

https://dspace.org/

Policy reaction to hidden spaces on the urban periphery: the case of backyard accommodation in Dube Township, Johannesburg

Chabalala, Tshepo Clement

2021
https://hdl.handle.net/10539/31930

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

POLICY REACTION TO HIDDEN SPACES ON THE URBAN PERIPHERY: THE CASE OF BACKYARD ACCOMMODATION IN DUBE TOWNSHIP, JOHANNESBURG

TSHEPO CLEMENT CHABALALA

A Research Report submitted to the Faculty of Engineering and the Built Environment, University of the Witwatersrand, in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Urban Studies Urban Politics and Governance School of Architecture and Planning.

Johannesburg, 2020

Policy Reaction to Hidden Spaces on the Urban Periphery: The Case of Backyard Accommodation in Dube Township, Johannesburg

Author: Tshepo Clement Chabalala (832377)

Supervisor: Amanda Williamson

Master of Urban Studies Urban Politics and Governance

School of Architecture and Planning

University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg

Johannesburg, 2020

Declaration

I, Tshepo Clement Chabalala hereby declare that this research report is entirely my own unaided work. I have been the sole researcher involved in this research project. It is being submitted for the degree of Master of Urban Studies Urban Politics and Governance to the Faculty of Engineering and the Built Environment at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination to the University of the Witwatersrand or any other university.



Tshepo Clement Chabalala

On the 01 Day of December 2020

Abstract

Backyard rental accommodation is not covered by a policy that addresses the issues of the market and the sector does not receive any support from the state. This study investigates backyard rental accommodation. The main argument is that backyard accommodation provides beneficiaries or property owners (landlords) of government-subsidized housing with opportunities to improve their economic situation, material and social well-being and allows them to improve their houses, thereby improving their quality of life. Backyard accommodation provides affordable, flexible accommodation and social stable environments to tenants. Moreover, it represents a unique mixture of informal and formal land-tenure modes that has not yet been recognized in policy formulation for housing. Measures taken by authorities and policy makers rather condemn and discourage the practice of backyard rental accommodation instead of supporting it as an aspect of housing that can help realize housing as an asset. The reasoning is that backyard rental accommodation increases the density of the houses and households beyond which they were created for and puts pressure on infrastructure and other several implications that requires careful management and coordination.

The overall contribution of this research is to understand the processes of informality and the reaction from government policy on backyard accommodation on the urban periphery. The research study focuses on the case of backyard accommodation in Dube Township, Johannesburg. Various qualitative research methods are adopted for this research including desktop analysis of grey literature, and data collection methods such as interviews and questionnaires. The study took place in 2019.

There has been a shift to greater understanding and acknowledgement of the role backyard accommodation plays and initial attempts have been made to support it. The findings and synopsis of the study show that there is a direct relationship between the landlords and tenants and that there are common drivers of supply and demand of backyard accommodation. The study makes recommendations such as awareness campaigns, government's acknowledgement and area-based municipal policy approach for interventions and development regarding backyard accommodation.

Key Words: *Policy, backyard accommodation, housing, urban periphery, local government*

Dedication

In memory of my mother Tinyiko Chabalala and my father Robert Maswanganyi, and my granny Midjadji Mchabi, may your souls continue to rest in peace. To Rivers and Saseki. Moreover, it is dedicated to my grandparents Mthavini Maswanganye and Mamaila Mathebula, my Uncle Gezani Chavalala, Mthavini Chabalala and special dedication to Winston, Matimu, Xihluke, Life, Lesley, Themba, Nsovo, Dunisani, Rivoningo and my aunt Mildred for your endless support.

To my family and friends, for the support and assistance you gave me, you have taught me the virtues of hard work. I will always cherish your love.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Almighty God for giving me strength, wisdom and knowledge and for protecting me throughout my studies. Indeed, it is by the grace of Jesus Christ that I complete my studies.

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

The financial assistance of the Postgraduate Masters Merit Award towards this research is hereby acknowledged.

The success of this study is attributed to a number of people. I would like to thank my supervisor, Ms. Amanda Williamson, for being available when I needed her. Those long discussions were in my best interest. Thank you for your patience, guidance and leadership. Indeed, your excellent work and your good reputation speak for themselves. Thank you very much for making me a better student.

I extend my sincere gratitude to the following people who made writing this report possible and successful:

- My family, for your unconditional support, inspiration and motivation. You accompanied me on my journey and helped me to reach my destination on time. Thank you.
- To Matimu and Life Maswanganye, for your support and assistance.
- The property owners and tenants of the community of Dube Township.
- The municipal officials at the City of Johannesburg Research and Development: Housing Department for your time and support.
- My BSc URP honours supervisor, Prof. Mfaniseni Sihlongonyane. Thank you.
- Dr Sherin Ramparsad, for your support and encouragement, and to the Mandela Mining Precinct and The Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR). Thank you.
- Dr R P. Sambo, my pastor, for the support, guidance and assistance throughout the study.
- Healing Ministry Church for enriching me with the Word of God.
- My friends: Prudence, Dikeledi, Gracious, Lulamile, Vukosi, Hlonipho, Andrew and Aubrey for your encouragement and support, throughout the research period for always checking up on me.

Ndza khensa swinene[1].

[1] Thank you very much

Table of Contents

Declaration....2
Abstract....3
Dedication....4
Acknowledgements....5
Table of Contents....6
List of Figures....11
List of Tables....11
List of Acronyms....12
1. CHAPTER ONE: The Need for the Study....14
Section One: Introduction to the research....14
1.1 Introduction....14
1.2 Background....15
1.3 Problem Statement....17
1.4 The Rationale for the Study....20
1.5 Aim and Objectives....21
1.6 Main Research Question and Sub-questions....21
Section Two: Data Collection Tools and Research Methods....22
1.7 Research Methods Background....22
1.8 Qualitative Method....23
1.9 Research Approach....23
1.10 Data Collection and Research Instruments....24
1.10.1 Desktop: Grey Literature....24
1.10.2 Case Study....24
1.10.3 Area of Research....25
1.10.4 Data Collection Method....25
1.11 Coding and Analysis....29
1.12 Limitations....29
1.13 Ethical Considerations....30
1.14 Personal Lesson Learnt....30
1.15 Outline of Chapters....31
2. CHAPTER TWO: Backyard Accommodation and Policy Exploration through Literature....33
2.1 Introduction....33

2.2 Definitions 34
2.3 Conceptual Framework 35
2.4 International Experience of Backyard Accommodation 36
2.4.1 Metro Manila, Philippines Case Study 37
2.5 Overview of Backyard Accommodation: The South African Context 39
2.5.1 Historical Development of Backyard Accommodation in South Africa 39
2.5.2 Introduction of State-subsidized Housing as the Official Policy 40
2.5.3 Analysis of Demand and Supply on the Development of Backyard Accommodation 41
2.5.4 The Impact of Backyard Structures on Infrastructure and Service Delivery 43
2.5.5 The Backyard Sector and Planning Regulations 43
2.6 Implication, advantages and disadvantages of backyard accommodation 44
2.6.1 The Developmental Implications of Backyard Accommodation 45
2.6.2 Advantages of Backyard Accommodation 45
2.6.3 Disadvantages of backyard rooms 46
2.7 Towards a New Housing Typology: Hybrid Typology 46
2.8 The Urban Periphery 47
2.9 Critiques of backyard accommodation 48
2.10 Concluding Remarks 49
3 CHAPTER THREE: Contextualising Housing Policy and Backyard Accommodation 50
3.1 Introduction 50
3.2 The South African Legislative, Policy and Regulatory Framework 50
3.3 Housing Policies and Legislations Related to Backyard Accommodation since 1994 51
3.3.1 White Paper on Housing (1994) 51
3.3.2 New Housing Policy and Strategy for South Africa, 1994 52
3.3.3 Extension of Security of Tenure Act, 1997 (no 62 of 1997) 52
3.3.4 People's Housing Process (1998) 52
3.3.5 Prevention of Illegal Eviction and Unlawful Occupation of Land Act, 1998 (PIE) 53
3.3.6 Rental Housing Act 50 of 1999 (amended in Act 43 of 2007 and Act 35 of 2014) 53
3.3.7 Breaking New Ground: A Comprehensive Plan for the Development of Sustainable Human Settlements (2004) 54
3.3.8 Social Housing Policy for South Africa (2005) 54
3.3.9 The Social Housing Act, No. 16, 2008 55
3.4 Provincial and Local Housing Policy in South Africa 55

3.4.1 Gauteng Policy on Backyard Rental Housing, 2015 56
3.4.2 Inclusionary Housing: Incentives, Regulations and Mechanisms (Policy), 2007 57
3.4.3 Backyard Accommodation 57
3.5 Priorities for future policy-development 58
3.6 Concluding Remarks 58
4 CHAPTER FOUR: Situation Analysis of the Urban Periphery: Case Study of Dube Township, Johannesburg 59
4.1 Introduction 59
4.2 Locational background of the study area 59
4.2.1 City of Johannesburg, Region D and Soweto 59
4.2.2 Greater Soweto 61
4.2.3 Geographical Location of Dube 62
4.3 Brief historical background of Dube Township. 66
4.4 Socio-economic characteristics 68
4.4.1 Population 68
4.4.2 Migration 69
4.5 Access to Services, Infrastructure Backlogs and Environmental Challenges 70
4.5.1 Access to Basic Services 70
4.5.2 Government-subsidized housing 71
4.5.3 Hostels 71
4.6 Economic Profile 71
4.6.1 Unemployment 72
4.6.2 Education 73
4.6.3 Income Distribution 73
4.7 Concluding Remarks 74
5 CHAPTER FIVE: Exploring Hidden Spaces on the Urban Periphery 75
5.1 Introduction 75
5.2 Research Process 75
5.3 Types of backyard accommodation in Dube Township 76
5.4 Biographical Information of landlords and tenants 77
5.4.1 Gender of participants 77
5.4.2 Age Profile of landlords and tenants 79
5.4.3 Employment Status of landlords and tenants 79

5.5 Reasons for renting backyard accommodation in Dube 80
5.5.1 Area of origin of Tenants 80
5.5.2 Reasons for choosing Dube Township 81
5.5.3 Renting backyard accommodation 81
5.5.4 Locational advantages 83
5.5.5 The quality and amenity of backyard structure dwellings in Dube Township 87
5.6 The landlord-tenant relationship 90
5.7 Housing Policy in Dube Township 94
5.7.1 Density 94
5.7.2 Service Delivery 96
5.8 Challenges faced by the municipality because of backyard accommodation 100
5.9 Concluding Remarks 102
6. CHAPTER SIX: Analysis of Hidden Spaces on the Urban Periphery 103
6.1 Introduction 103
6.2 Municipal People-Centric Elements for sustainable backyard rental accommodation 103
6.3 Biographical analysis of tenants and landlords 104
6.3.1 Gender 104
6.3.2 Age 105
6.3.3 Employment 105
6.3.4 Relationship between property owners and backyard tenants 106
6.4 Tenants, landlords and municipal's perceptions on backyard rental accommodation 106
6.4.1 Affordability 106
6.4.2 Flexibility and better service 107
6.4.3 Property owner's perspective 107
6.4.4 Municipal official's perspective 108
6.5 Implications of Policy 109
6.5.1 Electricity and water services 109
6.6 Demographic trends, literature review and policy 110
7. CHAPTER SEVEN: Conclusion and Planning Recommendations 111
7.1 Introduction 111
7.2 Evaluating the Research Process 111
7.3 Synopsis of the Study 111
7.4 Planning and Governance Recommendations to Dube and the City of Johannesburg 111

