

https://dspace.org/

Johannesburg city officials' visions for low income housing typologies along the Corridors of Freedom

Lembede, Xolile Minentle

2016

UNIVERSITY OF WITWATERSRAND FACULTY OF ENGINEERING & THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT

http://hdl.handle.net/10539/22806

Lembede, X.M (2016), Johannesburg city officials' visions for low income housing typologies along the Corridors of Freedom, Faculty of Engineering and the Built Environment, University of the Witwatersrand

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

Johannesburg city officials' visions for low income housing typologies along the Corridors of Freedom

Xolile Minentle Lembede: 724996

2016

Supervised by:

Dr Sarah Charlton

A research report submitted to the School of Architecture and Planning, University of the Witwatersrand, in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Bachelor of Science with Honours in Urban and Regional Planning.



Declaration

I declare that this research report is my own work. It has been submitted for the BSc with Honours in Urban and Regional Planning to the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted for any degree to any other university.

……

(Signature of Candidate)

……Day of…….Year……..

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to thank God almighty for providing me with the strength to persevere through the hardships of this year. I would also like to thank my family for their love, support and encouragement through the process of completing this report.

I would also like to thank my funders, Practices of the State in Urban Governance (PSUG), a National Research Foundation (NRF) research programme and South African Research Chair in Spatial Analysis and City Planning research cohort for funding this research as without their support this research would not have been possible.

Lastly but not least I would like to thank my supervisor Dr Sarah Charlton. Thank you for your guidance and understanding throughout the research.

This research is dedicated to my late Mom and Dad; your boy did it.

Definitions

Affordability	Affordability
Affordable Housing	A dwelling where the total costs do not exceed 30% of a household's gross income including taxes and insurance for owners, and utility costs. (Definition from Spatial development framework, 2016).
Backyard Dwelling	Dwelling Units subsidiary to a main residential dwelling unit.
Bad buildings	“Bad buildings” are buildings which were once sound in physical structure, management, use and occupancy, but have become dysfunctional in one or more ways. ‘Bad’ buildings are often abandoned by owners and have developed compromised ownership and management arrangements over the years. They are very often in a poor physical condition; They are buildings which fail to meet the requirements of municipal, provincial or national legislation and by-law; and have inadequate or dysfunctional access to basic services like water, sanitation, electricity and refuse removal. ‘Bad’ buildings also typically have outstanding municipal arrears and services payments
Consolidation Zone	Areas neither outside the Urban Development Boundary, nor inside nodes or the Transformation Zone. These areas are developable; but are not a high priority for capital investment, except where there is a backlog of services.
Corridors of Freedom	Johannesburg’s development corridors based on public transport corridors and transit oriented development, with the potential to generate substantial compact economic and housing development around strategic points along the primary movement axis. They include the Turffontein, Louis Botha, Empire-Perth and Soweto corridors.
Extended benefits programme	The aim of the EEDBS is to ensure that the majority of the occupants of public housing stock (pre-1994) are provided with the opportunity to secure individual ownership of their housing units.
Finance Linked Individual Subsidy Program (FLISP)	A housing finance subsidy that is aimed at the ‘gap market’; people whose income is inadequate to qualify for a home loan, but exceeds the maximum limit applicable to access the Government's 'free basic house' subsidy scheme (earning between R3 501 and R15 000 per month).
Form Based Codes	A land development regulation that fosters predictable built results and a high-quality public realm by using physical form (rather than separation of uses) as the organising principle for the code. A form-based code is a regulation, not a mere guideline, adopted into city, town, or county law.

Gap housing	The gap housing market comprises of people who typically earn between R3 500 and R15 000 per month, which is too little to enable them to participate in the private property market, yet too much to qualify for state fully subsidised housing.
Grey spaces	The relations with exist between informality and formality. An area or part of something existing between two extremes (the formal and informal) and having mixed characteristics of both.
Inclusionary Housing	A housing programme that requires developers to dedicate a certain percentage of new housing developments to low income and low middle income households at affordable housing cost.
Infill developments	Process of developing vacant or under-used parcels within existing urban areas that are already largely developed.
Low Cost Housing	Housing catering to low income households, which are households earning R3500 per month and below. A range which is below the defined social housing range of R3 500 – R7 500.
Market-led approach	Prices and delivery of low income housing are determined by the formal market.
Missing bottom	The low income residents that earn below R 3500 per month can thus not afford accommodation provided by the formal private sector nor access social housing. There is no concrete sustainable housing plan by the City for this income bracket.
Multiple occupancy housing	This is a term which commonly refers to residential properties that are occupied by different households and where these households share the 'common areas'
Non-conforming typologies	These are typologies which do not conform to city by-laws and building regulations. They are seen to be illegal, interchangeable with informal typologies.
Pursue strings	The right or power to manage the disposition of money
Social Housing	A rental or co-operative housing option for low to medium income households (R3500 – R7500 per month) which requires institutionalised management and is provided by accredited Social Housing Institutions or in accredited social housing projects in designated areas.
Social Infrastructure	Assets that accommodate social services, such as schools, libraries, clinics and public facilities. Sometimes referred to as 'soft' services or infrastructure.

South hills	South Hills is an integrated residential development pushed the City of Johannesburg housing department in the south of Johannesburg, 5km south of Johannesburg CBD within the Turffontein corridor. The project will consist of 6 204 residential opportunities and on completion of the project will provide homes to approximately 32,000 people.
Spatial Inequality	Unequal access to urban opportunities because of spatial distribution.
Transitional housing	Provides *temporary* (18 months) *housing* for the homeless and displaced

Abbreviations

AFHCO	Africa Housing Company
BNG	Breaking New Ground
BRT	Bus Rapid Transport
CoF	Corridors of Freedom
CoJ	City of Johannesburg
FLISP	Finance Linked Individual Subsidy Program
JOSHCO	Johannesburg Social Housing Company
JPC	Johannesburg Property Company
NIMBY	Not in my back yard
PSUG	Practices of the State in Urban Governance
RDP	Reconstruction and Development Programme
SA&CHI	South African Research Chair in Spatial Analysis and City Planning
SACN	South African Cities Network
SAF	Strategic area framework
SDF	Spatial Development Framework
SDZ	Spatial development zone
SHF	Social Housing Foundation
SHI	Social housing Institute
SHSUP	Sustainable Human Settlements Urbanisation Plan
SPLUMA	Spatial Planning and Land Use Management Act 16 of 2013
TRA	Transitional Residential Accommodation
TUHF	Trust for Urban Housing Finance
UDZ	Urban development zone

Contents

Declaration 1
Acknowledgements 2
Definitions 3
Abbreviations 6
Contents 7
Chapter one: Introduction and Background 10
1.1 Introduction 10
1.2 Background 12
1.3 Research Rationale 14
1.4 Problem Statement 16
1.5 Research Question 17
1.5.1 Research Sub Questions 17
Chapter two: Literature Review 18
2.1. Introduction 18
2.2 What informs how the state sees 18
2.2.1. How the states 'sees' 18
2.2.2 Views of Urban Modernity 20
2.2.3 Understanding being a developmental state 24
2.3 Housing conditions in the city of Johannesburg: A story of Conflicting rationalities between the state and the marginalised 27
2.4 Corridors of freedom: restructuring the post-apartheid city 32
2.5. Conclusion 34
Chapter three: Research Methodology 36
3.1 Introduction 36
3.2 Research Approach 36
3.3 The kind of information needed 37
3.4 Research instruments 38
3.4.1 Interviews 39
3.4.2 Sampling 39
3.4.3 Document analysis 41
3.4.4 Input from experts and stakeholders 42
3.5 Data Collection 42
3.6 Data analysis 45
3.7 Ethical consideration 45

3.8 Conclusion 46
Chapter four: Findings and analysis 48
4. 4.1 Introduction 48
4.2 How are city officials understanding the problem/ what are they thinking 48
4.2.1 The 'benevolent' state 49
4.2.2 City embracing new ways of understanding low income housing needs and solutions 51
4.2.3 City's visions & ambitions 54
4.2.4. Through the lens of their mandates 55
4.3 Responses, solutions and interventions 58
4.3.1 Market-led approach 58
4.3.2 Incentives 61
4.3.3 Disincentive(s) 64
4.3.4 Interventions 64
4.3.5 Future plans 67
4.4 Reasons for these views? 68
4.4.1 The robustness of the vision 68
4.4.2 Practicalities of governance 70
4.4.3 Understandings of Dignity and Appropriate living: "It's a fine line" 71
4.4.4 Lack of statistical information 72
4.5 Analysis 73
4.5.1 Conflict of rationalities 73
4.5.2 Urban theories and visions of well-functioning and efficient cities 76
4.5.3 The Corridors of Exclusion 77
4.5.4 Change of tone on informality? 79
4.5.5 Interrogating the standards 79
4.5.6 The missing bottom 80
4.6 Conclusion 82
Chapter five: Recommendations and conclusions 83
5.1 Introduction 83
5.2 Research question and sub questions 83
5.2.1. 'How do City officials see existing low income housing issues and needs along the Corridors of Freedom'? 83
5.2.2. Which perspectives frame official's reasoning towards existing and often non-conforming low income housing typologies? 85

5.2.4. How do city officials conceptualise low income housing and what new housing plans/ proposals are officials suggesting? 88
5.2.5. How do these proposals relate to the status quo? 89
5.3 Conclusions 90
5.4. Recommendations 92
References 95
Appendix: Sources of Data 98

Chapter one: Introduction and Background

1.1 Introduction

This research asks the question of how city officials in the City of Johannesburg are conceptualising low income housing along the Corridors of Freedom? The issues of low income housing are important issues to be looked at along the corridors because the CoF have been earmarked as the City of Johannesburg's main spatial restructuring plan so will be shaping the future urban form.

This investigation is oriented towards understanding how housing needs are being understood by City officials; uncover the City's views on existing housing practices and conditions; what are proposals and plans for housing; and what's guiding city officials thinking when it comes to aspirations towards certain modernities and the chosen housing typologies that accompany them.

At the foundational level the research question aims to explore the practices of the state in urban governance and in shaping urban futures in the city of Johannesburg by using the case of the Corridors of Freedom to explore this.

This study is part of research conducted by the Practices of the State in Urban Governance (PSUG), a National Research Foundation (NRF) research programme which is interested in exploring "how state officials and politicians are (re)structuring, (re)shaping and governing the city, and what are the effects/impact of their practices on inequality and social change in the city?" (PSUG, 2016). This study also forms part of a project conducted by the South African Research Chair in Spatial Analysis and City Planning (SA&CP), which is an NRF funded research chair which has amongst its primary objectives 'supporting and developing forms of development planning that will make cities more liveable, efficient and equitable with a particular focus on Johannesburg' (SA&CP, 2016). The SA&CP project which this research forms a part of is meant to provide research based operational support to the city of Johannesburg's Corridors of Freedom project so it's able to be more socially inclusive and more responsive to current conditions on the ground in these areas (SA&CP, 2016).

Low income housing is at a crisis point in the city of Johannesburg as a result of the disconnect between an insufficient supply and extremely high demand. 51% of the city's population earns less than R3500 a month which has resulted in a crisis in where people can't afford to the need of well-located low income accommodation. According to authors

such as Kate Tissington (2013) the gap between the demand and the supply of decent, well-located, low income accommodation within Johannesburg remains a crisis; as it is in many other cities in South Africa (Gilbert et al, 1998).

Low income residents have to turn to non-conforming typologies in order to access affordable well located accommodation in Johannesburg. Low income people in the city must then turn to non-conforming housing typologies like sub-dived rooms and flats in multi-storey buildings, back yard dwellings, 'shacks' and multiple occupancy housing. The use of these types of typologies is viewed as an issue by the City because they contravene City by laws, are unregulated, mostly don't contribute to the tax base, usually overcrowded and unsafe; and the quality of most of these typologies is considered to be slum like conditions.

It is thus imperative to explore 'what role city officials are envisioning non-conforming housing typologies to play within the future of the city as this has real consequences for the lives of many people within the city. For urban planners working with the realities of informality, these are vital questions to ask. Will everybody be able to access the future city after spatial transformation has been achieved?

It's important to note that in this research the term affordable housing is used in a relative way. The term is used to mean that housing costs should be no more than 30% of a household's gross income including taxes and insurance for owners, plus utility costs; no matter the household income. Thus this term is not used to define a specific income bracket.

The rest of chapter one will look at the background to the study, outlining the context in which this research question was borne from. It will then outline the problem statement that the research will be interested in answering. From that, research sub questions will be crystallised.

Chapter two looks at the literature review. The research makes use of literature and theories clustered around this idea of how a state 'sees' society, with a particular focus on how this may affect the way low income housing is conceptualised. It aims to outline housing conditions in the city of Johannesburg; formal private sector and state's objectives, on the one hand and those of people's micro practices on the other hand. And what conflicts they may be. This literature will provide the research with the tools to be able to analyse and make sense of the findings but also what to look for in the interviews that will be conducted with officials.

To achieve the goals of the research, chapter three will be looking at the methodology needed to conduct such a research. The research study compromised of in depth interviews,

document analysis and inputs from experts. The chapter will discuss in depth the methodology used, the kind of data that might be needed and how I went about collecting this data. In addition this chapter will take into consideration the ethical challenges faced in conducting this study.

Chapter four will comprise of the presentation of the findings and their analysis. The chapter will lay out all the information drawn from the data collected and then analyses these findings using concepts and themes that were drawn out of the literature.

The final chapter, chapter five comprises of the recommendations and conclusions section. This chapter finds conclusions for the study by circling back and answering the research question and research sub-questions. From that discussion the chapter goes make recommendations for furthers studies or alternative interventions in order to ensure that the City's goal of creating an integrated urban form with the CoF will be achieved.

1.2 Background

When looking at the landscape of low income housing in the city of Johannesburg, you are confronted mostly with a bleak picture. According to research conducted by the Socio-Economic Rights Institute of South Africa (SERI) in 2013, the supply of well-located low income accommodation within Johannesburg is at a crisis point due to the mismatch between the great demand and low supply of this type of accommodation (Tissington, 2013). The 2011 census data shows that Johannesburg's population stood at 4.4 million and of that an estimated 73% earn an income of R6400 and less per month (JOSHCO, 2014). Income is then split disproportionately amongst the remaining 27% of the population; highlighting the stark income inequality in the city (StatsSA, 2011). Internationally, the generally accepted rule of thumb is that households should not spend more than 30% of their monthly income on rent and services (Stone, 2006). According to the United States Department of Housing and Human Services, expenditure above 30% would classify a household as being in housing distress and would hence qualify for subsidy assistance from them (Stone, 2006).

Using this internationally accepted rule of thumb for monthly housing expenditure, only rents ranging from R0 - R1920 per month would theoretically be seen as affordable for an estimated 73% of the Johannesburg's population; those who earn R6400 and less per month. SERI's research also found that 51,8% of all households in Johannesburg earn less than R3200 per month. Consequently using the 30% housing expenditure rule for those households the ideal affordable rental range for the majority (51, 8%) of the population in Johannesburg, would be between R0 to R960 per month (Tissington, 2013).

Residential accommodation provided by the formal private sector does not go downmarket enough to supply accommodation that is at a rental range which the majority of Johannesburg population could afford. The formal private sector is said to go as low as R1 700 for a single room but that price is a far cry from the ideal affordable rental range of R0 - R960 per month that would be needed by 51, 8% of the city's population (Tissington, 2013). The current supply of residential accommodation by the formal private sector leaves a lot of people 'marooned' in the city because they can't afford the rentals currently on offer.

Due to the formal private sector being unable (or unwilling) to cater for this low-income housing market, there has been a great demand for social housing units. People turn to the state subsidised social housing sector because its rentals, at times, do go lower than those offered in the formal private sector (JOSHCO, 2016). One example of these Social Housing Institutions (SHI) is the City of Johannesburg's municipal owned entity Johannesburg Social Housing Company (JOSHCO); which has been mandated by the municipality to "provide quality affordable housing to the citizens of Johannesburg" (City of Johannesburg, 2013: 1). While the strides JOSHCO has been making in the provision of well located, affordable and quality accommodation in the city of Johannesburg have been applauded, many people still cannot access JOSHCO units. Some of the main reasons why people cannot access JOSHCO'S units is because they are too expensive for them or they are oversubscribed (Tissington, 2013). Some of the rentals provided by JOSHCO's, like those of the private sector, don't go downmarket enough to benefit the urban poor. Even when people can afford the social housing units, due to their low rentals, strategic location and high quality the units are oversubscribed and they have extremely high occupancy rates. This 'inaccessibility' of JOSHCO units has meant that it hasn't been able to adequately fill what can been described as the "bottomless pit" of low income housing demand in Johannesburg.

The shortcomings of the formal private sector and social housing in provision of affordable low income accommodation in the city of Johannesburg has forced some of the residents to seek housing solutions outside of the formal housing market. The only viable options left for most low income earners in the city is to either move further away from the city to townships in the periphery (which in itself continues to entrench apartheid spatial planning) or alternatively make use of non-conforming housing typologies (like sub dived houses and flats, backyard dwellings, informal settlements, bad buildings, etc.) in places which are better located (Todes, 2012). Living in these 'grey spaces' is a lived reality for many of Johannesburg's population (COJ, 2016).

The lack of affordable well located residential accommodation in the city perpetuates apartheid spatial patterns which breeds a divided and inefficient spatial form (Tissington, 2011). People, who reside in these areas in the periphery of the city, spend a large percentage of their low incomes on commuting to places of economic opportunities (Huchzermeyer, 2003). Their location means that these people also cannot fully benefit from the amenities and the economic opportunities that are present in the city.

Those people who decide against locating in the periphery because they need to be located more central in the city in order to access benefits such as decreased transport costs or close proximity to economic opportunities face the challenge of finding 'affordable' housing. If these people are unable to afford the rent provided by the formal private sector (like most are) they have to make use of existing and often non-conforming housing typologies. These existing but often non-conforming typologies are prevalent in all shapes and sizes around the city. Mayson and Charlton (2013) have argued that the benefits that people acquire from using these non-conforming housing typologies are essential to negotiating their tenuous livelihoods. These non-conforming typologies are argued to be an invaluable 'asset' at the disposable of the marginalised and poor (Mayson and Charlton, 2013).

Even though they may be seen as an invaluable asset to the people that live in these typologies they are usually are at odds with state standards and aspirations for the city. These typologies contravene City bylaws and national building regulations; they are also seen to go against what the City sees as appropriate or dignified standard of living. There is a conflict in rationalities between what people are doing and what the state aspires to (Charlton & Shapurjee, 2013). This conflict creates a situation where state interventions into the 'betterment' of people's lives are usually inappropriate and even constraining because they are not governed by the same logic that governs people's informal micro practices (Charlton 2013; Watson 2009).

1.3 Research Rationale

What is evident from the context described above is that accessible affordable housing in Johannesburg is an important factor in the lives of many of its residents. There is a very constrained supply or availability accommodation that is affordable and which complies with city regulations. Thus, the issue of 'lack in supply of well-located, quality low income housing' should be at the forefront in the thinking of spatial transformation by the City. If this issue is not at the forefront in the thinking of spatial transformation then the City runs the risk

of entrenching apartheid's urban division; perpetuating a unequal and divided spatial form; and discarding those less fortunate to the urban periphery (Huchzermeyer, 2003).

The Corridors of Freedom (CoF) is the City's new spatial vision that is based on transport orientated development along well defined public transport arteries 'with the potential to generate substantial compact economic and housing development around strategic points along the primary movement axes' (City of Johannesburg: Department of Development Planning, 2016: 5). The CoF is the most tangible example of the CoJ's new spatial vision as its been earmarked by the mayor and the SDF (2014) the flagship project that will reshape and restructure the city in a way that will overcome apartheid spatial planning and transform the city spatial form to one which is more socially inclusive, compact, resilient and efficient (Tau, 2013). The Corridors of Freedom are shaped around brownfield developments and redevelopments of the existing urban fabric, which is occupied in various ways by existing residents. Unavoidably, this restructuring project will encounter existing and often non-conforming housing typologies that are found on the ground all over the city; typologies which act as invaluable assets in the marginalised attempt to negotiate their precarious livelihoods. How the City sees and plans to deal with these non-conforming typologies will have far reaching effects not limited to the people who live in these typologies but also on the City's attempt to develop an inclusive and re-stitched city.

On several occasions, States around the world and particularly those located in the global south have over the years developed 'inappropriate' interventions in an attempt to 'better' the lives of their residents (Owusu, 2007). These interventions at times are not only just contradictory to people's current practices but can also be detrimental to the livelihoods of the most vulnerable of the populace (Owusu, 2007). Research needs to be conducted to determine whether the City's Johannesburg's Corridors of Freedom plan will be able to avoid this recurring issue which what Charlton (2013) calls, a disjuncture between state ambitions and peoples practices.

There needs to be an exploration of the state views and visions when it comes to low income housing as they attempt to reshape, reconstruct and govern the post-apartheid city. The ways in which housing needs, existing housing practices and conditions are being understood by city officials will directly inform the kinds of policies formed and developments approved.

