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The Stellenbosch Municipality in the Western Cape Province, South Africa, has implemented a novel approach to providing housing – the Integrated Residential Development Program – a multi-phase initiative to develop economically integrated communities. This project documented perspectives of the program, collecting narratives and employing a photo-elicitation strategy to understand the views of municipal officials, program beneficiaries, and neighboring community residents. Collected data reveal that the approach has potential, but still needs to address shared concerns of establishing safety measures, offering effective consumer education, and defining roles and responsibilities. We suggest engaging the community with small projects, youth involvement, and further municipal collaboration.
With 1.6 billion people lacking access to adequate housing, addressing the global housing crisis remains a focus for many countries worldwide (Homeless World Cup Foundation, 2017). South Africa is a unique case as the constitution explicitly affords all residents the right to adequate housing. Therefore, it is the government’s responsibility to address the lack of affordable housing evident throughout the country. The need for affordable housing in South Africa continues to expand as a result of urbanization, lack of affordable land, and population growth. Since 1994, 3.3 million low-cost homes have been built utilizing various government subsidized housing programs (Todes, Kok, Wentzel, Van Zyl, & Cross, 2010). Even so, the backlog remains at 2.3 million households (Government Official-7, 2017).

In order to provide dignified living to underprivileged residents, the national government has created various housing subsidy programs. The program involving the upgrading of informal settlements has been successful in enhancing the living conditions of people residing in informal shacks by providing secure tenure and access to basic services (water, electricity, sanitation) (Government Official-1, 2017). However, this is only a temporary solution to addressing the housing crisis, as residents are not provided formal housing. A more permanent solution to housing was developed by the ANC government in 1994 under the Reconstruction and Development Program (RDP). The goal of RDP was to address many socio-economic issues such as unemployment, poverty, health, the provision of electricity and water, education, transportation, and most importantly the lack of affordable housing (African National Congress, 2017). Although RDP has been successful in providing 3 million homes since 1994 (African National Congress, 2017), it has generated “poverty pockets” as all residents who qualify for RDP houses make less than 3,500 ZAR (250 USD) per month (Government Official-7, 2017). For residents who make between 3,501-15,000 ZAR (250-1,070 USD) and do not qualify for RDP houses, affordable rental units are available through the Social Housing subsidy. The Social Housing program attempts to create low-cost rental facilities in areas of economic opportunity to promote economic prosperity and provide secure tenure1 to those in need (Department of Human Settlements, 2010). More recently, the national government has created the Integrated Residential Development Program (IRDP), aiming to create economically diverse communities in an effort to promote economic class integration (Department of Human Settlements, 2010). With the IRDP approach being fairly new and unexplored, examinations of its affect are limited.

1 Secure tenure refers to the right to adequate housing, more importantly the legal ownership of not only the structure but the land. Insecure access to land is a repercussion of the spatial inequality experienced from colonialism and the apartheid era. When the South African government provides free housing, the beneficiaries also receive the title deed, giving them the right to ownership and security from eviction.
This project aimed to document perspectives surrounding the IRDP initiative implemented by the Stellenbosch Municipality in Mountain View.

Our project took place in Stellenbosch, the second oldest city within the Western Cape Province. One of the communities in the Stellenbosch Municipality that facilitates IRDP housing is Mountain View; a small community, adjacent to Jamestown, where private homes, government provided housing, and informal settlements all coexist (Statistics South Africa, 2017a). Mountain View has become a site where farm workers, squatters, and informal settlement dwellers are relocated by the government, under the Extension of Security of Tenure Act, with the understanding that they will be prioritized in receiving a government subsidized home (Government Official-5, 2017a). The community is currently comprised of two forms of housing: Phase 1 RDP houses provided by the government and a temporary housing section comprised of prefabricated “Wendy Shacks” (also provided by the government), and self-constructed corrugated metal shacks.

In order to uncover diverse perspectives for a complete and well-rounded case study of the Mountain View IRDP initiative, we engaged with Municipal officials involved in the project, beneficiaries of the project, and residents in surrounding neighborhoods (including residents in the informal settlement area and those in Jamestown). We conducted semi-structured interviews to assess how people perceived the IRDP project, and elicited drawings or photographs from housing recipients to gain an understanding of how they perceived their new homes. Municipal officials provided background on government housing policies, information regarding the project plans, and strategies for project implementation in Mountain View. IRDP beneficiaries provided first-hand accounts of their experiences with the approach and how it has affected their lifestyles, families, and community. Residents of the informal settlement provided insights on their experience with the approach to date, although they are still waiting to be provided formal housing through the project. The surrounding Jamestown community members provided an outside perspective on the idea of integrating low-, middle-, and high-income households within one IRDP neighborhood and how the current Phase I (low-income housing) has affected their community directly. Collectively, data from all four groups offered crucial shared and contrasting insights on the program’s current implementation and opportunities for improvement.

Our data revealed that although the IRDP implementation in Mountain View has been successful in providing housing, beneficiaries and surrounding neighborhood residents raised some shared concerns. All parties interviewed indicated the growing lack of safety within the Mountain View community. This has created a constant unease among residents within Mountain View and residents in surrounding neighborhoods. Safety concerns also pose as a barrier to a fully integrated housing development, idealized by IRDP. In order for middle- and high-income residents to feel secure in moving into a fully integrated community like Mountain View, safety issues need to be addressed. Residents indicate that streetlights have yet to be provided, which would illuminate public spaces in the neighborhood at night, limiting the potential for crime. Furthermore, speed bumps would help to reduce the high speed of traffic within the neighborhood.

Research suggests that engaging residents as “community resources” through consultation and project development will empower members to take pride in their communities
and search for ways of perpetual growth and well-being (Zeldin, 2004, p. 630). The Stellenbosch Municipality has established ward committees as well as a beneficiary committee, which could serve as platforms for further community involvement and a starting point for introducing youth sub-committees to begin engagements early on. For example, with future Municipal plans for infrastructure implementation, such as lighting structures, a youth subcommittee could be created to advise the ward councilor on crime hot spots and how to address implementing various methods of crime prevention. By introducing the youth as community resources and developers, they may begin to take ownership of the growth and development of Mountain View, as “residents become community leaders and actively participate in solving community problems, [they] take part in the design and provisions of services that enhance the wellbeing of community members” (Itzhaky, Zanbar, Levy, & Schwartz, 2015, p. 1679). In this way, the goal is to initiate a sense of ownership and responsibility among those involved to encourage them to progress the social and communal aspects of Mountain View, with the overarching purpose of making Mountain View safer and inherently more appealing for future integration.

A second major limitation in the current implementation of IRDP in Mountain View is a communication disconnect between residents (beneficiaries of the program, Jamestown residents, and informal settlement dwellers) and the Municipality. The Municipality uses multiple communication platforms to engage with residents, including community forums, newspaper announcements, and large-group informational sessions. Despite these efforts, data collected from housing beneficiaries reveals a limited understanding of resident-municipality relationships, as well as roles and responsibilities, despite engagement with educational programming provided by the Municipality. Conversations with Jamestown residents similarly revealed a lack of clarity regarding the Mountain View initiative.

We recommend that involving the Mountain View community in a small project could increase community engagement and aid in the communication process. If community members work together on a project that benefits them, it increases their involvement and aids in creating better relationships with government workers (Lategan, 2012). These relationships could promote more effective communication between the community and the Municipality. A possible project could be repurposing the dilapidated wooden structure at the entrance of Mountain View into something that better suits the community’s needs, such as a community farm stand or bus stop. In addition, Municipality departments should review education dissemination procedures, as well as their roles and obligations in the IRDP process, such that they can clearly convey these roles to beneficiaries and community residents. Consumer education may also be improved by facilitating smaller group informational sessions of no more than 30 individuals rather than large community meetings of over 150. Finally, meetings should occur more frequently with a representative from all departments present to help answer recipients’ specific questions.

IRDP may not resolve the backlog of housing needed in South Africa, however, it offers a good supplementary approach to be used in combination with various other government housing subsidies being implemented throughout the country. In addition, it addresses a growing concern of social and economic integration that other housing initiatives fail to address.
The global housing crisis has had a profound impact on the world we live in, rendering an estimated 100 million people homeless worldwide with “approximately 1.6 billion people lack[ing] adequate housing” (Homeless World Cup Foundation, 2017). Economic and urban development play a large role in the housing crisis, encouraging businesses to center operations in cities, which often results in increased property values and consequently less opportunities for affordable housing (Marx, Stoker, & Suri, 2013). Slums generate as a response, in and around cities, to accommodate the approximately one third of the world population who cannot afford formal housing (Zhang & Ball, 2016). The United Nations is attempting to promote a global response to address the increasing number of people living in slums, with a particular focus on housing conditions in developing countries where situations continue to deteriorate. In sub-Saharan Africa, from 1981 to 2010, the number of people living in extreme poverty rose from 205 to 414 million (UN-Habitat, 2016).

While many countries are following the United Nation’s call to action to address the global housing crisis, the efforts taking place in South Africa are particularly interesting. The South African constitution guarantees that all residents have the right to adequate housing as cited in Section 26 of the South African Bill of Rights (South African Government, 1996). However, this guarantee has created a significant challenge as national housing programs have failed to keep up with the rapid population growth, urbanization, and potential political corruption² (Todes et al., 2010). The South African government has tried to address their housing crisis in numerous ways, including temporary upgrades to existing facilities and permanent solutions such as building new homes. The Reconstruction and Development Program (RDP) passed by the African National Congress government aims to provide fully subsidized houses to the poorest of the poor in South Africa. The RDP approach has provided 3 million homes since 1994, yet there are still millions of people on the national waiting list, which is growing by an annual-average of 150,000 households (African National Congress, 2017).