7.4.1 Policy Recognition 112
7.4.2 Controlling Norms and Standard 112
7.4.3 Relax, Simplify and Streamline laws and Regulatory Procedures 112
7.4.4 Awareness-raising and information dissemination 112
7.4.5 Government Acknowledgement 113
7.4.6 Area-Based Municipal Policy Approach 113
7.4.7 Capacity Building 113
7.4.8 Assessing Municipal Infrastructure Capacity 114
7.4.9 NSDF Pro-active Settlement Design, Stand and Township Layouts 114
7.4.10 Research and Development 114
7.5 Potential Policy Response Framework 115
7.6 Researcher's Perspective 116
7.7 Further Areas for Research and Concluding Remarks 117
8. Reference List 119
9. Appendices 128
9.1 Appendix 1: Table of Participants 128
9.2 Appendix 2: Ethics Clearance Certificate 129
9.3 Appendix 3: Permission Letter 130
9.4 Appendix 4: Participation Information Sheet (PIS) 131
9.4.1. Tenants PIS 131
9.4.2. Property Owners PIS 132
9.4.3. Municipal Official's PIS 133
9.5 Appendix 5: Participant Consent Form 134
9.5.1. Tenants and Property Owners Consent Form 134
9.5.2. Municipal Official's consent Form 135
9.6 Appendix 6: Research Interview Guide 136
9.6.1. Tenants 136
9.6.2. Property Owners 138
9.6.3. City of Joburg Municipal Official 141

List of Figures

Figure 1: Conceptual Framework....36
Figure 2: Gauteng, City of Johannesburg Metropolitan....60
Figure 3: Map of Greater Soweto....63
Figure 4: Dube Township....64
Figure 5: Dube Township....64
Figure 6: Backyard accommodation in Dube Township....65
Figure 7: Three roomed matchbox house....67
Figure 8: Population by age range....69
Figure 9: Population by employment status....72
Figure 10: Population by highest educational level....73
Figure 11: Annual employees and household income....74
Figure 12: Gender and Ethnicity of Participants (Tenants) in Percentages....78
Figure 13: Gender and Ethnicity of Participants (Landlords) in Percentages....78
Figure 14: Age Profile of Participants in Percentages....79
Figure 15: Employment Status of Participants....80
Figure 16: Area of origin of research participants (tenants)....81
Figure 17: Shoprite Community Noticeboard....82
Figure 18: Room availability notice in Dube....82
Figure 19: Rea Vaya Station....84
Figure 20: Dube Train Station....85
Figure 21: Dube facilities....85
Figure 22: Arial photograph of Dube Township....86
Figure 23: Steel burglar doors and windows....89
Figure 24: Brick and mortar backyard structures....94
Figure 25: Density of Backyard dwellings – Located at the Corner (Landlord 3)....95
Figure 26: Backyard dwellings - Between properties (Tenant 13 and 14)....95
Figure 27: Backyard dwellings - Between properties (Landlord 9)....95
Figure 28: Dumping area....97
Figure 29: Electrical Connections to backyard rooms....99

List of Tables

Table 1: Categories of Research Participants....27
Table 2: Structure of Greater Soweto....61

List of Acronyms

ANC : African National Congress

BNG : Breaking New Ground

CBD : Central Business District

NCoGTA : National Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs

NDoH/ NDHS : National Department of Housing/ Department of Human Settlements

HDAA : Housing Development Agency Act

IMF : International Monetary Fund

IUDF : Integrated Urban Development Framework

JCC : Johannesburg City Council

JMPD : Johannesburg Metro Police Department

LUMS : Land Use Management Scheme

LUS : Land Use Scheme

NGO : Non-Governmental Organisation

NHSS : National Housing Subsidy Scheme

NUAA : Natives (Urban Areas) Act

PHDA : Priority Housing Development Areas

PHP : People's Housing Process

PIE : Prevention of Illegal Eviction and Unlawful Occupation of Land Act

SACN : South African Cities Network

SDF : Spatial Development Frameworks

SHRA : Social Housing Regulatory Authority

SPLUMA : Spatial Planning and Land Management Act

StatsSA : Statistics South Africa

Soweto : South Western Township

UN-Habitat : United Nations Habitat

WB : World Bank

WEF : World Economic Forum

1. CHAPTER ONE: The Need for the Study

Section One: Introduction to the research

1.1 Introduction

Many countries in the Global South are relatively young democracies. The resilience and legitimacy of their political systems rely largely on their ability to integrate and represent millions of citizens who the formal social, political, and economic structures exclude. Exclusion from the formal structures has deep-reaching consequences in the built environment, as many of the excluded citizens must 'help themselves' to inhabit the urban areas and the city. They often build informal settlements, mostly characterized by insecurity of tenure, poor infrastructure, and lack of basic services, though in time, and some through public intervention and tenants by themselves (Rio favelas), some of those neighbourhoods might develop into livable places. Informality has become and will remain a part of urban life for the near future across the globe (Ernstson, Ernstson, Lawhon & Duminy, 2014).

Despite the growth in informality globally, an emerging land-use practice, 'backyarding' or backyard accommodation, has proliferated in South Africa and is expanding in other developing countries (Lemanski, 2009). Housing policies have discounted the sector, focussing instead on subsidized homeownership and eradicating informal settlements (Shapurjee, et al., 2014). The neglect of the informal backyard rental sector disregards prospects for more sustainable human settlements (Lemanski, 2009). The role of informality in shaping policy formulation is significant. This is intended to draw lessons for appropriating regulations to various housing development needs and impact cultural aspects, which influence how people respond to situations and opportunities when making decisions about housing. This contrasts with the informal system, which offers developers (tenants and landlords) the freedom to use alternative construction methods offering affordable means of house production. The informal setting also offers people the freedom to construct houses according to individual preferences enabling people to 'live their dreams' made possible by the relaxation in rules and regulations. This helps in filling the gap created by the demand and supply mismatch in the formal areas.

In this regard, informal housing has become a pertinent field of investigation within a number of fields and particularly in urban planning, but, the backyard accommodation market is under-researched (Gunter, 2014). Related to informal housing (hidden spaces or backyard accommodation) and policy, is informality on the urban periphery as a specific sub-theme. This study shows that there are multiple logics underpinning the reasons why people live in the urban peripheries and how policy

react to this phenomenon. Urban Peripheries offer relatively affordable access to homeownership and state-provided housing.

This research report seeks to address the gap that existing between informal housing and policy by asking, in what ways can municipal policy effectively respond to the trend of backyard rental accommodation? The study explores the landlord-tenant relationship dynamics and experiences, and how policy reacts to the informal housing market and sector. The landlord-tenant relationship dynamics and experiences are tied to lower barriers to backyard accommodation entry, availability of rental land or space, larger plots of land, lower levels of policing and control and proximity to employment opportunities. The focus area of study is Dube Township, which is located in the City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality. The findings of this study contribute insights into the dynamics of backyard accommodation as a viable housing sector as well as develop the debate on the role of informality in shaping policy formulation.

1.2 Background

According to Huchzermeyer and Karam (2006), the housing market is classified into three categories which are as follows: (a) the formal housing sector, characterised by sophisticated legal frameworks and financial mechanisms; (b) The informal housing sector (informal settlements), characterised by little legal frameworks and poor quality access to services and (c) the 'backyard' sector, which has informal dwellings in formal housing suburbs. As a concern for the developing world, the term, informality, has traditionally been conceptualised around potential negative impacts: that it is illegal, chaotic and anarchistic, and it is fundamentally unsustainable (Shapurjee & Charlton, 2013). Whilst informality comprises a range of unregulated settlements, unsanctioned social networks, livelihood and income-generating strategies, cultural and political mobilisation practices, it is most distinct where physically manifested (Huchzermeyer, 2009). There were expectations that the mass construction of housing by the state would be able to eradicate poverty. These expectations were based on the belief that the government-subsidized houses can be used as collateral to access finance and be sold in the formal property market for the creation of secondary housing market (Rust, et al., 2009). However, this has proven ineffective because households often attach values to their housing, and are not willing to either sell or use their houses as collateral (Rust, et al., 2009).

Additionally, most of the government-subsidized houses were built in areas where there were no functional housing market. The 2004 study into Township Residential Property Markets (Shisaka Development Management Services, 2004) and FNB 2016 "Township" Property Barometer research

(First National Bank, 2016) found that property prices vary by neighbourhood, and that specifically, properties in former black township areas appreciate at a much lower rate to the rest of the country. The study conducted by Shisaka reveals that in Johannesburg for instance, there is a clear difference in property prices in the northern and western suburbs from the central and southern suburbs (Shisaka Development Management Services, 2004). Furthermore, strict conditions govern the sale of a government-subsidized house, introduced in 2015 by Minister of Human Settlements, Lindiwe Sisulu after claims that the sale of government-subsidized houses was on the rise (Mail and Guardian, 2018). According to the Housing Amendment Act 4 of 2001, a beneficiary may not sell the house within the first eight years of having taken occupation and should the beneficiary wish to sell the house after eight years, the government has priority (Republic of South Africa, 2001). Should a house be sold, a letter of authority from the deeds office must be attached to the sale agreement (Republic of South Africa, 2001). However, there are vast backlogs on the issuance of deeds. The transfer of title is imperative to unlock value for homeowners. The importance of title is often seen as an asset against which homeowners can raise secured financing (Napier & Arendse, 2014).

An unintended consequence of the rollout of government-subsidized housing is that it has greatly expanded the opportunity for backyard accommodation in urban areas (Lategan & Cilliers, 2019). Under this practice, an existing formal homeowner (landlord or property owner) rents a portion of his or her yard area to occupants (tenants) who live in a dwelling constructed either by formal or informal methods that yield a backyard shack or house (Lategan & Cilliers, 2019; Tshangana, 2014). The presence of backyard accommodation indicates that existing homeowners who are mainly recipients of government-subsidized houses view their yard areas as an income-generating mechanism because of the available space. The lack of affordable housing is a key factor in driving demand for affordable and well-located rental accommodation in urban areas (Lategan & Cilliers, 2019). The lack of affordable housing has given rise to backyard accommodation development, encouraging property owners to reduce the consumption of their yard space in return for cash (Lemanski, 2009).

