every month, and one of the reasons she likes living in a rented room is that she is more easily able to do this (whereas when she lived with her employers, they refused to let her go home every month).

Some respondents are sending remittances to family members at the rural home. For example, EW9 said that he has to send money home to Gazankulu and support his family because he is the only one who is working.

Some respondents said that they intend moving back to their rural home in the future. For example, EW7 intends returning home to the Free State once he has accumulated enough money, and EW9 plans "to erect a decent house back home in Phalaborwa".

Customary communal tenure

Adams Mission is a semi-rural area in which some families have their ancestral homes (in one case, no members of the family lived at their home in Adams Mission, but they occasionally used it for cultural ceremonies).The relatively good location of Adams Mission, however, has meant that many outsiders, without direct links to the area, have recently settled in the area. Kinship linkages do still play some role, though. At least two respondents moved to Adams Mission because they had relatives in the settlement. KA2 said: "I just thought [Adam's Mission] suits me because there are also relatives staying around in case I have any problems I'll just talk to them. And my cousin's wife also helps me sometimes. That's why I liked the place, because there are relatives". Similarly, KA3 moved to Adam's Mission "because all my relatives are here. My sister is married here and two brothers and if I have a problem I would contact them and since my husband and my son have died, so they gave me this shack, and they helped me to build this house".

RDP housing

It is difficult to generalise about migration and urban-rural linkages with regards to the respondents in RDP housing settlements. The respondents in the three RDP settlements ranged from those who had spent their entire lives in that particular metropolitan area to

recent migrants from rural areas who still regarded the rural area as their home. At least two respondents in RDP housing were maintaining both an urban home and a rural home. EK9 of Kingsway had two wives, one of whom lived with him in his RDP house in Kingsway and "the other one is left back in the rural home" (although EK9 keeps a shack in an informal settlement for her to stay in for when she visits him in Ekurhuleni). KC8, who mainly lives in Old Dunbar, built a house in the customary communal tenure area of Mpendle (near Pietermaritzburg) in 1995, and some members of his family live there.

In Delft, there seemed to be a higher proportion of locally-born residents (i.e. born in Cape Town), whereas all of the respondents in Old Dunbar and most of the respondents in Kingsway were migrants from rural areas. This is most likely an indication of the fact that Old Dunbar and Kingsway were projects aimed exclusively at residents of informal settlements (and residents of informal settlements seem to largely be migrants from rural areas), whereas Delft was partially allocated from the general housing waiting list (which seems, in the Cape Town case, to be dominated by urban-born people living in rental or shared accommodation).

Public rental housing

All the respondents were born in Cape Town and had always lived in Cape Town, and did not appear to have any rural linkages.

The long waiting periods to get housing (typically more than ten years) seems to have resulted in adult children with spouses and/or children continuing to live with their parents for extended periods of time before getting a house of their own. Many respondents mentioned having done this, and this practice seems to be continuing, as is reflected in the large households of many of the respondents (four respondents had households of 9 or more people).

3.13 Gender differences with regards to urban land

The most notable gender difference with regards to access to urban land is that women were being explicitly prioritised in the allocation of RDP houses in some projects (such as Kingsway). For example, EK10 of Kingsway said: "it is only women that they wanted, if you were a man you had to follow behind your woman. No men allowed! No men, only women there". EK6 confirmed this: "in most cases we men could not qualify for houses".

Although none of the respondents said that women were discriminated against with regards to accessing land, the unfair division of responsibilities between men and women tenants in backyard rental accommodation and the perceived greater risk of eviction for women backyard tenants and for women purchasers of rights to land in Adams Mission, suggested

that women do often face additional obstacles and bear additional burdens when it comes to accessing land.

Informal settlements

None of the respondents in Somalia Park said that they felt that women were discriminated against with regards to accessing or holding land. For example, ES3 (who is a woman), when asked whether there is any difference if a male or female comes and asks for a place, replied "no". In fact, one respondent felt that women had an easier time accessing land. ES2 (who is also a woman) said: "a woman gets the place so quick… Anything that has got to do with a woman goes fast, but with men it goes slow… A woman has got a sweet tongue. The man's got a tough one. They don't know how to talk. If I can come to you and say, hey you, girl, I want the place to sleep, will you give it to me? That is why it's not easy for them to get a place; they don't know how to approach".

The issue of gender differences with regard to urban land was not raised in any of the interviews in Blackburn Village or Enkanini, but women did not seem to have more difficulties than men in accessing land (and one of the largest landlords encountered in the survey, who owned five shacks in Blackburn Village, was a woman).

Although there are no obvious obstacles to the access of land in informal settlements by women, the multiple role that women heads of households have to play as breadwinners, home-makers and child-carers undoubtedly places extra stresses on women. Crime and violence in informal settlements, which seems to be a major issue, also undoubtedly particularly affects women.

Backyard rental

The main gender differences with regards to access to rental accommodation in Wattville were the differences in the obligations of men and women tenants, and restrictions on women tenants having male visitors.

Men and women tenants appeared to have different types of obligations. Whereas women had to clean the toilet and sweep the yard, men tenants said that they occasionally did repairs or were responsible for security. For example, when asked if they have any other obligations or responsibilities in the place they are staying, EW8 said: "my wife sweeps the place and washes the toilets, but for me I just do repairs where it's necessary". EW5 said "if you stay in someone's place you need to clean the toilets and the yard. Those are the things a woman is supposed to do".

EW5 said that women tenants with many boyfriends visiting them at night were more likely to be evicted by their landlords. Similarly, KA2 of Adams Mission said that when she was a tenant in a rented room the landlord "told me about the rules that if you are a tenant and how

you would behave when you live here, and that he doesn't want a drinking woman here, and he doesn't want a woman who keeps changing men".

Customary communal tenure

In Adams Mission, the only mention of gender differences with regards to land was that KA6 said that women purchasers are more at risk of later being dispossessed by the seller: "It would happen that you get the place and pay money. But there might be a risk when you give money to the former owner and you will find out that after a while he would want to chase you away from his place so that he could sell that place again. In places like these, you have to have a male in the house because if it were only a female buying a place, they would do anything to chase them out again".

RDP housing

The issue of gender differences with regards to accessing land was only explicitly raised in one of the interviews in the RDP housing settlements (when asked if the process for getting a house differed between women and men, KC5 of Old Dunbar, a woman, replied: "no, it's the same"). It appears, however, that there is often a bias towards women-headed households in the allocation of RDP housing, as is most clearly shown by the case of Kingsway. For example, EK10 said of the allocation process in Kingsway, "it is only women that they wanted" and EK6 said: "in most cases we men could not qualify for houses").

It is likely, however, that an upgrading project such as Old Dunbar would not be able to have an explicit bias towards women-headed households, as the project was aimed at all existing households in the informal settlement, rather than choosing between applicants from a number of different areas.

Public rental housing

This issue did not come up in any of the interviews in Manenberg.

3.14 Perspectives of the future

Future intentions with regards to urban land are greatly influenced by the form of tenure. Those with legally secure tenure (i.e. in RDP housing settlements and public rental housing) were generally likely to intend to stay where they were, even if there were problems with the location of the settlement they were in (possibly because they are aware that they may not easily be able to get access to legally secure tenure again). In Adams Mission, where people have strong rights in practice, there was also little willingness to move. Respondents in relatively insecure tenure (such as backyard rental accommodation), on the other hand,

were generally likely to intend to move. Respondents in informal settlements often wanted to stay where they were, but were usually resigned to being relocated by the government (usually at some unknown time in the future, and often to some unknown place).

Informal settlements

Perceptions of the future in informal settlements are strongly shaped by government intentions. Somalia Park and Blackburn Village are on privately-owned land (and Somalia Park is also on dolomitic soil) and residents of both settlements expect to be relocated at some stage, but they do not know when and, in the case of Somalia Park, they also do not know where to. Enkanini is on government-owned land, but even here at least some relocations may be necessary because of the planned railway line and the relatively high densities in the settlement.