Current housing strategies have failed to address the backlog or keep pace with the growing demand. In addition, they have generated “poverty pockets” as new, low-income housing developments are separated from middle- and high-income areas. To address these concerns, a newer initiative, which integrates RDP housing into a more holistic development plan – the Integrated Residential Development Program (IRDP) – has recently been developed. The IRDP strategy involves co-constructing low- (fully subsidized RDP housing), medium-

² Illegal sale of RDP homes by the African National Congress (governing body of South Africa) has been observed in numerous accounts where, “the backlog could partly be attributed to corrupt activities which saw houses being given to undeserving people by ANC officials” (Moatshe, 2017, p. 1).
(partially subsidized), and high-income (non-subsidized) housing in integrated neighborhoods in an effort to promote economic class integration (The Stellenbosch Municipality, 2017). The intended result is to drive economic growth communally such that job creation and new opportunities arise within an integrated community, rather than in exclusively high-income regions (Government Official-6, 2017). Ideally, economic stimulation will enable IRDP beneficiaries to become more independent in terms of housing and government-subsidy-reliance.

To address their housing crisis, the Stellenbosch Municipality, in South Africa’s Western Cape Province, has begun implementing the IRDP program. Stellenbosch, the second oldest city within the Western Cape, has seen its population grow rapidly as it continues to urbanize, resulting in a greater demand for housing, particularly affordable housing (The Stellenbosch Municipality, 2017). In 2017, the municipality was awarded the Govan Mbeki Award (Figure 1) for the Best Integrated Residential Development Program in South Africa, specifically for the implementation of IRDP in Mountain View (Government Official-5, 2017a). Mountain View is comprised of an informal settlement, emergency temporary housing, and fully subsidized housing. In order to realize the goal of IRDP, plans for middle- and high-income housing within Mountain View have been approved, indicating progress toward an integrated community.

The IRDP project in Mountain View (Figure 2) has only just begun, and the perceptions, expectations, and effects of this new housing initiative are unknown. As such, this novel housing
strategy needs to be better documented in order to understand its ability to address the perpetuating housing crisis with regards not only to demand, but also to social integration. The national recognition of the implementation of IRDP in Stellenbosch, paired with the evident dedication of the Municipality to continue IRDP development in Mountain View, makes this an ideal location to document this unique upgrading and social integration approach and the perceptions surrounding the development. The goal of this project is to conduct a case study on the IRDP approach in Mountain View exploring the perceptions, expectations, and effects that the IRDP approach is having on Mountain View and neighboring-Jamestown residents. Through this assessment, efforts to address the affordable housing crisis in South Africa will be better informed, with the hopes for more accepted housing initiatives in the future.
Lack of Affordable Urban Housing Leading to the Global Housing Crisis

As countries across the globe continue to focus on urban and economic development, access to affordable urban housing is becoming an increasingly prominent issue. Greater economic opportunities present in cities have stimulated migration towards urban centers, but resources are insufficient to meet the sudden increase in demand – especially regarding affordable housing (Marx et al., 2013). World Bank statistics indicate a steady 2% growth of worldwide urban populations since 1965, with 33.6% of the world’s population living in urban areas in 1960, 46.5% in 2000, and 54.3% in 2015. This rapid expansion of urban populations has resulted in a significant housing crisis. The current affordable housing gap, or the difference between the cost of an acceptable standard house and what households can afford to pay using no more than 30% of income, is currently 330 million (Woetzel, Ram, Mischke, Garemo, & Sankhe, 2014). This number is expected to increase by more than 30%, encompassing a backlog of 440 million homes by the year 2025 (Levenson, 2017). The crisis of affordable urban housing is expected to progressively expand as economic prosperity and urbanization play out in developing countries (Woetzel et al., 2014).

Vast informal settlements or slums have developed as a consequence of the lack of affordable urban housing worldwide. Approximately one third of the world’s population live in slums (Zhang & Ball, 2016). With three billion people, or one third of the world's population living off of less than 2 USD per day, the number of slum dwellers continues to increase worldwide (Grabowski, 2017). The United Nations Human Settlement Program describes slums as the physical and spatial manifestation of urban poverty and intra-city inequality (UN-Habitat, 2003). Slum households are characterized as lacking: access to sufficient water or sanitation facilities according to government regulations, a sufficient living area, structural quality/durability of dwellings, and security of tenure (UN-Habitat, 2003). Several factors have contributed to the creation of slums globally, including income inequality, lack of economic opportunity, migration towards cities, poverty, lack of affordable housing, and weak governance (Smit, Musango, Kovacic, & Brent, 2017). As the affordable housing backlog continues to increase, global slum populations are predicted to double from one billion to two billion residents over the next 15 years (Al Fin Next Level, 2014).

In an effort to promote a global response to the increasing number of people living in slums, the United Nations hosted multiple meetings with world leaders to discuss the consequences of rapid urbanization. The first meeting in Vancouver in 1976 resulted in a list of goals and commitments aimed at improving the living conditions of those that are unable to afford adequate shelter (called the Habitat Agenda; United Nations, 2006). These goals included, “ensuring adequate shelter for all and making human settlements safer, healthier, and more
livable, equitable, sustainable and productive” (United Nations, 2006). The United Nations has placed more emphasis on improving the living conditions of those living in developing countries as the living situations continue to deteriorate. For instance, from 1981 to 2010, the amount of people living in extreme poverty in sub-Saharan Africa rose from 205 to 414 million (United Nations, 2006). The UN Habitat meetings have moved the issue of inadequate housing and the associated negative effects to the global stage to incite world leaders to work towards effective solutions.

**Understanding the Housing Crisis in South Africa**

South Africa’s transformative constitution, adopted as a celebration of a dawning democratic age, guarantees that all residents have the right to adequate housing (South African Government, 1996). However, given the legacies of colonialism and apartheid, this guarantee has created a significant challenge and over 20 years of unfulfilled promises. Although 3.3 million low-cost homes have been built since 1994, shantytowns have mushroomed around cities as state housing programs have failed to keep pace with rapid population growth and urbanization (Todes et al., 2010). Since 1994, the population has grown by 15.36 million (The World Bank, 2016). Only 15% of South Africa’s 15 million households earn enough to secure a mortgage, while 60% earn less than 3,500 ZAR (about 270 USD equivalent) a month and can qualify for government provided housing (The Fuller Center for Housing, 2014). The remaining 25%, including educated and skilled laborers (teachers, nurses, and police officers) are neither qualified for state assistance nor private mortgages.

The current housing crisis in South Africa is largely fueled by a legacy of segregation, whereby economically prosperous areas were designated for whites. Official segregation policies have a long history in South Africa, dating back to the 1800s. The Public Health Act (No. 4) of 1883 called for the mass removal of Cape Town’s black-African population. The Cape government asserted that blacks needed to be protected from the diseases of the city, including the bubonic plague pandemic, “even though the number of Africans contracting the plague was less than either whites or coloureds” (O’Malley, 1998). The Natives’ Land Act of 1913, severely restricted ownership of land for the black population. Black South Africans were only allowed to buy land specifically designated for them. The inequality is apparent as this act “reserved nearly

---

3 The right to adequate housing is a socio-economic right as opposed to a civil and political right. Social, economic and cultural rights are usually vaguer and require positive action by government to ensure that they are implemented. In terms of legislative provisions, the Housing Act (1997) echoes the calls of paragraph 61 of the Habitat Agenda that states that housing policy and programs should ensure: non-discriminatory access; security of tenure and equal access to all; that housing is made accessible through a series of interventions to improve the supply of affordable housing; and monitoring and evaluation of homelessness and inadequate housing. South African housing policy is therefore strong in its commitment to achieve a holistic concept of adequate housing by supporting citizens to achieve this vision incrementally (South African Government, 1996).
ninety percent of the land in South Africa for a tiny minority white population” (Findley & Ogbu, 2011). The Group Areas act of 1950 categorized South Africans as black, coloured or white and segregated housing into these groups (Johnson-Castle, 2014). As a result, people were relocated, often times by forced removal. The Group Areas act had legally allowed for South African, primarily black and coloured, citizens to be uprooted from their homes and forced to the outskirts of urban areas. An infamous example occurred during 1968-1982 when 60,000 residents of District Six, an area of Cape Town, were forcibly removed to clear land. A portion of the land was used to create a white-only university, while the unused portion has remained vacant for decades (Findley & Ogbu, 2011).

In 1994, South Africa held its first democratic election, where all races were allowed to vote. This new era of democracy brought the African National Congress (ANC) into a leadership role. Repercussions from segregation due to the apartheid government and colonial policies are still prevalent in the inequality of housing in South Africa. However, the South African government has been making amends to provide inclusion and adequate housing for all. For example, Brett Herron, a member of the City of Cape Town’s mayoral committee for urban development, unveiled the launch of a large-scale affordable housing project, which aims to create more inclusive communities. Noting that reversing the spatial inequality of the apartheid is a key priority for the government (Chambers, 2017). As shown in Figure 3, neighborhoods in Cape Town remain largely divided along racial lines, with white populations dominating in areas with high economic activity.

---

Figure 3. In Cape Town, for example, well-serviced and secure suburban areas on prime real estate — close to Table Mountain, in the inner city, and around the coastline — are mostly inhabited by white people. Low-income areas on the outskirts of the city where black,

---

4 South Africa’s population is 54,841,552. The population breakdown of ethnic groups is black African 80.2%, white 8.4%, colored 8.8%, Indian/Asian 2.5% (CIA, 2017).
While the South African government has been trying to provide adequate housing for all, there still exists a significant housing backlog. This backlog is due to the inability, on the government's behalf, to provide affordable housing at the same rate that it is required. For example, “in 1990 there was a shortage of about 1.3 million homes. Each year [since], about 200,000 new households seek a home, but in 1992 only 50,000 homes were built” (African National Congress, 2017). The increasing need can be attributed, in large part, to a population increase and lack of affordable land.