Turok and Borel-Saladin (2016) assert that there is a close connection between government-subsidized house owners, poverty and backyard accommodation, and argue that housing should not be understood in isolation but should be understood as a multidimensional asset that has a complex interaction with the households. The requirement to receive a government-subsidized house is that one must be earning less than R3500 (Molope, 2017). However, in reality, the majority of beneficiaries earn below R1500 and hence the cost of owning a house often becomes a burden to the

beneficiaries of government-subsidized houses in townships (Molope, 2017). As a result, beneficiaries often engage in informal income-generating strategies such as backyard rental accommodation to provide affordable housing to meet the scale of demand for rental accommodation (Turok & Borel-Saladin, 2016).

Moreover, backyard accommodation as a form of informality absorbs the pressure of urbanization and acts as a safety valve to urbanization (Turok & Borel-Saladin, 2016). Turok and Borel-Saladin (2016) state that there is a correlation between informality and urbanization. Turok and Borel-Saladin (2016) further argue that South Africa's recent experience of urbanization is somewhat unusual in that the growth of informality has taken the form of backyard structures in established townships rather than freestanding shacks in informal settlements. According to Huchzermeyer (2011), evictions and forced removals from informal settlements also lead to more backyard accommodation development because people are likely to find alternative means of accommodation, which in most cases is to occupy shacks or formal rooms in the backyards of other households.

1.3 Problem Statement

According to Turok and Borel-Saladin (2016), government policy neglects the phenomenon of backyard rental accommodation and instead focuses on building new homes for low-income households.

Despite its emergence as the fastest growing housing type in South Africa, backyard accommodation remains poorly understood (Turok & Borel-Saladin, 2016). The potential of government-subsidized housing to generate income through backyard rental accommodation and other home-based economic activities does not receive the necessary support from the government and is overlooked in most cases (Charlton, et al., 2014). Moreover, it represents a unique mixture of informal and formal land-tenure modes that that future housing policy formulation can recognize in developing countries (Turok & Borel-Saladin, 2016). This is so because their informal nature does not conform to the minimum standards and can create the same conditions that the housing programme is trying to eradicate (Turok & Borel-Saladin, 2016; Charlton, et al., 2014). The neglect of backyard accommodation overlooks the fact that backyard rentals and other home based economic activities provide households with the platform to generate income for themselves while supplying affordable rental accommodation at the same time (Lemanski, 2009; Mabasa, 2017).

More than a decade ago, Bank (2007) made a similar argument that the majority of urbanization activities in the existing townships such as Soweto have taken place in the form of informal backyard rentals that are predominately shack and brick houses and not as free-standing informal dwellings in informal settlements and urban sprawl. This indicates that South African housing policy has not paid much attention to this established trend of informal backyard rentals and that a dedicated national policy is overdue (Bank, 2007; Shapurjee, et al., 2014). Informal backyard rental sector has (Shapurjee, et al., 2014), only narrowly referenced in certain policy documents and addressed in limited fragmentary attempts at national, provincial and metropolitan level (Rubin & Gardner, 2013). The disregard shown for the informal backyard rental sector to date stands as a testament to the complexity of the issue and the negative lens through which it has been perceived by most authorities (Lategan & Cilliers, 2019).

There have also been many cases of existing shack areas being demolished, people being evicted from land intended for other purposes, and removed to 'temporary relocation areas' or 'transit camps' pending eventual provision of formal housing (Huchzermeyer, 2011). Evictions and forced removals from informal settlements also lead to more backyard accommodation development because people are likely to find alternative means of accommodation that is to occupy shacks or formal rooms in the backyards of other households (Huchzermeyer, 2011; Rubin & Gardner, 2013; Carey, 2009). Turok & Borel-Saladin (2016, p. 14) have argued that 'living in a shack structure is not a positive experience for most people'. Nevertheless, the positive contribution of the backyard-housing sector must not be discounted; most notably its role in dealing with the housing backlog that the country is faced with. Additionally, many backyard structures are of reasonable quality based on the materials used by the tenants or the property owners to build the structures. It is important to build on these positive aspects for future development planning.

Within the City of Johannesburg's urban periphery, housing policies and legislation have a unique past, masked by the legacy of apartheid (Charlton, 2014). Overcoming apartheid policies has been somewhat slow (Charlton, 2014). Many previously disadvantaged households continue to live in poor housing conditions on the urban periphery of the city, either in informal settlements or informally in backyard rental units (Charlton, 2014). This situation prevailed even with the Constitution of 1996 incorporating the right of housing for all, especially the vulnerable. The presence of informal backyard dwellings erected on stands of state-subsidized homes across Johannesburg has its origins in the apartheid restrictions on black migrants settling in the inner cities (Turok & Borel-Saladin,

2016). Despite policy changes, the South African government at its various spheres and departments continues to focus largely on eradicating informality and promoting subsidized homeownership (Turok & Borel-Saladin, 2016).

The government also fails to acknowledge the role played by policy in encouraging backyard accommodation activities on both the demand and supply side (Lemanski, 2009). Municipalities' traditional zoning and planning regulation do not accommodate these kinds of activities and choose to curtail rather than find a better way to support them (Rust, et al., 2009; Zack & Silverman, 2007). According to Rubin and Gardner (2013), many backyard dwellings, specifically those in the informal sector, contravene municipal by-laws, do not meet building regulation norms and standards, or other health and safety considerations. Backyard accommodation conditions are not uniform across municipalities in South Africa (Rubin & Gardner, 2013). Backyard accommodation will require differentiated responses and reactions from various municipalities and within different zones within each municipality (Rubin & Gardner, 2013). There have been regulatory government policies formulated to regulate townships in municipalities such as Land Use Management Scheme (LUMS) and town planning schemes (Watson, 2009). Such restrictions often result in low-income people occupying 'hidden spaces' such as backyard rooms and shacks in the existing townships and dilapidated buildings in the inner cities (Turok, 2012). However, the Spatial Planning and Land Use Management Act 16 of 2013 (SPLUMA) requires a unified LUMS across an entire municipal area. The promulgation of SPLUMA in 2013, which came into effect in mid-2015, is the first legislative measure to provide a unified spatial planning and land use management system for all of South Africa and all government levels (Act 16 of 2013).

SPLUMA (Act 16 of 2013) obliges all spatial planning mechanisms to redress issues related to access to land, security of tenure and the incremental upgrade of informal areas. The Act obliges spatial development and policies at all government levels to speak to the inclusion of people and spaces that previous development frameworks excluded. In this regard, the development principles contained in Section 7 of SPLUMA (Act 16 of 2013) emphasises the inclusion of informalities and regions regarded as deprived and poverty-stricken. According to the Act, the primary instrument in planning and development is the Land Use Scheme (LUS), which give effect to Municipal Spatial Development Frameworks (SDFs), as the context for determination of all land development applications (Act 16 of 2013). In accordance, several LUSs and SDFs would need to be updated and made SPLUMA compliant, thus leaving the opportunity to include backyard accommodation. SPLUMA (Act 16 of

2013) conceivably provides an opportune platform to launch such interventions through scientific research, as provided by this research.

The problem that this research aims to explore is that the avoidance or lack of acceptance of unregulated and unplanned backyard accommodation will have long-term implications and challenges for urban planning and housing policy in the future. The most prevalent challenges are that (a) many structures are illegal; (b) backyard accommodation may be unsafe and unhealthy; (c) tenants may not have access to adequate basic services; (d) over-burdening of infrastructure; (e) landlord-tenant conflicts which are often exacerbated by the informality of lease agreements; (f) the scope and exact conditions in the informal backyard rental sector is unclear; and (g) backyard conditions and intervention requirements vary contextually (Charlton, 2014; Lategan & Cilliers, 2019; Lemanski, 2009; Rubin & Gardner, 2013; Shapurjee, et al., 2014; Turok & Borel-Saladin, 2016; Tshangana, 2014; Zack & Silverman, 2007). The challenges presented above focus primarily on implications at the local municipal level, including municipal zoning regulations and enforcement capacity, health concerns, local infrastructural capacity, service delivery and contextual variances (Zack & Silverman, 2007; Shapurjee, et al., 2014). Until a national policy emerges, local authorities will face the responsibility to respond to the informal backyard accommodation issues in their areas of jurisdiction (Shapurjee, et al., 2014, p. 20).

1.4 The Rationale for the Study

The purpose of this research is to understand how backyard rental accommodation helps improves the quality of life of both the beneficiaries of government-subsidized houses and the tenants who occupy ‘hidden spaces’ commonly known as backyard accommodation.

According to Rubin and Gardner (2013), much of the information on informal backyard rental accommodation is contradictory and is from quite dated studies, thus this research is significant in closing that gap in the literature. Backyard accommodation is not well known and documented in comparison to other types of urban dwellings such as informal settlements (Lemanski, 2009). Backyard accommodation has attracted relatively little comments, systematic research and official response from the government (Lemanski, 2009). Shapurjee, et al., (2014) also contend that there is a need for more qualitative research to address what Rubin and Gardner (2013) refer to as a dearth of accurate data on informal backyard rentals in South Africa. As asserted by Turok and Borel-Saladin (2016) it would be premature to offer specific policy proposals without more comprehensive research.

Therefore, this research will assist in acquiring primary or first-hand information about the policy, backyard accommodation and the lived experiences of tenants and property owners.

1.5 Aim and Objectives

The main aim of this research is to reflect on informality and the reaction from government policy, by evaluating the role and contribution of the informal backyard rental sector, the livelihoods of people and on the realisation of government-subsidized houses as an asset. The main objectives of the research are as follows: (a) Contextualising South Africa's informal backyard rental sector in terms of the historic, policy and legislative framework; (b) To analyse how relevant existing municipal, provincial and national policies and strategies are reacting to the phenomenon of backyard accommodation; (c) Outline the experience of landlords and tenants; (d) To review current practices by various municipalities and provinces in dealing with this matter, including existing successes in addressing the challenges of backyard dwellings; and (e) provide some recommendations for future municipal interventions in the informal backyard rental sector to be considered in policymaking.

From property owners, this research also explores the challenges that they face concerning backyard rental accommodation. The research looks at the support systems especially policy, that helps with the backyard rentals. This research will also look at the tenants and property owner's relationship that exist through backyard rental accommodation. This research is significant because it also looks at the tenants' reasons for choosing backyard rental accommodation and their perceptions about it.

1.6 Main Research Question and Sub-questions

In view of the outlined problem statement and the background of the research, the study asks various questions. The main research question is: **Is the municipal policy responsive to the backyard rental accommodation on the urban periphery of Johannesburg?**

The following sub-questions contribute to answering the main research question:

- What elements should be central to municipal interventions to foster supportive and sustainable backyard rental accommodation?
- In what ways does the City of Johannesburg (CoJ) policy recognise and support backyard rental accommodation? Alternatively, what are the responses of the CoJ to backyard rental accommodation?
- What are the expectations, benefits and challenges affecting property owners and tenants?
- What is the way forward for urban planning?