Most respondents in Somalia Park said that they would like to continue staying there, but some said that they were resigned to moving if they had to. For example, ES9 said: "it is not my wish, but if they say we must shift from here, there is nothing I can do about that". Respondents in Blackburn Village knew that they will eventually be relocated to Waterloo, but KB4 and KB8 said that they did not want to move, and probably will just return home to the Eastern Cape when Blackburn Village was eventually cleared. In Enkanini, some respondents wanted to stay there (for example, CE1 said: "I don't want to leave this place, I have fought hard for it to be improved"), some are undecided (for example, CE7 said "I don't mind living here, as long as it get improved, but that doesn't seem like it is going to happen anytime soon, so I would not mind moving to a better place"), while others are waiting to be relocated to RDP housing somewhere else (for example, CE5 said: "I am just waiting for them to allocate me a place at any time from now, then I will move").

Backyard rental

Only one respondent did not plan to move. When asked if she had plans to move, EW6 said: "no, I love this place". She added that she would continue to stay there even if she got a higher-paying job.

All the other respondents planned to move at some point. Some respondents hoped to eventually get the RDP houses they had been waiting for, some respondents planned to return to the rural home and some just said they will have to move to somewhere close to the next job they get.

Customary communal tenure

Virtually all of the respondents intended staying in Adam's Mission, reflecting the high levels of satisfaction with the area. One respondent was on the brink of (reluctantly) moving to

another house he had acquired elsewhere, although he would have ideally liked to purchase the house he was currently renting in Adams Mission. Another respondent implied that he might need to move elsewhere because of his rising career in the church.

RDP housing

Most of the respondents in the RDP housing settlements intended to continue staying where they are, mainly because they are happy to have legally-recognised tenure and are keen to settle down in a place after previously having had to move around frequently. Some respondents, however, wanted to move somewhere else (for example, because of crime, because of a lack of job opportunities or because their house or plot was too small), but have not yet moved because they cannot afford to. Many respondents in Kingsway said that there was a rumour that they will be relocated from Kingsway (a few years after being relocated to it, because of the hazards of a nearby mine), and this has resulted in uncertainty about their future.

Public rental housing

Some respondents wanted to move, mainly because they felt that the houses/flats in which they were staying were too small, while others intended to spend the rest of their lives in their current houses or flats in Manenberg.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The key conclusions of this study about how the poor access, hold and trade land are as follows:

- Household decision-making about accessing urban land is closely linked to livelihoods (i.e. accessing urban land in a suitable location can result in increased access to jobs and income-generating activities, and lower living costs).
- There are land markets (i.e. sets of processes whereby the allocation and re-allocation of claims to land are mediated in some way) in the poorer parts of South African cities.
- These land markets are a mixture of socially dominated, financially dominated and state dominated processes (i.e. processes mediated by community-based institutions, financially-driven processes and processes mediated by the state).
- These land markets provide a wide range of choices (at the informal end of the continuum) but are not working well for the poor.

These conclusions are discussed below.

4.1 Household decision-making about accessing urban land is closely linked to livelihoods

The reasons why respondents chose to live in specific areas were usually closely linked to livelihoods (for example, proximity to jobs, cost of transport and the cost of rent/services). Livelihoods-related reasons for moving from previous places of residence included unaffordability of rent (for people previously living in backyard rental accommodation) and rural poverty and unemployment (for people previously living in rural areas). Livelihoods-related reasons for moving to a specific settlement included good location (i.e. close to jobs, shops, facilities and/or transport) and cheaper living expenses (i.e. not having to pay rent and service charges, being able to access food cheaply, or being able to grow one's own food).

Access to land in a relatively good location, as in the case of Somalia Park (which is within walking distance of a wide range of economic opportunities and social facilities), can result in more likelihood of getting a job or earning an income in other ways, less time and money spent on transport and in a better quality of life for all members of the household. On the other hand, access to land in a poor location (i.e. far from jobs, schools, shops, facilities and transport), as in the case of Kingsway, can have a very negative impact on the quality of life. The case of Adams Mission also shows that being able to grow one's own food (i.e. having relatively large pieces of land and fertile soil) can also be a factor in terms of livelihoods, but usually, as in the Adams Mission case, with the trade-off of being further away from CBDs and other concentrations of job opportunities.

From the interviews, it appears that respondents often made conscious decisions about location, weighing up the advantages and disadvantages of different locations before choosing where to stay. Even in settlements where there were some locational disadvantages, such as Blackburn Village and Enkanini, there were still certain real advantages to the locations of those settlements. In relocations to greenfield RDP housing projects, however, the recipients generally have little or no choice as to where the project is located, and this can have a severely negative impact on the quality of life (as in the case of Kingsway).

4.2 There are land markets in the poorer parts of South African cities

Urban LandMark's *Operation of Markets* study implicitly defines land markets as the processes whereby the allocation and re-allocation land are mediated in some way. Adopting this definition, it can be said that there are land markets in the poorer parts of South African cities. The analysis of the findings shows that there are clearly-identifiable processes through which access to land, the use of land and exchanges of land are mediated in poorer parts of the city, such as informal settlements.

These land markets are different from conventional "formal" land markets in that land (or claims to land) is usually not regarded as a commodity, whereas in conventional formal land markets in South Africa, land is usually regarded as a commodity. In some cases, claims to land are seen as commodities to be bought or rented (for example, in Adams Mission and in the rental market in Wattville), but in most cases claims to land are not regarded as commodities. Claims to land generally did not appear to be being bought or sold in any of the three informal settlements in the survey; although shacks were being bought and sold *in situ*, the purchaser generally had to get permission to occupy the site from the local community-based organisation. Even in the three RDP housing settlements, the buying and selling of RDP houses seemed to be fairly rare.

4.3 Land markets in the poorer parts of South African cities are a mixture of socially dominated, financially dominated and state dominated processes

Urban Landmark's *Operation of Markets* study distinguished between socially dominated and financially dominated land markets. Although the land markets in the poorer parts of South African cities are too complex to be characterised as being either socially dominated or financially dominated, the distinction is useful for describing specific land market processes. The processes in the three informal settlements in the survey can be characterised as largely being "socially dominated", in that local community-based organisations are generally responsible for mediating access to land and land is generally not regarded as a commodity with a price (although shacks are very much regarded as a

commodity with a price, and are often bought or sold, selling a shack does not usually seem to mean selling the claim to the site the shack is on). It should be noted, however, that in some other informal settlements that some of the respondents in the RDP housing settlements had previously lived in, it did appear that land was possibly sometimes bought and sold, so it appears that there could be some "financially dominated" land market processes in some informal settlements (and in informal settlements where there is rental accommodation, such as Blackburn Village, these processes generally also seem to be financially dominated).

The land market processes in the backyard rental market in Wattville generally seem to be financially dominated processes. The local community-based organisation has no role whatsoever in controlling access to rental accommodation in Wattville, and whether or not one can get access to rental accommodation depends almost entirely on the ability to pay the rent (although, of course, as with the formal rental market, landlords may sometimes prefer a prospective tenant who is referred by someone the landlord knows).

The land market processes in RDP housing settlements do not seem to be either socially dominated or financially dominated, though. Processes in the early years of RDP settlements (during the allocation of RDP houses and while the restrictions of sale apply) seem, in fact, to be very similar to that in informal settlements, but with the councillors and municipal officials taking over the role that is played by local community-based organisations in informal settlements (i.e. controlling access to and the use of land). Whereas in informal settlements the accepted way to get access to land is through the local community-based organisation, in RDP settlements the way to get access was through councillors or municipal housing officials, and some of the transactions/re-allocations in the early stages of RDP housing settlements also seem to go through councillors and the municipality. The processes found in the early stages of RDP housing settlements can perhaps be referred to as "state dominated" market processes. The processes in public rental housing can also be characterised as state dominated processes, as municipal officials are entirely responsible for allocating or re-allocating rental housing units.

The informal sale of RDP houses, while on a small scale, is definitely occurring, but insufficient information on this was collected in the survey to conclude whether this can be characterised as being financially dominated or socially dominated (or a mixture of the two). Other studies (for example, DAG, 2006) have documented the processes whereby RDP houses are bought and sold, and the widespread use of affidavits drawn up at the local police station to document these transactions, which some respondents in this survey also referred to.