**Addressing the Housing Crisis in South Africa**

South Africa is divided into nine provinces that are overseen by a three-tiered government system – national, provincial, and municipal – as geographically represented in Figure 4. Each tier has its own responsibilities in addressing the lack of affordable housing. The national tier is responsible for allocating housing funds to the nine provincial governments. This distribution of money is based on factors such as population size and the extent of the respective housing backlog (Government Official-3, 2017). The provincial governments then decide how to allocate funding for housing projects to the municipalities they oversee.

All approved government funded housing programs follow a nationwide guideline, the National Housing Code, developed in 2009 to outline the principles and standards for all South African housing subsidies that were instated in 1994 (Department of Human Settlements, 2010). The national government is responsible for defining adequate affordable housing, while municipal governments are responsible for implementation. Refer to Figure 5 to see the pathway of funding through the South African government.

In 1994, the ANC government passed the Reconstruction and Development Program (RDP), in an effort to correct the social, economic, and political injustices of apartheid and colonial era policies. The goal of RDP was to address many socio-economic issues such as unemployment, poverty, health, the provision of electricity and water, education, transportation,
and most importantly the lack of affordable housing (African National Congress, 2017). The housing structures provided through this development program became commonly known as ‘RDP houses.’ The RDP approach has been successful in providing around 3 million homes since 1994 (African National Congress, 2017).

While succeeding in providing housing, the process of building new construction is slow and costly. Consequently, millions of citizens who are eligible for a housing subsidy are still on the national housing waitlist. As a faster alternative, the South African government has attempted to provide dignified living conditions through the “upgrading of informal settlements program” (UISP). This program focuses on enhancing the living conditions of people residing in informal shacks by providing secure tenure and access to basic services (water, electricity, sanitation). Compared to RDP, this program is cheaper, but it is only a temporary solution to addressing the housing crisis (Government Official-1, 2017). There are various ways to upgrade informal settlements and the approach chosen depends on the wants and needs of the community in which it is implemented, which are jointly determined by municipal and provincial governments and residents (Government Official-1, 2017). The aim of this approach is to bring about social cohesion, stability, and security in spite of not providing formal housing (Department of Human Settlements, 2010).

In their assessment of the USIP approach, Brown-Luthango and colleagues (2017) have identified two primary strategies: in-situ incremental formal housing and in-situ re-blocking. The in-situ approach involves in-place upgrading, where the improvements occur with minimal disruption to the residents’ lives (Government Official-2, 2017). The incremental upgrading approach was applied in Freedom Park located in the Mitchells Plain township (Figure 6), under the Stellenbosch Municipality. The approach included a complete transformation of infrastructure and the addition of basic amenities, such as toilets, water taps, and electricity.

---

5 Secure tenure refers to the right to adequate housing, more importantly the legal ownership of not only the structure but the land. Insecure access to land is a repercussion of the spatial inequality experienced from colonialism and the apartheid era. When the South African government provides free housing, the beneficiaries also receive the title deed, giving them the right to ownership and security from eviction.
A total of 493 houses were built, of which 289 were allotted to the previous Freedom Park residents and 204 were awarded to people on the national housing waitlist. Throughout this process, residents were not relocated, rather they were pushed to the boundary of Freedom Park temporarily, while infrastructure was installed.

By contrast, the re-blocking approach, as implemented in Sheffield Road, Philippi, a township to the west of Stellenbosch (under the Cape Town Municipality), involves the rearrangement of structures to create space that allows municipalities to better provide essential services, protection against natural disasters, and security of tenure. Residents are also given material to improve the structure of their current houses and develop more personal space, while more public space is generated within the settlement and community for amenities such as water taps and toilets. Both approaches are government/non-government organization partnership led processes that emphasize active community involvement (Brown-Luthango, Reyes, Gubeyu 2017). The approaches generate mixed perspectives, with some residents feeling that the upgrades gave them dignity and made their lives easier. According to Brown-Luthango and colleagues (2017), the Philippi community members reacted, overall, positively towards this approach to improving the community, saying that it added cleanliness, safety and an improved sense of community throughout their settlement. Yet, others responded more negatively and had feelings that the provision of their housing led to a lack of community and no sense of unity (Brown-Luthango et al., 2017).

An assessment of an RDP housing establishment has been offered by De-Moss Norman (2015), with her assessment of the Coega Development Project of 1999 in Port Elizabeth Harbor. The harbor area of Port Elizabeth was identified as a lucrative industrial park, requiring the
relocation of 300 people living in three informal settlements (DeMoss-Norman, 2015). As a solution, the Wells Estate township was developed in 2001, nine miles from Port Elizabeth, providing 1,000 homes (DeMoss-Norman, 2015). The Coega Development Corporation also provided work training and a guaranteed job for one member of each family living in the development project. In addition, 5,000 ZAR (370 USD) was given to each family so that the relocation to Wells Estate was seen as a positive change (DeMoss-Norman, 2015). Despite this, residents expressed dissatisfaction with the estate, given problems with safety and security, a lack of public commodities such as a medical clinic, stores, schools, and playgrounds, and a reduced sense of community (DeMoss-Norman, 2015). In addition, many residents did not have the skills Coega was looking for in new employees, and therefore were left without jobs. Residents were, however, satisfied with the housing that was provided (DeMoss-Norman, 2015).

RDP and in-situ upgrading address people living in extreme poverty. However, there is also an increased need for programs that provide affordable rental units. The social housing program attempts to address this problem by creating low-cost rental facilities in areas of economic opportunity. Social housing is geared toward the people who are just above the monthly income qualification for a fully government subsidized house, but still too poor to provide a home for themselves (3,501-15,000 ZAR; 250-1,070 USD). Social housing units are categorized into bachelor, one-bed, two-bed, and three-bed units with an average floor space of 45 square meters (The Stellenbosch Municipality, 2017).

Emergency Housing Assistance (Figure 7) is another government subsidy that protects people from both manmade and natural disasters. In the case of disasters, for example, eviction from a previous house or fire, the government is responsible for providing victims with temporary living structures until they can be accommodated in permanent housing through the National Disaster Relief Fund. Emergency Housing is used as a temporary form of housing subsidy and is implemented as a transition to formal housing granted through government-funded projects such as IRDP (Government Official-1, 2017).

Figure 7. Wendy Shacks are commonly used for emergency housing. These are Wendy Shacks in Mountain View.

---

6 Other forms of housing include communal/transitional housing units that are 20 square meters of floor space; formalized home ownership that offer three bedroom apartments, measuring 75 square meters; and employer housing that consists of either houses in the agricultural villages or houses directly on the farms, which are required to be at least 40 square meters (The Stellenbosch Municipality, 2017).
A New Approach to Affordable Housing in South Africa: IRDP Implementation in Jamestown, Stellenbosch Municipality of the Western Cape Province

In an effort to address more of the basic needs of shelter and services, the Integrated Residential Development Program (IRDP) has been developed as a holistic development approach (Department of Human Settlements, 2010). The goal of IRDP is to integrate economically differing human settlements in well-located areas to facilitate access to urban amenities, places of employment, and the creation of social cohesion (Department of Human Settlements, 2010). In essence, the idea is for housing to provide a stable platform to achieve greater equity through a more holistic welfare system that stimulates empowerment and economic opportunities (Potts, 2010). With IRDP being a holistic redevelopment program, the goal of integrating economic classes is to drive economic growth communally, such that job creation and new opportunities arise within an integrated community rather than in exclusively high-income regions (Government Official-4, 2017). According to a Stellenbosch Municipal Official, the only way to begin decreasing the flat-lined dependency ratio\(^7\) in the country is to develop communities holistically rather than simply delivering the end product – a house.

Of the nine provinces of South Africa, the Western Cape Province’s economic opportunities make it one of the most immigrated provinces. It has the second largest amount of in-migration in all of the nine provinces, with 160,000 people migrating into the Western Cape Province from 2011 to 2016 (Meny-Gibert & Chiumia, 2016). Twenty-three percent of the Western Cape Province’s population was born elsewhere (Meny-Gibert & Chiumia, 2016). Migrants to the Western Cape Province are primarily driven by economic opportunities (Jacobs & Du Plessis, 2016). However, the lack of affordable housing has resulted in approximately 30% of these migrants living in informal settlements or in an informal structure in another person’s backyard (Jacobs & Du Plessis, 2016). People residing in informal housing, shacks or slums fall under the responsibility of the Human Settlements Department of the Western Cape Provincial Government. This provincial government department is responsible for allocating national funding to create subsidies, acquire land, and oversee the use of various housing strategies to provide houses to ‘qualifying citizens’, who are described in Table 1 (Department of Human Settlements, 2017).

The second oldest city within the Western Cape Province is Stellenbosch, the “smallest of the five municipalities in the district, making up only four percent of its geographical area” (Municipalities of South Africa, 2017). Despite its small size, the Municipality’s goal is to become the innovation capital of South Africa through enhancing technological development and increasing their vast tourist experiences (Stellenbosch Municipality, 2017a). However, there exists a vast separation in terms of economic status between the rich and the poor within the municipal area where 23% of households are earning less than 4,800 ZAR (350 USD) per month (Wazimap, 2016). The Municipality aims to close this gap and relieve the alarming 39% dependency ratio that currently exists (Municipalities of South Africa, 2017).