These questions are important because we know so little about the large numbers of South Africans who live in backyard shelters or about the form and organization of this kind of accommodation and what kind of municipal response is appropriate.

Section Two: Data Collection Tools and Research Methods

1.7 Research Methods Background

This section outlines the research approach adopted for the study. Denzin and Lincoln (2005) define a research method as being a basic set of beliefs that influence and guide the researcher's view of the world. There are three types of research methodology: quantitative, qualitative and mixed research methods (Creswell, 2009). Quantitative research methodology focuses on the counting of and analysis of specific objects in reality (Creswell, 2009). The main source of data collection for quantitative methods is the use of questionnaires, which further requires numerical analysis (Creswell, 2009). Qualitative methods focus on describing a set of non-statistical inquiry techniques and processes used to gather data about social phenomena (Creswell, 2009). Mixed research methods rely on quantitative data gathered via questionnaires and qualitative data from interviews (Creswell, 2009). This research employs a qualitative method to satisfy the aim and objectives of the report and to respond to the research questions.

A qualitative method is necessary for this research because it can draw on the everyday experiences of people's lives (Bell, 2005). The qualitative method captures the complexities of people in places that research explores (Bell, 2005). The method also illustrates people's perceptions as it represents different aspects from various people before concluding on a particular matter (Bell, 2005; Creswell, 2009). According to Creswell (2009), there are numerous characteristics of a qualitative approach; firstly, research conducted is in a natural setting; secondly, the researcher gathers information by himself or herself; and thirdly, respondents can express themselves regarding the issues. However, the effectiveness of qualitative research is heavily based on the skills and abilities of the researcher (Henning, et al., 2004), and they mostly come from researcher's personal judgments and interpretations of a small sample (Bell, 2005). Because it is more appropriate for small samples, it is also risky for the results of qualitative research to be perceived as reflecting the opinions of a wider population (Bell, 2005). The collected data is coded into themes and analysed (Merriam, 2009). Conclusions are drawn from the analysed data and recommendations are made.

1.8 Qualitative Method

This research lends itself to qualitative research method to study the issues that relate to human behaviour and the government's response through policy-making (Creswell, 2009). This research is qualitative in nature because it seeks to understand the role of backyard rental accommodation from the people who are involved, which are the property owners, the tenants and municipal officials. The research also takes into consideration the perspective of municipal officials from the City of Johannesburg. The qualitative method uses interviews with identified subjects or interviewees (Creswell, 2009). Henning, Van Rensburg and Smit (2004) suggest that the use of qualitative research methodology is more suitable in instances where the researcher explores variables that are easily controlled. Qualitative research requires the researcher to have a personal experience of the study area and depends on the analytic and integrative skills of the researcher to evaluate perceptions, actions and feelings of the participant (Henning, et al., 2004; Creswell, 2009).

Additionally, the qualitative research method is concerned with observing participants in their natural environment and interpretation of the findings (Maree, 2007). According to Patton and Cochran (2002) the characteristics of qualitative research is that it is appropriate for small samples. Moreover, qualitative research is preferable over quantitative research for this study because it offers a complete description and analysis of the research and does not limit the scope and nature of participants (Maree, 2007; Patton & Cochran, 2002; Creswell, 2009). Bell (2005) argues that qualitative research is risky because samples are small, and should not be perceived to be representative to the larger population. However, the skills, abilities, personal judgements and interpretations by the researcher determine the effectiveness of qualitative research (Bell, 2005).

1.9 Research Approach

The qualitative research approach is exploratory, which allows for social interaction with the key role-players in the process by analysing their perceptions (Creswell, 2009). According to Narayanan, et al. (2000) qualitative research allows the researcher to gain insight into people's perceptions to properly understand how different processes interface with each other. The research approach followed in this research will be inductive (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). According to Denzin and Lincoln (2005), in inductive research, the researcher commences with specific observations of an area to produce a generalized theory, and conclusions are drawn. Inductive research is also useful for small samples using qualitative data (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Bell, 2005). The weakness of inductive research approach is that it produces generalized theories, interpretation of results is usually biased

and conclusions are based on a small number of observations (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). To address these weaknesses, the basic strength of inductive research is its use in predicting what might happen in the future, establishing the possibility and probability of what to encounter (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). Inductive research allows the researcher to be wrong, which gives room for more observations and looking for patterns (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005).

1.10 Data Collection and Research Instruments

Qualitative research studies are designed to discover what can be learned about some phenomena of interest, particularly social phenomena in which people are the participants (Mouton & Marais, 1994). Therefore, the outcome of any qualitative studies are not the generalisation of results, but rather, a deeper understanding of experience from the perspectives of the participants selected for study (Mouton & Marais, 1994). There are various qualitative research methods adopted for this research such as desktop analysis of grey literature, case study research approach and data collection methods such as face-to-face semi-structured interviews using a research guide with questions (Creswell, 2009). The following are data collection and research instruments.

1.10.1 Desktop: Grey Literature

A desktop literature review involves the discussion around housing policy and legislative documents in South Africa and how policy react to backyard accommodation as a contrast (Bowen, 2009). Document analysis is used in combination with other qualitative research methods as a means of triangulation to seek convergence and corroboration with different data sources and methods (Bowen, 2009).

1.10.2 Case Study

According to Yin (2003, p. 2), 'the distinctive need for case studies arises out of the desire to understand complex social phenomena because the case study method allows investigators to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real-life events'. The use of the case study method employed helps to improve the understanding of the complex nature of policy-making and co-ordination by providing an opportunity to gain a holistic view of the study area and an understanding of the policy in the area (Yin, 2003). Yin (2003) argues that there are six possible sources of evidence for case studies: documents, archival records, interviews, direct observation, participant-observation and physical artefacts. For this research, the researcher focuses on statistical data, the geography of the study area, historical archival records, fieldwork interviews and observations.

1.10.3 Area of Research

Dube Township is a peripheral township, which is located in South Africa's Gauteng Province, within the City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality in Soweto (City of Johannesburg, 2014). Dube Township is one of the oldest townships in Soweto (City of Johannesburg, 2014). Dube Township demonstrates evidence of backyard accommodation. The motivation to choose Dube Township is because of the researcher's personal observation of the area and desktop study, which sparked an interest in knowing why a settlement has a high number of backyard rental accommodation structures. The researcher's interest is on finding out how policy reacts to backyard rental accommodation on the urban periphery. The criteria for the selection of Dube Township emanates from the knowledge that the researcher has about the settlement in terms of accessibility to the area, knowledge of existing backyard rental accommodation in the area and contactable people that will help with setting up the interviews.

Dube Township provides a typical example of 're-informalisation' of formal state-subsidized homes (Rubin & Gardner, 2013, p. 5). The prevalence of backyard dwellings in Dube is a consequence of an approach used by residents to respond to the very high demand for shelter and accommodation in well-located settlements (Rubin & Gardner, 2013; Tshangana, 2014). The limited supply of low-income homes has provided many households with formal units to rent out spaces and shacks to earn extra income and provide much-needed accommodation in an area that has limited low-income housing opportunities (Rubin & Gardner, 2013). 'Re-informalisation', as argued by Rubin and Gardner (2013) and high level of densification as argued by Tshangana (2014) through backyard dwellings in Dube Township clearly shows a demand-driven market at play within the settlement. The location of the case study area is explored in more details in Chapter 4.

1.10.4 Data Collection Method

Data collection for the study is qualitative, as the research tries to understand the lived social experiences of the participants (Creswell, 2009; Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). Qualitative data collection methods are used to obtain richness and depth of data, gathered from a complex and multi-faceted phenomenon in a specific social context (Du Plooy-Cilliers, et al., 2014). The methods used to gather data in this study include document reviews, observation and semi-structured interviews with individuals who are property owners, tenants and a City of Johannesburg municipal official (Creswell, 2009; Bell, 2005; Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). Data collection is undertaken in three different phases as outlined below.

1.10.4.1Phase One: Document study

During phase one of the research process, documents relevant to the study are consulted through a desktop study. Document study in this research refers to grey literature, which others can be regarded as primary sources. Mouton (2001) and Henning et al. (2004) define document study as a collection of information relevant in the research that can be found in speeches, annual reports, business plans, official memoranda, diaries and letters. Du Plooy-Cilliers et al. (2014) describe a document study or content analysis phase as one in which the researcher is interpreting social or historical artefacts to provide a rich account of the social reality as contained in the text being studied.

Existing documents on housing legislation, housing policy and backyard accommodation in South Africa, and the Province of Gauteng in particular, have been analysed in terms of their contribution to the research. Data were coded according to themes and patterns as they emerged. The results of the document analysis are presented in Chapter 3. In dealing with the potential bias from grey literature and official documentation, research interviews were conducted with selected key informants in Phase 2.

1.10.4.2Phase Two: Semi-structured Interviews

Semi-structured interviews are valuable in that they allow the space for the researcher to clarify participant answers and probe further into specific lines of enquiry (Simon, 2006). Interviews, as emphasized by authors such as Simon (2006) and Mouton (2001) bring to the fore the underlying assumptions that are drawn in literature for a certain study area. Interviews give a 'voice' to the people rather than merely looking at them as samples, numbers or respondents, as it allows the researcher to capture the uniqueness of the case rather than the generalized and mechanistic view (Mouton, 2001).

According to Allison (1996), an interview is a face-to-face research technique of data collection to elicit information or opinion from a subject. Interviews are personal, aiming to identify the participant's emotions, feelings and opinions regarding a particular research subject (Simon, 2006). The main advantage of interviews is that they involve personal and direct contact between the interviewee and the interviewer (Simon, 2006).

To allow the interview process to flow, the researcher makes use of semi-structured interviews, which offers some form of flexibility in terms of the flow of the interview process (Simon, 2006). However, semi-structured interviews have a risk of deviation from the main research aims and objectives from both the interviewee and the interviewer (Simon, 2006). To address deviation, the researcher uses a

research guide with questions. For this study, an open-ended research guide with questions allowed respondents to expand and explain further on certain points that the researcher could otherwise miss if the interview entailed a close-ended questionnaire (Simon, 2006). The aim of the interviews is deepening the level of understanding, allowing for the deeper exploration of the themes that emerged from the literature review (Chapter 2) and to answer sub-question 3.

A purposive sampling technique was used for the selection of research participants (Punch, 2000). The main goal of purposive sampling is to focus on particular characteristics of a population that are of interest, which will best enable answer the research questions (Punch, 2000). The disadvantage of using purposive sampling, also known as judgmental, selective, or subjective sampling is that it depends on the availability and if the people approached, are willing to participate in the interviews (Punch, 2000; Patton & Cochran, 2002). There were no difficulties in identifying participants. The possibility of incurring difficulties was largely eliminated through familiarity with the area and the introduction by friends and relatives.