Overall, then, it can be said that the land markets in the poorer parts of South African cities are a complex mix of financially-driven processes, processes mediated by local community-based organisations and processes mediated by the state.

It should also be noted that the earliest stage of a spontaneously-established informal settlement, where households see other people building shacks and join in and erect their own shack, such as Enkanini, probably cannot be regarded as a being part of market processes (but the subsequent stage in which permission is sought from neighbouring residents is perhaps on the way towards the development of socially dominated processes).

4.4 Land markets in the poorer parts of South African cities provide a range of choices (at the informal end of the continuum) but are not working well for the poor

The survey shows that there is a wide variety of land/housing options, or sub-markets, available in the in the poorer parts of South African cities. Each option has various advantages and disadvantages, and respondents usually made conscious choices between different options (for example, in terms of location, type of accommodation, access to services, and affordability level). Different options are suitable at different stages in the history of households and individuals, and there is frequent movement between options. Table 7 conceptually represents some of the important land/housing options available in the poorer parts of cities and roughly categorises their adequacy in terms of a number of key factors (based on the interviews in this survey). Customary communal tenure in peri-urban areas and public rental housing are relatively rare options, and are not included in the table. In addition, some options which were not represented in the survey (for example, informally-purchased RDP houses) are also not represented in the table.

The key factors on which people usually base their decision-making on where to stay, and which can be used for categorising various land/housing options, are the following:

- **Adequacy of location:** Rental accommodation in an established township seems to offer the best location, as older townships are usually centrally-located and have developed transport links and a range of facilities over many decades. Informal settlements can also offer a relatively good location, and this is often the reason why people occupy a specific piece of vacant land, as in Cato Manor. Greenfield RDP housing projects seem, in practice, often to be less well-located than the informal settlements where recipients of RDP houses used to live, as is the case with respondents relocated from informal settlements such as Emlotheni and Emandleni to Kingsway, and from the Joe Slovo informal settlement to Delft.
- Adequacy of shelter: Rented shacks generally provide the lowest standards of shelter (in the survey, tenants in rented shacks almost always complained about leaks). Shacks that the occupants own themselves are usually of better quality than rented shacks. Rented formal rooms and RDP houses have the highest standard of shelter.
- **Adequacy of space (both indoor and outdoor space):** Rented rooms, backyard shacks and rented shacks in informal settlements generally have the least amount of

space. For owner-occupants in informal settlements, the sizes of shacks and "plots" can vary enormously, from one-room shacks and little or no private outdoor space in an overcrowded settlement like Enkanini to larger shacks and larger "plots" (with extensive gardens) in a settlement like Somalia Park. The sizes of RDP houses and plots are often smaller than the largest shacks and "plots" in informal settlements, but they obviously have much more space than rented rooms or backyard shacks.

- **Adequacy of services:** Informal settlements have the lowest level of services, usually just a few communal taps, and perhaps some portable toilets. Some households may have connections to electricity (either legal or illegal) but many do not. Access to services is better in backyard accommodation, as there will usually be access to water, flush toilets and electricity on the plot. RDP houses have the highest standard of services.

- **Affordability (upfront costs):** In most cases the upfront costs for getting accommodation are very low. For RDP housing, some respondents had to pay R350 to have electricity installed, and for rental accommodation some respondents had to pay a deposit of up to R300. Buying a shack or the materials for a shack can, however, be considerably more expensive. The materials for a typical shack in a Wattville backyard seem to cost about R2000, although, on the other hand, some shacks seem to be bought and sold for few hundred Rand, and one respondent said that he built his shack from scrap material that he found, so it did not cost him anything.

- **Affordability (ongoing costs):** Having one's own shack in an informal settlement is probably the most affordable option in the longer-term (even if the higher cost of paraffin, as opposed to electricity, is taken into account), as no rent needs to be paid. Renting accommodation in an informal settlement or renting a backyard shack (or renting space in the backyard for one's own shack) requires a relatively low monthly rental to be paid (typically not more than R150 per month). For rented rooms and RDP houses a higher monthly cost needs to be paid (ranging from R250 to R300 per month, including water and electricity, for rented rooms in Wattville, and ranging from R200 to R400 per month for water and electricity charges for RDP housing in Delft).

- **Physical security:** Shacks in informal settlements have the least security and are easily broken into, or can even be stolen while the occupant is away, as happened in one case in the survey. Renting one room in a multi-roomed shack with a number of other tenants probably provides more security, as there would usually be more people around than in the case of a stand-alone shack. RDP housing also provides more security than a stand-alone shack because the house is more solidly constructed and less easy to break into. Backyard accommodation can provide the most security as there are normally a number of households in the yard and the main house, and there would always be people present.

- **Security of tenure:** Renting accommodation in backyards and informal settlements is the least secure form of tenure, as the landlord can evict their tenant at any time (although as long as the tenant pays the rent, the tenant can be quite secure in

practice). The one exception to the low security of tenure of informal rental is renting a shack in an informal settlement. As shown by some of the interviews, the local community-based organisation can sometimes intervene in cases where the landlords try to evict tenants, and the tenant can end up as the *de facto* owner. Having one's own shack in an informal settlement is considerably more secure than renting accommodation. Recognition of one's claim by the local community-based organisation and neighbours (and recognition by the municipality in shack numbering exercises) can result in quite a high security of tenure. RDP houses, of course, usually have the highest security of tenure (for the initial owners; for informal purchasers of RDP houses there would be low security of tenure).

- **Future prospects for RDP housing:** Current government policies prioritise informal settlement residents for RDP housing. Owners of shacks in informal settlements therefore have the strongest prospects for getting RDP houses. People renting shacks in an informal settlement may have less of a chance of getting a RDP house (but this is not always the case). People in other forms of rental accommodation, however, have very little chance of ever getting a RDP house (although some of the respondents in Delft were former tenants who had received RDP housing through the housing waiting list, this is probably an increasingly rare way of accessing RDP housing).

Table 7: Selected options in the land markets in the poorer parts of South African cities

Land/ housing option	Adequacy of location	Adequacy of shelter	Adequacy of space	Adequacy of services	Affordability (upfront cost)	Affordability (ongoing costs)	Physical security	Security of tenure	Future prospects for RDP housing
Own shack in informal settlement	Medium	Medium	Low/ Medium/ High	Low	Medium/ High	High	Low	Medium	High
Rented shack in informal settlement	Medium	Low	Low	Low	High	Medium	Low	Low/ Medium	Medium
Rented room within shack in informal settlement	Medium	Low	Low	Low	High	Medium	Medium	Low	Low
Own backyard shack in established township	High	Medium	Low	Medium	Medium/ High	Medium	High	Low	Low
Rented backyard shack in established township	High	Low	Low	Medium	High	Medium	High	Low	Low
Rented room in established township	High	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	High	Low	Low
RDP house in upgrading project	Medium	High	Medium	High	High	Low	Medium	High	N/A
RDP house in greenfield project	Low	High	Medium	High	High	Low	Medium	High	N/A

Note: Adequacy is categorised as High, Medium or Low. For example, for affordability, High means that the option is relatively very affordable, and Low means that the option has a relatively low level of affordability.

What is a well-performing urban land market? As with other types of markets, it can (from an end-user perspective) be defined as being where a wide range of adequate options at a range of affordability levels can be accessed. Specific sub-markets would have additional criteria for being well-performing, for example, being able to realise the financial asset value of a property (i.e. to be able to sell it reasonably quickly for a reasonable price) would be important for the ownership sub-market, and adequate protection against arbitrary eviction would be particularly important for the rental sub-market.

Urban land markets can be said to be working well if households are able to access a variety of different options with adequate shelter and adequate services in suitable locations at an affordable cost and with a reasonable *de facto* security of tenure. This is clearly not the case at the moment. Although people are, for example, able to access relatively good locations and affordable accommodation in informal settlements and adequate shelter/ services and secure tenure in RDP housing settlements, they are seldom able to access all the components of adequate housing simultaneously. Therefore, although the land markets in the poorer parts of South African cities can be said to be functioning, they cannot be said to be working well for the poor.