1.4 Problem Statement

The problem ‘on the ground’ is that there is a lack of formal affordable residential accommodation on offer in Johannesburg so people make use of various non-conforming low income housing typologies that exist all over the city. For the purposes of this research the non-conforming typologies which are of most interest will be backyard dwellings, multiple occupancy housing and subdivided houses/flats. These non-conforming typologies are prevalent all along the corridors with, and backyarding popping up in most suburbs along the corridors and with the subdivision of apartments especially prevalent in the inner city and suburbs around it like Rosenttenville or Berea.

The problem at the heart of this research is that; these typologies exist in various forms in and around CoF areas (though they are not prevalent in the same amounts throughout the CoF, different amounts exist in different areas), and are essential to the livelihoods of many low income people in Johannesburg. If these typologies are not given ‘appropriate’ attention the City runs the risk of creating undesirable consequences for not only low income people’s livelihoods but also undermine the City’s own attempts to transform the current urban fabric towards a more efficient, equitable and united urban form.

Looking at the above described problem on the ground, the research problem statement is that there needs to be a closer exploration of City’s visions and ambitions towards low income housing along the CoF in order to identify and probe how officials in the City see housing status quo, needs and responses. The second part of this task involves task is about uncovering the perspectives and logic that is guiding the City’s reasoning towards low income housing along the CoF.

Seeing how the states perceives low income housing needs and responses would allow for research that could contribute to understanding why the state supports one type of intervention (certain housing typologies) over the other. It will hopefully be possible to then start thinking about kinds of typologies which can reach a common ground between what works for the people and will realistically be implemented by the state (in order to develop alternative proposals that will not only be ‘appropriate’ but will actually get implemented). If City officials fail to engage with current realities on the ground, the Corridors of Freedom project runs the risk of recreating apartheid spatial planning thus undermining the core premise of the project of re-stitching the city.

1.5 Research Question

"How are city officials in the City of Johannesburg conceptualising low income housing along the Corridors of Freedom?"

Because this will be a more high level study, the study area for this research will be all the CoF proposed development corridors in the city of Johannesburg (See figure 1 in appendix).

1.5.1 Research Sub Questions

1. How do City officials see existing low income housing issues and needs along the corridors of freedom
2. What perspectives guide or frame official's reasoning towards existing and often non-conforming low income housing typologies?
3. How do city officials conceptualise low income housing and what new housing plans/ proposals are officials suggesting?
4. What guides the official's conceptualization of what kind of typologies should be supported along the Corridors of Freedom?
5. How do these proposals relate to the status quo?

Chapter two: Literature Review

2.1. Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of relevant literature for tackling the above described research question and its subsequent research sub questions. Relevant literature is organised and presented in key themes and in clusters of literature in this chapter. The first key theme/cluster of literature that drawn out of the literature was about how state's 'sees' society, with particular focus on how this may affect the way low income housing is conceptualised. The second cluster of literature focuses on the subject of the research question (low income housing in Johannesburg) and aims to outline housing conditions in the city of Johannesburg and how there seems to be a conflict in rationalities between formal private sector and state's objectives on the one hand and on the other hand with those of people's micro practices. The final set of literature looks at the Corridors of Freedom as an urban restructuring and regeneration project. This section is particularly concerned about the negative and unexpected consequences that urban restructuring and regeneration plans have had on cities around the world; especially on the urban poor.

2.2 What informs how the state sees

2.2.1. How the states 'sees'

One part of this research is about trying to identify and understand how the state 'sees', with regards to housing needs and solutions. The literature gathered in this section draws from works of literature that try to theorise the nature of the state. What you see from the various works that comment about the nature and functioning of the state is that the state is something that is heterogeneous, at times contradictory and cannot easily be quantified (Charlton 2013; Gupta & Sharma 2006; Scott 1998). The state can be understood in many different ways for instance Sarah Charlton (2013) argues that a focus on the bureaucracy, what Migdal (1994) calls the machine that runs it, 'personalizes the state' and unveils the different personnel components, from the key officials to the people working on the ground. Other works of literature go the opposite route and represent the state as a monolithic entity void of complexities that come with adding the human dimension. According to Migdal (1994) these works that represent the state as a monolithic entity "reify and anthropomorphize the state, treating it as a unitary actor that assesses its situation strategically and then acts accordingly to maximize its interests" (Migdal 1994: 8)

Looking at the human dimension of the state would support the view that it's difficult to represent a singular view of what the state 'thinks' because the state is made up of individuals who themselves are shaped by their own lived experiences and world views. Different institutions within the state may hold different views on an issue from one another. This means most times there will not be one uniform view but diverse and several views (Migdal, 1994). This heterogeneity of the state means that different relevant institutions in the City of Johannesburg like JOSHCO, the City's spatial planning department and housing department might see issues on low income housing in (fundamentally) different ways from each other. This acknowledgement of the heterogeneity of the state is not to say that its' impossible to capture a general idea of what the state 'sees' as holds the danger of leading into a trap of describing the state as hopelessly heterogeneous and contradictory (PSUG, 2016).

The main literature that will be used to conceptualise how the state sees in this section is James C. Scott's (1998) book titled "Seeing like a state: how certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed". One of Scott's (1998) main arguments in his book is that by their nature, states have to make complex societal realities easier to administrate and 'legible', by simplifying these complex societal realties. According to Scott (1998) "Society became an object that the state might manage with a view towards perfecting it" (Scott 1998:92). In Scott's (1998) view the states' primary role is the role of simplification; states try to tame these 'wild and complex' realities so they can better administrate them. This process of trying to tame society and make it more 'legible' for the state, creates gross simplifications of the complex realities that are actually evident on the ground (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2014).

On the state's part, this may not be a malicious attempt to suppress the local energies of the populace but can be viewed as a by-product of the state's need to make generalisations and reductions in order to manage a large civil population (Scott, 1998). For Scott (1998) one of the reasons why developments that are intended to improve the human condition sometimes fail is because the state obscures the chaotic and multifaceted realities of society and then bases plans on this simplified version of society. State interventions and state visions of the future are sometimes inappropriate or suffer from unintended consequences because they are detached from peoples lived realities (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2014).

With regards to low income housing in Johannesburg, existing and often non-conforming housing typologies constitute an integral part of people's complex realities. These non-conforming typologies by their very nature usually operate in a flexible, 'chaotic' and organic

manner. For Scott (1998) the state would simplify them in order to make them more legible and easier to administrate. According to Bryceson (2006) this simplification of 'informal' city life results in a "severe lack of statistical data" regarding informality size, form, function or other characteristics (Bryceson 2006:9-10). Using Scott's (1998) logic, interventions by the state which aim to plan for these non-conforming typologies are likely to have unintended consequences for the territories they are meant for because they would be based on a simplification of peoples complex realities. Scott's (1998) critique of the state does not bode well for plans which aim to restructure the city and engineer social change, especially those trying to intervene in spaces characterized by informality.

States simplifying complex realities leads to a disjuncture between state aspirations and practices with people's aspirations and livelihoods; a theme which runs throughout the presented literature. Watson (2009) argues that there is a conflict in rationalities evident in most cities in the global south, between the state and the people; a conflict which she describes as being the result of a clash between "the rationality to govern and the rationality of survival" (Watson 2009; 2267). The disjuncture is said to come from state's (especially those located in the global south) pursuit of a particular form of urban modernity and adopting inappropriate urban practices which Watson (2009) and Simone (2002) argue originates from a global north context. A context which is historically, socially, economically, culturally and politically different to the context that these states find themselves in (Simone 2002). Simone (2002) and Tibaijuka (2005) believe that this understanding of development with its preconceived notions of what good urban form should look like can be detrimental to the 'development' of cities in Africa because it is disconnected from the lived realities of the people that live within these cities. Cities end up implementing detrimental intervention in the pursuit of a certain image of modernity (Tibaijuka, 2005).

Moving from this more abstract exercise of trying to conceptualise how states 'see;' the following section will be interested in what factors, logic or rationalities affect how states view low income housing issues and housing responses.

2.2.2 Views of Urban Modernity

What you see in previous literature discussion is that the kinds of developments that states aspire too (in terms of aesthetic or function) greatly influences what kinds of developments are supported or seen to be appropriate; which can inform how those states view low income housing issues and housing responses.

The kinds of developments that the state aspires to or supports in most cities located in the global south, is framed by a particular image of urban modernity. For Watson (2009) this image is framed by a picture of urban modernity that is predominantly defined by cities located in the global north. This image of urban modernity frames what types of housing typologies or housing issue responses are seen as appropriate. The image of urban modernity that states aspire to also determine what kinds of housing typologies or housing issue responses are rejected because they are seen as going against the desired image. Charlton and Shapurjee (2013) have argued in their research on backyard dwellings in state subsidised housing in Alexandra, Johannesburg that non-conforming housing typologies are seen to "contradict South Africa's state housing objectives" because they are seen by the state as a "corruption of modernity and order" (Charlton & Shapurjee, 2013: 2). This idea of corruption of modernity is a thread that runs throughout the literature gathered in this section.

Many authors have grappled with the concept how different understandings of urban modernity affect the way cities are experienced and imagined (Harrison; Robinson; Simone; Watson). In her book 'Ordinary cities: between modernity and development', Jenifer Robinson (2006) writes that binary thinking has primarily shaped the way in which cities have been classified, studied and seen over the years. The dichotomy that binary thinking creates perpetuates a colonialist view that positions innovative "global cities" in rich countries on the one side and imitative "third world" cities in poor countries on the other side (Schuermans 2009: 1). Robinson (2006) argues that "visible accounts of urban modernity" over the years, have "assumed a privileged relationship with certain cities located in the global north" (Robinson, 2006: 2). There is a presumed desirability of being on the same level as these innovative cities for cities situated in the 'developing' world because of what benefits seem to come with; from the "economic, cultural and political levels" (McCarney & Stren, 2003:227). The impression that this binary thinking gives off is that cities located in the global north embody all that it means to be modern and cities located in the 'third world' must aspire to emulate them (Robinson, 2006). Thus 'third world' cities are seen to be missing something, which they adopt or imitate from 'first world' cities in ordered to be considered whole (Harrison, 2006).

Robinson (2006) argues that what's crucial for us to be able to move past this impasse that is created by classifying, studying and seeing cities in a binary way, lies in our interpretation of modernity and modernism and how these interpretations influence the way we see the ability of cities to innovatively shape their own future (Leaf, 2007).

Robinson's (2006) book weaves together various arguments, and discussions in urban theories to bring together a volume that can be read at different levels, and cannot fully be covered in this section of the report. At a broader level, Robinsons' (2006) book can be read as a critique of how the categories and definitions we construct, can in turn set the interpretive lenses through which we view the world. These interpretive lenses have the power to shape how we understand our urban environment and how we live in it (Leaf, 2007: 235). Using this idea of interpretative lenses, it is easy to argue that informal housing developments like back yard dwellings wouldn't fit into preconceived notion of what development and modernity is supposed to look like and would thus be rejected by 'third world' cities as they try to imitate 'global cities' in the developed world.

For Leaf (2007), Robinson's (2006) nuanced critique of received notions of development and modernity in urban studies moves away from binary thinking towards articulating a form of post-colonial representation; form which understands that the nature of modernity should be place specific. So, cities are not seen as either global cities or third world cities but all as ordinary cities that each have the potential to be innovative in shaping their futures. This ordinary city approach would go a long way in dislodging the belief that being modern is a developed world construct which must thus be 'desired, emulated and adopted by poorer countries'.

Chasing a normative ideal of urban modernity has direct implications for the kinds of urban policies supported by the state. According to Robinson (2002) this pursuit encourages certain government rationalities like urban entrepreneurialism or calculated projects of 'city management' which have significant and real world effects (Robinson 2002: 547; Zeiderman 2008). Given that, states aspire to this normative ideal of urban modernity, it becomes what Robinson (2002) noted in global cities to be an unfolding "regulating fiction" that "can have devastating consequences for most people in the city, especially the poorest" (2002, 547), (Zeiderman, 2008).

For McCarney & Stren, (2003) pursuing an understanding of urban modernity that is inspired by an external context creates a situation where the majority, who remain outside of these processes, have to constantly improvise or anticipate things not working in order to negotiate their livelihoods (McCarney & Stren, 2003). This is an issue witnessed in many countries around the world especially those located in so called developing countries in the global south.

It operates in spaces where the marginalised majority have to live in a situation of uncertainty because they hold a different "notion of what cities should be" which is based on

their attempts to survive and prosper in these 'alien' spaces (Watson 2007:69). There is a conflict in rationalities in how the city should be understood and thus function; and these two different understandings seem to collide with each other in the urban planning in these cities *(*Myers*, 2010)*.

Several examples have been documented in previous literature that show just how disastrous pursuing an understanding that is inspired by external context for the marginalised majority in cities of the global south. One example of these was a 'clean-up operation' of all cities that was launched by the government of Zimbabwe in 2005 called operation Murambatsvina (Operation Restore Order). At the time the government of Zimbabwe described the motivation behind the operation as an attempt to return order to the 'chaotic' informality in their cities by enforcing laws; stopping all illegal activities like informal trading, informal vendors and informal dwelling structures amongst others (Tibaijuka, 2006). Mrs. Anna Kajumulo Tibaijuka (2006) was commissioned by the UN to produce a fact-finding mission report that would access the scope and impact that Operation Murambatsvina had on Zimbabwe. The detailed report found out that roughly 700 000 people were rendered homeless, lost their source of income, or both as a direct effect of the operation. According to Tibaijuka (2006) the operation indirectly affected a further 2.4 million people in varying effects.

Hundreds of thousands of people residing in informal housing in cities in Zimbabwe felt the full might of the operation. Police and army demolished their informal dwelling structures because they were seen as chaotic, and they contravened what Tibaijuka (2006) calls outdated colonist bylaws. During the operation 92 460 'chaotic' informal housing structures were demolished thus displacing an estimated 569 685 people. The destruction of these informal structures caused immediate and devastating effects on the livelihoods of people living in them. It is estimated that roughly 97 614 people lost their primary source of livelihood because of the operation (Tibaijuka, 2006). This operation is an example of how its problematic for states to reject existing and often non-conforming housing typologies responses to housing issues just because they are seen to symbolise disorder and chaos and thus do not neatly fit into the state's understanding of urban modernity (Charlton & Shapurjee, 2013).

There is a growing acceptance in the literature that in some ways informal housing typologies are an 'asset' (this idea will be expanded upon more in section 2.2: Housing conditions in Johannesburg) that can be used to negotiate precarious livelihoods. Neuwirth (2006) sees these spaces of informality with a sense of optimism as the innovative

capacities of residents in creating livelihoods in adverse conditions. Even so, the view that these informal spaces are a reflection of a chaotic dystopia that needs intervention has a longer and more prominent legacy (Zeiderman, 2008). New imaginings of city life (Mbembe & Nuttall 2004, Robinson, 2006, Simone 2002) are challenging received notions of urban modernity but many states still see Western and Eurocentric aesthetic sensibilities as what cities ought to look like and function.

States will continue to develop inappropriate interventions for housing issues and reject informal housing typologies as solutions to housing issues if they do not recognise the innovative capacities of people micro practices in their cities. Ananya Roy (2005) was quoted in Zeiderman (2008) as saying that it's not as simple as just stemming the tide of "inappropriate euro-centric ideas into third world countries" because planning practices are "constantly borrowed and replicated across borders" (Zeiderman, 2008: 33). Rather what would be more helpful in developing appropriate housing responses to localised housing issue is not to see cities in the third world as an incomplete example of urban modernity but rather as a "process of becoming something new that is both part of and separate from Western modernity" (Harrison, 2006: 323). This would require acknowledging the importance of context and recognising the resourcefulness of residents when confronted with precarious livelihoods (Harrison, 2006). This understanding of urban modernity like the one argued for by Robinsons (2006) opens up possibilities to reimagine and develop alternative modernities that would allow us to think about existing and often non-confirming typologies response to housing issues in a more positive way. Generally, this can result in the development of more 'appropriate' interventions for cities located in the 'third world', dependent on their context.

2.2.3 Understanding being a developmental state

The literature gathered in this section focuses on South Africa as a developmental state and how the role of being 'developmental' might inform how cities in South Africa view housing issues and non-conforming housing responses. The relevant literature, regarding the direct correlation between being a 'developmental state' and effects on views of housing issues and their non-conforming housing responses nearly non-existent. Although, through the reading of literature on developmental states and developmental local governments in South Africa, relevant questions with regards to this research arise, pertaining to what is a 'developmental' state? What are its defining features? This gives us an idea about how a state that considers itself to be developmental views issues of low income housing needs and responses. Similarly, to the preceding discussion on 'images of modernity', it's can be argued that how a state understands its role (in this case being developmental) in the

provision of low income housing can influence what the state 'sees' to be the appropriate development(s).

Due to the wide scope and variety of literature available on developmental states and, to a lesser extent, on South African developmental local governments it would be an impossible task to explore these concepts in all their intricacies within the scope of this section. The section tries to draw on the parts of the literature that is of greatest relevance.

Literature on developmental states has been around for some time now and has experienced some variations over the years. Even so, there still exists a traditional/classical understanding of the developmental state in the literature. According to Chang (2010) the classical understanding of developmental states is based on the experiences of the East Asian 'miracle' economies such as countries like Japan, Singapore, Taiwan and South Korea from the early 1960s to 1990's. Narrowly speaking, these countries went through rapid industrialization and maintained exceptionally high growth rates through this period with the state being intimately involved in both the macro and micro economic planning (Chang 2010; Rice-Jones 2013). It is generally agreed that the traditional developmental state is an 'ideal type' meaning that no two developmental states existing at different localities at different times can be identical. As this concept has been adapted for and adopted to different contexts over the years, there have been variations as the concept has been faced with different development challenges and circumstances (Chang, 2010).

The economic aspect of developmental states is major part of how it is generally understood but many other authors (Gumede 2011; Park 1998; Rice-Jones 2013) have also identified social development as a major part of how developmental states are understood. Accompanying rapid industrialisation and high economic growth rates is the conscious attempt to "deploy resources in developing better lives for the people" (Rice-Jones 2013; 1). For Bae-Gyoon Park (1998) social development meant the improvement of the social system regarding reproduction, which means the improvement of "social welfare and public services, such as housing, education, public health, transportation and the like" (Park, 1998: 272-3). For Park (1998) housing, one of the most important factors, social development that the state can intervene to better the lives of people because it has the ability to affect access to social and material sources (Park, 1998: 272-3).

This social development aspect of developmental states is why some people view the concept to literally mean 'states doing developmental work' or states 'doing things which better the lives of the poor'.

The multifaceted nature of the developmental state concept makes it difficult to pin down one all-encompassing definition for a developmental state, but we can turn to some of its defining features. These defining features of a developmental state are usually the principles underpinning policy formulation and can thus greatly influence the kind of urban policies chosen. As shown in the previous section on the 'Corruption of Modernity' using Robinson (2006); the kinds of urban policies chosen can have material effects on the lives of the marginalised because they can affect how housing issues and non-conforming housing responses are being understood. For the identification of the defining features of a developmental state the report borrows from Peter Meyns & Charity Musamba (2010) report, titled "The developmental state in Africa: problems and prospects". In their synthesis of a developmental state they found that there are four defining features to a developmental state. By drawing largely from (but not exclusively) the 'classical' East Asian experiences, they identified developmental-oriented political leadership; an autonomous and effective bureaucracy; a production-oriented private sector, and performance-oriented governance as the four defining features of a developmental state (Musamba, 2010; 21).

Looking at the defining features identified of a development state by Meyns & Musamba (2010), a key thread is that government is seen to have to part in driving development and transformation. For Fritz and Menocal (2007) this thread is integral to how the developmental state is understood because states gain their legitimacy by being able to deliver on state-led positive transformation. States driving positive transformation through development is such a big part of the concept of a developmental state that Fritz and Menocal (2007) drawing from works of Johnson (1982) and Evans (1995) to argue that a developmental state only exists "when the state possesses the vision, leadership and capacity to bring about a positive transformation of society within a condensed period of time" (Fritz and Menocal 2007: 533).

Thandika Mkandawire (2001) echoes this view as he sees the ideology of developmentalism to be one of two components that define a developmental state in contrast to other forms of states; one component is ideological and the other being structural. Focusing on the ideological component, according to Mkandawire (2001) developmental states are ideologically underpinned by developmentalist, in that it conceives it as its "mission" to ensure economic development, social development. Such a state "establishes as its principle of legitimacy its ability to promote sustained development" (Castells, 1992: 55)

The state is seen to have the ability and the legitimacy to be able to bring about a positive transformation of society through state led developments. This is not necessarily a bad thing, what's of issue for non-conforming housing responses is when these housing responses are

deemed inappropriate and do not fit into what states think development or the positive transformation should look like. As has been seen before, ambitious state-led transformations in developing countries particularly those driven by high modernism have commonly failed with unintended and negative consequences to the most vulnerable of the population (Scott, 1998).