According to Punch (2000), sampling is important because it is not possible to interview everyone in the community given the duration of the degree. In total, 31 participants were interviewed above the age of 18 years as illustrated in Table 1 and Appendix 1. Interviews lasted for about 30 minutes each and as argued by Simon (2006), semi-structured interviews take about 45 to 60 minutes. The researcher used a research interview guide (appendix 6) with questions to conduct interviews with the participants. The categories of the participants have been broken down in the following manner (Table 1) and a more detailed table as Appendix 1:

Table 1: Categories of Research Participants

Category	**Number**	**Breakdown of participants**
Region D Official	1	City of Johannesburg Department of Human Settlement
Landlords	10	Male and Female
Tenants	20	Backyard – Brick/ Shack (Male and Female)
Total	+31	

As broken down in the table above, 20 tenants and 10 property owners have been interviewed and one municipal official was interviewed from the City of Johannesburg's Department of Human Settlement (Research and Development: Housing Department). The researcher adopted this approach of selecting at least 10 property owners and 20 tenants according to the ratio of 1:2. The ratio means that for one property owner who participate in the interview, at least two tenants participated in the

interview. Additionally, the selection of the sample ratio is based on the advice by the researcher's relative and availability of the target audience for the interviews. One property owner is capable of accommodating roughly around 3 to 6 backyard structures in one yard. More tenants than property owners will help draw from various perspectives of tenants accommodated by one property owner. Because of the lengthy bureaucracy of securing an interview with municipal officials, the researcher managed to interview one City of Johannesburg official. Within the City of Johannesburg, each region has a specific housing official who is assigned to deal with housing related issues. For instance, the researcher came into contact with Region E housing official through the Community Participation in Urban Governance: Theories, Discourses and Practices (ARPL7044A) course as part of a mini-research project that the researcher conducted for the course for profiling a municipal official. The researcher used this skill and resource to contact the Region D housing official and the process was a success.

1..1.1 Phase Three: Observation

Henning et al. (2004) describe observation in research as gaining a 'first-hand experience' by the researcher during the activity of gathering information. This is precisely because the researcher has a frontline seat during the action. According to Nieuwenhuis (2007), observation is an essential data gathering technique as it holds the possibility of providing the researcher with an insider perspective of the group dynamics and behaviours in different settings. In the context of this study, observation will be useful because it entails as a discrete tool for gathering information as well as participating in the actions of the people in the research setting and getting to know their ways of doing things very well. Observation as a research method is useful in terms of categorizing the densities of backyard accommodation (Nieuwenhuis, 2007) and visualization through images.

Elements to note for observation included the services provided by the municipality to the households such as water, sanitation, refuse removal, electricity supply and maintenance of infrastructure such as roads, streetlights and leakages. Additionally, observation helps to identify how the tenants and property owners utilise the services mentioned above. Information observed through observation is presented as images in Chapter 5.

1.10.4.3Interview Guide: Questions

Tools used for the smooth flow of the research will involve the use of an interview research guide. Questions focus on what are the expectations, benefits and challenges affecting property owners and tenants. These issues are significant because they will assist in terms of finding out the occupants

(tenants) of rental accommodation and the relationships that exist between tenants and property owners. Regarding the economic context, questions will focus on the impacts of government's development and policy position, backyard accommodation as an income generating mechanism, social security, job creation and security of tenure. The research guide with question is attached in Appendix 6.

1.11 Coding and Analysis

The research method for this study is qualitative. Bogdan and Biklen (2007) define qualitative data analysis as working with data, organizing it, breaking it into manageable coding, synthesizing it and searching for patterns. De Vos et al. (2011) define data analysis as the process whereby the researcher brings order and structure and provides meaning to the otherwise mounds of data that is unorganized. In conducting data analysis, Merriam (2009) suggests the development of units of analysis or codes according to themes. The codes and themes are then grouped into categories and analysed in relation to the literature (Merriam, 2009). Categorizing or indexing establishes a framework of thematic ideas about the data (Merriam, 2009). Data collected is presented in Chapter 5 according to themes that emerged from the various sources to reach a reliable conclusion at the end of the study.

1.12 Limitations

All the interviews were conducted during the day. This means the researcher only spoke to participants who were not at work or unemployed at the time. Language (majority speaks IsiZulu) was a factor and a limitation during the interviews. Respondents were not fluent in English and the researcher had to translate to some respondents. There were limitations when translating during transcription and the researcher noticed that some nuances are lost. There are sensitivities in this research such as the treatment of data obtained from people that live in backyard accommodation where people could be exposed to looming evictions, demolitions of backyard structures by the government, risky tenant-landlord situations, and exposure to the stigma of living in backyard accommodation. When people talk about their lives and experiences of previous evictions and other forms of displacement induce feelings of sadness and anxiety from interviewees. Therefore, care is taken to only use this data for academic purposes and ensuring anonymity and confidentiality for all respondents and sensitivity to their responses by using pseudonyms.

Participants were briefed about the purpose of the interview and were requested to sign consent form. Not all participants who were part of this study were willing to give his or her names or sign the consent form. However, the researcher was able to convince them verbally to participate by insuring

them that there would be no harm done to them because of the study, and that they would be referenced to anonymously. The initial information provided and consent form ensures that participants are aware of what the research entails. A considerable amount of time was spent with the participants in order to discuss all the aspects of the research to ensure that there are no unfulfilled expectations on the part of the participants. It was made clear to the participants that they have the right to withdraw from the research at any point during the research process with no negative repercussions accruing to themselves. The methods and instruments used to collect the data for the research were designed in a way as to ensure that no harm or embarrassment would come to the participants, as well as to ensure that the process is stress-free on the participants as possible.

Assurance to participants that all of the information gathered during the research process will remain confidential and pseudonyms are used to ensure anonymity of the participant responses. Participants were informed about the significance of the research and that the information collected will be disseminated. The insights gained from the research may inform further practice and improve the understanding of backyard accommodation.

1.13 Ethical Considerations

This study is subject to the University of the Witwatersrand's ethical standards because it involves human beings. Participants had to sign consent forms as outlined in the Participant Information Sheet (Appendix 4). Age also is also significant and people above the age of 18 years were interviewed. Vulnerable groups such as people with disabilities, people with HIV and AIDS and Children under the age of 18 were not be affected because the researcher did not interview them. To ensure confidentiality and anonymity, pseudonyms are used for respondents and their names are not published. Property owners are referred to as Landlord 1, 2, etc., tenants as Tenant 1, 2 etc., and municipal officials as Official 1. However, high profile individuals such as the municipal officials cannot be assured about anonymity because their names can be guessed easily because of their positions. Ethics clearance certificate is attached as Appendix 2. The participation information sheet is attached as Appendix 4. The participant consent form is attached as Appendix 5.

1.14 Personal Lesson Learnt

The lessons that the researcher has learnt in doing the study are many and include that gaining access to urban peripheral communities is a careful exercise that requires acknowledgement of all authorities in these communities. Regarding the use of research ethics, I learnt that not all elements of ethics are acceptable to participants. While some elements of ethical practice were acceptable, others were not

readily acceptable by the participants in the communities because of the manner in which they perceived the study. For instance, informed consent was acceptable but ensuring anonymity of participants and their communities was problematic for some participants, because they saw the study as providing them with an important platform to make them visible and their voices heard.

1.15 Outline of Chapters

The structure of the research report is as follows:

CHAPTER ONE: The Need for the Study.

This is an introductory chapter, which outlines the introduction, problem statement, and research question, main aim and objectives of the research and the rationale of the research. Furthermore, the chapter discusses the research methods that are employed to conduct the research. The chapter covers the processes and procedures that are employed for collecting and analyzing data in the study.

CHAPTER TWO: Backyard Accommodation and Policy Exploration through Literature

The chapter explores the literature that is relevant to the research firstly by looking at the conceptual framework. The chapter discusses debates around backyard accommodation on the urban periphery. This chapter should answer the first sub-question: What elements should be central to municipal interventions to foster supportive and sustainable backyard rental accommodation?

CHAPTER THREE: Contextualising Housing Policy and Backyard Accommodation

The chapter explores the housing policies that are relevant to backyard accommodation in South Africa through a desktop study. This chapter should answer sub-question 2: In what ways does City of Johannesburg policy recognise and support backyard rental accommodation? Alternatively, what are the responses of the CoJ to backyard rental accommodation?

CHAPTER FOUR: Situation Analysis of the Urban Periphery: Case Study of Dube Township, Johannesburg

The chapter presents a case study of the Dube Township. It presents the location background of the area, reasons for choosing the area, backyard accommodation, current socio-economic profile, analysis of the current political situation of the area.

CHAPTER FIVE: Exploring Hidden Spaces on the Urban Periphery

The chapter presents the research findings based on the research interviews conducted with various participants and different themes that come from the transcripts. Data is presented from the perspective and perception of respondents and provides an analysis of the data in light of (a) overall understanding of Dube (Chapter 4), (b) the policies and responses (Chapter 3) and (c) key themes emerging from the literature (Chapter 2). It should answer sub-question 3: What are the expectations, benefits and challenges affecting property owners and tenants?

CHAPTER SIX: Analysis of Hidden Spaces on the Urban Periphery

This chapter presents an analyses the findings from the interviews conducted, literature review, desktop data, and the case study of the area. The chapter also demonstrates, through the findings, the disjuncture between what housing policy is meant to achieve and what outcomes they actually produce.

CHAPTER SEVEN: Conclusion and Planning Recommendations

This is the final chapter of the research, which presents the conclusion and makes urban planning recommendations of the study based on the findings. The chapter also presents the lessons learnt from the study. The chapter attempt to answer the research sub-question 4: What is the way forward for urban planning?

2. CHAPTER TWO: Backyard Accommodation and Policy Exploration through Literature

2.1 Introduction

South Africa's troubled past, rooted in oppressive segregation brought about by the policy of Apartheid continues to obscure the country's current and future urban development prospects (Charlton, 2014; Govender, Barnes & Pieper, 2011; Turok, 2012). South African urban planners face the segregated, dispersed and fragmented urban structures they inherited, as well as a growing demand for low-income housing and limited resources to meet these needs (Charlton, 2014; Lategan & Cilliers, 2019). In an attempt to compensate for past injustices, the South African government has focused on delivering housing units in large numbers (Lategan & Cilliers, 2019). Subsequently, the pressure to deliver in large quantities has superseded quality and sustainability considerations, such as social inclusion and well-being, economic growth and environmental protection (Lategan & Cilliers, 2019; Makamu, 2010).