A particular problem with the land markets in the poorer parts of South African cities is that, whereas there are many options available for poor households towards the "informal" end of the continuum (for example, in terms of location, type of accommodation, forms of tenure and affordability levels), there are very few options for poor households towards the "formal" end of the continuum. Currently, the only "formal" option for most poor households is an RDP house, and poor households generally have little or no choice when it comes to RDP housing (i.e. location, type of accommodation, form of tenure and affordability level). Generally, a standardized product is provided in a few locations. Although RDP housing settlements provide adequate shelter, adequate services and adequate security of tenure, in terms of location, affordability and size (indoor space per capita) they are often not adequate.

5. COMPARISONS WITH THE KEY FINDINGS OF OTHER URBAN LANDMARK STUDIES

The key findings of this study are here compared with the findings of the *Operation of Markets* study and *Voices of the Poor* study completed by Urban LandMark in 2007.

5.1 Operation of Markets study

The *Operation of Markets* study was partially based on the same qualitative survey this study was based on, as well as a quantitative survey in the same nine settlements.

The key findings of the *Operation of Markets* study were the following (Urban Landmark, 2007a):

1. Land markets operate in the poorer parts of the three metropolitan areas;
2. Informal settlements play a critical role in urban land access;
3. Social relations are dominant in these markets, although an economic rationale is present when people make decisions;
4. Financial logic is evident, although these markets are socially dominated;
5. The state is present in socially dominated land markets;
6. These markets work for poor people in the short-term but, with current policy interventions, have limitations in the long-term;
7. Little differentiation in perceived advantages of living in informal settlements, RDP housing projects and backyard shacks limits growth in the value of properties.

Each of the findings is discussed below.

Land markets operate in poorer parts of the three metropolitan areas

A "land market" can be defined in various ways, but land markets in the broad sense of the term (i.e. as a set of processes whereby the allocation and re-allocation of claims to land are mediated in some way) do definitely exist in the poorer parts of the three metropolitan areas. There are a variety of clearly-identifiable processes through which people are able to access and hold land.

It is, however, important to note that the land markets in the poorer parts of the three metropolitan areas are different from "formal" land markets in that land (or claims to land) is usually not regarded as a commodity. In some cases, claims to land are seen as a commodity to be bought or rented (for example, in Adams Mission or in the rental market in Wattville), but in most cases claims to land are not regarded as a commodity. For example, claims to land generally did not appear to be being bought or sold in any of the three informal settlements in the survey; although shacks were being bought and sold *in situ*, the

purchaser generally had to get permission to occupy the site from the local community-based organisation. While some informal buying and selling of RDP houses was occurring, this seemed to be fairly rare.

Informal settlements play a critical role in urban land access

All the various sub-markets play an important role in urban land access. Informal settlements do play a unique role in that this is the way that more land in new locations is made available for/by the poor. Residents of informal settlements cannot, however, be regarded as a static and discreet target group; living in an informal settlement is often just one element of a complex household history. In the survey, many of the respondents in informal settlements had previously lived in backyard rental accommodation (and other types of accommodation), and many of the respondents in backyard rental accommodation had previously lived in informal settlements. Sometimes people moved with the same shacks from an informal settlement to a backyard, or from a backyard to an informal settlement.

Social relations are dominant in these markets, although an economic rationale is present when people make decisions

In the *Operation of Markets* study, land markets are conceptualised as a being in a continuum from financially dominated markets (where price is the most important factor in mediating the supply of and demand for land) to socially dominated markets (where social relationships are the most important factor in mediating the supply of and demand for land). The *Operation of Markets* study concluded that the land markets in the poorer parts of South African cities are socially dominated.

In this study, however, the conclusion is that land markets in the poorer parts of South African cities are a complex mix of financially-driven processes, processes mediated by local community-based organisations and processes mediated by the state. Many land market processes in the poorer parts of South African cities can be described as being "socially dominated", but "financially dominated" and "state dominated" processes also play an important role.

The processes in informal settlements can indeed largely be characterised as "socially dominated" market processes in that, in the three informal settlements in the survey, local community-based organisations are generally responsible for mediating access to land and land is generally not regarded as a commodity with a price (although shacks are very much regarded as a commodity with a price, and are often bought or sold, selling a shack does not usually seem to mean selling the claim to the site the shack is on). It should be noted, however, that in some other informal settlements that some of the respondents in the RDP housing settlements had previously lived in, it did appear that land was possibly sometimes bought and sold, so there are possibly some "financially dominated" market processes in

some informal settlements. In informal settlements where there is rental accommodation, such as Blackburn Village, this generally also seems to be financially dominated.

The land market processes in the backyard rental market in Wattville generally seem to be financially dominated processes. The local community-based organisation has no role whatsoever in controlling access to rental accommodation in Wattville, and whether or not one can get access to rental accommodation depends almost entirely on the ability to pay the rent.

The land market processes in RDP housing settlements do not seem to be either socially dominated or financially dominated, though. Processes in the early years of RDP settlements (during the allocation of RDP houses and while the restrictions of sale apply) seem, in fact, to be very similar to that in informal settlements, but with the councillors and municipal officials taking over the role that is played by local community-based organisations in informal settlements. These processes can be perhaps be referred to as "state dominated" processes. The processes in public rental housing can also be characterised as state dominated processes, as municipal officials are entirely responsible for allocating or re-allocating rental housing units.

The informal sale of RDP houses, while on a small scale, is definitely occurring, but insufficient information on this was collected in the survey to conclude whether this can be characterised as being financially dominated or socially dominated.

It should also be noted that the earliest stage of a spontaneously-established informal settlement, where households see other people building shacks and join in and erect their own shack, such as Enkanini, probably cannot be regarded as a being part of market processes (but the subsequent stage in which permission is sought from neighbouring residents is perhaps on the way towards the development of socially dominated processes).

With regards to the economic rationale, this was dominant when respondents made decisions about where and how to access land. Issues of proximity to jobs, the cost of rent/services and the cost of transport were usually the key factors people considered when deciding where to move. The only real exceptions to this was where people moved to a place primarily because they had friends or relatives there (but even in these cases, the friends and relatives had usually encouraged them to move there because of factors like proximity to jobs) or where people were allocated RDP housing or public rental housing.

Financial logic is evident, although these markets are socially dominated

As discussed above, although many land market processes in poorer areas can be regarded as being "socially dominated", there are also processes which can be characterised as being "financially dominated" or "state dominated".

The state is present in socially dominated land markets

Although the state seems almost entirely absent from the rental market in townships such as Wattville, the state's programme to eradicate informal settlements does indeed seem to have largely shaped the nature of land markets in informal settlements. The most crucial state interventions with regard to shaping the land market in informal settlements have been as follows (in some cases, however, it is not always clear what the effect of the intervention has been):

- Shack numbering processes, which confer stronger perceived claims to certain households;
- The provision of communal services;
- Restrictions on new entrants to informal settlements and on the construction of new shacks (or extensions to shacks, in some cases);
- The planned relocation of many informal settlement residents, which reduces long-term security of tenure;
- The policy of prioritising informal settlement residents for RDP houses, which helps encourage people to move from backyard shacks to informal settlements (most notably in the case of Enkanini).

These markets work for poor people in the short term but, with current policy interventions, have limitations in the long term

Although there are a variety of land/housing options available to the poor, and there is frequent moving between various options, the land markets in the poorer parts of the three metropolitan areas could only be said to be working well if poor households are able to access a variety of land/housing options with adequate shelter and adequate services in suitable locations at an affordable cost and with a reasonable *de facto* security of tenure. This is clearly not the case at the moment. Although people are, for example, sometimes able to access good locations and affordable accommodation in informal settlements, and sometimes able to access adequate shelter/services and secure tenure in RDP housing settlements, they are seldom able to satisfy all (or even most) of their land/housing needs simultaneously. Therefore, although the land markets in the poorer parts of the three metropolitan areas can be said to be functioning, they cannot be said to be working well for the poor (either in the short-term or the long-term).

There is also an imbalance in the land markets in the poorer parts of the three metropolitan areas in that, whereas there are many options available for poor households towards the "informal" end of the continuum (in terms of location, type of accommodation, forms of tenure and affordability levels), there are very few options for poor households towards the "formal" end of the continuum. The only current "formal" option for most poor households is an RDP

house, and poor households have little or no choice when it comes to RDP housing (i.e. location, type of accommodation, form of tenure and affordability level).