The state holding the view that there are the champions of development and positive society transformation is not necessarily an issue; it becomes an issue when what is deemed to be development, positive transformation or forward progression gets favoured/ supported and what is deemed will be suppressed. And in most cases informality does not fit into the image that states have of development and positive transformation. So the marginalised urban poor are the ones that suffer the most from states pushing a view of development that doesn't resonate with their lived realities

With the state recognising themselves as the drivers of positive transformation and the custodians of development, it can be argued that they would find themselves ill-equipped when their understanding of development is actually producing negative effects on the people their trying to help instead of making a positive change. Negative unintended consequences for the marginalised can occur when all the states policies and thinking have an image of development that their micro practices do not fit into.

When the state and the people believe that the state has the ability to provide and should provide in order to improve social development, how does the state actually go about this huge task of intervening in housing to increase social development but still being able to work with the complex, location specific, micro practices at play in the city.

2.3 Housing conditions in the city of Johannesburg: A story of Conflicting rationalities between the state and the marginalised

The literature gathered in this section looks at low income housing in the city of Johannesburg. This exploration entailed outlining the current conditions of low income housing in terms of its supply and demand and the significance of the mismatch that exists between the supply and demand. The theme of conflicting rationalities is adopted in this section again to make sense of the significance of the mismatch between low income housing supply and demand. The main literature that will be guiding this clustering is Kate Tissington's (2013) "Minding the Gap: An analysis of the supply and demand of low income rental accommodation in the city of Johannesburg". In line with the thread of conflicting rationalities and the thinking of low income housing this section also makes use of literature

such as Simon Mayson and Sarah Charlton's (2013) "Accommodation and tenuous livelihoods in Johannesburg's inner city: The rooms and spaces typologies.

There is not only an overwhelming demand but also a critical need for affordable rental accommodation in South African urban areas (SHF, 2008). This especially holds true when looking at low income housing in the city of Johannesburg. The Social Housing Foundation's (2008) research found that *35*% of the dwellings in the greater Johannesburg area are rented; accounting for 411 000 households. This high percentage not only alludes to the high demand for rentals in the city but also shows the importance of rental accommodation in Johannesburg (GHS, 2007).

SHF (2008) shows that the demand for rental accommodation is highest in the low income market segment and they project that this demand is only going to grow. The demand for quality low income accommodation in Johannesburg is so high that a property owner operating in the Johannesburg CBD was quoted as saying "(It is a) bottomless pit. I do not see an end in sight. Rentals are rocketing you could build another 10 000 units in the centre of Johannesburg and that would not dent demand" (SHF, 2008: 36).

In part, the demand can be attributed to the fact that a large percentage of the city's population fall into low income housing bracket. According to Tissington (2013) roughly 51, 8% of all households in Johannesburg earn less than R3200 per month. In Johannesburg's inner city alone it has been estimated that there are more then 121 899 people who earn less than R3200 which means that they would have to find rentals of about R1060 (including services) so to avoid housing distress (Wilson, 2014). The demand is greater the more you go down the income ladder, 31% of all households earn less than R1 600 per month which means that for 31% of the central city's population rent (including services) should not exceed R480 in order to avoid housing distress; prices which the private is unable and unwilling to go down to (Clark & Royston, 2014).

The private sector offers a wide variety of typologies ranging from single rooms with communal facilities, bachelor units, four bedroom apartments to penthouses; though analysis done by Gardner (2010) shows that there is a trend of smaller households and a need for intermediate size accommodation. This means there is an increased demand for single person, two people and small family units (Urban LandMark, 2011). Influx of temporary workers looking for economic opportunities, and demographic shifts towards smaller households points to the demand of cheap, flexible and smaller units (Gardner,

2010). Over the last 10 years the number of households earning a monthly income of between R1 601 and R3 200 (low income bracket) has increased.

In Johannesburg, private developers are witnessing an immediate take up of small units in the city centre; units as small as 12 square metres bachelor flats and are being snatched up usually by single people, couples or single parents (Urban LandMark, 2011). Private developers also indicated that it's often difficult to rent out larger units, such as two or more bedroom units in the same or similar areas (Urban LandMark, 2011: 5). The preferred typologies for this accommodation are usually medium to high density buildings that are either flats or high rise buildings.

Though the demand for low income housing may be great in the city of Johannesburg, Tissington (2013) shows that the current supply doesn't meet the demand of this market. Tissington (2013) researched what kind of rental prices were being provided by the formal private sector in the city of Johannesburg, from the research conducted she found that the cheapest rental accommodation provided formally by the private sector is a single room that can be shared by a maximum of two people costing R1 700 a month (Stuart Wilson, 2014). Keeping in mind this is all excluding services, the research concluded that with added services charges the rent could go up R2200 per month. Rentals starting from would mean a single person would have to earn roughly R5700 per month, including services will mean that they would have to earn roughly R7350 per month to avoid hosing distress. That's a far cry of income of R3200 of the majority of the population. According to Wilson (2014) the only way in which formal rental housing is affordable to low-income households is if they sublet flats illegally and overcrowd housing units in contravention of municipal by-laws.

People do have the option to turn to the non-profit or state subsidised sector to access "affordable" accommodation. Several social housing institutes operate in Johannesburg with the City's very own JOSHCO being the main player. Unlike rentals provided by the private sector, JOSHCO's rentals do go down (even though it's rare) to about R600 (JOSHCO, 2016). JOSHCO provides a wide variety of typologies such as rooms, 1-3 bedrooms' flats, studios and even bachelor duplexes. The cheapest room provided by JOSHCO is "Per room 2 families sharing" for R532.71 in the Pennyville development; with the most expensive room costing R4, 315 for a two bedroom flat in the refurbished AA house building (JOSHCO, 2016). According to Tissington (2013) JOSHCO's rentals benefit mostly those in the upper portion of the R0 - R3200 p/m income bracket that 51, 8% of the city find themselves in. The smaller typologies understandably fetch a smaller rental.

Even if JOSHCO's rentals at times are more affordable then the formal private sector people are still unable to access these units because like all social housing suppliers their units are extremely oversubscribed with close to none available (Wilson, 2014). According to the SHF (2008) report, one of the SHI in Johannesburg was reported to have said that they received "2, 000 applicants for a 220 unit project" in just 4 months (SHF, 2008: 39). This inaccessibility of social housing and the unaffordability of private sector rental has meant that the poor people have are structurally excluded from the rental housing market. JOSHCO has made a commitment in its business plan to supply 50% - 70% of all accommodation within the corridors of freedom (JOSHCO, 2015).

For Tissington (2013) this mismatch between the supply and the demand of low income housing in the city of Johannesburg has great significance in the lives of the people that need this accommodation (i.e. the poor). Tissington (2013) found that because many people couldn't afford or access formal private sector accommodation or social either they have to make use of informal housing typologies like dilapidated high-rise buildings, illegally subdivided flats, multiply occupied houses, rooms or parts of rooms, balconies, doorways or bed-sharing arrangements, etc. just to be able to access affordable housing in the city.

Some of these informal housing options like bad buildings are usually undesirable to live in, over-crowded, unsafe and contravene municipal by laws; they are also viewed as undesirable by the City (Wilson, 2014). Though a high percentage of these 'informal' typologies are said to be characterised by slum like conditions, they are affordable to low income earners. For instance a research project called "Yeoville Studio" conducted by researchers at the Centre on Urbanism and Built Environment Studies (CUBES) at the University of the Witwatersrand found that on average rental for "rooms to rent range from R800 to R1 400 per month, rooms to share or portion of rooms rent at a range of R100 to R800 per month per space", R450 – R550 per month to share a bed and an "enclosed balcony of a flat can go for around R600 or more" (Tissington, 2013: 65).

The ability of the rentals in these non-conforming typologies to go down market enough so they are affordable to low income earners works for the survival and accumulation rationality of the low income. There is a clash in rationalities of the low income residents and the city because for the City these typologies contravene municipal by laws; are unsafe and illegal; and are deemed undesirable (Watson, 2009). Like in the previous section poor people's rationalities of survival and accumulation are at times at odds with what's seen to be acceptable by the state and their rationality to govern.

A reading that highlights this conflict in rationality in the existing houses practices in the city of Johannesburg is Mayson and Charlton (2013). Through participant observation and qualitative interviews the study explored the concept of rooms and spaces in the Johannesburg inner city. The argument the study made was that rooms and spaces in inner city Johannesburg have characteristics (such as flexibility, diversity and locational advantage) that allow the people that occupy them the ability to negotiate their precarious livelihoods. Benefits derived from staying in these particular typologies offer degrees of flexibility and diversity that the authors argue to be invaluable to the occupants with insecure livelihoods and income. The ability for these kinds of typologies to be used as an asset by occupants means occupants can respond more effectively to opportunities or strengthen resilience to sudden shocks to their livelihoods.

Mayson and Charlton (2013) don't fall into the trap of romanticizing the conditions in some of these typologies by recognizing that even with these benefits the conditions in some of these spaces can also increase the occupant's vulnerability. To the City the people living in these rooms and spaces are contravening City by-laws and building regulations and make it hard for them to plan.

Other studies have concluded similar things about how invaluable these non-conforming typologies are to the livelihoods of those that inhabit them. One of the concluding remarks of Charlton's and Shapurjee's (2013) study on the development of backyard shacks and rooms in an RDP development in Alexandra Johannesburg was that backyard dwellings "crucially serve as life-liners to diverse urban households and despite not being ideal or even accepted mode of accommodation, remains relatively successful" (Charlton and Shapurjee, 2013).

Looking at the literature of low income housing in the city of Johannesburg you can conclude that the situation of the gap between supply and demand remains a crisis; a crisis which can potentially derail plans to restructure and transform the city. They have the ability to derail the aims of the corridors because the CoF project instead of being a project to integrate and create a more inclusive urban it will be a gentrification project for the City that will exclude and push the poor to the periphery, entrenching the inefficient spatial patterns of the apartheid era.

This problem will foreseeable continue into the Corridors of Freedom because on numerous occasions the former mayor has cited JOSHCO and the formal private sector in his state of the city address (2013-2015) as the primary supplier of 'affordable' housing (JOSHCO,

2014). For Tissington (2013) this represents an overreliance on the market to provide this accommodation because the City itself has stated that “affordability, particularly of rental accommodation, [is] a notch below the social housing rental market” at a rental range of between R300 and R600 per month, and that “the need for such a rental sector is urgent” (Tissington, 2013: 51). If this trend of supply of ‘low income’ housing continues with the CoF then the corridors will be essentially leaving low income earners out in the dark simply because they can’t afford.

This brings the question of how does the CoF plan to do tackle the structural exclusion of the urban poor from the urban housing market in the city of Johannesburg? What is the plan for those that earn R3 200 per month or less since the City and private developers agree that the market will not or cannot provide for this market segment? How will the CoF go about dealing with the existing residents already living in (in some cases) quite dense circumstances though often not compliant with building and planning regulations but which are seen to be invaluable to their livelihoods (Third year housing students, 2014)?

If most of the current population of these areas will be crowded out by unaffordability, where does the City see these people being housed? What will be the socio-economic profile of the additional population? What is the approach to existing residents already living in (in some cases) quite dense circumstances though often not compliant with building and planning regulations? Who’s going to be able to live in these areas?

2.4 Corridors of freedom: restructuring the post-apartheid city

A key component of the proposed research topic is the Corridors of Freedom. Although the CoF are held by the City as a flagship project in the spatial restructuring of the city of Johannesburg, there is still only a limited amount of literature that has been produced on it. This could be attributed to the fact that the CoF are still a relatively new concept and literature on it is still being developed.

The literature that was available about the CoF seemed to bear little to no mention of low income housing issues and responses along the CoF. Reading through the little available literature they also seems to be no mention of non-conforming housing typologies that are prevalent in the City. Due to the lack of literature the researched focused on engaging literature about states using Transit oriented development (TOD) as a way of restructuring and transforming their cities; and how these urban restructuring attempts have affected low income housing in those cities. The idea of using transit orientated development to restructure the urban landscape to create more efficient, smart, and more desirable cities is

not unique to the CoF. This idea has been attempted by different cities from all over the world like Bogota in Colombia, Curitiba in Brazil, Atlanta in America and Bangkok in Thailand (just to name a few); all with varying results. So experiences documented in these countries could shed some light on the effects the CoF project might have on the livelihoods of low income housing.

This section will be briefly looking at what does the CoF aim to do as an urban restructuring plan; what have been the experiences of other cities with a policy focus on TOD as an urban restructuring plan, with particular focus on the impacts (intended or unintended) that these projects have had on low income housing.

It's widely accepted in the literature that public investments focused on TOD can have catalytic results in the transformation of the physical, demographic, economic makeup of the city. What has not been agreed upon in the literature is if this transformation is along upwards, flat or downwards trajectories.

Research that has been done in American cities about the effects of public investments into transit oriented development has critiqued these programs by saying that these mixed income TOD developments that are invested in by states, can at times displace those living in poverty rather than supporting their social mobility by catalysing other upgrades and development (Bridge et al. 2012). (Bridge and others, 2012) argues that this is paramount to 'state-sponsored gentrification'.

The investigations done in most of the literature that was engaged instead of focusing on how public investment into TOD effect the demographic and social transition in neighbourhood it looked at looked at how public investments have in some cities increased property values in these neighbourhoods. As it was assumed an increase in values is closely tied to the social status of the people who are able to live in those areas. No generalizable conclusions were found about TOD effects on property prices in most of the studies but it seemed to be conventional knowledge that the development of transit stations could increase the prices of property close to the station.

Even though TOD effects on property prices is regarded as conventional wisdom, research on the effects of public investment into gentrification generally find that it's nearly impossible to quantify connection between property values and transportation infrastructure because of the many variables involved. Development is very dependent on the local contexts and they should always be taken into consideration for a better chance at developing a successful urban system. This would mean the CoJ would have to hold a close understanding of the

local context that they plan to intervene in with the CoF of the unpredictable nature of the effects of TOD on a city.

What can also be seen from the literature is that even in the same city, the effects of TOD varied between the different modes of transport and even between the different transit stations. For Rodriguez and Targa (2004 the link between the development of transit stations and the increase in property prices is more evident in rail development, while there is limited evidence about the relationship between land values and BRT (Rodriguez and Targa 2004; Johnson 2003).

It's important to note that these results were drawn from experiences from the global north (mostly North America). As the CoF are in a city located in the Global South, looking at experiences of cities with similar contexts could prove more useful.

One of the most documented examples of the use of BRT to transform the urban functioning in the global south is Bogota, Colombia's BRT TransMilenio (Cervero 2005). This is the BRT system that gained global favour especially for regions that aimed to emulate the high-efficiency, high-capacity, low-cost transit networks that were evident in Bogota. Although it's been widely hailed, a recent study found that "those residing close to TransMilenio stations pay higher monthly rents; on average, housing prices fell between 6.8 and 9.3 percent for every five minutes' increase in walking time to a station" (Cervero 2005: 2).

For Harrison (2006), if these developments don't have a pro poor orientation or specific regulations and policies in place to guard against gentrification then when these developments are successful they will generally crowd out the poor because the land has become more desirable? Though there has been evidence of the poor being crowded out of these types of transport oriented development in cities like Bangkok in Thailand, it's still difficult to conclude inconclusively the effects a project might have on the current status quo. I align myself with Harrison's (2014) view that we need to create inclusive functional corridors, that don't throw the poor to the periphery if spatial transformation is to be achieved truly (SACN, 2014).

2.5. Conclusion

This chapter has discussed all the relevant literature in order to build a picture of how the state 'sees' society, with particular focus on how this may affect the way low income housing is conceptualised. It then built a picture of low income in the city of Johannesburg as the subject of our enquiry. The chapter lastly looks at how the CoF as an urban restructuring

plan might play out in Johannesburg taking into consideration experiences in other cities. Understand the nuances in the issues of understanding how states see how income housing in the CoF.

A couple of themes were drawn from the above discussion of literature that will help frame the kinds of questions and enquiry that informs the data collection. A theme of interest is the Homogeneous vs. Heterogeneous within the state in terms of views, will Johannesburg city officials hold similar or differing views towards low income housing needs and issues. Second theme of interest in this inquiry is what rationalities inform the officials' choices when it comes to low income housing decisions and which rationalities inform how people low income residents micro practices. Another theme of interest would be the idea of a particular image of development or modernity, which would be interested in understanding the kinds of modernities city officials are aiming for along the CoF.

Chapter three: Research Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This chapter of the research report looks at the method that was used to conduct this research. The research question the methodology aimed to respond to was 'How are city officials in the City of Johannesburg conceptualising low income housing along the Corridors of Freedom'.

The methodological approach used to conduct this research was a qualitative approach. Firstly in this chapter I look at the chosen qualitative approach, justifying why this research approach was chosen and what it entails for the research. Secondly, the chapter outlines the kind of data that was needed in order for me to be able to answer the research question and its subsequent research sub questions. The chapter then focuses on the instruments used to collect data and how they were used in this research. The chapter then goes to detail on how the data was collected and how the data was analysed. This outlines in detail the data collection process, all the challenges faced in the completion of this research; the process that was followed in analysing and representing the data. In the last section the chapter describes the ethical considerations that had to be tackled in the development of this research.

3.2 Research Approach

An evaluation of the research question made it clear that this research needed a methodological approach which was exploratory, open-ended, flexible and could engage with the complexities of the topic. Importantly, the approach had to be able to answer questions of "How?" and 'What?" that are central to the research question. The chosen methodological approach to conduct this research was the qualitative approach that focuses on in-depth interviews.

Qualitative research has been described by Creswell (2003) as an approach that emphasises the socially constructed nature of reality and sets out to interpret human actions (Creswell, 2003). For Mason (2002:3) this is an approach that is particularly concerned with how certain phenomena are understood, produced, interpreted or constituted by people (Mason 2002). Different individuals construct different meanings and understanding, so researchers have to engage with the complexity of individuals views rather than narrowing them and trying to fit them into a couple of categories (Creswell, 2003). When researchers engage with of individuals views rather than narrowing them a more nuanced picture of a

phenomena can be seen; a picture which is better representation of what is actually happening in peoples lived realities.

The aim of this kind of research is to then rely as heavily as possible on the participants' own views of the topic being studied (Creswell, 2003:8). This central feature of the approach was particularly useful to the research because it provided a methodological approach that enabled the research to explore City official's views and understandings of low income housing along the CoF in all their complexities in a way that was flexible and didn't aggregate the complexities into numbers as you would usually find with the quantitative research approach (Kumar, 1997). It also meant the research relied heavily on the officials own views rather than try to bend them to some preconceived theories.

Studies done using a qualitative approach are usually small and intensive studies focusing on a single main concept (which is low income housing in the case of this research); they generally involve the use of interviews with open-ended questions or the use of other instruments such as field observation, focus groups and document analysis.

3.3 The kind of information needed

There were two crucial elements to the research question that needed to be addressed. These two elements entailed firstly exploring City official's views and understandings of low income housing within the CoF and secondly looking at what City officials are planning or proposing with regards to the low income housing along the CoF. The bulk of the information needed was obtained through the use of in-depth interviews with key informants because they gave the useful tool in reflecting City official's views understandings of low income housing within the CoF (see section 3.4.1).

In order to be able to answer the question of 'how are City officials conceptualising low income housing along the Corridors of Freedom' a variety of information was needed. From the onset the research needed to gather the views of City officials that are in departments in the City that have a direct influence on the development of low income housing along the CoF. This meant gathering data on City officials' views, perceptions and plans for the future of low income housing. The research needed information on how City's officials envision the role of existing and often non-conforming housing typologies in the development of the Corridors of Freedom. These typologies are a fundamental feature in the landscape of low income housing in the city of Johannesburg (as section 2.3 has shown); the role City officials envision these typologies to play in the future will have significant effects on low income earners ability to access the city and all its opportunities.

The research needed to gather information that would give an idea of what guides officials' decisions when they decide which type of typology must be the desired housing typologies. Collecting all this information from City officials interviews would help shed light on the rationales guiding state practices in urban governance; this in turn would mean that 'better' and 'realistic' recommendations could be developed by this research because they would be grounded in a close understanding of the context taking consideration all real world constraints.

To construct a holistic picture of how the City views low income housing in the CoF the research also needed information from current plans and future proposals that the City has developed for low income housing in the CoF. The plan gives us an idea of the form of development that is preferred and supported by the city, also they arguably show how the City has understood the problem and how they plan going about tackling it; an analysis of their actions rather than the rhetoric (opinion vs plans). Low income housing proposals were also needed to be sourced in order to answer the research question because the proposals gave insight into how the City plans to engage with the issue of low income housing as the City develops.

While conducting the research I realised that I was missing an important element in the discussion of low income housing in the CoF and that element was information relating to the formal private sectors involvement in low income housing provision along the CoF. This information was needed because through discussion with the City it became very apparent that from the City's point of view the private sector was going to play a central role in the development of the corridors. The addition of this information gave the research a more holistic perspective; it started to sketch out a picture of this negotiated relationship that existed between the State – private developers – and low income earners.