In addition, one of the critical challenges is formulating housing policies and strategies that respond and react to day-to-day challenges that people face (Govender, et al., 2011). Housing policies in the past have overlooked backyard accommodation, and they focus on upgrading and eradicating informal settlements (Bank, 2007). Despite local governments' efforts to provide state-funded housing and free basic services to poor households, there has been little change in the housing policies to tackle backyard accommodation (Turok & Borel-Saladin, 2016).

The purpose of this chapter is to respond to sub-question 1: What elements should be central to municipal interventions to foster supportive and sustainable backyard rental accommodation? The chapter presents an overview of backyard accommodation, its expansion, developmental implications and a suggestion towards a new housing typology in South Africa. The chapter presents a literature review, which discusses and debates the relationship between formality and informality. It should set out the relationships between the various concepts in the research question and more specifically, address the sub-question 1. The relationship between the various concepts are outlined in section 2.3 to serve as the conceptual framework. The review of both international and local literature on backyard accommodation in this chapter provides a more nuanced understanding of the extent of the issue, the nature of government institutions and service provider interventions, together with the potentials and shortcomings of these interventions in the current South African context as well as international practices.

2.2 Definitions

The following section discusses the key concepts that the study uses. To understand the local and international lessons of backyard accommodation, it is important to understand different terminologies that describe backyard accommodation internationally and locally. For the purposes of this report, the researcher use the definition of the term housing advanced by Tissington (2010, p. 28), which defines housing as a package of services: land, public facilities, access to employment and other social services, as well as the dwelling structure itself. Housing can be seen as an object or a complex of material components, where its value is judged by its material quality (Tissington, 2010). For the purposes of this study, housing is defined in two ways; on the one hand, it refers to government-subsidized structures that are provided by the state and on the other hand, it refers to structures that are built by property owners and/or tenants in the backyards of formal housing. Government-subsidized houses are government houses that are built as part of a government funded social housing project, in which the houses are owned (not rented) by beneficiaries (Republic of South Africa, 2020). The UN-Habitat refers to backyard accommodation as multiple households. The economics definition of the backyard accommodation sector is that, houses are utilised as a consumer good and as asset. Property owners can live in the house and source income from renting backyard structures or space. This combination of attributes makes housing a very special and difficult commodity to analyse, as the earlier definition relates to physical and spatial features of the house and the later definition relates to the use and exchange value in the market place.

As outlined in the UN-Habitat (2003; 2015) reports on rental housing, there are various distinctions about backyard accommodation. For instance, people who live in someone else's home and pay rent at regular intervals are tenants, while those who hold some rights to live on a separate plot of land are property-owners or landlords (UN-Habitat, 2003). Tenants range across various scales, from those tenants who have legal contracts with the owner and live in formal housing, while others only have verbal contracts and may live in an illegal dwelling called a backroom (UN-Habitat, 2003). This would include backyard dwellings in which the occupants do not pay rent, such as 'hokkies' in Cape Town and accommodate family members (Lemanski, 2009; Cobbett, 2009).

The terms 'backyard housing' and 'backyard dwelling' will be used interchangeably in this chapter with the term 'backyard accommodation' and for the purposes of this research, they are also referred to as the 'hidden spaces'. These structures are hidden spaces, which the government or officials sometimes do not have knowledge about and sometimes do know about them, however, there are no

statistical data or records of these structures and are not accounted for (Turok, 2012). Additionally, some of these hidden spaces are visible to the public based on the location within the yard (Turok, 2012).

The materials that are used are either bricks and mortar, or corrugated iron and planks (Turok, 2012). Informal backyard structures usually occur when tenants rent the backyard spaces from property owners and use their own resources to construct a dwelling using corrugated iron (Lemanski, 2009). Tenants typically use corrugated iron, metal sheets, and wooden planks to construct informal backyard structures (Lemanski, 2009). In such cases where tenants build the backyard structures themselves rent is relatively low (Lemanski, 2009). In other cases, the property owner build the structure either with corrugated iron or with bricks and mortar (Lemanski, 2009). In such cases where the property owner builds the backyard structures themselves, rent is relatively high, especially for structures constructed using brick and mortar (Lemanski, 2009).

Corrugated iron structures are commonly referred to as shacks and are more prominent in informal settlements. The term ‘backyard shack’ is one of many terms used to refer to backyard accommodation and other terms used include terms such as ‘self-help houses’, ‘wendy houses’, ‘hokkies’ and ‘bungalows’ (Lemanski, 2009). Other terms used include ‘household rental’ that describe the rental of a house, flat, room in a backyard or informal dwelling (Watson, 2009). The researcher has made a choice to avoid using the term ‘backyard shack’, which has mainly negative meanings related to its ‘informality’, and many of the backyard structures cannot be seen as ‘shacks’ in any event and which, research has shown, does not represent the full spectrum of backyard housing typologies (Shapurjee & Charlton, 2013, pp. 659-660).

The term ‘backyard dweller’ and occupant will be used interchangeably with the term tenant, which refers to a person who occupiers backyard dwelling. The term ‘property owner’ refers to the owner or legal custodian of the main house (in most cases this is a government-subsidized house, which may sometimes be renovated) and the term will be used interchangeably with the term ‘landlord’.

2.3 Conceptual Framework

This section presents the conceptual framework. There are two broad concepts that the conceptual framework covers that are formality and informality. Within formality, there is housing policy, which discusses the intentions of the state, the role of the state and mass delivery of houses. Within informality, there is backyard accommodation, which discusses the landlord-tenant relationship,

impact of backyard accommodation, why people choose backyard accommodation, the type of materials used to build the structures, and location on the urban periphery. The diagram below indicates a conceptual framework:



Figure 1: Conceptual Framework

2.4 International Experience of Backyard Accommodation

Globally, the renting of informal forms of accommodation to tenants has become an effective livelihood strategy employed by the urban poor, answering to the need for affordable housing (Carey, 2009). A growing body of global (Cohen, 2004), regional (Holloway, et al., 2013) and South African academic literature (Hoogendoorn & Nel, 2012) suggests that informal and low-income populations of townships are growing at an unsustainable rate, unmatched by parallel economic growth and high levels of poverty. Since the Second World War, governments in developing countries have been forced to embrace neo-liberal policies by international monetary bodies such as the World Bank (WB) and International Monetary Fund (IMF) through structural adjustment programmes (Harvey, 2005). As a result, public spending by the government on housing and service delivery for the poor was discouraged due to neo-liberal policies (Harvey, 2005).

Neoliberalism is a school of thought that encompasses both politics and economics and seeks to transfer the control of economic factors from the public sector to the private sector. Neoliberal

economic policies stress two fundamental concepts, which are deregulation (the removal of government control over industry) and privatization (the transfer of ownership, property, or business from the government to the private sector). However, over time proponents of neoliberalism acknowledged the need for government to play a role in housing the poor and providing basic services. As a result, international aid donors were heavily influenced by, and adapted the neoliberal policy positions of the World Bank and UN-Habitat (Harvey, 2005) and promoted aided self-help housing policy in developing countries (Van Waeyenberge, 2015). In the South African context, the government after assuming power in 1994 they adopted a leftist, basic-needs-oriented Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) as the popular foundation for its economic policy, and within two years, they switched to a rightist, neoliberal Growth, Employment and Redistribution (GEAR) policy stressing privatization, deregulation, and trade liberalization (Sebake, 2017).

In Africa and Asia, informal rental accommodation provides over half the housing needs of population in urban areas, and a third of those in Latin America (Fay & Wellenstein, 2005). Gaining access to housing that provides adequate shelter and physical safety is one of the greatest challenges confronting the urban poor (Fay & Wellenstein, 2005). Most poor people live in informal housing, often located in marginal areas that are vulnerable to natural disasters and poorly served by public services (Fay & Wellenstein, 2005).

2.4.1 Metro Manila, Philippines Case Study

In Metro Manila, Philippines, the increase in urban population through migration and natural increase has been absorbed largely by formal and informal rental housing markets, with the majority of the urban poor living in congested, substandard housing structures (Pampanga, et al., 2015). However, as in many other cities in developing countries, Metro Manila lacks adequate housing supply that is able to cater to the needs of the urban poor (Pampanga, et al., 2015). This has widened the market for informal rental housing sector, which is in most cases supplied by the property owners and tenants (Pampanga, et al., 2015). Low-income housing in Metro Manila is often characterized by poor quality housing, hazardous environments and poverty (Monsod, 2012).

Before 1992, the Philippines' national government had a monopoly in the production of housing required under the housing policy of the country (Pampanga, et al., 2015). However, despite this long history of public sector housing programmes, there is still a significantly high number of unmet needs of housing improvements and additional housing units for poor urban Philippians (Monsod, 2012). In 2007, the housing backlog was standing at 1.3 million in a metro of 11.5 million people (Monsod,

2012, p. 226). Carino and Corpuz (2009) point out that higher population growth rate, insufficiency of land in urban areas to build detached housing units, and the lack of state funds to meet housing backlog are a significant factor in limiting the effectiveness of the government's housing policy programmes. Furthermore, land invasions due to high prices of land and development of informal settlements within the city Manila are not uncommon (Monsod, 2012). Pampanga, et al (2015) also point out that the high prices of land in urban areas contributed to the development and supply of social housing. The convenience of flexibility that informal rental accommodations provides to tenants living in backyard accommodation, or those renting land from their landlords also contributed to ease the burden of supply social housing (Monsod, 2012). The next part discuses alternative policy approaches and the lessons for South Africa.

The Philippines' housing programme approach emphasizes mass provision of government-subsidized housing, which sets up a situation very similar to South Africa and there are lessons that can be learnt (Monsod, 2012). Housing policy is embodied in a national housing programme that features housing finance, production and regulation, led by Housing and Urban Development Coordinating Council (HUDCC). Housing finance has been the dominant component of the housing program to maximize output through low-priced housing loans. On the housing production side, production inefficiency has also been an issue because of poor pricing, weak sales and even weaker collections through high transaction costs.

Additionally, Metro Manila has various approaches to their housing programme depending on the nature, location and circumstances of the community. For established communities that have access to the land upon which their community resides, on-site upgrading to include regularization of the land, introduction of basic services such as water supply and sanitation, and provision of other infrastructure and community facilities. For vulnerable squatter communities in danger zones, relocation to appropriate serviced land and the provision of integrated urban development solutions with an emphasis on livelihood opportunities. In line with this thinking the Housing and Urban Development Coordinating council, which is in charge of slum eradication in the city has a number of programmes and policies that are in line with the abovementioned approaches. These include: The asset reform program, which tries to redistribute resource through a beneficiary-led approach; Regularization of tenure through issuance of presidential proclamations; Provision of secure tenure through the Community Mortgage Program; and increasing social housing stock, which requires developers of subdivisions to set aside 20 percent of the area, or the cost, for social housing.