Little differentiation in perceived advantages of living in informal settlements, RDP housing projects and backyard shacks limits growth in the value of properties

The *Operation of Markets* study argued that there had been no growth in the value of RDP properties because RDP housing was not perceived as significantly better than other land/housing options (the quantitative survey which the study is partially based on found that only 53% of respondents in RDP houses felt that their situation had improved after getting their RDP houses).

This study confirms this finding. Various land/housing options are seen as having various advantages and disadvantages, and particular land/housing options are seen as suitable for particular households/individuals at certain times, and not as inherently "better" or "worse" than other options (see Table 4). RDP housing is also seen as having advantages and disadvantages. Therefore, although RDP houses may be valued for some things (such as the quality of shelter, quality of services and security of tenure), they are often less valued in terms of location, (ongoing) affordability and size. This probably has contributed to the low values people place of RDP houses, but there are also a number of other factors that could be influencing this, such as the restrictions on the (formal) sale of RDP houses, complex and expensive formal transfer procedures and inadequate homeowner education.

5.2 Voices of the Poor study

The Voices of the Poor study summarised the views of community organisations on urban land issues, based on a series of workshops across the country. The key findings of the study were fairly broad, but the key ones of relevance to this study were the following:

1. **Formal land market:** "Community organisations generally see the [formal] land market as something alien that the poor do not engage with... Some felt that the poor are not participating in the sale of property because of the five-year restriction on the sale of subsidy houses. It is generally accepted that people are selling their homes informally because of a need to access money, or losing their homes to loan sharks because of non-payment" (Urban LandMark, 2007b: 4).
2. **Informal land market:** "Although feelings about informal tenure are generally negative, these arrangements were generally seen as being quick and flexible. In the Cape Town workshop, participants agreed that informal tenure can work well if there are strong community organisations in place that can monitor and control access. On the other hand, perceptions of informal tenure are closely linked to [negative] perceptions about life in informal settlements" (Urban LandMark, 2007b: 5).

3. **Access to finance:** "The dominant view is that poor people, by definition, are unable to access finance from banks because they can't afford it... Although there was often an implicit desire to access mortgage finance, views of mortgage finance were generally negative" (Urban LandMark, 2007b: 6).

4. **Urban land and livelihoods:** "Community organisations overwhelmingly link access to urban land and livelihoods. Many informal settlement communities are fighting for their right to stay close to jobs and facilities such as schools, and are resisting relocation by the state to peripheral locations where there are no jobs or facilities... Land for urban agriculture was also seen as being important... Although not explicitly raised as a livelihoods issue, it was also clear that the rental of backyard shacks was seen as a form of income generation" (Urban LandMark, 2007b: 6).

5. **Urban-rural links:** "Links between urban and rural areas remain strong... The key implication of the prevalence of urban-rural links was seen as the need to provide rental housing in urban areas" (Urban LandMark, 2007b: 6).

6. **Gender:** "Community organisations' views on gender differences in relation to access to urban land were mixed" (Urban LandMark, 2007b: 7).

Each of the findings is discussed below.

Formal land market

This study confirms that the conventional "formal" land market is something that the poor seldom engage with. Of the 74 respondents, only two respondents had had any (direct or indirect) interaction with formal land market processes (other than being allocated a formally registered RDP house); one respondent in Delft had purchased a (pre-1994) subsidised house with a mortgage bond and one respondent had previously lived in an area where there were many residents with mortgage bonds. The other 72 respondents had had no significant interaction with conventional formal land market processes.

Insufficient information was collected on the informal buying and selling of RDP houses to confirm or refute the view that the informal selling of RDP houses was driven by poverty. Although one respondent mentioned moneylenders taking over houses from people who could not repay their loans, some respondents mentioned that some people were probably selling their houses because they wanted to move elsewhere for various reasons.

Informal land market

In the interviews upon which this study is based, the terms "formal tenure" and "informal tenure" were not used, so much more nuanced views on various land/housing options were obtained. Different land/housing options clearly have different advantages and disadvantages (see Table 7). In practice, it seems that tenure in informal settlements can be fairly secure where residents' claims to land are recognised by the local community-based

organisation and their neighbours (backyard tenants can be evicted at the whim of the landlord, but in practice, as long as the rent is paid and no conflicts arise, backyard rental can also be fairly secure). Most respondents were aware of the benefits of formal/legal/State-recognised tenure, however, and aspired to eventually have a title deed that showed that the property they stayed in was theirs.

Access to finance

This study confirmed that "formal" finance is both difficult to access for the poor and that there are negative perceptions of it (only two respondents had had any encounter with mortgage loans, and in both cases the experience was negative). In most cases, the amounts paid were fairly small and were able to be covered by savings, through paying in instalments or through getting a loan from a friend, relative or employer.

Urban land and livelihoods

The findings of this study with regard to urban land and livelihoods are the same as the *Voices of the Poor* study. The reasons respondents chose to live in specific areas were usually linked to livelihoods (for example, proximity to jobs, cost of transport and the cost of rent/services). Although none of the communities in the survey were struggling to resist relocation from the informal settlement where they lived to distant RDP settlements, the example of Kingsway clearly show the negative impacts of relocating people from a well-located informal settlement, close to jobs, shops, facilities and transport, to a settlement that is far from jobs, shops, facilities, and where transport costs were much higher. In Kingsway, for example, whereas people had been able to walk to shops when they lived in their previous places of residence, a trip to the shops now costs R12 in taxi fare, and residents of Kingsway have to spend R20 to R50 per day on transport to get to places where there are jobs. In contrast, in Old Dunbar, which is an upgrading project, residents have been able to maintain the benefits of the relatively good location of the site (which is why people had established informal settlements in the Cato Manor area in the first place).

Urban-rural links

This study confirmed that many households in urban areas have strong rural links. The nature of these links can include building/owning a rural home, having family members at the rural home, sending remittances to the family members at the rural home, regular visits to the rural home and an intention to return to one day to permanently live in the rural home.

Many of the respondents with the strongest rural links seemed to live in rental accommodation, which seems to suggest that rental accommodation does hold certain advantages for people with strong rural links.

Gender

In the *Voices of the Poor* study, community organisations did not have any clear views of the differences between men's and women's access to land, some feeling that women were being prioritised in the allocation of RDP houses and others that women are still discriminated against in various ways. This study confirmed that women were being prioritised in the allocation of RDP houses in some projects (such as Kingsway). Although none of the respondents said that women were discriminated against with regards to accessing and holding land, the unfair division of responsibilities between men and women backyard tenants and the perceived increased risk of eviction for women in Wattville and Adams Mission suggested that women do often face additional obstacles and bear additional burdens when it comes to accessing and holding land.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

The ultimate objective of this study is to gain a greater understanding of how land markets can be made to work better for the poor. As discussed previously in this report, land markets can be said to be working well for the poor when poor households are able to access a variety of land/housing options with adequate shelter and adequate services in suitable locations at an affordable cost and with a reasonable *de facto* security of tenure.

From Table 7, it appears that the major inadequacies with the land/housing options currently provided by land markets in the poorer parts of South African cities (based on the case studies in the survey) are the following:

- Poor location of greenfield RDP housing projects;
- Low standard of shelter (with accompanying lack of physical security) in informal settlements;
- Low amounts of space in rented rooms/shacks (this is probably not a major problem, though, as many rented rooms/shacks seem to be only occupied by one or two people);
- Low standards of services in informal settlements;
- Low affordability (of ongoing costs) of RDP houses;
- Low security of tenure in rental accommodation (although it should be noted that this is not always a problem, as in some cases tenants have stayed for many years in the same rented accommodation);
- Low prospects for people in rental accommodation to ever get RDP housing.

Although not represented in the survey, low security of tenure for those who have informally purchased RDP houses is probably also a major inadequacy. Over and above these inadequacies, two additional, cross-cutting, inadequacies are that there are too few options for poor households towards the "formal" end of the land markets continuum and that the resale values of properties (for ownership options) appear to generally be very low.