\(^7\) Dependency ratio refers to the number of people who are relying on the government for fiscal support.
The city of Stellenbosch continues to urbanize and attract people to its location, and as stated in the Stellenbosch 2017 housing strategy, is expected to double in size from 2008-2017 (The Stellenbosch Municipality, 2017). The influx of people living in Stellenbosch led to the attempt to provide 20,456 new housing units, with 9,791 units reserved for residents who qualify for some kind of government subsidy (The Stellenbosch Municipality, 2017). Of the total new housing units to be delivered, 4,991 are projected to be RDP housing, as depicted in Figure 8.

IRDP is the newest affordable housing program implemented by the Stellenbosch Municipality. Myra Francis, a project manager for the Municipality, stated that the IRDP approach is usually completed in phases in order to accommodate the implementation of varying housing structures (Government Official-5, 2017a). The first phase usually consists of the creation of RDP structures as an option for affordable housing to lower income citizens, moving people out of informal housing structures rather than upgrading existing slums. RDP housing units can vary in size and structure, but in general, are two-bedroom houses with 45 meters of floor space, a living room, a kitchen, and a bathroom. The next phase begins to incorporate another form of affordable social housing – GAP housing. GAP housing aims to service those who do not qualify for a free government subsidy, but are still too poor to purchase a private house and pay full mortgage. The monthly income bracket to qualify for GAP housing is 3,501-15,000 ZAR (250-1,071 USD) (Government Official-1, 2017). Residents who qualify for GAP housing are expected to help pay for their dwellings based on their economic status and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All of the following conditions apply to be considered a “Qualifying Citizen”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Be on the municipal housing demand database for a minimum period of 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Priority is given to applicants over the age of 40 and / or with special needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Person is married or living with a long-term partner or is divorced with others who rely on their income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Person is a South African citizen or has a permanent residence permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Person is over 18 years of age or if under 18, married or divorced with others who rely on their income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Person’s monthly household income before deductions is less than R3 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Person or person’s partner have never received a subsidy from the government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Person or person’s partner has never owned property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Person and person’s family will live on the property bought with the subsidy (where applicable)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Conditions to be considered a “Qualifying Citizen” for a housing subsidy (Western Cape Government, 2017).
applicable bank loans. The last phase of the housing development focuses on privately owned houses and integrating higher economic classes into the community. Each of these phases can take anywhere from three to five years to complete based on the national government funding and the processes of approval and construction (Government Official-6, 2017).

One of the communities within the Stellenbosch Municipality that facilitates IRDP housing is Jamestown; a small community where private homes, government provided housing, and informal settlements all coexist (Statistics South Africa, 2017a). This particular IRDP application is unique for two reasons. First, all of the individuals occupying the fully subsidized houses originate from areas in and around Jamestown. A portion of the RDP houses are occupied by people who had previously worked on farms, where, once they became too old to continue working, were evicted from the provided farm housing. Similarly, people who had previously been squatting on private land, where they were eventually evicted, occupy another portion of the RDP development. According to a provincial government employee, typical subsidized housing efforts within the IRDP upgrading strategy include migrating and combining groups from numerous informal settlements and land plots based upon their viability in terms of the previously mentioned qualification criteria⁸, which is not the case in Mountain View. Second, the Stellenbosch Municipality provided structures and amenities beyond the basic requirements set

---

⁸ The South African Bill of Rights mandates that government may not evict citizens, nor may they allow farmers to evict people without giving them an opportunity for “dignified” alternative living conditions (South African Government, 1996).
forth by the South African National Government including larger houses, metal window frames, front patios, and tile flooring (Government Official-5, 2017a).

Mountain View is a plot of municipality owned land adjacent to Jamestown where the aforementioned farm workers, squatters, and informal settlement dwellers were relocated with the understanding that they would be prioritized in receiving a government subsidized home, outlined through the Extension of Security of Tenure Act\(^9\) (Government Official-1, 2017). This expectation came to fruition in 2016, when the Stellenbosch Municipality provided 162 fully subsidized RDP houses to those individuals and families (Government Official-4, 2017). Further, there exist Municipality provided emergency “Wendy Shacks”, temporary wooden structures utilized as an in-between-phase to transfer people from informal settlements to RDP homes, as well as an informal settlement comprised of 167 self-constructed shacks, shown in Figure 9.

![Figure 9. The three types of housing present in Mountain View.](image)

These three types of housing are situated in the southernmost portion of Jamestown, known as Mountain View, shown outlined in Figure 10. Mountain View is within the land area owned by the Municipality, which is the land south of Valley Road, shown. In contrast, the land north of Valley Road is exclusively privately owned land. Figure 10 offers a brief overview of the Mountain View and Jamestown area in relation to the Stellenbosch Municipality including history, size, and housing demand.

\(^{9}\) “ESTA gives people who lived on someone else’s land on or after 4 February 1997 with permission from the owner, a secure legal right to carry on living on and using that land. It specifies clearly what the landlord must do before he or she can evict a tenant. ESTA covers people who live in rural areas, on farms and on undeveloped land. It also protects people living on land that is encircled by a township or land within a township that is marked for agricultural purposes.” (PASSOP, 2016).
Most notably, the Municipal building capacity is roughly 300 homes per year despite facing an ever-growing housing backlog, currently amounting to 22,000 citizens awaiting a home (Government Official-5, 2017a). As these numbers indicate, it is critical to collect and analyze perceptions surrounding the viability of the IRDP approach to providing housing in a way that addresses the housing backlog and begins to alleviate the issues of accessibility to affordable housing and social integration.

The IRDP project in Jamestown has only just begun, as the implementation of fully subsidized housing (low-income) is only Phase I of four distinct phases. Phases II and III of the project will include various implementations of social housing (middle-income) where the
Municipality will construct GAP housing structures and the tenants will pay a partially-government-subsidized rental fee (based upon income criteria) that will then be applied to eventual ownership of the rental unit. Phase IV, the final phase of the IRDP project, will include the development of privately owned homes (high-income).

Prior to the new IRDP strategy, the Stellenbosch Municipality had been implementing these housing strategies separately within the municipal area. The extent of their past implementation within the Municipality can be observed below in Table 2. As the transition to IRDP manifested, the Municipality refocused its housing strategies toward RDP and formalized home ownership, rather than communal/transitional and social housing. Moving forward with the IRDP approach, the Municipality combines RDP, social, and formalized home ownership, in phases, addressing the spectrum of residents who qualify for these various government housing subsidies. However, the effects and viability of the approach taken by the Stellenbosch Municipality in Mountain View is not well documented, particularly regarding its impact on community inclusiveness, economic stimulation, and reduced dependency on the state.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Strategy</th>
<th>Implementation Requirements</th>
<th>Multi-Year Program</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal/ Transitional</td>
<td>New build, Conversions, Tenant management, Occupational placing</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDP</td>
<td>Town planning, Confirm MIG, Procurement, Allocation</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Land release, Property management</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formalized Home Ownership</td>
<td>Land release, Conditions of land use</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Housing Strategies and Levels of Implementation (Stellenbosch Municipality, 2017).
This project aimed to document the perspectives surrounding the Stellenbosch Municipality's efforts in addressing the South African housing crisis by creating a case study of the Mountain View (Jamestown) community. We were particularly interested in exploring how people living within Jamestown perceive the IRDP approach to providing improved and affordable housing, as well as the acceptability of integrating low-income housing developments with middle- and high-income communities.

A case study aims to present a complete perspective of a case or situation as it exists presently. Methodologist, Jacques Hamel in his guide to conducting case studies states that “case studies employ various methods [including] interviews, participant observation, and field studies” (1993, p. 1). In our case study, we recruited Mountain View residents, Jamestown residents, and Stellenbosch Municipality employees to gain various perspectives on IRDP. We utilized semi-structured interviews, drawing elicitation, and photovoice to gather these perspectives. Details of each method are explained further in their corresponding sections to follow.

The process followed to create our case study was dependent on the housing designation of the participant we were interviewing (Figure 11) – Mountain View residents, Jamestown residents, and Municipality representatives. Prior to starting any interaction, we explained our project to potential participants and gained verbal consent to conduct the interview, we obtained consent to audio record the interview, and requested photographs be taken. All interactions involved two components: semi-structured interviews and drawing elicitation or photovoice for Mountain View residents, with reactions to drawings and photos elicited from Jamestown residents and Municipality officials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7 RDP Recipients / 7 Informal Residents</th>
<th>9 Jamestown Residents</th>
<th>10 Government Officials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Interview</td>
<td>1. Interview</td>
<td>1. Interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11. Key to our Case Study with RDP Recipients/Informal Residents, Jamestown Residents, and Government Officials.
**Semi-structured interviews**

A semi-structured approach allows interviewers to, “prepare a list of predetermined questions [where]... interviews unfold in a conversational manner offering participants the chance to explore issues they feel are important” (Longhurst, 2009). This method of interview allows the interviewer to understand the topic through the informant’s viewpoint given that the conversation direction is variable. We utilized the semi-structured interviews as it allowed residents and officials to discuss relevant topics of importance to them. Interviews were recorded using a smartphone, and a field notebook was used to document environmental conditions as well as visual cues given by the respondents (Figure 12). All interviews were transcribed.

![Figure 12. Lucas taking notes in his field notebook, Caraline conducting an interview, and Kurt our translator/guide from the Stellenbosch](image)

**Drawing Elicitation and Photovoice**

Drawing elicitations allow participants to freely illustrate their understanding, perceptions, and experiences. According to Claudia Mitchell (2011, p.19) drawings are a “super-effective way of encouraging people to express what they were thinking or feeling or longing for, or even what they had experienced-the good and the bad.” As drawing is two-fold, a product and a process, it enables the participant to reflect on their knowledge, and it is best used in conjunction with other data collection methods (Guillemin, 2004). More specifically, Guillemin (2004) recommends conducting an interview, requesting the participant to draw, and then asking the participants to describe their drawing. In Theron’s (2011) book chapter, Picture Research: An Introduction, she explains that as she was being trained on drawings as a method, her professor “became suddenly very serious ‘Never, ever assume you know what your clients’ drawings mean… you are not the expert on their perceptions or feelings or thoughts. Your clients are the
It was important throughout our methods that we correctly capture the experiences and feelings of the informants. It was also important for us to interrogate our own assumptions.