The problem with this approach, according to Monsod (2012), is that it only treats the symptoms of failures of the housing system instead of its fundamental causes and as a result, it has not achieved much (Monsod, 2012). Monsod (2012) recommended that the government should shift its approach and concentrate on addressing the supply of low-cost housing. The general lack of financial resources for people to buy their own homes is an indicator that there is a need for government intervention in the housing market in order to ensure equity and the welfare of all citizens especially the poor.

An important lesson that the Philippine experience has shown is that secure tenure through freehold has high transaction costs, which are often passed on to the state and make the process of securing tenure for beneficiaries extremely expensive. However, the Philippines have also benefited enormously from bringing in the help of various sectors including other departments, NGOs, grassroots movements, academics, research institutions and multi-lateral organization, who have helped to drive new ways of understanding housing issues and approaches and ensuring their acceptance at community and state level.

2.5 Overview of Backyard Accommodation: The South African Context

Housing in South Africa is highly politicized and has a long history of state control and involvement (Lemanski, 2009). The prohibition of homeownership for Africans during apartheid together with insufficient housing construction in designated African areas resulted in severe overcrowding and housing shortages (Lemanski, 2011). This section discusses the phenomenon of backyard housing with state housing and urban policies, showing historical pattern of interconnectedness about one affecting the other.

2.5.1 Historical Development of Backyard Accommodation in South Africa

Backyard dwellings today have become a common feature of the South African urban landscape (Rubin & Gardner, 2013; Tshangana, 2014; Turok & Borel-Saladin, 2016). However, it is not a new phenomenon in South African urban areas (Bank, 2007). South African's backyard accommodation may have originated from the need to reduce transport costs and distances from casual job opportunities with low incomes by migrant laborers and the urban poor (Todes, et al., 2016). The earliest recorded backyard dwelling in South Africa was located on the East Rand in 1910 (Gauteng Province, 2015). This form of accommodation gained increasing popularity in the Gauteng area in the 1920s and 1930s, when the booming mining and industrial sectors attracted vast numbers of labour migrants seeking affordable and well-located accommodation (Crankshaw, et al., 2000). In the 1950s, evidence suggests that backyard dwelling was prevalent (Bank, 2007). In the 1960s, there was

insufficient housing for casual labour (from the homelands) and housing was supplemented by informal backyard structures (Lemanski, 2009).

The construction of houses for urban black Africans and the prohibition of informal settlements consequently led to the creation of more backyard dwellings in the late 1960s and early 1970s (Lemanski, 2009; Bank, 2007). The Apartheid state organized large-scale clearance programmes in the main cities in the hope of eradicating the 'pathologies of the yard' or backyard dwelling structures (Bank, 2007). At the same time, in the early 1970s, informal settlements were growing, the apartheid state was losing its control over the townships, and, as a result, backyard accommodation increased in these newly 'freed' spaces (Lemanski, 2009). The idea by the State that backyard dwellings would gradually disappear did not materialize (Lemanski, 2009; Huchzermeyer, 2011; Bank, 2007). Backyard dwelling erection re-emerged on a large scale from the 1970s and the new townships became overcrowded (Bank, 2007). From the late 1980s, the control on the townships declined and the number of backyard dwellings increased together with the expansion of informal settlements in the mid-1980s (Lemanski, 2009; Bank, 2007). At this time (late 1980s), the state and other institutions (e.g. the neoliberal Urban Foundation) were instituting informal settlement and township upgrading programmes. This informality, though illegal, offered an alternative housing to accommodate growing populations in already overcrowded Black African townships, particularly in main cities such as Johannesburg and Cape Town, where the nearest homelands were distant (Bank, 2007). Backyard dwelling tenants, however, did not own the structures and were evicted by property owners when they broke the yard rules or degraded the dwellings. State-subsidized housing was introduced in pilot form before 1994 and the strength of its lobby ensured that it became the predominant housing approach after 1994.

2.5.2 Introduction of State-subsidized Housing as the Official Policy

South Africa's transition from apartheid to democracy ushered in a period in which the foundations were laid to eradicate the legacy of the past housing policies and their delivery systems. Thus, the establishment of democratic government in South Africa, in April 1994, had as a priority the provision of houses to the previously disadvantaged. To achieve its goal in housing provision, government formulated several policy documents. These include the White Paper on Housing in 1994, Peoples Housing Process policy in 1998, and the Comprehensive Plan for the Development of Sustainable Human Settlements in 2004 (commonly known as BNG) (Department of Housing, 2004). At the same time, government also negated backyard accommodation (Bank, 2007).

Bank (2007) argues that the reason for the lack of attention and support to backyard accommodation has been due to a certain type of logic, which assumed that backyard accommodation would be gradually eradicated through the delivery of government-subsidized housing for the low-income households. However, government-subsidized housing has altered the nature of backyard housing, creating a new class of homeowners who are dependent on income from backyard dwellers' rent (Bank, 2007). The owners of the government-subsidized houses use backyard accommodation to generate revenue, thus the more backyard dwellers they accommodate the better the revenue (Lemanski, 2009). This housing stock is often found in areas previously designated for black Africans under apartheid (Lemanski, 2011). The reason for this development was and still is a severe shortage of affordable housing (Charlton & Kihato, 2006).

Backyard dwelling as a form of housing in South Africa is indirectly affected by South Africa's housing policies and regulations. Certainly, explicit policy recognition for backyard dwellings is not yet apparent by the national government. A social housing approach, which provides rental alternatives for low-income communities, has emerged. Although this emerging policy focuses on rental options, explicit policy recognition for backyard dwellings can be discerned. In 2008, the Gauteng Department of Housing released a draft 'Backyard Rental Policy' to regulate and formalize backyard dwellings, which was piloted in two Johannesburg townships including Soweto and Sedibeng (Gauteng Province, 2008).The policy provides a grant to upgrade backyard dwelling into formal two or three-roomed fully serviced structures as well as legal support to formalize the landlord-tenant relationship (Gauteng Province, 2008). Lemanski (2009) notes that the policy intends to upgrade existing backyard structures, which therefore will eradicate the informality in the cities in Gauteng Province. There has been little progress in addressing the plight of backyard accommodation through the Backyard Rental Policy due to a lack of support by national government. The policy was in draft form for a long time and was not made publicly available. However, the Gauteng Province then released another policy called 'Backyard Rental Housing', which is explored in sub-section 3.4.1.

2.5.3 Analysis of Demand and Supply on the Development of Backyard Accommodation

Backyard structures and low-income households are closely connected to insecurity and poverty (Turok & Borel-Saladin, 2016). Lemanski (2009) argues that backyard structures are similar to informal settlements because they are characterized by inadequate size, lack of quality and that they perpetuate trend of unhealthy living environment. However, backyard structures differ from informal

settlements in that they are built on a demarcated plot within a formal and fully serviced housing area (Lemanski, 2009). These backyard structures are usually located on a formally developed and serviced stand (Shapurjee & Charlton, 2013, p. 655). Although some can be found in informally developed areas such as informal settlements (Lemanski, 2009; Shapurjee & Charlton, 2013; Zweig, 2015). It is in these informal settlements that the conditions of living in the backyard are the poorest. According to Crankshaw, et al. (2000), what makes the South African backyard housing market unique is that tenants frequently rent space in which to construct their own dwellings, whereas in other parts of the world it is the landlords who build backyard accommodation with a view to taking in tenants.

Backyard accommodation typically involves a situation in which a property owner and a tenant co-habit on the same plot, although they live in different dwellings (Shapurjee & Charlton, 2013). Informal backyard rental structures are usually one or two roomed informal structures erected of corrugated iron, wooden planks, metal sheets and plastics, located within a plot with a formal dwelling generally in the backyard space and are commonly occupied by a low income tenants (Watson, 2009, p. 5; Morange, 2002, p. 6; Robins, 2002, p. 512; Lemanski, 2009, p. 473; Cirolia, 2014, p. 398).

On the supply side of the backyard market, property owners willingly make available their backyard space or dwelling unit for accommodation (Cirolia, 2014). They then generate income from the rental payments coming from their tenants, and most of the property owners operate in this sector for survival rather than profit-maximization (Cirolia, 2014). The prospect of rental income also encourages property owners to provide and develop more units for accommodation without government intervention (Watson, 2009).The demand-side of the backyard housing market is driven by tenants' need for affordable accommodation who are willing and able to pay rent for accommodation in other people's backyards (Cirolia, 2014). These two forces of demand and supply are the driving engine of the backyard-housing sector.

Another reason for the development of backyard housing units is the lack of space or overcrowding in the main structure as the family grows (Govender, et al., 2011). Thus, some of the backyard dwellings are constructed to accommodate family overspills (Turok & Borel-Saladin, 2016; Govender, et al., 2011). These family members may be too young or adults who cannot afford their buy or rent properties, although this trend appears to be less common (Turok & Borel-Saladin, 2016, p. 389). Given the general informal nature of backyard structures, tenants often occupy poor quality dwellings that are small, uncomfortable, restrictive, permeable, poorly ventilated with low thermal

performance and lack access to basic services (Turok & Borel-Saladin, 2016). All of this can be summarized as both unsafe and unhealthy (Lemanski, 2009, p. 473; Shapurjee & Charlton, 2013, p. 662).

2.5.4 The Impact of Backyard Structures on Infrastructure and Service Delivery

All people are supposed to have access to basic services, as this is a constitutional right, which is central to people's health and safety. Backyard dwellers commonly access these services through the main dwelling structure (Zweig, 2015; Lategan, 2017). Tenants in backyard structures place great pressure on infrastructure, which was mainly designed to cater for the homeowners of the main structures (Zweig, 2015; Lategan, 2017). According to Govender, et al. (2011), municipalities are sometimes not able to efficiently dispose of solid waste and sewage due to the increased population densities associated with extra residents of backyard structures. This is because municipal utilities that are originally designed to service a single household of six individuals end up having to service up to six families per plot (Govender, et al., 2011). Consequently, this places immense pressure and strain on infrastructural services. The municipal infrastructure is stretched beyond its capacity, as property owners who are the main intended services recipients share it with additional families living in their backyards (Govender, et al., 2011; Lategan, 2017). This extra infrastructural pressure caused by backyard dwellers, and the lack of infrastructural maintenance can ultimately lead to urban decay (Govender, et al., 2011). Concerns about degradation of infrastructure and creation of slums have given rise to hostility to backyard accommodation, particularly in low-income areas.

2.5.5 The Backyard Sector and Planning Regulations

Outside buildings such as backyard structures can be found in low, middle, and high income areas. In most private properties in urban areas, property owners are allowed by law to extend their properties (Lategan, 2012). This means that building a backyard structure is legal if it abides by the land use regulations of that area and bylaws. In some areas, the residential and commercial land uses are mixed. However, residents are expected to go through the legal processes in order to construct an additional building or if they want to use their homes and outside building for commercial purposes (Lategan, 2012). In most middle income and high-income areas, property owners are financially able to construct outside buildings that comply with municipal bylaws, zoning regulations and building norms and standards (Lategan, 2012).