3.4 Research instruments

Instead of relying on a single data source I collected multiple forms of data using a variety of instruments which were not only in line with the chosen qualitative approach but also enabled me to acquire all the need information (as outlined in section 3.3) to answer the research question and sub-questions. The data collection techniques used in this research were in-depth semi-structured interviews, purposeful sampling, document analysis, notes from presentations and discussions given by both City officials and academics; and informal discussions. This section looks at each instrument individually and how I went about using these instruments to answer the research question and achieve the research's objectives.

3.4.1 Interviews

Semi-structured interviews were the primary instrument used to collect data for this research. Semi structured interviews have been described as interviews with a core set of pre-determined questions for guidance but also allowed the researcher to probe and deviate slightly. These core pre-determined questions are needed so there is some sort of uniformity across interviews and the data collected can be analysed and represented in a comparative manner.

All semi structured interviews used on key informant in this study had open ended questions so as to enable the interviewees to express their opinions openly. These open ended questions produced some very rich data and information which helped a lot seeing as the topic under discussion was multifaceted. As said, to allow for some level of uniformity all interviews had core pre planned questions (based on the primary research question) so that all interviewees covered the same topic area, and could thus be compared or contrasted in the findings and analysis chapter (Chapter four). Besides the core pre-determined questions, questions were shaped to the interviewee in term of their position and were they work. More importantly this choice of instrument meant that during the interviews I was able to gently probe with follow up questions that either seek more detail, elaboration or clarity from the interviewees. Views on complex issues must be probed when given the opportunity, or run the risk of receiving surface level answers replies.

All the semi-structured interviews conducted were roughly one hour long and were composed of no less than ten open-ended questions, a criteria which qualitative interviews are seen to have to meet in order to qualify them as “robust” research.

3.4.2 Sampling

I used purposeful sampling as another research instrument in order to select the interview respondents in this research. Purposeful sampling, selective sampling or judgmental sampling as others call it (Crossman 2016; Kumar 1997), is a data collecting instrument that is synonymous with qualitative research. Crossman (2016) described purposeful sampling as non-random sample chosen on the characteristics that sample holds and the overall objectives of the research. Basically, you pick information-rich samples based on their certain social standing or the specialist knowledge they hold on a particular subject so as to provide you with the relevant information needed to answer the research question and achieve your research aims (Kumar, 1997).

Because the research question was concerned with exploring City official's views and understandings the sampling process was crucial to the success of the research. The selection of interviewees for this research was done through criterion-based sampling. Basically the criterion was based on the question of 'what kind of respondent would possess the knowledge that I need to sufficiently answer the research question?' The factors considered in the criteria are as follows:

City officials:

- The interviewees must currently work within a City of Johannesburg Department or a municipally owned entity that has a direct influence on the development of low income housing along the Corridors of Freedom.
- Must be working on or has contributed to their departments work on the Corridors of Freedom
- Must be knowledgeable about the issue of low income housing; and their departments role in the development of the Corridors of Freedom

Consultants:

- Must have been contracted by the City of Johannesburg at some point in time to develop strategic plans relating to the Corridors of Freedom or low income housing on the City's behalf;

Researchers/ academics:

- Must have a close understanding of the issue of low income housing in Johannesburg
- A close understanding of what the Corridors of Freedom as a project attempts to do to Johannesburg's spatial form and the plans to get there
- Must have an understanding of the private sector supply of low income housing in the Corridors of Freedom (this criterion was developed during the data collection when the private sector aspect was seen to be missing from the data).

Samples for qualitative studies are relatively small, but produce detailed rich information (Creswell, 2009). Due to the intensive nature of conducting the interviews and the notoriously difficult task of obtaining relevant City officials to interview, nine key informants were interviewed formally (5 development planning officials, 1 JOSHCO interviewee, 1 consultant interviewee, 1 Researcher interviewee). The intensive nature of qualitative studies means that there does not need to be an extensive sample size to gather information

from. Officials were sourced from the different departments in the City, partially because of the need to compare and contrast departmental views but also due to the need to speak with relevant City officials in every department that has a direct influence on the development of low income housing along the Corridors of Freedom. Formal interviewees are composed of City of Johannesburg officials (Department of Development Planning and Department of Housing); social housing institution (Johannesburg Social Housing Company official); a Consultant; and a researcher/ academic.

3.4.3 Document analysis

For Bowen (2009) document analysis is a useful tool to systematically "review and evaluate" documents so as to examine and interpret data (printed and electronic) in order to elicit meaning, gain understanding and develop empirical knowledge (Bowen, 2009: 27). Within this research the document analysis looked at a selection of key government policies, strategic plans developed by the various departments in the City that affect low income housing in Johannesburg, institutional and organisation reports (like annual reports and yearly business plans), documents electronically released by the City of Johannesburg detailing the CoF plan; newspaper articles, press releases and speeches done by the former mayor where also used to supplement the limited literature available on the CoF. Most of these documents were found electronically on the internet through a desktop search.

The documents were analysed in preparation for conducting the semi-structured interviews. The information received from the initial stage of document analysis combined with what came out the literature informed the questions that were asked to the key informants. There was a constant loop back from interviews I conducted to what documents were analysed and thus what questions were asked (an iterative cycle). During interviews with key informants, the respondent would make mention of a certain document or they might refer me to a relevant plan and policy that I may have not read. I would then analyse these documents in preparation of my next interview. This process tightened my research by refining my interview questions without causing a drastic deviation from the core pre-planned questions.

By using this qualitative instrument the research was able to gain insight into the City's ideas and thinking on and around housing. The document analysis importantly showed me the kinds of development the City's wanted and what kind of urban functionality the City aimed while also showing me how they plan on getting there (their use of incentives).The document analysis was used to see the difference between what officials said and the plans that were actually developed (Bowen, 2009).

3.4.4 Input from experts and stakeholders

Contributions received from ongoing interactions and discussions with various experts and other knowledgeable persons were used to refine my research and give me a different perspective on things at times. I made use of discussions with research colleagues, City officials and academics knowledgeable in this topic area. I benefitted from discussion with research colleagues in the in the two research cohorts I was in. I was in the Practices of the State in Urban Governance (PSUG) research programme located in CUBES and coordinated by Prof Claire Bénit-Gbaffou from the School of Architecture and Planning, Wits University. I was also part of the SA&CP's research cohort which was aimed at producing research based operational support to the COJ for the CoF project. I was able to refine my research by drawing from this valuable pool of advice; I was also able to use discussions on other people's initial research findings to try and make sense of phenomena I was finding in my own findings. My supervisor, Dr. Sarah Charlton played a huge role in the formation of the research as her expert advice would help in pivoting and reframing the investigation and also help in understanding the findings. The research benefitted from brief informal discussions with academics and relevant stakeholders like Dr Margot Rubin. Essentially I also had informal discussion with City officials from the Housing department (Simon Mayson) and the JDA (Nicki Pingo & Matt Jackson) whom I was able to catch after presentations and discussions but never got to formally interview.

3.5 Data Collection

This section aims to explicitly lay out the process that I went through in order to collect all the data needed to answer the research question. The section goes beyond just outlining the instruments used as was done in section 3.4, but elaborates on the process in more depth. It elaborates on what data was exactly used, which respondents were interviewed, the challenges faced in collecting data and how those might have affected the captured data.

Prior to conducting any interviews I firstly conducted a document analysis, where I selectively picked documents that would give me an idea of the City's thinking in around low income housing in the CoF and those that would shed light on the kinds of developments by City entities and the private developers the City would see as desirable. The documents I initially selected were as follows. Firstly, I analysed the Strategic Area Frameworks (SAF) for all three corridors (Turffontein, Louis Botha and Empire-Perth) since the City sees the SAF's as providing an outline of the "desired spatial response to the intent of the Corridors of Freedom vision by providing development guidelines and parameters such as housing

typologies, development controls, densities and land use mix" (COF, 2016: 2). I analysed all relevant housing plans within the City; this included the final draft of the Inner City Housing Implementation Plan (ICHIP) at the suggestion of one of the interviewees. I looked at JOSHCO's business plans (2014-2017) and annual reports (2013-2015) to see what they were 'saying' about low income housing along the CoF. I looked at articles and blogs that specifically spoke about low income housing in Johannesburg, the CoF, or (preferably) low income housing along the CoF. The articles did help but like the available plans not much was written about low income housing along the CoF. These documents helped frame my initial core discussion points in the semi structured interview I conducted.

I later added the recent Johannesburg spatial development framework (SDF) which came out during my field work. I also analysed documents from the housing department on their plans for development in the CoF like the Business case for Transitional Residential accommodation (TRA) in the CoF, South Hills development plan, and corridor principle document which highlights the base corridor principles that the housing department bases their plans on.

The field work began on the 24th of June 2016 and concluded on the 2nd of October 2016. I initially had targeted to interview a total of 6-8 city officials evenly spread out across development planning department, Housing department, JOSHCO and state contracted private consultants. In terms of which City officials to interview, my initial plan was to get hold of the Directors of departments because the assumption was they were the people in charge of conceptualising plans. After countless emails, it proved impossible to get a hold of these people, though as the research progressed my strategy on who I was going to interview changed. I still managed to get a hold of the acting director of one department and a Director of another. Meaning I ended up getting two out of three heads of the targeted departments.

During the course of the research I realised that the department heads play more of an overseeing role and weren't hands on so they saw the issue in a more broad view while officials views seemed to grounded in a close understanding of conditions in corridors. So in a way, getting views from both the director of departments and officials benefitted the research because I was able to capture a more holistic view from the City.

As I was struggling to get a hold of department heads I turned my focus to officials working within those departments. Email was the primary way of sourcing these interviews, most of the time the emails and the follow ups I sent remained answered. The breakthrough came when I managed to get an interview with one senior official in the development planning department; through that interview I used the snowballing technique to secure interviews

with other officials in the department. Officials in the development planning department made up 5 of the 9 interviewed key informants. This could be viewed as a limitation of this study but because the development planning department spearheads the development of plans (i.e. SAF & precinct plans) in the CoF; they coordinate the capital spending of all department in terms of the CoF investments; and they determine the desired housing typologies, densities and guiding frameworks for the CoF areas; so significantly shifting the weighting of how many officials in each department to be interviewed could be seen as a strength of the research.

The one JOSHCO official I was able to get to reply to my emails said they would only be able to answer the questions if I sent through the open ended questions which they would fill out and send back to me. The limitation with this is that I wasn't there personally to probe some of the replies they gave or gauge other forms of communication like body language or silences. However it did produce some rich and useful information.

Besides City officials I interviewed one of the consultants in the consulting team that was contracted by the CoJ and JDA to develop the 'Inner City Housing Strategy & Implementation Plan 2014-2021 (ICHIP)', the primary low income housing delivery plan in the central Johannesburg.

Through information gathered from the interviews and discussions at an Urban Lab held by South African Research Chair on Spatial Analysis and City Planning (SA&CP) in conjunction with the with the City of Johannesburg (CoJ) and the Agence Française de Développement (AFD) it became apparent that the research needed a view on the involvement of the private sector. I planned to interview somebody from the JDA development facilitation unit because they could better inform me of private sector interest. I was unable to secure an interview with an official in the JDA development facilitation unit so as a back-up plan I managed to secure an interview with a researcher who was conducting research on the CoF; and a large part of that research entailed conducting interviews with several private developers.

Throughout the field work I attended three informative presentations and round table discussions. The first was a presentation and discussion on the inner city housing implementation plan by the City *of* Johannesburg Housing Department hosted by CUBES (Centre for Urbanism and Built Environment Studies) at the University of the Witwatersrand on the 5th of May 2016. Second was on the 24th of June, a Corridors of Freedom Consultative Dialogue organised by Planact aimed to bring together Johannesburg City officials in relevant departments, academics, communities and development practitioners in order to spark ideas and debates that might help the development of the

CoF. The third was the SA&CP urban lab on the 9th of September mentioned above which brought together academics and researchers, high-level COJ officials, and selected members of civil society and private developers. The lab was about presenting and discussing the preliminary findings of the research on the Corridors of Freedom that SA&CP has undertaken for the City.

3.6 Data analysis

After collecting information from the different data sources I analysed and represented the information in the following way. Bogdan and Biklen (2003) see analyzing qualitative date as "working with the data, organizing it, and breaking it into manageable units, coding it, synthesizing it, and searching for patterns". This is meant to discern certain themes, patterns and meanings within the data. These chosen themes help the research to present the findings and also assists the researcher in making comparisons or contrasts that came from the data.

For all the interviews conducted I analysed them using vertical and horizontal analysis technique (Van Zyl, 2016). Firstly I would conduct a vertical analysis on individual interviews, that is, I would pick out from one interview the main points, the themes that emerged, and then summarise the overall sense of the interview. I tabulated the points drawn from each interview and summarises onto a matrix. I then conducted a horizontal analysis on the matrix which entailed performing a comparison exercise across the entire set of interviews. This was done in order to holistically view the data collected, draw out themes from it; determine how views differed or reinforced each other; and assess the overall character of the discussion. I wanted to represent the data in themes but I also wanted to represent it in relation to the research questions so both the inductive and deductive analysis approach was used to draw out the themes in the data. Inductive was more favoured because I didn't want to lose the voice of the respondents by trying to forcefully fit their responses into preconceived categories.

3.7 Ethical consideration

The University of the Witwatersrand Human Research Committee sets out clear guidelines for ethical considerations which researchers have to abide by in order to receive formal clearance to conduct their research. This research received formal clearance before the starting the interviews. The research did not deal with vulnerable groups or people but what was of importance in terms of ethical consideration for the report was informed consent and confidentiality for the interviewees. Interviewees were told that their identities would be kept

anonymous and care would be taken to not inadvertently identify them through reference to their name or job position if they wished to stay anonymous. This is to limit any foreseeable risks to public officials' reputations or their sitting in the organization because of how their views are reported.

The participants were informed on the nature of the research, its purpose, the research aims and their rights as participants before the interview. If they wished to continue with the interview they were handed a formal consent form which they would need to sign. The participants were also issued a participants' information sheet that they could keep which summarised the research, why they were chosen, guarantee of their anonymity if they wished their identities to stay confidential and my supervisors and my contact details. I would then ask the participant if I could make a voice recording of the interview and if I could make notes. No payments were made to any participant for their participation in this study.

3.8 Conclusion

This chapter has described and justified the approach and instruments chosen in this study, but also paying attention to how they were used in the research. I discussed the data collection process in detail, highlighting the challenges faced and the revelations that came along the way thus changing the scope of the research. I proceeded to outline the way in which I have analysed the data. The chosen method effects the way in which the data is represented in the following chapter (chapter 4).chapter 3 finishes off with the ethical considerations of conducting the research, in which commitments to anonymity have had a major bearing in how this document has been written.

I feel that although it might have been a difficult task to collect all this data especially city officials views (hard to get interviews), the overall methodological approach enabled me to answer the research questions.

Chapter four: Findings and analysis

4. 4.1 Introduction

The following chapter presents the findings of the fieldwork i.e. ‘how are City officials conceptualising low income housing along the Corridors of Freedom’ and then goes on to analyse the data using literature covered in the literature review (chapter 2). This enables the research to make sense of the key findings so that recommendations can be suggested and conclusions can be drawn in the following chapter (Chapter 5).

The first half of this chapter focuses on a discussion of the key findings that came out of the data collection process. Multiple themes were observed and were placed under three broad headings. These three broad headings are, firstly ‘how are officials understanding the problem?’ which entails identifying City officials’ views on the status quo, needs and responses of low income housing along the CoF. The Second heading looks at how the City is planning on developing low income housing in the CoF’; this looks at the responses, solutions and interventions that the City has come up with. The third heading is titled ‘why does the City think this way’ and is focused at laying out the logics and perceptions that guides the thinking of City officials.

The second part of this chapter confronts the discussed findings through the lens of the relevant literature. Ideas in literature that were discussed in chapter 2 are used to try and make sense of the findings. The purpose of this chapter is to draw out the significance in the data collected and then begin to start drawing conclusions and recommendations. But the analysis for this research has a much more practical aim to it; namely trying to build the bases of developing practical recommendations for the City in chapter 5.

4.2 How are city officials understanding the problem/ what are they thinking

This section of the chapter is about identifying City officials’ views on the status quo, needs and responses of low income housing along the CoF. Several themes and key points emerge from the data collected. The identified themes are as follows: the benevolent state; embracing new ways of understanding low income housing needs and responses; City’s visions and ambitions; understanding through the lens of departmental views.

4.2.1 The ‘benevolent’ state

Through interviews, this idea/ theme of a benevolent state comes out strongly in the data collected. All the interviewed respondents recognised the plight of the poor and marginalised in the city of Johannesburg with regards to access to quality ‘affordable’ and well located accommodation. Most respondents attributed this issue to several structural constraints and stark realities evident within the city of Johannesburg. Some of the major structural constraints which were identified by the officials were issues such as the lack of supply of ‘affordable’, quality formal accommodation in the city; the absence of disposable income for a large percentage of the city’s residents to afford the rentals that are being offered by the formal private sector; and the formal private sectors inability (or unwillingness) to go down market enough to a rental level that the majority can afford.

The stark realities within the city that were identified by officials as major contributing factors is the fact that nearly half the city has a monthly income of R3500 or less; the poor are mostly concentrated in marginalised areas at the periphery of the city while the more affluent residents live in the well-located and well serviced areas in the city.

An official described that all the above-mentioned constraints and stark realities are “major contributors to the occurrence of non-conforming typologies as well as the affordability issue” (planning department interviewee, 2016). This phenomenon (non-conforming typologies) is so prevalent that the City now recognises that it’s part of the fabric of the city, so they cannot be pushed out; hence the City has started to recognise that they must find a way to work with these typologies.

The interviewed officials agreed that non-conforming typologies used by low income residents are an important housing market segment, as they allow low income residents to access well located and affordable housing in the city. These non-conforming typologies are said to provide a level of rentals which the formal private sector does not go down to and which social housing might go down to but is hindered by the fact that they are extremely oversubscribed. So, officials now see non-conforming housing typologies as something that must be worked with and managed rather than being shunned or ignored in the planning of the development of the city.

Officials agree that there needs to be an engagement with informality to make these plans more pro poor and inclusive by nature because “if you don’t plan for the poor the poor will show up anyway” (interviewee, 2016). Officials are recognising the significance of informality as can be seen in this following quote:

> "You cannot wish away the poor, they're here. You can't wish away informality it's here, you have to embrace it. And when I say embrace it I mean you have to make it work, make it safer, make sure it's healthy and make sure it's clean. Because we can't do away with it. It's about how do we deal with this in a humane and sustainable manner" (housing department Interviewee, August 24 2016).

The data captured from the interviews showed that the City is engaging with non-conforming typologies within the CoF and cares about low income residents because they are actively trying to guard against the CoF becoming just a gentrification project for the City, which prices out the poor and pushes them further into the periphery. Interviewees in the development planning department especially highlighted this fact. They identified the biggest fear/threat of the CoF project is that the project does the opposite of what it was intended to do (re-stitch and integrate the city) and results in exclusion of the poor; due to a situation where property prices goes up, densification goes up, and a lot of public and private developments/investments happen around government infrastructure, but the poor get pushed out. The following quote from an official in the development planning department perfectly sums up this fear;

> "The ironic part about this whole thing is that they could actually end up becoming the **Corridors of Exclusion**" (planning department interviewee, 2016).

For one of the interviewed respondents in the development planning department it is crucial that the City does not let the market "run us [the city] over or create a situation where the market dictates and causes gentrification". So to guard against this exclusionary effects which the CoF can easily cause, incentives must be pro poor by orientation (will be discussed in further detail in section 4.3).

Though there is a strong political will to engage with informality from the City this generally translated to only the formalisation of backyard dwellings.

The City wants to support backyard dwellings and try and bring it into the fold, but in order for them to play a role in the development of the CoF the City says that they have to be formalised by complying with certain standards and regulations (in terms of design, materials, size, etc.) Discussed in detail in section 4.2.2.

This pro poor orientation is explicitly clear when consulting documents such as SDF, ICHIP, SHSUP but wasn't so explicitly clear when looking at the 3 strategic area frameworks (SAF) for the 3 corridors. This is surprising because the SAF's are meant to be there to guide what kind of developments should take place. In the SAF's, affordable housing is not positioned

as a central feature in the plan but housing issues are closely tied into the plan (i.e. densification). Looking solely at the 3 SAF's it could easily be concluded that the significance of the problem of low income housing is missed by the City.

This observation can be seen elsewhere in the data collected. At a high level the City seems to be very knowledgeable about all the nuances at play in the functioning of the city but their understanding or pro poor views does not seem to translate strongly enough when it comes to the detail of how exactly development will be delivered. There are some gaps in the details of how exactly the City will 'ensure' that they get the development that they need to transition from where they are currently to where they envision the urban form to be.

4.2.2 City embracing new ways of understanding low income housing needs and solutions

A large part of the state being benevolent is them embracing new ways of understanding low income housing needs and solutions. This section looks at what does the City 'embracing new ways of thinking when it comes to low income housing status quo, needs and solutions along the CoF' look like.

Based on the interviews conducted and the documents analysed, the City's has altered their views on low income housing needs and issues. City officials say that the City now accepts that it must reject the view that informality is a corruption of modernity (so it's not about the image anymore); the City admits it must work with non-conforming housing typologies like back yard dwellings in the transitional densification of the city. Though, the City is of the view that they [back yard dwellings] need to conform to certain standards and regulations. The City says this has meant recognising the importance of small players such as property owners and developers in the property market.