In addition to drawing elicitation, we used a photovoice approach to better understand Mountain View residents’ conceptualization of what a home means to them. Photovoice uses the participant’s photography and corresponding verbal description (Figure 13) in order to explore different community aspects and issues. The photograph is intended to “help to kindle dialogue amongst participants about their perceptions of the issues under discussion; further, different ideas may be obtained than those gathered solely from interviews” (Darbyshire, MacDougall, & Schiller, 2005, p. 417).

We asked the participant to take a picture that represents their idea of a home (e.g., house itself, family, their community). After taking the picture, participants described why the captured image was their idea of home and why they chose to share the provided picture with us. Using photovoice gives the participant the “opportunity to tell their stories through photographs and have their voices heard” (Bulled & Hersh, 2017, p.39).

With the consent of the residents, we showed the drawings/photographs and descriptions to Jamestown residents and Municipality employees to elicit their perceptions of the drawings. This was done to explore if there were differences in how individuals view homes and what a home looks like based on their own life experiences and interactions with government provided housing.

**Sampling**

We aimed to conduct enough interviews to reach saturation, or a point in which the ability to gather new information has been hindered and coding is no longer beneficial (Fusch & Ness, 2015). According to Guest, Bunce, and Johnson (2006, p.60), following their examination of appropriate sampling sizes, “there are no published guidelines or tests of adequacy for estimating the sample size required to reach saturation.” Accordingly, we aimed to conduct interviews until our qualitative analyses became redundant and did not surface any new information. The team reached saturation of information through conducting 33 informant interviews with 14 Mountain View residents, 9 Jamestown residents, and 10 Stellenbosch Municipality officials. A list of names, titles, and divisions of all Municipal officials interviewed.
is included in Table 3. All informants were identified through convenience and snowball sampling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kamohelo Mculo</td>
<td>Informal Housing-Stellenbosch Municipality</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Lamberts</td>
<td>Informal Housing-Stellenbosch Municipality</td>
<td>Senior Field Worker</td>
<td>8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Welgemoed</td>
<td>Human Settlements-Western Cape Governance</td>
<td>Regional Planner</td>
<td>9.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rikus Badenhorst</td>
<td>Ward Councilors-Stellenbosch Municipality</td>
<td>Ward 21 Councilor</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myra Francis</td>
<td>New Housing-Stellenbosch Municipality</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>12 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johru Robyn</td>
<td>Informal Settlements-Stellenbosch Municipality</td>
<td>Town Planner</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabiso Mfeya</td>
<td>Human Settlements and Property Management-Stellenbosch Municipality</td>
<td>Director of Human Settlements and Property Management</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara-Ann Henning</td>
<td>Spatial Development-Stellenbosch Municipality</td>
<td>Spatial Planner</td>
<td>9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotanda Nona Swartbooi</td>
<td>Human Settlements and Property Management</td>
<td>Housing Administration</td>
<td>1 month</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. A comprehensive list of government official informants as well as their official title, experience, and department they work for.
Data Analysis

Data gathered from the interviews were coded using a modified grounded theory approach, allowing the themes to emerge from the text. The modified grounded theory approach is one in which, “theory evolves during actual research, and it does this through continuous interplay between analysis and data collection” (Strauss & Corbin, 2005).

Following each informant interview, the team transcribed the dialogue so as to parse the data and record the emergence of various themes. This was the method for determining, coding, and reporting the frequency of certain themes emergence. The most common or frequently appearing themes were expanded upon and discussed in the findings (Figure 14) and conclusion sections, providing perspectives and discussion from each of the sampling frames.

Figure 14. Discussing our findings with our sponsor, Kamohelo Mculu, who is project manager in the informal housing department of the Stellenbosch Municipality.
We obtained three different perspectives of the housing approach from our interviews with residents awaiting RDP houses (informal settlement section of Mountain View), residents living in RDP houses (Mountain View residents), and residents who do not qualify for RDP housing (Jamestown residents). We present the perspectives as composite narratives, using pseudonyms. Each reveals the unique and often contrasting views of residents, each with different relationships to the state with regards to housing dependency. Following each narrative is a discussion of the issues presented. These issues are not limited to single perspectives, and as such, we show the interplay of the different perspectives in a discussion following each narrative.

**Waiting for permanence, waiting for a house, waiting for a home to be happy**

Mamello invited us into his corrugated iron shack that he had built by hand and lived in for many years. Entering his shack, we passed through his beautifully kept garden, which he proudly displayed. Clothes were hung to dry, the sprinkler enriched the grass, there was steam coming from the food on the stove. It was just another day for Mamello. He invited our team to sit in his living area where he had a few chairs huddled around a table, under which his dog was resting. For Mamello, this property was his, one of the few things he could control.

He began to explain that he had been living in an informal settlement in Mountain View, South Africa for 12 years now, awaiting relocation into an RDP home. His home overlooks the newest IRDP development in his community, lines of grey, single, and duplex houses. We asked Mamello if he could describe the South African housing crisis through his eyes, he responded, “I just need a house.”

Mamello reminds us that he wakes up, shivering cold, to rain water dripping from the cardboard and sheet metal that form the walls and roof of his shelter, the only barrier between him and the outside elements. Mamello does not have the “dignified living” that he was promised, he is concerned for his family and their safety. He is unsure of the timeline for future development but reiterates, “I just need a house… it takes too long.” Mamello is not aware of the future development plans for Mountain View, the phases set to break ground in the coming months.

Despite concern for the small size that offers no consideration of varied family size, the structural appearance of the RDP houses excites him and perpetuates his hope to be granted a home someday with an understanding that “the people that live there must appreciate it because they got it for free.” To Mamello, being given a house is “uplifting” and should empower people to grow strong as a community as beneficiaries of the generous sentiment proposed by the post-apartheid government.

Mamello understands the program to hopefully be his final solution. A house would mean “everything” to him; it’s not an economic opportunity. It’s his house and it’s his children’s home, “where they’re happy.”
Mamello’s narrative identifies a key concern regarding the IRDP approach to providing affordable housing – the IRDP program cannot produce houses fast enough to stagnate or lessen the growing demand rate. However, the RDP house itself is seen as a gift and the ownership that comes with it makes those that receive one feel at home.

Informal settlement residents commonly mentioned the time it takes to become a beneficiary of the IRDP program as well as the ability of the government to achieve the efficacy of the program by providing “dignified living” to all residents eligible. Mamello, being one example of an informal settlement resident, has been awaiting permanent relocation for 12 years, however, he is not alone, nor has he been waiting the longest, “some of these people have been here for more than 20 years” (IR-1, 2017). However, according to the informal settlement residents who have yet to be given the opportunity of a permanent house, a common sentiment was that, “nobody has to give you anything, you should be happy with the housing provided by the Municipality, and accept it as your house” (IR-3, 2017). This idea was also present through our drawing elicitation with informal settlement residents. When asked to draw their ideal home, one resident drew a picture of simple, small house with just a single light bulb (IR-4, 2017), Figure 15.

The feeling that no-one is inherently owed anything was shared by those who had already received the gift of ownership in the new RDP development. Through our discussions with the RDP residents of Mountain View, we have found that secure ownership gave recipients a sense of permanence that is essential to their feeling of being at home in Mountain View. One resident told us that she was “happy because [the house] is mine” (RDP-1, 2017). Having land area around their house’s was also very important to residents, with many residents taking pride in their personal gardens. When asked to take a picture of what meant home to them, one resident had us take a picture of her in her home and said, “I like this house because it is mine” (RDP-1, 2017), see Figure 16. In general, RDP residents, having previously been evicted from their house on a farm, felt pride and comfort in knowing that this RDP house could not be taken from them.
Ownership and security were the most consistent themes that arose when we asked RDP residents what made a house a home, “this is my home, its for my family, because it belongs to me” (RDP-1, 2017). This attitude also influenced their willingness to sell the RDP house. Only one of the seven RDP residents that we spoke with considered selling or renting their house, the rest of the beneficiaries said they could not sell their house, noting, “we live here” (RDP-4, 2017). Having ownership allows residents to pass down the house to their children as an inheritance, which 57% of residents cited as a reason not to sell their house. This feeling of security for their family, currently and for future generations, is worth more than the money from selling the house because, “everything about [the house] is special” (RDP-2, 2017).

The Municipality is proactive in advertising and providing opportunities for consumer education, but there appeared to be a disconnect in communication between the Municipality and the residents. A Housing Administration official addressed this disconnect stating, “we want people to know this is an asset and that they have rights and responsibilities (Figure 17), government has invested in this. We communicate this to the people, that is why we encourage people to look after their houses…. Going there once for me, doesn’t really assist them. Regular contact is needed” (Government Official-8, 2017).
From speaking with housing administration, we found consumer education has only been facilitated once in Mountain View on March 30, 2017. Through careful analysis of attendance registries, we discovered that approximately 150 residents signed into the attendance sheet out of the 162 RDP households, meaning about 90% of the RDP residents received the Municipality supplied consumer education. Only 14% (1 of 7) of the Mountain View residents interviewed were aware of the retention period. This suggests a miscommunication between the type of consumer education facilitated and the residents’ understanding of the information being provided.
One size might not fit all, but it is still a blessing

As we walked through the RDP neighborhood we could feel all eyes on us. We certainly did not belong here. We made eye contact with an older woman, working in her garden. She seemed surprised to see us but kindly smiled and waved when we said “Hello.” She was very friendly and introduced herself as Sanele. She shooed away her barking dogs and opened her gate, welcoming us into her house. She urged us to sit down, with the four of us taking up all the open space in the living room and kitchen area.