In order to address these inadequacies and contribute towards the development of land markets in which poor households are able to access a variety of land/housing options with adequate shelter and adequate services in suitable locations at an affordable cost and with a reasonable *de facto* security of tenure, the following recommendations are proposed:

- Reforming the formal/legal/State-recognised land system to be more widely applicable and useful for the poor;
- Providing a wider range of subsidised housing options for all categories of need;
- Incrementally upgrading informal settlements where appropriate; and
- Stimulating the provision of good quality backyard rental accommodation.

Table 8 shows the relationship of the recommendations to the land market inadequacies identified above. Each recommendation is discussed below.

Table 8: Relationship of recommendations to land market inadequacies

	1. Reforming the formal/ legal land system	2. Providing a wider range of subsidised housing options for all categories of need	3. Incremental upgrading of informal settlements where appropriate	4. Stimulating the provision of good quality backyard rental accommodation
Poor location of greenfield RDP housing projects			▓	
Low standard of shelter in informal settlements			▓	
Inadequate size of rented rooms/shacks				▓
Low standards of services in informal settlements			▓	
Low affordability (of ongoing costs) of RDP houses		▓		
Low security of tenure in rental accommodation and informally-purchased RDP housing	▓			
Low likelihood of people in rental accommodation getting RDP housing		▓		
Too few "formal" land/housing options		▓		
Low resale value of (ownership) properties	▓			

6.1 Reforming the formal/legal/State-recognised land system to be more widely applicable and useful for the poor

Although the informal sale of RDP houses was not represented in the survey, and although there are probably many reasons why these sales are occurring informally (typically with an affidavit witnessed by police to record the transaction), one of the reasons undoubtedly is that formally transferring a property is an expensive and complex process that requires going through a conveyancer and the deeds registry. Fourie (2001: 16), for example, sees one of

the reasons the formal/legal/State-recognised system is often bypassed by the poor (as in the informal sale of RDP houses) as being because "land registration is generally seen as centralized and costly to the user, as the systems are designed for use by the middle classes". Similarly, it is likely that one of the reasons landlords avoid more formalized, written rental agreements with tenants is because of the complexities and expenses involved in complying with rental legislation (e.g. the Rental Housing Act) and falling within the ambit of the provincial Rent Tribunals.

Although informal practices for the accessing and holding of land can provide an adequate degree of security of tenure, they have limitations, especially in terms of their interface with the formal processes of the state and the market. Informal practices work well when use value predominates, but are less effective when exchange values grow more important (Jenkins, 2000).

The current formal system of regulations relating to land and tenure need to be adapted so that that they can become more widely applicable and more useful for the poor, so that the poor can have a greater chance to share in the benefits of legally-recognised tenure. The benefits of legally-recognised tenure can include, amongst other things, greater security of tenure for tenants and increased property values for owners. For example, based on a study of formal and informal property markets in Ecuador, Lanjouw and Levy (1998) found that the granting of legal security of tenure resulted, on average, in a 23.5% increase in the value of properties where occupants had previously not had legal tenure.

In the words of the High Level Commission for the Legal Empowerment of the Poor: "Formalization is the process by which informal activities, participants and entities obtain legal recognition. It must often be supplemented, or preceded by, a variety of substantive reforms, including changes in commercial or property law, the recognition of customary or religious laws, and improvements in the mechanisms to enforce rights and adjudicate disputes. It must be based on empirical evidence of practices in the informal economy and developed with a clear understanding of local environments, systems and needs… Addressing informality is a multifaceted proposition which requires a thorough understanding of the factors that create and drive informality… Reform initiatives may also require that the formal sector be re-defined to accommodate many of the principles and values tolerated in the informal sector" (HLCLEP, 2006: 4-5).

In practice, what does reforming the formal legal system to accommodate some of the principles and values of local practices mean? Some of the key issues are: ensuring that formal system provides forms of tenure that are appropriate for, and affordable by the urban poor; ensuring security of tenure for all members of the household; and ensuring that land registration and transfer processes are accessible by the poor (both in terms of cost and location).

It is essential that appropriate and affordable forms of tenure are provided. Providing formal individual land ownership for all is not a realistic goal, and greater use should be made of more flexible forms of formal tenure which are more appropriate to the tenure needs of the urban poor (but which can be upgraded where necessary) (for example, see Durand-Lasserve, 1999). A range of innovative ways of providing greater legal security of tenure in flexible and appropriate ways have been successfully used internationally, ranging from moratoriums on relocations and evictions, to temporary occupation licences, communal or individual leases and community land trusts (Payne, 2003; UN-Habitat, 2004). In Cambodia, for example, there was a six month moratorium of relocations and evictions while decisions were made on which informal settlements should be relocated and which should be upgraded; for the upgrading of settlements, 12 year community leases and 10 year sub-leases were introduced, with the option, at the end of the 10 year period, for extending or upgrading the lease or of terminating the lease with market-related compensation for improvements (Payne, 2003). "This is considered adequate to encourage those with funds or access to credit to invest in home improvements without raising land values to the level at which 'downward raiding' by higher income groups would become widespread" (ibid.).

Successful examples of experiments where formal systems have been adapted to replicate informal/extra-legal practices include the Hyderabad Incremental Development Scheme in Pakistan, which was a "managed land settlement" programme intended to pre-empt the growth of unplanned and unserviced informal settlements (UNCHS, 1991; Walker et al., 1993). The key to the project's success was that administration and allocation procedures were very simple and rapid. Households applied for a plot by submitting a photocopy of their ID card, and they were allocated a plot within 12 days. A reception area was set up in the scheme where households could erect a temporary shelter or rent a room while they waited for their application for a site to be processed. Beneficiaries were required to complete construction of a house immediately (no building standards were applied in the project). This was a major departure from previous projects, where there had been periods of up to a year for beneficiaries to build a house on their plots, which had often resulted in plots being allocated to people who never occupied them. The legal transfer of tenure did not take place immediately (there were instalment sale agreements) In this way, the Hyderabad Development Authority had a way of cancelling the allocation of beneficiaries who left the project (beneficiaries leaving the project could be paid a proportion of the money they had paid for the plot). The Hyderabad Incremental Development Scheme was successful in a number of ways: it was able to reach the poorest 10% of the population; the time lag in implementing projects was eliminated, because households were immediately allocated plots, which were then subsequently upgraded while the household was living there; and the continuous supply of plots ensured that there was never a shortage of land in the area, which could have resulted in speculation (people with housing elsewhere obtaining plots to rent out accommodation) or land occupations resulting in overcrowded informal settlements.

Whatever the form of tenure, the tenure rights given need to ensure that all members of the household, not just the "head" of the household, have security of tenure. Registering tenure rights in the name of the (usually male) head of household often ignores complex household dynamics, and can result in little real security of tenure for other members of the household. Magni et al. (2002) highlight the notion of "family ownership" as a key local practice. This notion of "family ownership" is difficult to reconcile with the emphasis on the individual in our inherited formal legal system, but even within the existing legal framework, it is possible to register tenure rights in a way that is more appropriate to the needs of households, for example, in the name of the wife rather than the husband (as happens with subsidized housing in some other countries), in the name of two or more siblings, or in the name of a parent and adult child. Registration in the name of more than one adult in the household should be encouraged. Co-owners would have right of veto, which may complicate land transactions but would increase the security of other members of the household. The rights of, for example, long-term tenants or members of the extended family or vulnerable household members such as the aged or people with HIV/AIDS, could be protected by registering lifetime right of use (*usufruct*) on the title deed (Smit et al., 2000).