This view of embracing new ways of seeing non-conforming typologies, specifically back yarding came out strongest from officials in the development planning department. A key official in the development planning department stressed that, "the City now realises that different kinds/forms of densification will take place; in the form of back yarding, multiple occupancy housing and sub divided flats)".

When questioned about if the City is continuing to see non-conforming typologies as corruption of modernity, an official in the planning department replied by saying that:

> "I don't think that's it honestly, I think we have moved beyond that, seeing as we have a policy that out right says that its (back-yarding) basically that housing markets

> response to an inadequacy of supply of low income housing by the government. Since it's seen as a housing option by the City that just needs to be facilitated and supported. Then, no, the City is not of the opinion that it is a corruption of modernity. It facilitates densification and it provides accommodation for a particular market which isn't catered for from the private sector developer side and from government side. It (Gap in supply) manifests itself as backyard rental".

Officials feel like the City has finally moved away from the perspective that informality is a corruption of modernity and are of the view that the City makes its decisions regarding non-conforming typologies based on practical considerations. The practical consideration which different officials identified where issues of the fiscal sustainability of the City (property taxes and rates), quality of living conditions (appropriate and dignified conditions), and compliance to standards and regulations.

So, from the City's perspective, the argument that the City of Johannesburg rejects informal typologies because they don't fit into how the City sees the city is an out-dated argument that doesn't hold anymore.

Another important finding in terms of the City embracing new ways of thinking is that for the City embracing new ways of thinking with regards to non-conforming typologies only manifests itself as the City working with back yard dwellings. Other forms of non-conforming typologies like those of interest to this research like multiple occupancy housing or sub divided flats are given little to no attention in the plans developed by the City. To a point where one interviewed city official was of the view that other non-conforming typologies are not even prevalent in the CoF areas. At times, non-conforming typologies and back yard dwellings seem to be used interchangeably by officials. From the 6 interviewed officials in the development planning department, only 2 made specific mention to sub divided flats as a non-conforming housing typologies to be supported.

On the other hand, the City's commitment to support back yard dwellings in the city of Johannesburg is unmistakeable. Both the SDF and SHSUP speak to this. In the SHSUP one of the implementation mechanisms is the support of backyard rental. Maybe this focus is attributed to the significance this typology plays in housing people in Johannesburg. The Sustainable Human Settlements Urbanisation Plan, (SHSUP 2012) conducted a study in 2012 which estimated that Backyard dwellings accounted for about 320,652 families; with the largest concentration in Soweto. With the difficulty of measuring informality it would be reasonable to say that this number might be even higher.

It was evident from the interviews that the City recognised the benefits that residents and owners of backyard dwellings can accrue from these typologies such as providing an important source of income for the owners while also providing a crucial source of affordable accommodation for the residents.

An important note to make is that though the City may see back yarding as an important housing market segment as seen above, they are still of the view that it needs to conform to certain standards and regulations for it to be allowed to play a formal role in the development of the city. Without conforming to these prescribed standards backyard dwellings will not (or cannot) be brought into the fold. A big determinant of these standards is of course the technical buildings regulations, health and safety requirements which a shelter has to check off when they are getting built. What is evident from the data collected is that the idea of adequate shelter plays a factor in the City views towards what is acceptable in terms of these typologies and seems to be non-negotiable for the officials.

According to interviewed officials, the City's way of supporting backyard dwelling is by "getting a standard design and standard material" that the back yard dwellings should be built too (interviewee, 2016). The City started this process by sending out a call for proposals for alternative building techniques and materials for backyard dwellings that could be used to develop a standardised form which can be used by the City. Innovative proposals were submitted even ones in the form of containers.

At the completion of the call for proposals it was found that no matter how creative and innovative the proposals were the design was still too expensive for the market segment they were being developed for. The issue with imposing of this standardised form on people is that people can't afford to build these typologies to that standard model in terms of design and material. If people do build their back yard dwellings to this standardised model, they will be very expensive to build and will thus result in higher rentals.

Another finding in terms of the City embracing new ways of seeing low income housing needs and responses of significant to the corridors is that the City aims to enable smaller players in the property market. Some officials interviewed in the development planning department have the view that the smaller players in the housing market have a bigger role to play.

According to these officials "not everyone can build 4-5 story developments in the short term so we [the City] must support the back yard dwelling densification. We [the City] want everybody to take part in the property market and we want to enable smaller players' but they have to comply with the norms. So we [the City] are not excluding backyards or rooms.

All of it contributes". The same official said that as the City they want to encourage smaller players in the corridors to develop backyards, retaining the existing community but adding more densities to make BRT more viable and create the desired urban form.

Small players in the property markets are seen to be the ones to cover the demand of accommodation for people earning below R3500 per month, which falls below JOSHCO's range. Though officials are quick to point out that this doesn't shift the responsibility for this income bracket away from the City, hence they will continue to push JOSHCO to cater for various ranges and partnerships with all scales of private sector will be crucial (even more so because they don't have a product for that market range). Though the partnership with small scale developers is contingent on the fact that the developers must conform to the standards and regulations set.

Apart from the SHSUP and its attempt to find a standardised design, no current documents or plans that were consulted show a detailed plan of how the City is actually planning to enable smaller players (in terms of access to finance, targeted incentives, etc.) in the delivery of back yard dwellings.

4.2.3 City's visions & ambitions

I found that, officials' views on low income housing needs and responses along the CoF were greatly understood through the visions and ambitions that the City has for the corridors and Johannesburg as a whole. This section will look at the views that the officials hold towards low income housing needs and responses and how these are determined by their vision for the future. A more detailed discussion on how the City's robust vision informs its responses and interventions with regards to low income housing in the CoF is defined in section (4.4.1).

As discussed in the sections above, City officials agree to the importance non-conforming typologies in Johannesburg. Though due to the vision and ambitions they hold for the city, non-conforming housing typologies are only seen to be temporary features as the city transitions.

Key respondents in the development planning department were of the impression that in order for the city to accommodate the foreseeable population increase in well located areas and still function efficiently and sustainably there needs to be fundamental change in the city's urban form. For officials non-conforming typologies do not fit into this vision of a fundamentally changed urban form.

Non-conforming housing typologies are recognised as a valid alternative form of densification but they do not provide the required fit and function that the city envisions for the future. Officials see non-conforming housing typologies to only be fine while the city is transitioning to these formal medium-high rise typologies.

The words used by officials were “these non-conforming typologies are fine in the short term because they do increase densification, but they are the not end game, the final desired result”. City officials accept a radical change in areas where people make use of these nonconforming typologies due to ambitions held in the vision. City officials are of the view that in order for the ambitions and visions the City has for the CoF to be realised the current layout/setting/structure will have to fundamentally change; regardless of the current status quo.

The City’s aims and visions for the future also affect the kinds of developments that they invest in. City investments are orientated towards 4-5 story walks up and higher because that’s the kind of densification it wants to see. The specific reasons why these typologies are seen to be appropriate for the City’s vision of the future are discussed further in section 4.4.1

The consultant interviewee felt that though investing in formal medium-high rise typologies was a great idea by the City, they were concerned that the City does not seem to have outlined what happens if the typologies that they are aiming to achieve for the future do not get achieved.

> “If they don’t get them what then?” (Interviewee, 2016).

It could be argued that because of the City’s visions and ambitions, non-conforming typologies are seen as expendable in the pursuit of the vision. Though this could be seen as a harsh assessment of the City because they do provide ‘valid’ reasons for why they prefer formal high rise typologies going into the future. The actual issue arises when the City does not have a concrete plan in place to ensure that low income residents can access these envisioned typologies. If this plan is missing, poor people will continue to be structurally excluded from the access to formal, quality and affordable housing.

4.2.4. Through the lens of their mandates

Officials in different departments in the City were found to hold different views from one another with regards to low income housing needs and responses within the CoF. Having interviewed officials in the City’s housing department, development planning department and in JOSHCO I found that most departments understood low income housing responses and

needs largely through their mandates and functions. Also, what is worth noting is that different officials in the same department might have the core principles of their vision informing their views but depending on which localities (with their specific conditions) of the city they are focused they will put different amounts of significance to issues of non-conforming typologies.

With the housing department, they are not entirely concentrated on the CoF and see the corridors a just another part of the city. When asked what role the housing department will play in the development of the CoF the interviewed official explained that their mandate to provide the maximum yield of lower income and middle income housing stays unchanged; the corridors are just another piece of land in the city. He noted that they are now “trying to move away from housing only for the poor to a system of housing that incorporates all” (interviewee, 2016).

Until recently JOSHCO has also not focused much along the CoF. JOSHCO interviewee explained that JOSHCO’s main business function is the supply of rental accommodation to qualifying individuals that earn between R3 501 and R7 500 per month in the city of Johannesburg, and when JOSHCO is big enough in the future they will provide for those earning beyond R7 500 per month. JOSHCO as the City’s main affordable housing provider has committed to providing 50%-70% of all its new housing developments along the CoF.

The development planning department on the other hand is focusing all its energy and thinking down the corridors and they are trying to get other departments to follow suit. Since the department hold the “pursue strings” because the budget is controlled by them, they possess the ability to get other departments to look at the CoF (consultant interviewee, 2016). A development planning interviewee described his/her role as “integrating of the key players (departments) into the plan and making sure they support the plan through their specific functions”

The difference in orientation means that there are different understandings of the status quo, current needs and views on responses. The development planning understands issues of low income housing typologies in terms of the overall urban functionality of the city. The housing department and JOSHCO on the other hand also recognise the important role that these non-conforming typologies fulfil but they do not place much emphasis on these typologies. For the housing department, it is about getting people out of these non-conforming typologies to better, safe and formal accommodation. While engagements with JOSHCO have shown that JOSHCO has no plans to engage with these non-conforming housing typologies.

The planning department is trying to bring smaller players into the fold by trying to support back yarding. While both the housing department and JOSHCO favour large formal developments which are at times delivered through partnerships with the formal private sector (your traditional developers).

The housing department understands the needs for low income housing all the way down to people with no income. While the planning department; much like JOSHCO its preferred supplier of affordable housing along the CoF, understanding of low income housing needs stops at a monthly income level of R3500. Some officials in the planning department and JOSHCO didn't seem to know about any housing strategies that cater for those people below a monthly income level of R3500.

As the research focused on the development planning department I managed to determine if they officials in this department held diverging views or rather were they strong commonalities in the way they were thinking about low income housing needs and responses.

All the officials within the development planning department had a strong understanding of the ambitions the City holds with regards to its future urban form. When answering questions posed about the role of low income housing in the development of the CoF all the officials would refer back to the vision as their reference point. This informed the way they answered questions of which typologies were the most appropriate and why? The vision also informed questions of guiding logics and influential perspectives.

Though there are many commonalties in the views of officials within the development planning department with regards to the status quo, needs and responses of low income housing in the CoF there are some differences that were noted. An observation that was made is that the amount of significance an official would place on issues of non-conforming typologies was greatly influenced by the locality in which an official works.

For one interviewee who worked in areas of the corridors that had a lot of back yarding and 'informal' subdivision of flats; in their opinion it was crucial to consider the small players in the property market and find a way to bring them into the fold because they provide another acceptable form of densification. While another interviewee in the same department that works in a more affluent suburbs put less emphasis on the problem of non-conforming typologies but rather focused more on finding ways to attract formal private sector developers to develop the desired medium-high density typologies within the corridors. This

difference in views could affect what kind of incentives an official champion or chooses to implement.

4.3 Responses, solutions and interventions

The section on the first broad heading has covered how City officials view/understand the 'problem'. This section will now focus on looking at exactly what are city officials doing about the 'problem'. To understand what city officials are doing about the problem this section highlights the responses, solutions and interventions that officials in the City of Johannesburg have come up with.

Firstly, the section looks at the market-led approach which is the City's preferred approach in the supply of low income housing along the CoF. Closely linked to the market-led approach, is the issue of a difference in understandings of affordability and the problem of the 'missing bottom'. Importantly, the section then looks at the incentives and disincentives that the state has put in place or is planning on putting in place. Lastly, the chapter then focuses on the interventions that different parts of the City have implemented or plan to implement with regards to low income housing along the CoF.

4.3.1 Market-led approach

The City has decided to largely use the market-led approach to tackle the problem insufficient supply of low income housing. This is an approach that sees the formal private sector as the preferred provider of low income housing in the CoF.

In this approach housing supply is driven by the formal private sector at market prices. The developers, after they have purchased the land, decide which market segment they want to cater supply for. For the consultant interviewee (2016), developers are concerned about "profit maximisation" so they will price the rent at the highest price that they think they can get for that unit. Even though the price point which developers usually choose is unaffordable to a majority of the residents of Johannesburg.

City officials still view the market-led approach to be the most preferable way to supply housing in the CoF, and they name several reasons. reasons are that officials felt that the formal private sector is able to provide development at a rate that is much faster than that of the City's; the private sector stock is usually better managed than the City's; and also the formal private sector developments are seen by officials to come with the benefits of better living standards and conditions unlike non-conforming typologies.

The City is not completely oblivious to the harmful nature of the market-led approach profit maximisation agenda. Interviewed officials stated that they played a facilitating role in the market-led approach. An interviewed official described the role to entail:

> "making sure what is being provided (by the private sector) does not adversely affect people because if the market is left to its own devices in the outlining of rooms they will produce something that will adversely affect people" (development planning interviewee, 2016).

This facilitation role is meant to benefit the people but when developers like Africa housing company (AFHCO) are producing 11 square metre rooms which are below what's minimally accepted but seem to 'work' for the people that use them; this hints at a re-evaluation of what the City is supposed to do or aim to do as a facilitator of this market-led approach.

Another important factor as to why the City seems to support the market-led approach is that formally produced housing is crucial to the City's fiscal sustainability. This is because formally produced housing are a major source of income (taxes and rates) for the City while state produced housing like RDP/ BNG do not produce rates.

Developments produced by the market led approach usually comply with standards and regulations set by the City so they are viewed by the City to be better than non-conforming typologies because they provide a 'better' and more dignified living conditions.

The importance the City places on the formal private sector in the delivery of low income housing in the CoF can be seen through the incentives that the City has in place. All incentives seem to be geared towards trying to get the formal private sector to firstly develop along the corridors and then try to get them to provide affordable housing. What does this mean for non-conforming typologies in the CoF and the people that use them?

Because this is a market led approach, all those who cannot afford the prices set by the market will be excluded from accessing accommodation along the CoF. This is disconcerting when thinking that people already cannot afford the rental prices that are being offered by the formal private sector hence the prevalence of non-conforming typologies.

Another issue that one consulted researcher expressed with this market led approach is that developers are saying "they go where the market goes, they won't go somewhere where the market would not obviously go just because the City is contriving with a bunch of incentives" (Researcher interviewee, 2016). So, there are and will always be localised differences in the supply of housing within the city. Formal developers will be reluctant to go to more

degenerated areas along the corridors and develop these City desired four story walk ups. Who will then provide housing in the areas where developers are not willing to go but where there is still a great demand?

If the City's incentives do not attract the formal private sector into developing the desired typologies along the CoF, the City's ambitions will greatly be hindered. So the City's ambitions for the future are reliant on the City actually getting (sufficiently incentivising) the private sector down the corridors. As the planning department are the ones leading the attempt to get the formal private sector to develop in the CoF the private sector seems to have more bargaining power with this department. While the discussion with the key respondent from the housing department gave off the impression that the department believes they have more bargaining power with private developers due to the big role they play in packaging development (inter alia paying for all the bulk services and producing all the studies).

The market-led approach might have several negatives for non-conforming typologies and their users the upside is that some interviewees reported that currently in Johannesburg 'affordable' rental housing has become a huge investment opportunity in the property market. It's said that the affordable housing market is becoming more appealing to some developers as this is where the greatest demand is also the upmarket market segments are getting more saturated. This is potentially great for the supply of low income housing, but if developers' understanding of affordability is vastly different to how affordability is understood by low income residents then most low income residents will continue to be excluded from the formal property market.

4.3.1.1. Understandings of affordability

The biggest threat with the market-led approach that the City is relying so heavily on is the issue of affordability. In an urban lab discussion (9th of September 2016) where current on-going research on the CoF was being presented, it was said that "there is a lot of interest from the private sector in the affordable housing market. "Especially pertaining to the corridors themselves" (Rubin, September 2016). But the formal private sector's understanding of affordability differs from the one held by low income residents.

A key respondent that has conducted several interviews with formal private developers found that consulted actors within the formal private sector understood affordability to mean rents starting around 2000-3000 to 5000-6000 per month. This is a far cry from the rental

which would be considered to be affordable to low income residents (somebody earning R3500 per month and below).

This market based, and formal private sector led approach reinforces the situation where those that earn R3500 per month or less will still be structurally left out of this increased interest in the affordable housing market. To make matters worse the City's main supplier of affordable housing (JOSHCO) understands affordability to mean an income range of R3500-7500 per month.

Currently, the understanding of affordability and the actual need of the market is skewed. The consultant interviewee (2016) argued that JOSHCO needs to refocus its supply away from two bedrooms and three bedrooms, and rather focus on rooms for rent, with communal bathrooms, shared ablutions spaces because that is where there is massive demand from the market. These rooms for rent would also have to be targeted for an income bracket which is extremely low and which can only afford rentals of R900 or less per month" (consultant interviewee, 2016).

It was seen from the JOSHCO interviewee that JOSHCO does not hold intentions of going down market. JOSHCO is actually looking serving a higher income bracket (those earning above 7500 per month) because according to them their current range is not sustainable. They are not aiming to cater for the identified massive demand (people earning below R3500 per month) going into the future. The urban poor might still miss out if the private sector delivers housing in CoF. How does the city make sure this does not happen? How do they capture the value of their investment and interest into affordable housing in the CoF?

4.3.2 Incentives

The incentives that the City is putting together along the CoF provides a good example of how the City is planning on delivering low income housing along the corridors; i.e. what kinds of development is wanted. The incentives also provide insight about how the City thinks the change in the urban form is going to come about. The different departments in the City have different mechanisms in place to achieve specific goals.

Officials in the development planning department explained several incentives they have in place that could get the formal developers interested in investing along the corridors. They mentioned that the City allows for increased land rights within the CoF areas so greater densities can be built; developers are offered rates rebates; they are putting together Special Development Zones (SDZ) along the CoF in order to boost developments along the CoF this

entails conducting all necessary studies such as heritage studies for the whole area so to ease this onerous and expensive task for developers; they are also putting in the bulk infrastructure pre-emptively into the corridors so as to stimulate development and increase the infrastructural capacity to deal with increased densification. The development planning unit is also looking to extend the Urban Development Zone (UDZ) down the corridors, this will be an incentive because the UDZ is a tax incentive which takes the form of an allowance that covers the depreciation of investment made in refurbishment of existing property or the creation of new developments within the inner city.

The housing department strategy is based on putting in the necessary bulk infrastructure and services into a site as an incentive for developers. The department also does all the 'leg work' required in order to ready a site for development, this leg work was described by the housing department interviewee (2016) to include conducting all the studies that are needed to make a site developable i.e. Hydrology, toxicology, geotechnical studies.

The different departments have also come up with plans to get the formal private sector to deal directly with low income housing along the corridors. To get the developers to produce low income housing along the corridors the development planning department in partnership with JOSHCO have developed a Land Acquisition Strategy. Officials describe part of the strategy to be about buying up land and property which is strategically located within the corridors, then releasing that land and property into the market or to specific developers sector on the basis that the developer reserve a certain percentage of the units to be 'affordable housing'.

The housing department on the other hand get developers to provide for low income housing (BNG and Social housing) by paying for the cost of putting in all the services and bulk infrastructure onto a site, a feature which is described by the housing official as "not cheap at all" (interviewee, 2016). The money that developers save from having the department put in all the bulk infrastructure and services gets put it back into the project in order to change the City's housing products to look like their products.

A key respondent pointed out in the interview that so far most of the incentives offered by the City are largely on the supply side without focusing on the demand side. From the private developer's view these supply side incentives will not necessarily result in the increase demand for developing along the CoF. Developers are said to think that the current incentives don't provide for what they need, which is lower development risk, and the currently provided incentives are not enticing enough for them to move their entire business

into the corridors. This would point at trying to develop incentives which developers would see to lower their risk and thus entice them to invest in the corridors.

Smaller formal developers in the property market are said to feel like supply side incentives came along too far down the development process. One key respondent explained that in order to enjoy the benefits of a tax rebate you must firstly have a completed development. Which is not an easy feat; you plan, source and receive funding, conduct project viability, construction, etc. before you even see the benefits of the tax rebate incentive. For the key respondent, the incentives came too far down the line and thus probably won't be factored into the equation of project feasibility. The City should be looking to get into the mix much earlier in the process, when actual development plans are being made.