Sanele spoke little English and occasionally asked her son to translate phrases from Afrikaans. We sat there with Sanele, her son, and an unrelated man who is physically disabled and confined to a wheelchair. She told us she had only lived in this house for about a year but had been on the waiting list to receive a house for over twenty years.

She spoke fondly of her previous life on a farm and the much larger house where her, her husband, and her children had all lived. Sanele felt safe on the farm, her kids had room to play, and the community looked after one another. Yet, when her family’s labor was no longer needed the farmer, the legal owner of the house, forced them to leave. She explained the family took in the gentleman in the wheelchair, who had lost his legs working on that farm. She explained that prior to receiving the RDP house, the family went from farm to farm picking up little jobs to make money and find a place to sleep for the night.

While pleased with the house, she pointed out the cracks in the walls, the worn out floors, and the small size. She was unaware of how to fix the cracks and floors. All the doors and openings were too small for the wheelchair. To demonstrate, the gentleman in the wheelchair, collapsed it to fit through the door, then squeezed himself through the bedroom opening. Sanele shook her head, “they give you a small house, they don’t plan for your family size, they don’t plan for disabled people.” She also expressed surprise that the RDP houses were duplexes, having expected a single home, noting, “they want to put two families in one house, it’s not fair.”

Sanele’s concern about the house was only secondary to issues related to the community. She passionately described the close relationship she has developed with her direct neighbors, as if they were all part of the same family. But that’s not the case for the whole area. She told us how there are drugs, alcohol, and gangs of young people creating safety issues for older residents. She was particularly upset about the way that some people drive around the neighborhood, “when people come here and they spin with their cars, they don’t have respect for other people here.” When considering the next phases of IRDP, Sanele first talked about how that could be very good to give people here more jobs. But then she expressed her worry that having more money in the area would just bring more drugs and cause more crime, which would only worsen the situation. That was the part she missed most about the farm, “it was quiet there.”

Despite the difficulties of the small house, the limitations in its construction, and concerns over safety within the community, she expressed that the house is all that her family has and, “home is the best thing.” She repeatedly described the RDP house as a blessing; her family finally had a secure place to sleep at night.
Sanele’s narrative highlights the concern over safety, which was emphasized by all residents of Jamestown including the informal settlement, RDP housing neighborhood, and higher income neighborhoods. Five out of our seven RDP informants brought up the concern of safety when asked about the community aspect of Jamestown. RDP residents came from various backgrounds, but a majority were evicted from a group of illegal informal settlements referred to as Kreefgat. Now, in an RDP neighborhood, they have concerns with living next to the temporary emergency Wendy Shacks, “Why must I stay here, the people [in informal settlements] are not nice and no good for me… it is not a nice place to stay all those people do is drink, and smoke, and fight I will not stay in a place like that” (RDP-3, 2017).

One RDP resident we spoke to was unhappy with the lack of community in the neighborhood and believes Mountain View attributed to his daughter’s sudden downfall, “not two months there [living in RDP neighborhood] she dropped out of school! You see the situation, from farm to suburb. She came drunk to school! She was expelled three times! This [influence of crime and drugs] is the dangerous thing about here” (RDP-1, 2017). Residents of the RDP neighborhood reference the area as being high in crime, which creates concerns for their families’ and their own safety.

The residents of the informal settlement also had concerns about the safety of the area. Safety concerns were mentioned in six of our seven informal resident engagements. Among those concerns, street lighting was mentioned most frequently, “we don’t have lighting in the streets, people get mugged at night (Figure 18). Think about the old people who need to access basic services at night, they must walk in the dark” (IR-1, 2017). Although the Municipality currently has plans to build this infrastructure, the lack of safety provisions has already taken a toll on the community aspect of Mountain View.

Concerns regarding safety were also evident in our interactions with Jamestown residents. While speaking with residents of the Jamestown community, we found that the majority of interviewees would be willing to integrate and live in an IRDP development such as Mountain View, but have some reservations. For example, one of the interviewees from Jamestown provided her viewpoint on safety’s role in integration (Figure 19), stating, “If I was safe, and I really think that’s the key thing, I could live in that type of congregation… So, yes I

Figure 18. The Mountain View informal settlement currently does not have speed bumps or street lighting. These are safety concerns that the municipality is aware of and intending to address.
could, but I want safety above everything else. I want to know I can walk to my car and be safe, walk into my house safe” (JR-3, 2017). These are further explained in the following narrative of a representative Jamestown resident.

Figure 19. A Jamestown resident who identified as high-income. We interviewed her outside of a cafe in the Stellenbosch Square Mall. She stressed safety in her interviews and wouldn’t mind living next to low-income IRDP homes.

A Stellenbosch Municipal Official within the new housing department suggests that much of the safety concerns regarding the new RDP portion (Phase I) of the IRDP development stem from the majority of illegal young residents in the development (Government Official-5, 2017b). The illegal tenure is a result of the elderly, who are the intended beneficiaries of the RDP homes, choosing to move back to the farm or informal settlement where they had previously resided, leaving the RDP home to their younger children, who cause trouble by, “sell[ing] drugs, throwing parties, spinning tires; all of that is caused by illegal young people coming into the development. We expected the elderly to stay and set example for the younger beneficiaries, this would have created a good environment, like we had intended” (Government Official-5, 2017b). These observed behaviors of the youth align with the information we received from all three groups of residents interviewed.

Jamestown’s Ward 21 committee is aware that high crime is an issue within the Mountain View community, especially because there is not a police station within the community. Within the next 10 years the Ward 21 committee plans to address crime and safety by developing a satellite police station, resolving problems regarding foot and vehicle traffic, and implementing street lights (Stellenbosch Municipality, 2017b). One of the more recent initiatives piloted by the Stellenbosch Municipality aiming to reduce crime and address the lack of safety is the neighborhood watch in Mountain View. Further, this watch has been integrated within the Jamestown neighborhood watch in order to build a strong coalition as well as a community between the two developments (Government Official-5, 2017b). The response to this initiative is
well received, especially by the residents of Jamestown who presented the most concern regarding safety considerations, indicating that improving safety provisions will aid the effort of integration (JR-2, 2017). However, even with these systems in place, problems associated with youth crime are still prevalent throughout the community. Accordingly, government representatives indicate that the community must be willing to help themselves, particularly with regard to constructing a healthy living environment “the burden cannot solely be placed on the government, we need residents to support residents” (Government Official-7, 2017).

Government officials agree that, with the IRDP implementation adjacent to Jamestown, crime and safety are a major concern that could negatively impact integration of low-income housing. Currently high-income households are situated in “gated communities so they are enclosed with a lot of security and a lot of privacy. They prefer living that way having their own space, and not being interrupted. The problem I foresee is a lot of people wouldn’t be comfortable living close to low income” (Government Official-1, 2017). With one of the goals of IRDP being the creation of a cohesive but economically differing community, safety concerns must be addressed.

Despite these reservations, residents are still optimistic about building a strong and safe community within the IRDP development, “We cannot be different because we all have the same problems. We all need a house” (IR-2, 2017). The hopeful nature of the resident is mirrored through interactions with the Stellenbosch Municipality Informal Housing Division, who are dedicated to providing a safe and empowering community, “providing housing and a true integrated development is a beautiful dream to have, we just haven’t seen it yet. Mountain View could be it” (Government Official-7, 2017).
Grant’s narrative highlights the issues of future integration as well as communication between the Mountain View/Jamestown communities and the Stellenbosch Municipality. Our interviews highlighted the topic of disconnected communication between Jamestown residents and the Municipality. The Municipal Officials recognize the importance of community engagement and collaboration. However, Grant does not agree with many aspects of the Mountain View IRDP approach and implementation. Empathizing with the residents, he describes the RDP houses as both small and dreary. But, he also feels that “Mountain View is not a part of Jamestown, [the residents] need their own community and sense of independence.” He complains that Mountain View has disrupted life in Jamestown, indicating that consideration was not given to providing public amenities for the expanding community, stating softly that Mountain View residents have taken advantage of the Jamestown amenities, they have been integrated into their schooling system and begun using their sport fields for recreational purposes.

On a Thursday afternoon, we sat down at a quaint café just outside of the Mountain View community with Jamestown resident, Grant. Grant proudly talked about how he lives on a Jamestown plot of land that has been passed down in his family for several generations. He has seen Mountain View develop right before his eyes. Grant recognizes the immediate need for affordable housing within the Stellenbosch Municipal area. He suggests that the housing crisis in South Africa “stem[s] from the apartheid era, many blacks and coloureds are now left without homes. It is a true disgrace.” He sees housing as a huge problem throughout the country and one that is nearly impossible to address due to the increase in affordable housing backlog and lack of government provided houses. He realizes that he is one of the lucky ones and says, “I honestly don’t know where we would have been if we didn’t own land, I can promise you that we probably would be living in shacks somewhere.”

However, Grant does not agree with many aspects of the Mountain View IRDP approach and implementation. Empathizing with the residents, he describes the RDP houses as both small and dreary. But, he also feels that “Mountain View is not a part of Jamestown, [the residents] need their own community and sense of independence.” He complains that Mountain View has disrupted life in Jamestown, indicating that consideration was not given to providing public amenities for the expanding community, stating softly that Mountain View residents have taken advantage of the Jamestown amenities, they have been integrated into their schooling system and begun using their sport fields for recreational purposes.