Having a decentralized land administration system that can be more easily accessed by the urban poor is important. The principles of the Development Facilitation Act (DFA) for the granting of initial ownership need to be extended to transfer processes. The regulations allow for the initial issue of title to be decentralized (the conveyancer and surveyor sign the deed of initial transfer). By following the same principles, it should also be possible for the legal advisor and surveyor of a municipality to sign off on subsequent transfers to verify that it is the right diagram, and so on. There could therefore be, for example, a decentralized municipal office where people could go to, pay a fee and transfer property. Such a decentralized office could potentially be far more convenient and cheaper than having to transfer property via a conveyancer and the Deeds Office, as is currently the case. Some consent form would need to be signed, saying it is a voluntary sale and everybody in whose name the property is registered agrees. There would also need to be some community confirmation, for example from a street committee, that it is a voluntary sale and that everyone in the household has been consulted, so that vulnerable members of the household are not disadvantaged. An even greater level of decentralization, to community-based land registers, is also possible. A successful local example is the property register established in the informal settlement of New Rest, in Cape Town, in 1998. The municipality owned the land, and the Resident's Committee kept a community property register, resolved disputes and managed the vacant space (Walker, 2004). In such cases, it is important to develop the capacity of the local institution to manage this process.

6.2 Providing a wider range of subsidised housing options for all categories of need

The subsidised housing programme is essential. It is the only way that many poor households will ever be able to get access to adequate shelter, adequate services and legally-recognised security of tenure. Although there are a few minor exceptions (such as social housing), in the vast majority of cases the only subsidised housing option available is an RDP house, and poor households generally have little or no choice when it comes to RDP housing (for example, in terms of location, type of accommodation, form of tenure and affordability level). Generally, a standardized product is provided in a relatively few locations, and this standardized product seldom meets the diverse needs of households (and it does not meet the needs of individuals at all, as single people technically do not qualify for RDP houses). This lack of choice of "formal" land/housing options is causing a bottleneck in the land market processes in poorer areas, as the range of choices narrows greatly as households are drawn into formal processes through the housing subsidy scheme.

For land market processes to become more effective, there needs to be a wider range of land/housing options available towards the "formal" end of the continuum. A wider range of subsidised housing options to meet all categories of housing need is therefore essential. The range of choices in the options provided by the subsidised housing programme should ideally include the following: choice of location, choice of type of accommodation and choice of tenure. In addition the current focus on a narrow target group needs to be broadened.

Choice of location

Subsidised housing should be provided in a range of different types of locations, from high-density housing in well-located areas (which are within walking distance of jobs, shops and facilities) to lower-density housing in peri-urban areas (for example, agri-villages).

Choice of type of accommodation

A range of different types of subsidised housing should be provided to cater for different household sizes (from single people to extended families) and different affordability levels (from single rooms with shared facilities, as in the Wattville rental market, to self-contained housing units).

Choice of tenure

Subsidised housing should provide for different forms of tenure. Some people would prefer rental and some would prefer formal individual ownership, and there are a wide variety of other possible tenure options that could be appropriate.

Providing formal individual land ownership for all is not a realistic goal, and greater use should be made of more flexible forms of formal tenure which are more appropriate to the tenure needs of the urban poor (but which can be upgraded to formal individual ownership where necessary). For example, Durand-Lasserve (1999: 13) notes that "in most cases [providing individual land ownership for all] is not a realistic objective. Giving real rights is a complicated, time-consuming and expensive process. Administrations in charge of land management can simply not cope with the demand. However, it is essential that the right to occupy land for housing (whether it is guaranteed by a permanent or temporary administration permit or by any form of non-transferable leasehold) can be converted into a real right if the household needs it (for selling, inheritance reasons, investment projects or to mortgage the property). In this case, it can be agreed that formal land registration and the delivery of a real right should be made case by case at the expense of the applicant". A range of innovative ways of providing greater legal security of tenure in flexible and appropriate ways have been successfully used internationally, ranging from moratoriums on relocations and evictions, to temporary occupation licences, communal or individual leases and community land trusts (as discussed in the previous section).

Broadening the target group for subsidised housing

The target group for subsidised housing needs to be broadened. Currently, the housing subsidy programme focuses on residents of informal settlements, and on the stereotypical nuclear family (as opposed to individuals and extended families).

Residents of informal settlements cannot, however, be regarded as a static and discreet target group; living in an informal settlement is often just one element of a complex household history. In the survey, many of the respondents in informal settlements had previously lived in backyard rental accommodation (and other types of accommodation), and many of the respondents in backyard rental had previously lived in informal settlements (and sometimes people moved with the same shacks from an informal settlement to a backyard, or from a backyard to an informal settlement). In addition, a focus on residents of informal settlements may result in people moving from an option that may be more suitable for them to an informal settlement in order to get RDP housing (as was the case with some of the respondents in Enkanini). It is,, therefore important that all categories of household need are targeted to ensure that there are also "formal" options for poor households other than those in informal settlements. The various categories of need include the following:

- Residents of informal settlements (including tenants);
- People in rented accommodation in townships and other "formal" areas;
- People in employer-provided accommodation (e.g. domestic workers);
- People sharing with relatives or friends.

In addition, it is important that there also be "formal" options available for individuals and extended families. Although many, perhaps most, households are in the range of 3 to 5 people, there are a significant number of single-person households and extended-family households that cannot be ignored.

6.3 Incrementally upgrading informal settlements where appropriate

Informal settlements need to be upgraded where appropriate (i.e where the settlement is well-located and is not on a hazardous site), rather than being relocated. While relocation may be quicker and easier, it often makes people worse off, as their social and economic networks are disrupted and transport can become an enormous financial and time burden (although it should be noted that in some cases relocation may be unavoidable, for example, if the settlement is on a hazardous site). In the survey, the case of the Old Dunbar upgrading project clearly demonstrates the benefits of upgrading, compared to the cases of Kingsway and Delft, where residents (all residents in the case of Kingsway and some in the case of Delft) were relocated from informal settlements. In Old Dunbar (and the rest of Cato Manor) people specifically chose to occupy the site, and resisted eviction from the site, because of its relatively good location close to central Durban. Through the upgrading project, residents have been able to maintain the benefits of this good location, and the social organisation that has developed over many years (and which played an important role in controlling crime and violence in the area) has been maintained. In the case of Kingsway and Delft, however, people have been relocated from informal settlements such as Emlotheni, Emandleni and Joe Slovo, which were close to job opportunities, shops, and facilities to greenfield housing projects that were considerably further away from job opportunities, shops and facilities, and thus did not necessarily result in an overall improvement in people's lives (as jobs are now harder, and more expensive, to find, and it is more expensive to travel to shops and facilities). In addition, the relocation of people from many different areas to a new project at one time seems to have resulted in a decline in levels of social mobilisation.

What is also apparent from the survey is that many residents have been living for long periods of time (more than ten years, in many cases) in leaky shacks and with inadequate access to basic water and sanitation, and many residents will continue to live for many more years in these conditions while waiting for a RDP house. This is a serious health hazard and does not create a safe and dignified living environment for children to grow up in.

It is, therefore, essential that a more incremental approach be taken to informal settlement upgrading, with immediate steps to improve living conditions in the short-term. The first step should be the official recognition that the residents of a specific informal settlement have some rights to stay the area (and in some cases this has already happened). The provision of better basic services (more communal taps, more toilets, better waste water disposal) and the provision of advice and support for the construction of better quality shacks (perhaps

including the supply of subsidised materials) should be the second step. As part of this step, the site could also be laid out to reduce fire risks and facilitate future incremental upgrading (without the need for mass temporary relocations). It should be noted that some municipalities in South Africa have carried out similar programmes (for example, the former City of Tygerberg in Cape Town).

While local community-based organisations need to continue to play a key role in controlling access to these informal settlements, ultimately the overcrowding of existing informal settlements and the spontaneous, unplanned growth of new informal settlements can only be prevented by a "twin track" approach, in which urban upgrading initiatives to provide security of tenure and infrastructure in existing settlements are accompanied by a programme to ensure that new informal settlements do not form (Payne, 2003). The only way to prevent the growth of new informal settlements through new household formation and rural-urban migration is through the rapid provision of serviced land for settlement, or "managed land settlement" .These areas can be laid out and basic services provided so that health and safety can be considerably better than in informal settlements, and they are also considerably easier to upgrade than spontaneous, unplanned settlements. The key elements of such a strategy are that it must be simple and quick and it must replicate the key benefits of informal settlements as far as possible. The Hyderabad Incremental Development Scheme in Pakistan provides a model of managed land settlement in order to avoid the growth of unplanned and unserviced informal settlements (this example is discussed above in the section on reforming the formal/legal/State-recognised land system).