Those interested in the low-income housing space (especially smaller players) said the City was not giving them what they needed. Some of consulted smaller players suggested that city should look at dropping parking requirements so to allow for higher densifications. The issue of finance was an important issue for smaller developers. Small developers are said to be willing to develop along the corridor but they do not know how to approach the City and get funding. The Trust for Urban Housing Finance (TUHF) has been great in this regard because they have been able to take small developers by the hand through the process of getting funding. Smaller player were of the view that if such a process was adopted by the City along the corridors then that would be a far greater incentive then bulk infrastructure or any tax rebate.

One of the biggest issues for the consultant and research interviewees is that the concepts of cost and benefit and value capture are not at the forefront of thinking when the City develops and implements incentives. How do they make sure that the cost of the incentive that the City is providing can be directly linked to the benefits? For the key respondents these issues have not sufficiently been dealt with within the City.

The respondents are of the view that disincentives should play a bigger role in the city rather than/ or supplementary to incentives. The City should start excessing their regulatory might more in the form of stricter disincentives.

I found that when asked about what kind of typology or approach the City can take that would actually ensure the development of quality low income housing along the CoF, most respondents thought that the way forward would be for the City to either incentivise or/and compel the private sector to develop development with low income housing as a component. This will develop the income mix that is required and create a more integrated environment. I

think the City needs to give more thought to what kinds of incentives and disincentives would actually deliver the income mix that they are looking while keeping in mind the socio economic profile of the population of Johannesburg.

4.3.3 Disincentive(s)

Though the City is starting to think about and develop very innovative ways to try and incentivise development in the CoF a consulted key respondent is of the belief that the City actually needs stronger disincentives. The respondents felt that if the City started using their regulatory power more they would achieve more desirable outcomes.

> The respondent was quoted saying “It’s about them [the City] saying that if you do development here, you then have to provide X amount of social housing, X amount of this or that. Which I don’t think that they [the City] are being very careful of doing, so far” (researcher interviewee, 2016).

When I questioned some City officials about the disincentives that their department have in place they replied that they do not think they have any disincentives in place. If the expert analysis of the researcher, consultant and other officials is right the city should be thinking more about disincentives which according to them have the potential to be more effective than incentives. This is an avenue that the City is not exploring sufficiently. The City has to put as much energy into developing and implementing disincentives as much as they do into incentives so as to compel the formal private sector into developing low income housing along the CoF. Otherwise developers will continue developing where they perceive the market to be, and they will continue on building on cheap land at the outskirts of the City.

4.3.4 Interventions

4.3.4.1 Interventions planned by the housing department

Officials explained that the housing department has three broad interventions when it comes to the provision of low income housing along the CoF. The first intervention is its mixed income housing approach which informs the conceptualisation of Greenfield developments. The second intervention is the infill developments approach though only still being done on properties that the cities own. The third intervention is the development of transitional housing within the corridors.

The first approach is the mixed income housing programme approach which was described as an approach which “forms the basis of conceptualisation of most Greenfields projects, within the corridors”. In this approach the housing department works with ratios when providing housing, for instance 50% of the housing in the development would go to BNG/RDP, 25% goes to social housing/Rental units and 25% to bonded/FLISP housing. These ratios are not set in stone they can change but what remains constant is that “the financial model has to work” and “as long as our product which is the BNG or subsidised housing is not a minority” (housing department interviewee, 2016).

The interviewed key official explained that the housing department’s greenfield developments are packaged in the following way: The City puts in all the services in the site, does all the leg work by composing all the studies needed to make a site developable i.e. Hydrology, toxicology, geotechnical etc. The city develops a conceptual design of how they would like to integrate the housing (ratios, how they relate to one another). They put out a call for proposals to formal private developers. The money the developers save from the services and studies already being done gets put back into the project in order to improve the RDP product (making it better & greater value) so the RDP product can be placed next to market housing and the developers are still able to sell them. This has happened at the housing department’s South hills development which falls within the Turffontein corridor.

When the department does not own the land they get into partnerships. Similar process happens as the one mentioned above using similar ratios. Again, the department puts in services and does a lot of leg work so that the costs that the private developers save will be inserted back into the project augmenting the RDP product.

The second way in which the department is thinking about providing low income housing is to develop infill development in places where they own the property and the property allows like in Westbury. The department will be trying this for the first time as a trial case in a property it owns in Westbury. They will “look at the cost and look at how it works” so they can gauge how much this kind of development costs and what it takes to do this kind of development going forward into the future. For the official the aim of this approach is to intensify usage and increase densities on properties they already own in well located areas (i.e. the CoF). The departments anticipates that in the future they will be able to secure pieces of land along the CoF; seed them to developers for them to develop rental units which will have a percentage of housing department’s products; and then transfer the products (RDP, social housing, etc.) that were developed by the developer to people who have been living in those areas for a long time (extended benefits programme).

The department's third approach to packaging housing development within the corridors is the provision of transitional housing. The City is looking at a containerised solution in providing this transitional housing. And they want these typologies to be along the CoF. The target market is for dissolute people with nowhere to go but they can only stay a maximum of a year. Official quoted as saying the reason for wanting to develop transitional housing is because:

> "So, we would want to have a number of transitional type housing to be developed within the corridors to help us release buildings within the inner city" (Housing department Interviewee, 2016).

4.3.4.2 JOSHCO interventions

Besides committing 50%-70% of all their new development within the CoF area, JOSHCO plans to acquire buildings and land portions allocated along the CoF. The interviewed JOSHCO official said that existing buildings acquired are converted into residential units and rented out. Land portions are developed as Greenfield projects

4.3.4.3 Interventions by the Development planning department

Like the two other departments the development planning department is planning several interventions to compel the private sector to provide affordable housing along the CoF. Of the ways in which they plan to compel the private sector to provide affordable housing in all their future housing developments is by developing an inclusionary housing bill. Basically, the inclusionary housing bill is:

> "a housing programme that requires developers to dedicate a certain percentage of new housing developments to low income and low middle income households at affordable housing cost" (COJ, 2016).

The currently proposed percentage in the SDF is 10%-30% (COJ, 2016) and this housing must be targeted to people earning R3500-R7500 per month (COJ, 2016)

To date there has not been much uptake from the private sector. Officials say this is because the current inclusionary housing policy was legislatively weak and thus provided ways for developers to get around having to provide inclusionary housing. Officials see this new bill which is currently being developed as a way to force developers to put in inclusionary housing because now the Spatial Planning and Land Use Management Act 16 of 2013 (SPLUMA) has legislated inclusionary housing.

Officials state that the proposed inclusionary housing bill has the potential to actually create inclusive environments where lower income residents can live in affluent areas. Though this expected benefit can only be realised if the bill works as its being currently envisioned in the SDF. The problem which I foresee with the inclusionary housing bill is that when the bill gets consulted with the private sector and amendments are made it will be a shell of how its currently being envisioned now thus only slightly benefiting the urban poor.

The second intervention is the intervention which the planning department is currently using to ensure low income housing in the CoF; the Land acquisition strategy. This strategy works, by the planning department identifying strategic land within the corridors; strategic is determined by whether these parcels of land are close to a BRT station or something functional like transit nodes, social infrastructure, major pedestrian movements or economic opportunities (planning department interviewee, 2016). After these pieces of strategic land are identified this information is sent to the Johannesburg Property Company (JPC), which acquires the land for them. They have capex (capital expenditure) put aside in the budget that is meant to make sure the City has the funds to acquire this land. So once this land is acquired using a willing buyer and willing seller basis it is then passed on to JOSCHO for them to develop social housing. Officials are of the view that if they own the land they have full control over the types of housing stock that gets developed on the land in this case affordable housing

When asked about problems they expecting with this strategy, officials mentioned that these pieces of land could be in more affluent areas or perceived affluent areas and thus the Not In My Back Yard (NIMBY) effect can affect the amount of housing stock they eventually put into the area. Also another challenge is that because they are working on a willing buyer and willing seller and they do not expropriate land, no matter how much value they place on a piece of land they will not be able to utilise it if the seller does not want to sell it. Though the city can expropriate land this is only done in exceptional occasions.

4.3.5 Future plans

One of the most interesting plans that the housing department and the development planning department are working on is trying to refocus the delivery of fully subsidised state housing (RDP/BNG) into the corridors. An official explained the broad approach by saying it is about “getting government subsidised housing to be delivered as infill developments so they are better located”. Initially these developments will be more expensive to build along the CoF than they are in the outskirts in the short term but in the longer term (in like 10

years) it will become more of an investment for the City then a subsidy forever. That's the broad approach in a nutshell but as commented by officials this will not be an easy task.

This future tool seems like a sensible idea and plan if the City can actually implement it, seeing as it would go a long way in accommodating those who can only afford extremely low rentals. The relatively high value of land along the CoF areas will make these government subsidised housing more expensive to build but this should not make the City, provincial or national government shy away from the task because of the benefits this will accrue in the future.

4.4 Reasons for these views?

Following the discussion on the City's view on low income housing needs and solutions within the CoF (section 4.2) and the discussion on the tools in which the City plans to use to facilitate the delivery of low income housing within the CoF (section 4.3); this section draws out information from the data collected that gives insights into why the City is thinking the way it is with regards to low income housing needs and solutions within the CoF. These findings play a role in helping to understand and probe the rationalities that guide which typologies, plans, interventions and incentives are chosen by the City.

A couple of themes were seen with regards to this third broad heading. The themes that were identified and will thus be discussed in this section are the 'robustness of the vision'; 'practicalities of governance'; 'understanding of dignity and appropriate living'; the complexities of informality: and the City's pro poor orientation. I found that due to the many factors at play with the issue of low income housing in the city of Johannesburg these themes are interlinked, and can't be looked at exclusively without considering the others.

4.4.1 The robustness of the vision

A discussion on why the City understands the issue the way it does would be fundamentally flawed without looking at the theme of "the robustness of the vision", which seems to be a strong underlying logic when the City's thinks about low income housing needs and responses.

What comes out of the interviews conducted is that the 'vision' is comprehensively instilled in the thinking of officials especially those in the development planning department. It is the reference point which officials use to assess the appropriateness of typologies and responses along the CoF. The jest of the vision is that the City needs to 'sustainably' densify and transform to a more efficiently functioning urban form.

A exercise was done by the City where they measured current demand and then calculated the future population size which was then retrofitted into well located areas (hence the CoF), the conclusion from that exercise was that if the city was going to accommodate that increased demand they would need to get higher densities and the City interpreted higher densities to mean your 4-5 story walk ups typology.

City officials argued the following points to why the renderings of 4 story walk ups in the SAF are seen to be the preferred typology in the CoF and why they have 'rejected' non-conforming typologies:

- 4 story walk ups "hit a sweet spot" (Development planning interviewee, 2016) for the developer and the City. This is because higher then 4 - 5 stories the developers says that because of having to install a lift the cost of the building will be higher and will thus be reflected in the rents, making them unaffordable to the poor. Any lower the buildings wouldn't have the desired densities that the City is looking for and they might not make any financial sense to the developer.
- urban design principles dictate that the height of 4 story walk ups the typologies are at a human scale creating more pleasant urban environments
- These typologies can have an economic component at the ground level so it's not only just a residential component like in back yard dwellings
- Assumption is they create a more equitable situation as they place more people (increase densities) in well located areas increasing access to city amenities and services.

For JOSHCO "these topologies cannot be seen in isolation as addressing the high housing demand. They should rather be seen as a critical contribution towards filling the demand with other housing strategies i.e. RDP housing, Bonded Housing etc." (JOSHCO interviewee, 2016)

This means for the City ideally formal high density development led by the formal private sector would populate the city landscape. There seems to be no place for non-conforming typologies when the vision of the city is painted like this.

Though this vision might see non-conforming typologies becoming obsolete, the reality of it is that these typologies will probably always be there if structural constraints that caused them in the first placed are not attended to.

4.4.2 Practicalities of governance

Another logic which seems to come out strongly from how the City understands the problem and affects their plans is this idea of 'practicalities of governance'. There are certain practicalities that officials have to deal with on a day to day basis in order to ensure the smooth governance of the city. These practicalities entail needing to be sustainable, needing to be able to bring processes into the light (i.e. formalise non-conforming typologies) so they can be managed and contribute financially.

The City stresses that going forward into the future it is important that the City is sustainable both from a spatial form perceptive and from a fiscal perspective. They chose typologies which are formal because they pay property tax and rates, which is the City's main source of income. The City is able to use that income to put in infrastructure, maintain infrastructure and implement other interventions. Officials see formal densification to be essential to the functioning of the City because it "balances out the books" and makes the City economically sustainable (Development planning interviewee, 2016).

It seems as though the City sees their relationship with the formal private sector with regards to practicalities of governance as a symbiotic relationship. The housing department interviewee (2016) describes this relationship as symbiotic because;

> "If the city creates a conducive and enabling environment for the formal private sector, they are able to do development which then means the City is able to get taxes and rates [source of income]. On the other hand it's beneficial to the formal private sector because the more services and amenities the City puts into an area like the BRT the more valuable their properties become".

Officials have characterised this relationship as a win-win situation because if the City creates a scenario where the entire area is improving, private owners get an increased valuation on their properties thus resulting in more rates for the City.

It does not seem as if non-conforming typologies are seen by the City to have visible benefits from a fiscal perspective. For instance informal Back yards, land or buildings that are squatted on and even RDP/ BNG do not contribute rates.

Looking at the logic of these practicalities of governance it's evident that non-conforming typologies that are mostly used by the urban poor do not make financial sense to the City. That is why the City is pushing to standardise and formalise these non-conforming

typologies in order to get them to contribute to the sustainability of the city and get them to function with the same rationalities that govern officials' thinking.

4.4.3 Understandings of Dignity and Appropriate living: "It's a fine line"

Ensuring dignified and appropriate living is a logic that underpins many of the different department's interventions.

For officials in the development planning department the concept of dignified and appropriate living is a very elusive and malleable term. Officials felt like there was a fine line between imposing your standards on how other people live their lives on the one hand, but on the other hand it is imperative that they protect people from undignified conditions and elevate them to a level that is seen as appropriate.

Engagements with officials within the development planning department show that the officials in this department may understand the complexities of appropriate and dignified living; but in reality their measurement of appropriate and dignified living usually translates to the department attempting to get shelters to comply with rigid standards and regulations.

City officials also seem to understand the 'dignified' or 'appropriate' living through the City's by-laws. The City has a huge set of by-laws that developments have to comply with, such as planning by-laws, health & safety by-laws, environmental by-laws and emergency services by-laws. The Consultant interviewee noted that these by-laws could be quite a complex terrain to navigate.

According to the consultant interviewee there might be some by-laws that are inappropriate because they deal with aesthetics/ or maybe form based codes which are over designed. According to the interviewee there are a lot of those inappropriate aesthetics/ form based codes by-laws but on the other hand they are basic health and safety by-laws and emergency services by-laws that cannot be compromised. The latter cannot easily be negotiated.

For the housing department, the issues of dignified and appropriate living are much clearer. For the department dignified and appropriate living is defined by UN and their guidelines/standards must be adhered too. A consulted expert suggested that this could be because the housing department has to actually deliver on tangible products unlike the planning department, and these products have technical requirements.

4.4.4 Lack of statistical information

Another reason which was flagged by interviewed researchers and consultants was that the City lacks statistical data on informality so the rationales of developed plans might be skewed from rationalities governing the lived realities because the plans do not have a complete picture of conditions on the ground. According to officials, the lack of statistical information on informality along the corridors greatly influences the kinds of developments that get proposed.

For officials the lack of statistical data results in the City receiving skewed information when they do try to analyse certain areas of the city as was the case in the ICHIP's research process. Officials explained that there was instances during the conducting of research for ICHIP were researchers would collect certain information which might get used to as the bases of plans/policies but only to find out later that actual conditions on the ground are very different from data collected. The interviewed official believed information gets skewed because people living in these non-conforming typologies do not want to be documented as they operate outside of the law.

The researcher and consultant interviewees felt that the City does not investigate or capture ground conditions sufficiently enough; and then it plans in the absence of good data which is a big problem. Both the interviewees were of the view that planning in the absence of good data is an Achilles heel of some of the City's plans. The City is basically trying to solve a housing problem without actually fully understanding the nature of the problem first.

The consultant interview also flagged the "biggest problem that the Johannesburg City council has is data" (consultant interviewee, 2016). This is a real problem. It is a problem that is said to be evident in the issue of 'bad buildings'; the City does not know how many they are, where they are, or even who lives in them.

For the consultant (2016), planning without data breeds a situation where the basic assumptions are not adequately informed. For the consultant the adequate evidence of how the City should proceed from where they are now to where they want to be is missing in some of the City's strategies. The City needs to thoroughly understand the nature of demand, understand the users and understand local contexts which these plans get filtered through.

4.5 Analysis

The first part of this chapter focused on presenting the key findings from the data collected. There are interesting points that came out of the findings which will be analysed in this second part of the chapter. The analysis is arranged into several themes. For each theme the document analyses the key points through the lens of the literature collected in chapter 2; in order to explain the story that is coming out of the findings.

The following themes were looked at: conflicting rationalities (Watson, 2009); corridors as a gentrification process; Change of tone on informality? ; Institutional differences (Scott, 1998); interrogating standards (Robinson, 2006); and looking at 'the missing bottom'.

4.5.1 Conflict of rationalities

A theme that ran throughout the literature and which also came out strongly from the findings is that there is a conflict in rationalities between the 'practicalities of governance' for the state and the 'practicalities of survival' for low income residents (Watson, 2009). As discussed in the literature chapter, Watson (2009) argues that in most cities in the global south there exists a conflict in rationality; for Watson (2009) this conflict is a result of a clash between the rationality to govern which informs how government functions, administrates and approaches interventions on one hand, with the rationality to survive and accumulate in precarious conditions by the marginalised populace (Watson 2009).

This conflict that is described by Watson (2009) is evident in the City of Johannesburg's plans to provide low income housing along the CoF. The issue is that from the City's point of view they have to go for formal, private sector led, market-based developments due to the benefits which this kind of development accrues for them (section 4.4.1. for more detail). As can be seen from the findings the City adamantly defends their logic because in their eyes this is the only kind of development that makes sense going into the future and it's the type of developments which they want to populate the city's landscape with. There would be absolutely nothing 'wrong' with this approach and rationality if the majority of the population are employed, and thus had disposable income to afford to live in these formal developments. But in light of the structural constraints that are experienced by the low income residents of Johannesburg there is a clash in rationalities.

Low income residents operate with a different rationality; unlike the City their rationalities are not based on long term visions of the future rather their focused on trying to negotiate their immediate precarious circumstances (Mayson and Charlton, 2013). A big part of negotiating their precarious livelihoods entails finding well located and 'affordable' accommodation in the

City. To put affordable accommodation in perspective in the city of Johannesburg would mean the following. 51% of the city's population earns R3500 per month and less; using the affordability calculation (which states 30% of monthly income must go to housing needs) then ideally 51% of the population can only afford rents of R1050 per month and below. While the formal private sector which is favoured by the city's practicalities of governance can only go to a rental price of R1500 per month. Thus what is 'best' for the City and what works for the poor are at odds with one another; herein lays the conflict. For Kanbur (2007) this breeds a situation where the poor are structurally excluded from the processes of formality.

The City's attempt to formalise back yard dwellings so they can be brought into the fold of formal process is one good example of conflicting rationalities in low income housing in the CoF. From the City's point of view they want to standardise and formalise the informal typologies so that they can be administrated and be part of formal processes like contributing rates and taxes. But according to Scott (1998) when a state attempts to formalise the informal, they have to make complex societal realities easier to administer, so they simplifying these complex societal realties. This simplification more often than not has unintended consequences (1998). Although Scott (1998) also says that these simplifications are not a malicious attempt on the state's part, to suppress the local energies of the populace but can be viewed as a by-product of the states' need to make generalisations and reductions in order to manage a large civil population (Scott, 1998).

In the process of the City trying to find a standardised form that complies with regulations and standards for back yard dwellings (what Scott (1998) would call attempts to tame and manage society); there have been unintended negative consequences for the owners and users of back yard dwellings. This standard form which the City wants backyard dwellings to comply with was found to be expensive for the owners and eventually the users. It is expensive for the owners of the property because they now have to build to a certain standard which is expensive for them even with innovative thinking around materials. These additional costs to the owner will be reflected in an increase in the rental, making this housing option less affordable for users.

It might make sense from the City's perspective to find a standard form across all back yards but it's in conflict with the rationality of the poor who are using the typology because they are an affordable option. Forcing the only typologies that can go down to a rental range which is deemed affordable by low income residents without offering a viable alternative will cause an

increase in demand while decreasing the supply for the market segment; resulting in negative effect for the marginalised.

The City's need for formalisation, standardisation is at odds with the people's need for very cheap low income housing to survive. If the City were to provide the people with a better option that was at the same price or little bit higher than backyards dwellings then that would be a start but just imposing standards that make it difficult for people to access affordable housing is counterproductive. This is not to say the City must do away with the standards because they are said to be crucial with regards to safety and health hazards to people. Although it can be argued that by the City recognising and engaging with informality it has resulted in the potential decrease in the access to low income housing along the CoF. That's a problem the City must be wary about.