As a result of these poor interactions with the Mountain View community, Grant is hesitant to say that he would consider living in an integrated income community such as the future vision of Mountain View. He concludes that “IRDP has been a success in delivering affordable houses, but a failure in terms of a human settlement that provides the indigenous people of Mountain View houses.”
approval and involvement in the IRDP process. The primary way the Municipality keeps the Jamestown residents informed on the Mountain View housing development plans and progress is through organized community meetings. They advertise these through multiple platforms including newspapers, flyers, and hand delivered letters. As noted by one government representative, “throughout the [IRDP] project we must be as transparent as possible, so we advertise it in the community. Throughout the project we have community meetings, we inform them of the types of houses and the building plans. We advertise in the newspapers. The ward committee actually has a lot of people from the Jamestown community. They must inform the rest of their community. Appeals can be made with the Housing Administration department and they send it through to the New Housing department” (Government Official-5, 2017a).

Jamestown residents recognize that there are community meetings held by the Municipality, but still feel uniformed. The residents that do attend the meetings say that these sessions are not informative but rather described them as: “we attend your meetings and you have us sign your attendance register, and that is considered consultation. The consultation on this project was at a minimum” (JR-1, 2017). This disconnect in communication has led to some in the Jamestown community feeling that their input and participation on this IRDP project is dismissed. These feelings of being uninvolved or uninformed creates obstacles to the successful integration in the forming community because lacking participation limits the community’s ability to develop its own identity which, “may hamper the sustainability of human settlements in a significant manner” (Lategan, 2012).

A disconnect in communication was also apparent through our discussions with RDP residents, as some did not expect to receive a duplex designed RDP house. They expected to have their own separate house and explained that living in a duplex limited their ability to build additions and forced them to live very close to neighbors, stating “they are right there [pointing at shared wall], you can hear everything” (RDP-1, 2017). Although we found varied levels of awareness and understanding about the IRDP process including roles and responsibilities, the Municipality does have processes in place to communicate with beneficiaries throughout the planning and implementation of IRDP because the Municipality sees it as, “Their (the residents’) project” (Government Official-5, 2017b).

This process involves an initial election of a committee comprised of RDP house recipients. This committee conveys any community input to the Municipality, and vice-versa. Housing meetings are held four times a year, during which Municipality representatives would inform representatives of the status of the housing project and take any complaints or input.

These meetings were advertised to the community through flyers at popular shops and other locations, in the local newspaper, notices given to kids at school, and a loud hailer driven around the community. With these methods of communication in place, representatives from the Municipality have told us that they “feel that [the Municipality] has gone down all the avenues to inform them” (Government Official-5, 2017b). Accordingly, there exists a gap in communication regarding the process or transfer of data during community outreach, resulting in the misunderstandings evident in the narratives.
Our data indicates that IRDP has successes, but its implementation in Mountain View is limited by various factors. When examining our findings, it is important to keep in mind that the Mountain View IRDP implementation has only completed its first of four planned phases. Therefore, conclusions about IRDP as a holistic integration approach cannot be drawn. However, by addressing the various limitations including safety provisions, community involvement, and disconnect regarding consumer education communication, the beneficiaries should feel more capable of turning their provided houses into homes.

Insufficient safety provisions are effecting feelings of community within Mountain View and limiting future integration within Jamestown. To address this issue, opportunities for more substantial engagement in the community framework and development should be fostered, particularly for youth, who could advance progress toward a safe community.

One way to alleviate this concern is by increasing opportunities for human capital investment, specifically through education and skill training, “policies that subsidise schooling and human capital investment have significant potential to reduce crime in the longer run by increasing skill levels. At the very least… confirm[ing] that improving education amongst offenders and potential offenders should be viewed as a key policy lever that can be used in the drive to combat crime” (Machin, Marie, & Vujic, 2011, p. 479). Opportunities already exist in Mountain View to develop skills trainings for youth and engage youth as community resources.

The Jamestown/Mountain View community infrastructure includes a beneficiary committee and various ward councilor’s committees. Youth could be given the opportunity to engage as consultants to these leadership groups in their efforts to address crime, increase youth involvement, and generate a sense of empowerment. Research suggests that as “residents become community leaders and actively participate in solving community problems, [they] take part in the design and provisions of services that enhance the wellbeing of community members” (Itzhaky et al., 2015, p. 1679).

In addition, such involvement is seen as an effective measure to reducing involvement in crime, as “involving youth in community, it is argued, is an effective strategy for preventing aggressive behavior, but more broadly, for helping youths acquire the competencies, confidence, and sense of belonging necessary for a successful transition into young adulthood” (Zeldin, 2004, p. 624). Comparative research suggests that those “who do not have strong community ties [are] likely to compromise neighborhood-level collective efficacy and inflate crime rates” (Willits, Broidy, & Denman, 2013, p. 294), as currently evident in Jamestown/Mountain View. By engaging community members, especially youth, in opportunities that enhance their
empowerment (e.g., trainings, consultancies, community programs) a heightened sense of community and belonging can be developed and crime reduced.

There is a disconnect in communication between the Municipality and the different groups affected by the housing project. This issue can be addressed by encouraging further community participation through engaging residents in small community projects.

The importance of involving the affected community in the process of their housing project has been recognized even at the global scale. According to the United Nations Habitat Agenda, “We commit ourselves to the strategy of enabling all key actors in the public, private and community sectors to play an effective role – at the national, state/provincial, metropolitan and local levels – in human settlements and shelter development” (United Nations, 2003, p. 1). The Stellenbosch Municipality implements multiple strategies to keep residents informed and involved; however, residents still feel misinformed. Therefore, a disconnect in communication between the community and Municipality must be explored and addressed. This could be due to a lack of participation and cohesion within the community itself.

A possible way to address this issue would be through engaging residents in a community project. According to the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, in its paper on Developing Effective Community Involvement Strategies, “in communities that have been marginalized for many years, the confidence of local residents will often be at a low ebb and they may well be angry and frustrated. At an early stage, it can be helpful to encourage the community to take on some modest tangible projects that meet local needs” (2017, p. 2). If community members work together on a project that benefits them, it increases their involvement and aids in creating better relationships with government workers (Lategan, 2012). These relationships could provide more effective communication between the community and the Municipality.

The specific project that could be implemented requires further investigation, which is outside the scope of our case study. However, from being in Mountain View throughout the duration of our study, we believe that the wooden structure at the entrance of Mountain View offers a good opportunity for such a project (Figure 20). Currently, the structure is not in good condition and is littered with broken glass and various refuse. The location at the entrance of the

Figure 23. The wooden structure outside the entrance of Mountain View.
community makes it even more favorable because it would be prominent and visible to all residents of Mountain View and some surrounding residents of Jamestown. The wooden structure could be repurposed into a community farm stand where people could sell or share goods. Alternatively, it could also be made into a bus stop for people to use as shelter while they wait for mini bus taxis.

**Consumer education intends to provide RDP beneficiaries the tools necessary to succeed at becoming a new homeowner. However, there appears to be a miscommunication in terms of information delivery and reception as well as where responsibilities shift within the Municipality.**

RDP beneficiaries have opportunities to receive consumer education as provided by the Municipality; however, there is a disconnect as a majority of beneficiaries do not understand the responsibilities of home ownership. It is uncertain whether the disconnect exists between the Municipality and the beneficiary either from Housing Consumer Education (HCE) not being presented frequently enough and in a manner that residents understand; or if there is a miscommunication among the Municipal departments as to which department is responsible for providing consumer education and at what point in the IRDP project process.

We recommend that the Municipality host smaller and more frequent HCE meetings. Facilitating HCE in smaller groups allows more focus to be placed on individual beneficiaries’ understanding of ownership and the associated responsibilities. A smaller group also allows for individual questions to be addressed. In addition, a representative from each department should be present during these meetings, such that specific questions can be answered correctly.

We suggest that the Municipality investigates which department is responsible for facilitating consumer education and at which stage in the project. Ideally, “the Department of Housing Administration is responsible to provide consumer education related to housing. This does not mean that departments within the Municipality are not responsible to provide the same” (Government Official-1, 2017). However, according to a government official in the department of Housing Administration,

Any problem becomes a Housing Administration problem. The Municipality departments are not working together, there is no collaboration. For example if we [Housing Administration department] go out into a community and there is a structural defect and there is no one from the engineering department, what answers are we [Housing Administration department] going to be able to provide to the people. We don’t have that expertise, someone from [that department] should explain that to them. It shouldn't be just Housing Administration. (Government Official-8, 2017)

The Stellenbosch Municipality officials, from different departments agree that responsibility of consumer education should be distributed and must be a collaborative effort.

In closing, we have found that IRDP may not resolve the affordable housing backlog of South Africa. However, it offers a good supplementary approach to be used in combination with various other government housing subsidies. In addition, it addresses a growing concern of social
and economic integration that other housing initiatives fail to address. With consideration for the above recommendations, and the dedication of the Municipality, Mountain View Residents, and Jamestown Residents, Mountain View could be on course to becoming a successful implementation of IRDP, realizing a truly integrated residential development.
Chris’ Reflection:

No level of research can substantiate the importance and effect the global housing crisis has had on people, but this experience, this incredible, difficult experience gave me a glimpse into the lives of a minuscule proportion of the global issue. Through engaging with South African citizens and the public servants, being the Municipality, who work to empower and deliver housing to the underprivileged, my eyes were opened to the severity and difficulty of addressing such a large issue. How does one capitalize on a constitution that promises dignified living and opportunity for housing when funding and building capacity is so limited? The most profound quote of my experience here is, “providing housing and a true integrated development is a beautiful dream to have, we just haven’t seen it yet...what you need is an economy where people can assist themselves, for me [providing free housing], it’s a drop in the ocean” (Government Official-7, 2017). Arriving at this realization was hard but when you contextualize in terms of this experience I have had, it begins to surface the problem itself, rather than the symptoms we’ve managed to get caught up in. So what is the Global Housing Crisis and is it really a housing crisis? The efficacy of providing everyone a free house may never be realized but the
sentiment of this gift has a deep impact on the beneficiaries. A sentiment foreign to so many, but one that is chased daily by the dedication of the Stellenbosch Municipality, who, regardless of their view on the sustainability of the initiative, strive to deliver this gift to all of their constituents.