6.4 Stimulating the provision of good quality backyard rental accommodation

International experience shows that small-scale rental housing in developing countries tends to offer better location, services and infrastructure than equivalent ownership housing, and facilitates labour mobility, which is important for the livelihood strategies of poor households (Gilbert, 1997). This study confirms that this is also the case in some areas in South Africa. Backyard rental is an important land/housing option. It is a way in which many people are able to get access to adequate shelter (in the case of rented formal rooms) and adequate access to services in good locations and at a relatively affordable cost. The provision of good quality backyard rental accommodation therefore needs to be encouraged.

Potential ways of encouraging the provision of adequate and affordable rental housing by small-scale landlords include the following (UN-Habitat, 2003):

- Assuring small-scale landlords that, subject to very basic minimum standards, letting accommodation to tenants is encouraged, and that landlords will not lose the property to the tenants, and will be able to repossess the property if tenants do not pay the rent.

- Ensuring that landlords and tenants understand their right and responsibilities, that standard rent contracts are easily available, that all rent contracts are put in writing, and establishing mediation and conciliation tribunals.
- Implementing urban upgrading programmes (providing infrastructure and facilities, improving transport links, etc.). International experience shows that upgrading generally does not lead to the displacement of tenants, except in well-located areas which are particularly attractive to higher income groups, where "gentrification" sometimes occurs.
- Providing micro-credit for existing and potential landlords.
- Relaxing building and planning standards and regulations, although there do need to be certain minimum standards to ensure health and safety.
- Ensuring affordability of rentals through "second-generation" rent controls, i.e. rent controls that allow inflation-linked increases in rentals and which allow evictions of tenants under certain conditions.

In new subsidised housing projects, the design and layout of houses and plots could also be used to facilitate the construction of backyard rental accommodation (Watson et al., 1994), and rental rooms could even be provided as an integral addition to subsidised housing, as in the Far East Bank in the Alexandra Urban Renewal Project.

6.5 Conclusion

This study shows that there are land markets operating in the poorer parts of South African cities and there are a wide range of land/housing options available to poor households. Households make choices with regard to accommodation based on a range of factors, including location (especially proximity to jobs), affordability, quality of shelter and access to services. The land markets in poorer areas cannot be said to be working well for the poor, though, as the options available to households usually are inadequate in one way or another. Although people are, for example, able to access relatively good locations and affordable accommodation in informal settlements and adequate shelter/ services and secure tenure in RDP housing settlements, they are seldom able to satisfy all, or even most, of their requirements simultaneously. A particular bottleneck in the land markets is that whereas there are many options available for poor households towards the "informal" end of the continuum (for example, in terms of location, type of accommodation, forms of tenure and affordability levels), there are very few options for poor households towards the "formal" end of the continuum. The only current "formal" option for most poor households is an RDP house, and poor households generally have little or no choice when it comes to RDP housing (i.e. location, type of accommodation, form of tenure and affordability level).

Through the above recommendations (reforming the formal/legal/State-recognised land system to be more widely applicable and useful for the poor, providing a wider range of

subsidised housing options for all categories of need, incrementally upgrading informal settlements where appropriate, and stimulating the provision of good quality backyard rental accommodation) it will hopefully be possible to ensure that there are more options provided by the land markets in poorer areas and that these options are more adequate. Ultimately, we need to work towards land markets that work better for the poor, where households are able to access a variety of different options with adequate shelter and adequate services in suitable locations at an affordable cost and with a reasonable *de facto* security of tenure, and where more households are able to have legally-recognised tenure so that they have greater long-term security and that owners of property are able to sell their properties at reasonable prices when they wish to.

7. REFERENCES

Carney, D., Drinkwater, M., Rusinow, T., Neefjes, K., Wanmali, S. and Singh, N. (1999): *Livelihoods Approaches Compared: A Brief Comparison of the Livelihoods Approaches of the UK Department for International Development (DFID), CARE, Oxfam and the United Nations Development Programme*. London: Department for International Development (DFID).

Chambers, R. (1995): "Poverty and livelihoods: Whose reality counts?", *Environment and Urbanization* 7(1), 173-204.

DAG (Development Action Group) (2006) *Review of Knysna Municipality's Housing Allocations Processes*, report prepared for Knysna Municipality.

Durand-Lasserve, A. (1999) "Benefits of regularizing informal settlements", *Habitat Debate* 5(3): 13-15.

Fourie, C. (2001) "Land and property registration at the crossroads", *Habitat Debate* 7(3): 16.

Gilbert, A. (1997): "On subsidies and home ownership", *Third World Planning Review* 19(1), pp. 51-70.

HLCLEP (High Level Commission on Legal Empowerment of the Poor) (2006) *Overview Paper*. New York: United Nations Development Programme.

Lanjouw, J.O. and Levy, P.I. (1998) *A Study of Formal and Informal Property Rights in Urban Ecuador*, Discussion Paper No. 788. New Haven, CT: Economic Growth Center, Yale University.

Isandla Institute, Stephen Berrisford Consulting and Progressus Research and Development (2007): *Do Informal Land Markets Work for Poor People? An Assessment of Three Metropolitan Cities in South Africa: Synthesis report*. Pretoria: Urban LandMark.

Jenkins, P. (2000) *The Concepts of Formal and Informal with Reference to Land Access in Maputo*, paper presented at Nordic Africa Institute Conference on "The Formal and the Informal City – What Happens at the Interface?", Copenhagen, 15-18 June 2000.

Magni, P., Rutsch, P. & Von Riesen, A. (2002) *Informal Land Markets and Tenure Security in South Africa – The Experience of Folweni in KwaZulu-Natal*, paper presented at the Planning Africa 2002 Conference, Durban, 17-20 September 2002.

Marshall, C. and Rossman,G.B. (2006): *Designing Qualitative Research*. Fourth Edition. London: Sage.

Payne, G. (2003) *Getting Ahead of the Game: A Twin Track Approach to Improving Existing Slums and Reducing the Need for Future Slums*, paper presented at Urban Research Symposium 2003: "Urban Development for Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction", World Bank, Washington, D.C., 15-17 December 2003.

Smit, W., Smith, H. & Samaai, S. (2000) *Investigation of the Various Types of Tenure Applicable to Affordable Housing in the Cape Metropolitan Area*, report prepared by the Development Action Group for the Cape Metropolitan Council Housing Department. Cape Town: Cape Metropolitan Council.

SACN (South African Cities Network) (2006): *State of the Cities Report 2006*. Johannesburg: South African Cities Network.

UNCHS (United Nations Centre for Human Settlements) (1991) *The Incremental Development Scheme: A Case Study of Khuda-Ki-Basti in Hyderabad, Pakistan*. Nairobi: UNCHS.

UN-Habitat (2003): *Rental Housing: An Essential Option for the Urban Poor in Developing Countries*, Nairobi.

UN-Habitat (2004) *Dialogue on the Urban Poor: Improving the Lives of Slum-Dwellers*, paper prepared for the World Urban Forum, Barcelona, 13-17 September 2004.

Urban LandMark (2007a): *How the Poor Access, Hold and Trade Land*. Pretoria: Urban LandMark.

Urban Landmark (2007b): *Voices of the Poor: Community Perspectives on Access to Urban Land*. Pretoria: Urban LandMark.

USN (Urban Sector Network)/ Development Works (2004): *Scoping Study: Urban Land Issues*. Pretoria: United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID).

Wallace, J. and Williamson, I. (2006): Building land markets. *Land Use Policy* 23, 123-135.

Walker, N. (2004) *Towards a More Appropriate Approach to Tenure – the New Rest Case Study*, presentation at the University of the Witwatersrand Workshop on "The perpetuating challenge of informal settlements", Johannesburg, 8-10 November 2004.

Walker, N. et al. (1993) *Overview of Housing Delivery Systems in South Africa and Selected International Case Studies*. Johannesburg: National Housing Forum.

Watson, V., Behrens, R., Hennessy, K. & Smit, W. (1994) *Subletting: Towards an Appropriate Policy Response,* Working Paper No. 52 (Occasional Paper No. 39). Cape Town: Urban Problems Research Unit.