For Acemoglu & Robinson (2014) the process of trying to tame society and make it more 'legible' for the state, creates gross simplifications of the complex realities that are actually evident on the ground. As much as this has shown to be the case along the CoF it would be an unfair assessment of the City to conclude, as Watson (2009) would argue, that this is because of the City's pursuit of a particular form of urban modernity and adopting inappropriate urban practices which originates from a global north context (Simone 2002; Watson 2009).

The findings show that the City of Johannesburg is actually thinking about the realities that are present in the city and is just not blindly transferring ideas and images of modernity from western contexts. The change in tone towards informality that was highlighted in the findings section points to the fact that the City is acknowledging alternative modernities. They aren't simply transferring foreign understandings of modernity but they are also filtering these understandings through lived realities in the city. It is reasonable to say that the City is not completely detached from the lived experiences of people but the findings shows that the City is not completely free of the argument that they hold understandings of development that have detrimental effects on the lives of the marginalised (discussion on this will be expanded in section 4.5.2).

In reflection, the literature at times paints a dire picture for the planning of the city. The aim to render the city governable at times has detrimental effects to the lives of the marginalised. Officials' levels of understanding of factors at play in the issue of low income housing along the CoF marginally debunk that view. Although understanding and recognition is only the first battle, what will be of importance to low income residents in need of affordable accommodation is action.

The City seems to resign to the thinking that 'practicalities of governance' is just how the world works. Meaning the city seems to be working within determined frameworks, without thinking radically much. Others might view working within determined frameworks as the City working in a practical manner. I would argue that the state needs to adopt a more radical perspective especially in the conceptualisation of interventions to ensuring low income housing along the CoF. The City leaves room for the argument that they are not doing enough to solve the issues of low income housing along the CoF. Are there plans that are pushing the boundaries or is the City content with being conservative, even though it might not be working for the poor. But if they were to push the boundaries, what would that look like? Maybe the answers lie in the strength of both the incentives and disincentives that they provide, and maybe even in a change of their policy (changing the land policy for example).

According to Harrison (2006) going forward "for policy-makers and planners in Johannesburg, the key question is how to relate to the designs and rationalities of the private sector as well as the often-hidden designs and rationalities of ordinary people trying to survive and live meaningful lives" (Harrison, 2006: 331).

4.5.2 Urban theories and visions of well-functioning and efficient cities

What is evident from the findings is that one of the main reasons why the CoJ picks/favours certain types of developments or interventions over others is because of the vision that they have for the CoF. This vision is informed by substantive theories of urban form that detail how cities should function, such as theories of smart city growth, high densities around transit nodes and mixed use medium-high rise developments. Conceptually there is nothing inherently wrong with these urban theories; the problem comes when the City uses these theories to justify interventions that will have detrimental effects on the low income residents of the city.

For Watson (2009) these substantive theories of urban form fail to connect with the survival strategies of poor households which often require spatial mobility and may be seriously constrained by the spatial fix desired by planners (Harrison, 2006). Thus urban forms based on these theories only make sense for the poor if they are specifically designed to work with the rationalities that govern the lives of the poor.

Right now the City measures the appropriateness of chosen typologies based on their visions and ambitions for the future instead of current ground conditions. Even in the face of the argument that 'these proposed typologies and plans to develop low income housing along the CoF, do not sufficiently take into account the local context and status quo of some

of these neighbourhoods that these plans are being designed for'; the City still remains resolute that a fundamental change of these areas is imperative if they are to achieve the kind of form that these urban theories dictate will create desirable urban functionality.

In its pursuit of the vision, the City is looking at the long term but the poor that live in a situation of uncertainty have to deal with the problems of today not of the projected future. This calls for the City to look at the current conditions in place because their proposed plans will have to confront local dynamics and actors. Even though the urban form the City aims for has been seen in other cities in the world to produce efficient urban systems (Cervero, 2013) the City should not plan with a clean slate just because it sees the ends to justify the means. Glossing over the nuances and complexities that are at play in localities will have negative consequences on the lived realities of the marginalised in the areas they plan for.

It can be argued that by the state recognising themselves as the drivers of positive transformation and the custodians of development means they would find themselves ill-equipped when their understanding of development is actually producing negative effects on the people they are trying to create a positive change for.

Questions do arise in terms of what happens if the private sector does not want to develop down the corridors because that is not where the market is? And what's plan B or plan C if the City can't achieve the ideal model of 4 story walk ups and flats? Is the City thinking of an alternative model?

Going forward this means that City officials have to start thinking about the corridors as different individual neighbourhoods rather than strips because the local context of each neighbourhood along the corridor will inform questions on the needs for housing, inform peoples' responses and will thus frame the 'best' way to deal with low income housing in that neighbourhood. If the City does not understand the individual neighbourhood characteristics then it is more than likely going to be a disjuncture between the interventions envisioned and what works for the marginalised in that area.

4.5.3 The Corridors of Exclusion

The literature shows that transit orientated development when left unchecked theoretically can result in increased property prices around transit nodes and along routes, and that increase in property prices usually means a change in the socio economic profile of the people that are able to afford to live in those properties. This has already happened in Johannesburg where the state has put in infrastructure and the market has gone wild around

that infrastructure as seen in the rise in property values in Rosebank and Sandton around Gautrain stations.

What you see from the literature (Cervero 2013; Pindus et al, 2012; Wilkson 2006) is that gentrification is a major danger to any public investment into transit oriented development. The City recognises this risk of the corridors, with one official summing up the potential threat by saying that “one major threat that could result from the corridors is if they become the corridors of exclusion” (development planning interviewee, 2016). This recognition is shown in how the City understands itself as the benevolent state which protects and champions the needs of the marginalised. The state says its benevolent nature is evident in the kind of developments which they are packaging along the CoF for low income housing. The City though has to balance its duties of being the benevolent state in conjunction with its other role which entail trying to incentive market-based, private sector led development within the corridors.

The way the City tries to package low income housing development along the CoF tries to protect against the potential gentrification along the corridors. Their current approach might be enough to provide accommodation that can be accessed by those in the upper portions of the R0 – R3500 income bracket. But the CoF plan will fail at true integration because it does not accommodate those in the lower portions of the low income strata. If the CoF are to truly be inclusive and not become the corridors of exclusion the provision of affordable housing should be in line with population’s income distribution.

For instance, though 51% of the city’s population earn R3500 and less per month, they are spread differently throughout that income stratum. 25% of that 51% earn between R0 - R1730 per month, 15% of that 51% earn between R1730 - R2460 per month and only 10% of that 51% earn a monthly income of between R2460 – R3500. A proportional distribution of rentals using the affordability rule (all housing costs must be a maximum of 30% of monthly income), rental distribution would ideally look like the following: rentals of R0- R525 for 25% of the population; R525 - R746 for 15% of the population; and R746 – R1062 for 10% of the population. So the City should be aiming at this kind of distribution in the provision of affordable housing in the CoF if it is to provide an equitable housing distribution across the corridors.

The strong political will to plan for the poor and powerful political power behind the project is there, but the understanding of the problem and intent does not translate well into the plans that the City develops. The intent gets diluted through the regulations and laws that the City

has to abide to; and all of the other things that are involved in the practicalities of governance.

The strong political will and power that is behind the project is a strong point for the CoF but an overreliance on the market approach will only get the project so far; if the City is to truly create integrated spatial forms in South African cities. What the City currently has planned is not sufficient. The question then lies in how the City can push down the rentals to a level where they are truly incumbent of the income distribution that's evident in the city. What investment value can truly be captured and reflect this?

4.5.4 Change of tone on informality?

The argument that comes out the literature is that states aspire to a certain look of modernity or development that has been based on external contexts. Officials confirmed that this is how it used to happen in Johannesburg in the past. Now though, as outlined previously in this section, officials are starting to consider alternative modernities, even if though the officials hold a narrow view of what constitutes 'alternative'.

Officials' views on alternative modernities are seen to be narrow because all current engagement with alternative typologies for densification has focused exclusively at backyard dwellings. None of the plans presented by the City make an attempt to deal with sub divided flats and houses in neighbourhoods along the corridors, although these typologies are looked at it in the inner city by the ICHIP document. This is a component which I think is missing in the City's plans and conceptualisation of low income housing along the CoF since the significant role these typologies play in the livelihoods of many of Johannesburg's residents has been flagged in the literature (Mayson & Charlton, 2013).

Granted, sub divided flats and houses in most areas in the CoF are a small percentage of the available housing stock which might explain the limited focus by the City on them. However they are an important micro practice for low income residents especially in inner city neighbourhoods like Rosettenville, Turffontein, Yeoville, Berea, etc. The City has to start developing plans specifically for these non-conforming typologies. If the City does not understand why these typologies manifest, who uses them? Why do people use them? then it could result in these non-conforming typologies manifesting within the formal developments the City desires along the corridors.

4.5.5 Interrogating the standards

In the findings you see that the state strongly feels its role is to ensure the development of the city to the desired vision. The literature shows that the state at times sees itself to have

the ability or legitimacy to be able to bring about a positive transformation of society through state-led developments. This is not necessarily a bad thing, what is an issue for non-conforming housing responses is when these housing responses are deemed to be inappropriate because they do not fit into what states think development or positive transformation should look like (Robinson, 2006).

Generally the question of how the transformation should look like physically translates itself to the kind of developments that get built. The developments are guided by set standards and regulation which are set by the City that set parameters for function and form. The consultant interviewee (2016) argues that there has to be a serious engagement with some of the by-laws/standards that determine function and form. This is crucial especially when dealing with non-conforming typologies like spaces that are being subdivided by curtains or dry walls in Hillbrow or Berea. The City must start thinking about how they could allow some of these spaces which work for people as Mayson and Charlton (2013) argue, to continue to do so while not ignoring vital issues of health and safety.

An interviewee described by-laws as a difficult terrain to get into because there are by-laws which are petty and there are by-laws which are fundamental. And the City has not interrogated the scope of by-laws effectively so as to determine which is which. I found out that this question has been previously posed by consultants to the City in the development of the ICHIP but this did not result in a candid review of the by-laws so not much change happened. The City is not providing a simple set of core by-laws that must be followed in the development of housing. Instead by-laws sit in different departments making it an onerous task to work out which by-law might be affected by an innovative redesign of low income housing. At the same time by-laws regarding fire should be dealt with by the fire department. The core by-laws should be focused on issues of basic health and safety rather than aesthetics.

If the City is not careful with over designed standards and norms it might experience the effects of state-led transformations that are driven by high modernism that commonly result in unintended and negative consequences to the most vulnerable of the population (Scott, 1998).

4.5.6 The missing bottom

The lack of a permanent option for those earning below R3500 per month seems to be the crux of the problem within the CoF plan in terms of low income housing. I refer to this lack of a concrete solution for the low income group as ‘the missing bottom’.

Tissington (2013) found that there was a gap between the formal supply of low income housing in the city of Johannesburg and the great demand for low income housing. Tissington (2013) found, like this research did, that this gap exists because the formal private sector supply does not go down market enough to a level which is affordable for low income residents in the city. Tissington (2013) concludes her research that “It is clear that there are no permanent housing options available to those earning below R3 200 per month” in the city of Johannesburg.

In this research it was found that the City might be conscious of the issues of low income housing but it does not seem that they have a coherent plan for housing for people that earn R3500 and below, which is where the biggest demand for affordable housing is. The city officials themselves echo this sentiment. One interviewed City official believed that the City’s biggest dilemma in the provision of low income housing along the CoF is trying to find a product that can be provided by the formal market; a product which is safe, dignified and adequate; a product that contributes to the City financially; and most importantly is affordable to the bottom end of the market (planning interviewee, 2016). This may be the ideal situation but it is extremely difficult to achieve.

The problem is that 50% of Johannesburg’s population falls into the category of purely subsidised government housing (Tissington, 2013) and the delivery of this housing product is not focused on the Corridors of Freedom for now. So getting an integrated mix in the corridors will be very difficult for the City.

This holds serious questions regarding the development planning department’s plans to favour the formal private sector in providing housing for the low income housing market segment. The development planning department could see the supply of housing to this market segment as a function of the housing department. Or alternatively, non-conforming typologies will be able to continue to provide for this income bracket if they meet standardisation requirements. The City will have to choose if the formal private sectors are the ones that will provide for this market segment or will the City itself provide the accommodation; this is a very crucial question because the answer to this question will determine where resources and effort is focused going forward. If the City picks the route of supplying this market segment themselves it will be important to note that the City should not crowd out developers that are interested in developing for that market segment.

In response to the major issues of the missing bottom the City has looked at trying to focus RDP/BNG housing development as infill developments along the CoF. This plan is still in the conceptual phase meaning there are no interventions currently in motion. This plan will be

important in ensuring an integrated mix within the corridor as it will allow for very low income residents to be able to access housing in well located areas around the city. Addition of this product to the CoF housing stock will be a more honest reflection of the income distribution within the population. As a development planning interviewee said

> "Ideally 50% of all housing delivered in the CoF should be R3500 and below". If those earning R3500 and below are not included there is a high risk of producing gentrified communities" (development planning interviewee, 2016).

4.6 Conclusion

This chapter discussed the key findings from the data collected. The chapter grouped the findings into three broad headings, the first heading was about simply identifying city officials' view on non-conforming typologies and low income housing needs and responses in the CoF, the second broad heading looked at what plans and proposals has the City developed for low income housing along the CoF to give us a sense of exactly how the city is planning on tackling low income housing along the CoF. The last broad heading aimed to probe why the City thinks the way it does about the needs and responses of low income housing.

The chapter then goes on to analyse the findings using the themes and concepts that were discussed in the literature chapter as a lens through which we view the findings and start to makes sense of the story that is coming out of the findings. From the analysis discussed certain conclusions can now start to be drawn which inform the recommendations. This will be tackled in the following chapter 5.

Chapter five: Recommendations and conclusions

5.1 Introduction

As was stated in the beginning of this document, this research set out to explore city officials' views on low income housing needs and responses along the CoF. A major part of the investigation entailed uncovering the City's planned and proposed interventions for low income housing along the CoF and probing officials views on low income housing in order to understand the reasoning that guides them.

Rich amounts of data have been collected in this endeavour. The kind of information that was drawn from officials' views made it harder to make definitive conclusions and recommendations because they dispelled many of my preconceived assumption about the City's inability to understand what is really going on the ground in the City. But they (officials' views) also reinforced arguments about how the City does not sufficiently engage with the lived realities of the marginalised. No simple conclusion can be drawn from the data collected; the findings and analysis show that there are contradictions and/or conflicts evident.

The first purpose of this chapter is to circle back to the research question and sub questions and then try to use the rich amounts of data collected to answer the initially posed questions. The aim here is to try and answer these questions as holistically and concisely as possible but due to the highlighted conflicts, rejection of some assumptions, entrenching of assumptions, this may prove to be a difficult task. The second thrust of the chapter is to suggest possible recommendations that could make the corridors function 'better'.

5.2 Research question and sub questions

This section of the chapter aims to consolidate all the key points discussed in the findings and analysis chapter in order to answer the initially posed research question and research sub questions. The section will look at the different sub questions individually first, then use what comes out of those discussions to answer the main research question.

5.2.1. 'How do City officials see existing low income housing issues and needs along the Corridors of Freedom'?

The first sub question was interested in uncovering how city officials see existing low income housing issues and needs along the CoF. The research has shown that it is impossible to aggregate the views of all officials in order tell a single narrative without leaving out nuances in the views and the small but significant differences that exist. So it would thus be incorrect

to say that all the interviewed officials held similar views and understanding of low income housing needs and responses along the CoF.

Though, officials all seemed to agree that the issue of 'insufficient supply of affordable well-located low income housing' needed to be a high priority in the plans that the City develops so to make the city more inclusive and integrated. You can see this line of thinking in the states benevolent nature and the pro-poor orientation of the plans it is developing along the corridors. Even though the effectiveness of the City's 'pro-poor' orientation is questionable as current plans are not inclusive of a large majority of the urban population ('the missing bottom').

Through exploring officials' views, it was evident that officials believed that the need for low income housing in Johannesburg was real, and it was playing a crucial role in how people access and experience the city. Officials realise low income housing needs and their responses play a significant role in the lives of the urban poor in Johannesburg and if not engaged with 'properly', could result in the CoF plan becoming the Corridors of Exclusion.

I have argued in subsequent chapters that recognising the importance of low income housing need and responses has not manifested into concrete plans for the urban poor. Officials still favour formal private sector-led, market based approach to developing these medium-high density formal developments along the corridors. Officials favour this approach even though in light of prevalent structural issues in the city (lack of disposable income, high unemployment, majority of residents earning R3500 and below p/m, monthly in migration and the formal private sector developments unwilling/unable to go down to an affordable price point).

If the City is going to stick with the formal private sector-led approach to supplying affordable housing along the corridors they need to simultaneously to tackle the financial constraints in the city i.e. lack of employment and lack of disposable income. Or they must find a way to get the formal private sector to provide a much lower rental price for the urban poor in well located areas in the city. For there to be a significant positive transformation there will probably be a mixture of both, as one will be less effective without advancements in the other.

Without a sincere effect to break down these structural constraints that hinder the CoF plan, officials' ambitions of creating a re-stitched, re-imagined and inclusive city that address the spatial imbalances of the past will remain a vision and will never be realised.

What is also evident from the research is that views on low income housing responses have become more lenient/ understanding. Officials' views differed by how much value (importance to the functioning of the city) officials placed on certain low income housing responses.

The City is starting to open up to non-conforming housing responses along the CoF and other areas of the city. Views towards these non-conforming responses were more tolerant than was previously anticipated just from reading the literature.

The City now sees they need to work with non-conforming responses rather than reject them because these typologies are the norm in several areas rather than the exception. These non-conforming typologies allow for low income residents to access well-located affordable housing. This new acceptance would seem like as a positive aspect for people using these non-conforming typologies but as the research has shown this is not necessary true because the city still requires then to comply with stringent regulations and standards in order for them to be accepted.

Though officials identified these non-conforming typologies as a fundamental component in the city's housing market they are only recognising/ engaging with back yard dwellings. Subdivided flats and multiple occupancy houses are not being considered in the City's plans. From the different non-conforming typologies that this research was interested in only back yard dwellings were seen by officials as an alternative form of densification along the CoF. Subdivided flats and multiple occupancy houses are currently being ignored by the City even though literature on these non-conforming typologies has shown that they have several advantages to residents that make use of them (Mayson & Charlton, 2013).

5.2.2. Which perspectives frame official's reasoning towards existing and often non-conforming low income housing typologies?

The second research's sub question was interested in finding out which perspectives frame officials' reasoning towards existing and often non-conforming low income housing typologies. What the research found is that they were several perspectives and reasons framing officials views such as the 'practicalities of governance', lack of statistical information, ideas of dignified and appropriate living, but officials robust vision and ambitions held for the CoF seemed to be a reasoning that ran throughout most views.

Each individual reason will not be extensively examined again as they already have been in the Findings chapter (chapter 4), this section will rather touch upon on those perspective

which were seen to be a recurring themes throughout all the interviewed officials and documents analyzed.

Officials count back from their desired future and argue that in order to achieve that desired future the current landscape of the city would need to change drastically. These robust ambitions and visions of the future are instilled into how officials assess which developments to favour. The visions and ambitions become the reference point which officials use to assess the appropriateness of low income housing responses along the CoF. The City then argues that these non-conforming typologies are not appropriate for the development of the city as they don't deliver the functional requirements needed to make their ambitions and visions a reality.

Another perspective that influences how officials view issues of non –conforming typologies along the CoF are the 'practicalities of urban, governance'. As has been explained in the research practicalities of urban governance are the realities, facts and necessary day-to-day operational requirements which need to be tackled in order to ensure the continued smooth functioning of the City. Non-conforming typologies are then not appealing to the City because they operate with a conflicting rationality to these urban governance practicalities.

Another reason guiding officials' views on low income housing along the CoF which was flagged by interviewed researchers and consultants was the lack of statistical data on informality. Since informality is notoriously difficult to document and administrate the City might understate/overstate the issue creating plans with a lack of good data; thus not completely representing conditions on the ground.

Ensuring dignified and appropriate living is a strong guiding perspective in how the City views non-conforming housing typologies along the CoF. Officials themselves are not sure of the exact way to define these concepts and recognise the problematic nature of trying to enforce one's own understanding of appropriate living on others (who might have different lived realities to your own). Even with this uncertainty in the definition dignified and appropriate living is still defined using rigid standards and regulations. Non-conforming typologies are rejected by officials as a feasible typology alternative on the bases that they do not produce 'appropriate' or 'dignified living'.

At the same time the dire living conditions which are harmful to people's lives must not be romanticised. All officials agree that non-conforming typologies with slum like conditions have no room in the city's future. This does not mean there needs not be a discussion of how dignified and appropriate living is measured and delivered in the city. Key respondents

outside the City felt that because by-laws are the how the City enforces its understanding of dignified and appropriate living but their understandings of these concepts ill-defined there needs to be a sincere conversation about which by-laws could be changed. Especially in terms of low income housing design by the formal private sector.