I am honored to have worked alongside such incredible people including the Stellenbosch Municipality, the greater Jamestown community, and Mountain View residents. Little did I know when choosing to apply to Cape Town that I would meet some of the most incredible WPI students, who have lived within a mile of me for three years now. IQP is a grind, but when you have a team of 25 who you know always have your back, anything feels possible.
Kylie’s Reflection:

During this project we had an hour daily commute from Cape Town to Stellenbosch. Every day we would drive past Mitchell’s Plain and Khayelitsha, informal settlements that stretched for miles along the freeway. I remember researching the different informal settlements in the area, but seeing them first hand really took me back. In the United States, we had examined the different South African housing strategies in order to understand the implementation and the government’s role in providing housing.

As we drove past these stretches of informal settlements, we were able to witness firsthand the self-constructed shacks, people lining up to use the chemical toilets, bathing from buckets, the piles of garbage that accumulated on the outskirts of the property. I was upset. These were the conditions people were living in. It was one thing to read about but seeing the housing situations really changed how I viewed my project. I was frustrated with myself. I had tried putting myself in their shoes. I thought that moving around and losing my home helped me relate to these people’s situation. I was naïve and drastically underestimated how the housing crisis impacts individuals and their families.

In the preliminary process of understanding our report, we had researched how the segregation policies from colonialism and the apartheid era had affected the current housing situation in South Africa. The housing crisis in South Africa is a problem that is almost impossible to address. The government officials that we interviewed all thought providing people free houses was an unsustainable approach to addressing a symptom of a larger systematic issue—“the economic downfall of a
country” (Government Official 3, Personal Communication, November 1, 2017). The housing backlog is insurmountable, regardless of how many houses are delivered each year, the backlog increases.

Some officials felt that recipients would never be happy with the houses provided as they always had an issue or complaint, which from my experience was true; municipality officials felt the contractors cut corners and the beneficiaries were keen to inform us of the issues they found with the house. At one point during the project, it seemed as if it was the government against the residents. However, speaking with officials and residents individually revealed otherwise. The government officials, even though they believed that providing free houses was unsustainable on a large scale, recognized the huge difference that providing a house makes to the families that benefit from the program. Likewise, no matter how much RDP beneficiaries complained about the houses provided, they always concluded with how grateful they were for their house regardless of the quality.

This project really challenged me to be open-minded and explore all dimensions of the issue. The housing crisis is difficult to define, as there are political, social, and economic components. Narrowing it down to focus on perspectives of the IRDP approach in one community, still proved challenging. To conclude, I don’t believe the housing crisis in South Africa will be solved, but being faced with such a complex issue, it is admirable that the Municipality continues to work hard to provide housing, making a difference in individual’s lives. It is humbling to know how these people remain optimistic and have a positive outlook on life, regardless of their situation.
Lucas’ Reflection:

When we were first driven through Mountain View, both the RDP houses and the informal settlement, I very much felt like a tourist. All eyes were on us while we looked around through the back windows of the car. No one looked angry or particularly intimidating; they just seemed confused as to why we were there. After seeing these confused looks, I did not have high hopes for our ability to be accepted by community and develop a good working relationship with the residents. This feeling stayed with me as one of my fellow students and I walked around the RDP houses on our own. People politely waved back when we greeted them and there was only one area where we felt unsafe, but it still seemed like we were an oddity which did not bode well for the day’s interviews. However, the first person we asked for an interview graciously invited us inside and gave us a place to sit. We started by asking her our well thought out free listing question of, “what defines a home for you versus a house?”. As much as we planned this strategy back in the United States, we quickly learned that there is no difference between the words for ‘house’ and ‘home’ in Afrikaans making our question very difficult to answer. Nevertheless, we still ended up having a very good conversation for over an hour with her and her brother about what it was like moving into the RDP house. They told us all about living on the farm before and the troubles they had there and the troubles they still have living in the RDP house. They told us how the farm’s owner was constantly trying to kick them
out of the house they had lived in all their lives and how finally having proper ownership was hugely important to them. The man also told us a heart wrenching story about how his daughter was a top student before they moved to Mountain View, but then she started drinking heavily and dropped out of school. Hearing these harsh realities was difficult, but I was very appreciative of their willingness to be so open with us when we offered little in return.

One of the things that surprised me the most about the South African housing situation is the focus on providing people with a house and piece of land that they own. Coming from the United States, my idea of affordable housing is high rise apartment buildings where recipients pay rent with the help of government subsidies. This was in stark contrast to the RDP houses that we saw in Mountain View. The importance of ownership however, became a major finding in our report. Many of the residents that we spoke to told us about the hardships of never owning a house and feeling the threat of eviction. Hearing this perspective on housing was gave context to the IRDP approach being used in South Africa. It successfully gives people a feeling of security and being at home.
Caraline’s Reflection:

Walking into the Mountain View Community for the first time nearly two months ago is a moment that will stay with me forever. I can remember not knowing how my group would be perceived by the community, with the fear of safety and rejection always on my mind. To my surprise, the community was more than welcoming. That very first day I talked with a lot of residents living in the informal section of Mountain View. A clear image of metal corrugated shacks, temporary Wendy houses, chemical toilets and dogs and small children running about is permanently painted in my mind. With our translator, we made our way to the oldest part of the informal settlement. One interviewee in particular made a lasting impression on me. He was an older man, who spoke little English. By the end of our discussion it was clear he had one thing on his mind, answering many of our interview questions with the words “I just need a house.” He stressed that within his self-constructed shack, he is not fully sheltered from the cold and rain. When asked our drawing elicitation prompt of “draw what represents a home to you”, he drew a small house with a chimney for warmth and his two children smiling happily by the door. I know for this man he was most likely just answering a few questions out of kindness or to get a particular point across to the government about needing a house, but for me, he opened my eyes to the extent of the South African Housing Crisis and made me truly understand why our project was important.
Through our project, I quickly realized just how complex the South African housing crisis is. It is an issue stemming from the country’s unique past and one that is still extremely prominent in many resident’s lives today. At first glance, I thought that the constitution’s guarantee of “adequate housing for all” was a good way to approach the affordable housing backlog. Now, the conclusion I have come to is that the housing crisis of South Africa is much too big for the government alone to tackle. They are making good strides at providing housing and empowering those in need through secure tenure, but overall, the national economy as it stands currently, cannot sufficiently provide for all residents.

This project has been an extremely rewarding process and has taught me so much. I really enjoyed gathering all perspectives surrounding IRDP and using them to fully understand this housing subsidy and specifically the community of Mountain View. One aspect of our project that really hit me hard was my realization that with the government’s many restrictions such as lack of affordable land and budget money, the housing backlog is nearly impossible to ever fully address. Although we did find limitations within the IRDP program, I am hopeful that in the future, with consideration of our recommendations and some hard work put in by all parties (Municipality, Mountain View Residents and Jamestown Residents), Mountain View can become a cohesive integrated community that many deserving people can call home.
Appendix A: Giving Back to the Community of Mountain View

The team had the opportunity to go back to the community of Mountain View (informal and RDP sections), days before departure, to deliver a pamphlet including the mission of our project, a summary of our findings, and helpful contact numbers of the Municipality for their personal use, see Figures 24 & 25. Further, the team delivered door mats (Figure 26) as gifts and as a thank you for giving us their time through interviews, accepting us into their community, and making us feel welcome. This day’s experience concluded the project on the highest note, as many of the community members thanked us for hearing their stories, but we were the ones who should, and have, felt so thankful for them. Without their support and acceptance, this project could not have been successful, and we owe that to them.

Figure 24. Front side of pamphlet including “Our Mission” and a “Thank You” for participating in our project.
Figure 25. Back side of pamphlet including “Helpful Contacts” and summary findings — “What We Learned From Your Community.”

Figure 26. The team delivering the door mats and information pamphlets to the residents.
Appendix B: Collection of Photo Voice & Drawing Elicitation Pieces

The following collection includes all of the photo voice and drawings elicited throughout this project, excluding the examples cited throughout the “Findings” section of the report. To reiterate, the prompt for this method was, “Draw or take a picture of what represents home to you.” We then asked the informants to explain their drawing/photo; their responses appear under their respective pieces.

Figure 27. “This is my pastors… my home is my church.” (RDP-3, 2017)

Figure 28. “There is where my family can live. I want my boys to get this house when I am gone.” (RDP-4, 2017)

Figure 29. “Everything is special about it… and I own it. It’s my home.” (RDP-2, 2017)
Figure 30. “This is a big house, two stories… see the stairs. Flowers on the table and trees in my green front yard. It is hot here, the pool would be for my grandchildren to swim.” (RDP-1, 2017)

Figure 31. “A home and a house are the same things. It is a structure that we own.” (IR-2, 2017)

Figure 32. “I just need a house. This would be our home. We need to be warm, that is a chimney for fire. My kids are standing by the door, where they’re happy.” (IR-1, 2017)

Figure 33. “I want a bigger house with two floors and a front door. A fence to protect my house and a path to the front door. I want a garage to work on cars and a pool for my kids to have fun.” (IR-3, 2017)
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