What was also evident from the research is that officials also viewed issues of non-conforming typologies through their respective departmental mandates. Their departments approach to dealing with non-conforming typologies greatly influences how officials view issues of non-conforming typologies along the CoF. The views differed even more depending on the locality an official works in. Localities which officials are assigned influence how their views because its frames an official's understanding of how big of an issue low income housing is and the prevalence of non-conforming typologies.

5.2.3 What influences which kinds of typologies should be supported along the Corridors of Freedom.

The factors that influence which kinds of typologies that should be supported along the CoF have been touched up on in the above sections. The factors that influence which developments get supported and which do not is a combination of the reasons officials gave for supporting formal private sector led development and reasons for rejecting informality. To summarise, the reasons were practicalities considerations; vision and ambition of a transformed future urban form; quality of living conditions; compliance with strict standards and regulations; based on substantive theories on functioning of the city, etc.

These factors are the bases on which officials substantiate their arguments for choosing certain housing typologies.

Looking at the factors that were identified by official in favouring certain typologies seem to dispel the well documented argument that officials support inappropriate developments in their attempt at chasing an image of modernity that is based on alien experiences (i.e. western experiences).

For the City, their reasoning is clear as day as it is based on both practical considerations such as the fiscal sustainability of the City (balancing income from property taxes and rates with expenditure on developments and maintenance) and future fitting (introducing developments that will assist in realising the desired urban form). But the research has shown that it is not a clear cut situation. The City does not appreciate the magnitude of the issues of low income housing and a does not effectively deal with the structural constraints

at play in the City. Some of these practical considerations, which the City believes to be self-evident, are the very reasons that plans are not able to accommodate the urban poor.

5.2.4. How do city officials conceptualise low income housing and what new housing plans/ proposals are officials suggesting?

The third sub-question posed in the research aimed to find out **'**How do city officials conceptualise low income housing along the corridors of freedom' which entailed finding what new housing plans/ proposals are officials suggesting. The City conceptualises low income housing along the CoF to take the form of medium- high density typologies (i.e. 4 story walk-ups and flats), developed by the formal private sector for the market.

This favouring of the formal private sector led, market-based approach to the provision of low income housing along the corridors can be seen in the types of interventions the City is investing its money in and in the kinds of incentives that the City is packaging along the corridors.

The planning department have developed incentives like tax rebates, increased land rights within the CoF, Special Development Zones (SDZ) to make developing in the corridors easier and more appealing for formal for developers. The planning department's Land Acquisition Strategy is releasing land to JOSHCO and private developers so that they develop 'affordable' housing along the corridors. The planning department is also now accepting back yard dwellings as an alternative form densification can take by attempting to find a standardised form which all back yard dwellings would need to conform to. Though this form of densification is only envisioned for the transitional densification of the city, and does not fit into the end-state vision for the corridors.

The housing department is packaging low income housing developments by paying for all the bulk services and doing all the required studies so that formal developers can take those savings and augment the department's products so it is produced right next to bonded houses. The housing department is also trying to ensure the access of low income housing along the corridors by providing emergency transitional housing along the corridors and by also looking into densifying the housing stock they currently own along the corridors through infill developments.

JOSHCO on the other hand has committed to developing the majority of its new developments along the CoF.

What you seen from these planned interventions is that the City is envisioning formally built, medium to high density developments that cater for a more diverse incomes rather than just for the poor, as how low income housing will be provided along the CoF.

There are some interesting plans for low income housing along the CoF that are still in the pipeline which have the potential to have significant effect on ensuring inclusivity in the CoF and increasing the supply of well-located affordable housing in Johannesburg. These proposed plans are, developing RDP/BNG houses as infill development in CoF areas and the second one is ensuring inclusionary housing in all residential developments in Johannesburg.

The City has developed different plans and strategies to tackle the issues of low income housing needs and responses within the CoF at different fronts. What is worrying about the plans that are currently implemented is that none of them effectively deals with the 'missing bottom' which constitutes a large percentage of the low income housing demand in the city. The plans show that the role of non-conforming typologies in the development of the city is still not recognised by officials even though they able to get to a price point which formal developments cannot.

5.2.5. How do these proposals relate to the status quo?

This criticism of detachment placed on most plans developed by the City seemed to hold true when looking at the plans and proposals for the CoF. Most of the plans (especially the SAFs) seem to be proposing developments and typologies which are fundamentally different to the current status quo in some of the areas along the CoF; thus they fail to truly reflect the current conditions on the ground. Though the City defends the 'supposed' detachment of their proposals by arguing that if they are to achieve the desired form and accommodate the future projected population then there needs to be a fundamental change in the status quo.

As can be seen in the research most of the City's plans are based on projections of future demographical change and ambitions of a more functional urban form. Officials calculated the city's future population size and then retrofitted it into well located areas in the city (like the CoF). Their conclusion was that if the city was going to accommodate this projected increase in demand it would need to get higher densities in these well located areas. The City interpreted higher densities to mean your 4-5 story walk-ups and flats along the CoF.

Officials anticipate that this fundamental change in the status quo will have positive effects on the functioning of the city and on low income resident's ability to access and experience

the city. The anticipated positive change is not necessary the issue. The issue arises when low income residents, who depend on these non-conforming typologies, are not accommodated in the plans that get developed to achieve this positive change. Then who is this fundamental change in housing typologies meant for if the majority of the city's residents won't be able to afford to live in these envisioned formal developments; who is the future city then meant for?

Though not all current plans and proposals are detached from the status quo in those areas some take into consideration existing conditions. The formalisation of back yard dwellings, Transitional housing and the Housing departments proposed densification of existing housing stock are examples of current plans that were observed to be engaging with the existing ground conditions in the research.

5.3 Conclusions

In conclusion, from the above answers a picture of how officials in the City of Johannesburg are conceptualising low income housing along the Corridors of Freedom starts to emerge.

What is evident is that officials are recognizing the need and significance for low income housing along the CoF. There are a couple of plans and interventions in place along the corridors to increase the supply of 'appropriate' well-located 'affordable' housing. These plans couple with responses received from interviews conducted gave the impression that the City had a genuine interest in increasing access to well-located 'affordable' housing, and improving the quality of people's lives in the city. But what was equally as evident is the fact that there are some major structural problems that the City has to overcome in order to ensure people can access well-located 'affordable' housing along the CoF and herein lays the problem.

As has been mentioned above officials are currently conceptualising low income housing along the CoF to take the form of medium-high density typologies (i.e. 4 story walk-ups and flats), developed by the formal private sector for the market. This typology comes with many benefits for the City and formal private sector developers but at times it impedes the livelihood strategies of low income residents.

The City should start interrogating if this conceptualisation of low income housing is really the most appropriate typology to solve low income housing issues in Johannesburg; this means taking into consideration endogenous factors present in each distinct neighbourhood, major constraining issues, and aspirations of the people they are planning for.

The interviews have shown that there are major structural constraints which cannot be overcome overnight. Though if the City does not genuinely engage with these constraints the plans and interventions currently in place will only benefit a limited few of low income residents. Essentially Johannesburg's future looking plans (i.e. CoF) will still not cater for low income residents even though low income residents make up the majority of the city's population.

The document concludes that the plans that are being conceptualised for low income housing along the CoF are not sufficient to ensure that the re-stitched and equal city which is being envisioned by city officials will become a reality. These plans may go a long way in making the city function more efficiently but might not necessarily make it more integrated.

Though, it is difficult to start recommending solutions for the CoF and assessing plans & interventions because a lot of the incentives and plans have only just been introduced. Most of the plans and interventions have either just been implemented, are being tested, or are still being developed. As the CoF are a long term spatial restructuring goal it is hard to judge current mechanisms will deliver the desired urban landscape. But my preliminary evaluation of the current mechanisms in place to ensure the provision of low income housing along the CoF concludes that these mechanisms are simply not enough to help the urban poor access these envisioned formal private sector built low income housing developments along the CoF.

There are still many uncertainties with the CoF as they are based on projected densification, projected uptake from the formal private sector, and anticipated behaviour changes in transportation. A big reality is that the City's envisioned outcomes might not be possible causing all these mass investments in infrastructure to be underutilised. In order to try and protect against this the City has to see the corridors as individual neighbourhoods and focus research into these specific neighbourhoods along the corridors in order to under which mixture of incentives, disincentives, plans and interventions will produce their desired outcomes in each of these neighbourhoods.

The above described approach to conceptualising low income housing along the CoF will be more time consuming, require more resources, might stretch the capacity of the City and probably will require the City to tweak their grand visions for the corridors in order to adapt to what their investigations find. But the City should not shy away from this task. They need to break away from working within the framework set by the practicalities of governance and start pushing the envelope so as to achieve true **inclusive** positive **transformation**.

5.4. Recommendations

Though, it is difficult to start recommending solutions for the CoF and assessing plans & intervention because a lot of the interventions/plans have only just been introduced. What is certain though is that the City needs to develop incentives and disincentives that will produce exactly what they need, which the current ones are not. The City needs the formal private sector to develop medium-high density typologies (i.e. 4 story walk-ups and flats) for the market; they also need to ensure the increase in supply of well-located affordable housing. In order for there to be integration within the city the City needs the affordable housing to be at a lower rental level then is currently being supplied so as low income residents can afford it. All incentives and disincentives developed and all investments into the corridors sole aim should be to deliver on this objective.

If the City aims to bring more formal private sector developers into the affordable housing space they have to develop incentives that will lower the risks for formal private developers, and create more demand side incentives. The following recommendations should be considered by the City if they are to increase their chances of creating a truly inclusive CoF project.

- Before any incentives or disincentives can be developed, the City needs to partake on an area based analysis of the different neighbourhoods that make up the corridors so as to understand the different local contexts, improve their data, and then ultimately determine which mixture of incentives and disincentives are best suited for each neighbourhood. These area based analyses would build the City's statistical data records on each individual area so they cannot be accused of planning in the absence of good data. The City must think about the context-specific factors at play in each of these neighbourhoods. This is because the demand for low income housing or housing in general will be different in each locality and certain types of developers choose some localities over others.
- In order for the City to effectively cater for this low income market referred to in this research (R3 500 and below) they have to develop a subsidy for formal private sector developers to actually offer such low rentals. The consultant interviewee (2016) explains that "Currently the private sector is providing accommodation that at a minimum is around R1700 –R1800 and to get them down below a level of R1000 per month you would have to subsidise them". This subsidy could take the form of a capital subsidy or operational subsidy. It is important to get developers to go downmarket into a level that

they are currently unable to provide for because their returns are not market related so you need to provide the returns in the form of a subsidy.

- The City needs to start developing disincentives to force the formal private sector to develop along the corridors. Currently the City doesn't have any disincentives in place that push people into the corridors which is why developers are still building in the outskirts of the city were land is cheap.
- The City needs to start developing incentives that are focused on the demand side instead of focusing all their energy on supply side incentives. An example of a demand side approach would be the City packaging development finance for small scale players who will develop affordable housing (according to the City's specifications) along the CoF. The City could partner with companies such as TUHF even though TUHF normally deals with the inner city; TUHF processes and approach to providing finance to small scale developers might fit the corridors well.

The following are recommendations for further studies to be conducted by the City that will help the City achieve its vision of creating a more equitable environment.

- It's been said that the City currently is planning with a lack of statistical data on informality. The City should aim to document and understand the nature of informality in different segments of the CoF. This proposed study should be focused on non-conforming low income housing typologies for the purpose of this study. This study could be incorporated into the area based analysis recommended above.
- Much more work needs to go into understanding how informal typologies are currently managed and how formal processes can emulate the positive aspects of these informal management arrangements (a complimentary study channeling the work of Mayson & Charlton, 2013 is suggested). Though it's recognized that an adaption in formal processes to include or imitate informal processes will require serious motivation at a political level.
- What is critical for the CoF is understanding the nature of 'demand' for low income housing in the corridors. Do people need a minimum of 12 square metres for a room or is there space to experiment with smaller rooms arrangements depending on the need. The City can use a participative design process where residents of low income housing collaborate and collectively contribute to determining room requirements. An important part of this process though would be to make sure that the people understand how much each chosen design will cost. Developers should be a part of

this process as they would provide valuable input on how much each of the chosen designs would cost to develop and renting out.

From the results of this participatory design process there can be an earnest discussion on which housing design standards could be altered in order to better reflect how low income residents use space. The above proposed process will help the City identify which are the core design standards and which standards might be overdesigned. This will help the City conceptualise typologies which are appropriate for the demand and also guard against the possibility of the CoF becoming the Corridors of Exclusion.

In terms of current plans and frameworks, there has been a lot of work and money invested into the corridors, but the rolling out of these plans is not at a stage where they can easily be assessed especially since the CoF is a long term plan aiming for transforming the urban landscape. To quote one of the interviewees “we are just going to have to wait and see how plans unfold so as to see what’s working and what’s not”. Even so current mechanisms can be argued to not be sufficient to ensure the increase of access to low income housing along the CoF at the desirable rates and volumes; considering the high demand for low income housing, high unemployment, majority of residents falling into the low income bracket, etc.

References

Acemoglu, D and Robinson, J (2014*).* Seeing like a state. Available at: http://whynationsfail.com/blog/2014/7/10/seeing-like-a-state.html.

Bogdan, R, Biklen, S, (1982). Qualitative research methods for education: an introduction to theory and methods. Ally and Bacon, Boston

Bogdan, R, Biklen, S, (2003). Qualitative research for education: an introduction to theories and methods, Pearson

Bowen, Glenn A. (2009). Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method, *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9, (2), 27-40. DOI 10.3316/QRJ0902027.

Charlton, S, Shapurjee, C., (2013) Transforming South Africa's low-income housing projects through backyard dwellings: intersections with households and the state in Alexandra, Johannesburg

City of Johannesburg (2013) Business Case: Alternative transitional residential accommodation (TRA) development in Banket Street

City of Johannesburg, (2013), Johannesburg social housing company, available at: http://www.joburg.org.za/index.php?option=com_content&id=1227 [Accessed 18 August 2016]

City of Johannesburg (2016) Inner City Housing Implementation Plan

City of Johannesburg, (2016). JOSHCO tariff proposal for the 2016/17 financial year, available at: http://joburg.org.za/images/stories/2016/April/JOSHCO%20TARIFF%20PROPOSAL%20FOR%20THE%202016-17%20FINANCIAL%20YEAR.pdf [Accessed July 15. 2016].

Clark, M, Royston, L. (2014) low income housing not low cost enough. Availabile at: http://mg.co.za/article/2014-04-10-low-cost-housing-not-low-cost-enough [Accessed 18 August 2016]

Cresswell, J, W., (2003) Research design Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches: SECOND EDITION, Chapter one, Sage Publications, California

Creswell, J, W., (2009) Research design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches: third edition, Chapter nine, Sage Publications, California.

Crossman, A., (2016) Types of Sampling Designs Used in Sociology, Available at: http://sociology.about.com/od/Types-of-Samples/a/Purposive-Sample.htm .

Department of Housing City of Johannesburg (2015) Corridors of Freedom: human settlement perspective**,** presentation by CoJ director of housing

Gilbert, A., Mabin, A., McCarthy, M. and Watson, V. (1997). Low-income rental housing: are South African cities different? *Environment and Urbanisation*, 9, 133-147

Gumede, W., (2011) Delivering a democratic developmental state in South Africa, Policy Brief No. 1, development bank of southern Africa

Harrison, Philip (2006) On the Edge of Reason: Planning and Urban Futures in Africa, in *Urban Studies,* 43(2), pp. 319-335 - See more at: https://www.wits.ac.za/staff/academic-a-z-listing/h/philipharrisonwitsacza/#sthash.o3u21W1A.dpuf

Huchzermeyer, M. (2003). Low income housing and commodified urban segregation in South Africa, in the book “ambiguous restructurings of post-apartheid Cape Town: the spatial form of Socio-Political change” edited by Christoph Haferburg and Jurgen Ossenbrugge.

Johannesburg development agency (2016) Corridors of Freedom for a people-centred city, Available at: http://www.jda.org.za/index.php/whatwedo/programmes/the-big-idea. [Accessed 19 august 2016]

JOSHCO (2015) annual reports 2014/2015, available at: < http://www.joburg.org.za/images/stories/2016/Annual/Joshco/1.pdf>

JOSHCO (2016) JOSHCO business plan 2016-2021, available at http://www.joshco.co.za/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/BusinessPlan1617.pdf

JOSHCO (2016) JOSHCO tariff proposal for 2016/17’ accessed from http://joburg.org.za/images/stories/2016/April/JOSHCO%20TARIFF%20PROPOSAL%20FOR%20THE%202016-17%20FINANCIAL%20YEAR.pdf

Kanbur, R. (2007). Conceptualizing Economic Marginalization Key-notes for the Living at the Margins Conference Cape Town, March 26, 2007.

Kumar, R. (1997) Research methodology a step-by-step guide, Sage publications, Los Angeles

Leaf, M., 2007. Review: Ordinary Cities: Between Modernity and Development, by Jennifer Robinson. New York.

Mahlaka, R., (2015) Affordable property market: rental units on the rise. Available at; http://www.moneyweb.co.za/investing/property/affordable-property-market-rental-units-on-the-rise/

Mammon, N, Ewing, K., (2005) . Moving towards a design approach to low-income housing in urban Cape Town: the case of Joe Slovo Park, Paper presented at the XXXIII IAHS World Congress on Housing, 27-30 September 2005,"Transforming Housing Environments through Design", University of Pretoria.

Mason. J. (2002) Qualitative researching (2nd edn) London: Sage Publications

Myers, G, M., (2010) Seven Themes in African Urban Dynamics, discussion paper 10, Nordiska Afrikainstitutet, Uppsal

Owusu, F. 2007. “Conceptualizing livelihood strategies in African cities: Planning and development implications of multiple livelihood strategies,” Journal of Planning Education and Research, 26. 450-465

Park, B, G., (1998) Where Do Tigers Sleep at Night? The State's Role in Housing Policy in South Korea and Singapore, Economic Geography, Vol. 74, No. 3. 272-288. Available at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/144377 . [Accessed 23 July 2016]

Patton, M, Q., (1990) qualitative evaluation and research methods (2nd ed.) Sage publications, Sage publications Inc. Newbury Park, CA

Poulsen, L, Silverman, M., 2005. Design Strategies for the Densification of Low Income Housing, World Congress on Housing: Transforming Housing Environments through Design, Pretoria, South Africa

Rice-Jones, G., (2013) a beginners guide to the developmental state, received from http://www.romeconomics.com/beginners-guide-developmental-state/

Robinson, J. 2002. Global and world cities: A view from off the map. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research 26:531-54.

Roy, A. (2005) Urban Informality: Toward an Epistemology of Planning, Journal of the American Planning Association

Simon, M, K., (2011) analysis of qualitative data, excepted from Simon, M,K., (2011) dissertation and study research: recipes for success (2011 ED.), dissertation success LLC , Seattle, WA.

Statistics South Africa. (2012). *Census 2011 Municipal report Gauteng*. Available at: http://www.statssa.gov.za/census/census_2011/census_products/GP_Municipal_Report.pdf . [Accessed 7 March 2016]

Strauss, A, Corbin, J., (1990). Basics of qualitative research: grounded theory procedures and techniques. Sage publications Inc. Newbury Park, CA

Tau, P, (2013) Mayors State of the City address, Available at: http://www.joburg.org.za/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=10516&catid=217&Itemid=114

UN Habitat. (2013). A New Strategy of Sustainable Neighbourhood Planning: Five principles – Urban Planning Discussion Note 3. Retrieved March 9, 2016, from UN Habitat: http://unhabitat.org/a-new-strategy-of-sustainable-neighbourhood-planning-five-principles/

Van Zyl, S. (2016). Preliminary processing of qualitative data, research writing workshop held on the 4th of august at the wits university graduate centre seminar room.

Watson V (2009a) “Seeing from the South: refocusing urban planning on the globe’s central urban issues“, *Urban Studies*, 46(11) 2259-2275.

Watson, V (2009b) “The planned city sweeps the poor away: urban planning and 21st century urbanization“. *Progress in Planning* 72. (3), 151-193.

Zeiderman, A (2008) Cities of the future?: megacities and the space/time of urban modernity. Critical planning, Summer. pp. 23-39. ISSN 1522-9807

Appendix: Sources of Data

Data set	interviews	Analysing relevant Documents	Presentations	Notes from presentation discussion	Informal conversation with experts
Source	Planning department ○ Dylan Weakley ○ Rirhandzu Khoza ○ Lorraine Nzimande ○ Thabang Sithole ○ Monyake Moteane ○ Joshco interviewee 1 ○ Consultant interviewee 1 ○ Researcher interviewee 1	○ 3 SAF's ○ SDF ○ ICHIP ○ Newspaper articles ○ SHSUP ○ South hill documents ○ Business case for the TRA	○ Dr Kirsten Harris research presented by Margot Rubin ○ Eric's Planact presentation ○ Dr Sylvia croese	○ Discussion during Planact CoF consultative meeting ○ Notes during Corridors of freedom urban lab of other corridor research ○ ICHIP presentation	○ Simon Mayson ○ Margot Rubin ○ Nicki Pingo ○ Matt Jackson