However, property owners in low-income areas often do not follow the legal route because of the complicated nature of bureaucratic planning processes and the costs involved in obtaining planning

permission. Hence, most property owners who live in low-income areas tend to ignore regulatory procedures. However, it is common for municipal systems to demand that high and middle-income neighborhoods comply with formal processes, while low-income neighborhoods are left to contravene these processes (Lategan, 2012). Therefore, there is a policy vacuum, in which informal backyard structures continue to exist beyond regulatory oversight and legal protection (Lategan, 2012).

A formalization policy may benefit property owners and could possibly improve living conditions of the tenants. Lemanski (2009, p. 482) notes that landlords could get increased rental income, and would also then benefit from the added value to their homes due to upgrades. However, Watson (2009, p. 5) points out that formalization of the backyard rental sector may lead to rents that are too high for average backyard tenants to afford. There is very limited existing data to show whether backyard dwellers would be prepared to pay higher monthly rents for better quality accommodation (Social Housing Foundation, 2008, p. 9). Physical upgrades on backyard structures could pose a threat to affordability, and would therefore dilute/reduce the sector's contribution to the low-income housing market. In this regard, Lategan (2012) cautions that the poor should not be left without shelter for the sake of providing households who are already beneficiaries of housing subsidies with an increased income through backyard accommodation.

2.6 Implication, advantages and disadvantages of backyard accommodation

According to Tshangana (2014), the South African Local Government Association (SALGA) report (see Rubin & Gardner, 2013) found that, a quarter of all South Africans now live in some form of rental accommodation. Backyard rental accommodation is one of the fastest growing housing sectors, creating housing opportunities for nearly two thirds of households that are unable to access formal types of housing (Rubin & Gardner, 2013). A comparison of 2001 and 2011 census data by Turok and Borel-Saladin (2016) shows that the proportion of households living in backyard dwellings has been increasing more rapidly than those in informal settlements. According to Buhle Zuma (Zuma, 2019) and the Gauteng City-Region Observatory (Gauteng City-Region Observatory, 2018), backyard dwellings grew at a much faster rate (205%) than informal settlement dwellings (51%) over the period 2001 to 2016, and by 2016 there were over 800 000 backyard dwellings in Gauteng compared to some 600 000 informal settlement dwellings. This section probes the expansion of backyard accommodation, its implications, advantages and disadvantages.

2.6.1 The Developmental Implications of Backyard Accommodation

The proliferation of backyard dwellings, while inadvertently answering to the aim of National Development Plan (NDP), Breaking New Grounds (BNG), Integrated Urban Development Framework (IUDF) and National Development Spatial Framework (NDSF), which calls for the densification of urban areas to prevent further urban sprawl, is also posing a critical development challenge to local authorities in terms of increased infrastructural need and service provision (Zweig, 2015). Margot Rubin (as quoted in the article by Zuma, 2019) argues that backyard rental accommodation contributes to densification, and in thinking about backyard accommodation, the extent to which it contributes to densification or overcrowding also need to be considered (Zuma, 2019). Densification is the optimum use of the land space and is more desirable than overcrowding (Zuma, 2019).

It is also contributing to an increasingly risk-prone environment as shown in Gunter's (2014) study in Alexandra, Johannesburg where many foreign migrants rent backyard accommodation from South African property owners. Research has shown that most backyard dwellers are living in hazardous living conditions with constrained access to resources, such as ablution facilities, running water, toilets and electricity, and are often exploited by landlords (Gunter, 2014; Lemanski, 2009; Zweig, 2015).

2.6.2 Advantages of Backyard Accommodation

Backyard accommodation offers a flexible housing option, especially for low-income households, in terms of location and affordability (Rubin & Gardner, 2013). Backyard dwellings provide rental accommodation for residents who do not wish to pay expensive monthly rentals because this is all they can afford (Rubin & Gardner, 2013). Backyard rooms are usually in good location being close to work opportunities and social amenities, and often on land already set aside for residential use (Rubin & Gardner, 2013). Backyard accommodation provides affordable accommodation with access to basic services, often accommodate extended families and support kinship networks (Rubin & Gardner, 2013). Backyard dwellings can be developed incrementally as the primary homeowner acquires more capital and can help harness the entrepreneurial talents of the community and to allow small contractors to engage in construction (Rubin & Gardner, 2013). Tenants provide rent to landlords and supplement the revenue stream of the primary homeowner and help to define outdoor living space, often serving as the major social gathering area in township environments (Rubin & Gardner, 2013).

2.6.3 Disadvantages of backyard rooms

The main disadvantages and challenges, which affect backyard dwellers is the lack of mass visibility, (Lemanski, 2009). Invisibility (hidden) may also be advantageous because they are slipping below the regulatory radars. Backyard dwellers are merged into existing formal residential areas. Backyard rooms have limited access to the streets (Lemanski, 2009). The landlord-tenant relations are often unregulated (Lemanski, 2009). In all forms of tenure, the relationship is encoded in the Rental Housing Act, but it is just not well enforced by legal bodies. This housing category maintains an exploitative relationship between, property owners and backyard dwellers, and perpetuates informality (Lemanski, 2009). Densities in terms of backyard dwelling are often excessive with rooms often do not have adequate light and ventilation and are often built using flammable materials (Lemanski, 2009). Infrastructure provided based on one residence per plot cannot always cope with the increased densities. Access to services is generally of low quality and mainly comprises of electricity from the main house, access to a cold-water tap and access to a shared flush toilet (Gordon & Nell, 2006). Backyard accommodation is also linked to overburdening of infrastructure and services.

2.7 Towards a New Housing Typology: Hybrid Typology

In context of significant housing backlogs and the supply of backyard accommodation, the positives outweigh the negatives. This suggests that backyard accommodation could provide valuable lessons for the development of a new hybrid housing typology (Chetty, 2017). Mayson and Charlton's (2015) research, argues that there is a need for a new housing typology. They found that, in the inner city area of Jeppestown in Johannesburg, informal housing is meaningful to occupants as it minimizes expenditure on rent and residents mostly capitalize on locational advantage. They recognize that informal housing occurs as a form of establishing shelter outside the 'formal' spectrum and represents another form/type of housing even though they are often not approved by the local authority and the existing bylaws, policy and regulatory frameworks (Mayson & Charlton, 2015). They argue that by adopting a hybrid housing typology to backyard accommodation as an alternative rental tenure in the City of Johannesburg will help in unlocking the potential of backyard rentals in accommodating low-income groups and in dealing with the housing backlog that the city is currently facing (Chetty, 2017).

Formality and informality could be merged into a hybrid model to ensure a sustainable supply of alternative rental accommodation (Chetty, 2017). This would require policy support from the City of Johannesburg in a way that enables the sustainable development of incremental backyard dwellings.

Embracing both informality and formality, as a hybrid model could meet the demands and needs of the poor through the supply of low-income backyard rental units, thereby providing them access to the city (Chetty, 2017). Backyard accommodation as a new housing typology should build on the current experiences of property owners and tenants to set out a model to significantly increase the housing densities ordinarily associated with government-subsidized housing. Government-subsidized housing is the current delivery mechanism for most of the existing rental stock in old townships. As a result, both property owners and tenants are familiar with the system and they have developed the capacity to manage this form of rental, although in an unregulated fashion.

The development of a municipal backyard policy to guide future development offers the opportunity for progressive future-oriented planning, giving consideration not only to the backyard dweller, but also the landlord and the surrounding community (Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs, 2016). The old Gauteng Backyard Rental Policy released in 2008 and the Backyard Rental Housing policy released in 2015 are insufficient and new backyard municipal policy should be proposed. The key elements of the backyard housing policy should focus on sustainability, the principles integration, efficiency, choice, densification, affordability, livability, connectivity, transport accessibility, as well as access to political systems (such as ward councilors), employment and economic activities, legal systems, and housing and bulk infrastructure. Support for the backyard-housing sector is now a growing area of focus at national level, but also increasingly at municipal scale.

2.8 The Urban Periphery

According to Turok and Borel-Saladin (2016), South African townships are personified by inefficiency, promoted by horizontal sprawl, low population densities, segregation and spatial and racial fragmentation. Given the personified dynamics of South African townships, housing projects are habitually located on the urban periphery. Dube Township is peripheral to the City of Johannesburg metropole, sitting on the edge of its municipal boundary. However, its location is considerably less peripheral when looking at the broader Gauteng City-Region. The case study of the study area is presented in Chapter 4. Informal backyard dwellings resemble the structures found in South Africa's formal townships such as Soweto. Backyard dwellers enjoy partial or complete access to services provided to their landlords in formal dwellings. In general, backyard tenants enjoy improved access to services when compared to settlers in informal townships.

Location is important in assessing the contribution of backyards to urban integration and economic inclusion. Evidence presented by Turok and Borel-Saladin (2016) suggests that backyard

accommodation structures are slightly better located than freestanding shacks in informal settlements. However, they do not seem to be better located than government-subsidized houses. The distribution of backyard accommodation to the urban periphery show that they coincide closely with established townships. Both are poorly located in relation to formal job opportunities. One measure of location is walking distance to access public transport (Turok & Borel-Saladin, 2016). Backyard dwellers do not have to walk quite as far on average to use public transport as other shack dwellers. An indicator is the distance between different housing types and major employment centres within a region, explored through a simple comparison of the geography of economic activity and housing. Location also affects the economic efficiency of cities, and a lack of interaction between employment and residential location results in unacceptably high commuting times and high carbon-dioxide emissions.

The socio-economic composition of backyard dwellers on the urban periphery is important in understanding the dynamic function of this housing segment. The evidence in this section suggests that backyard tenants are much more similar to the residents of informal settlements than to people living in formal housing. Both groups of dwellers are relatively poor, low skilled and young. Almost two-thirds of them are migrants from outside Gauteng (StatsSA, 2011; Census, 2011). Backyarders have better access to basic services than freestanding shacks, yet inferior access than formal houses. This supports the idea that backyards are an alternative to freestanding shacks, performing a similar role in the urban housing market as a low-cost entry point for people trying to improve their living standards, but without much success at this stage. Income is a crucial indicator of socio-economic status and purchasing power in the housing market.

There have been additional problems with their peripheral location and neglect of people's need to secure jobs and incomes to pay for ongoing service charges, property upkeep and everyday family consumption needs. Lemanski (2009, p. 479) has gone further in arguing that government-housing policy has transformed the phenomenon by creating a new class of cash-poor homeowners. Backyarder rents comprise 'the economic backbone of landlord households'.

2.9 Critiques of backyard accommodation

Backyard accommodation has largely been critiqued for its informal conditions that goes against the aim of 'orderly urban areas' and the focus is on formality (Lemanski, 2009). The provincial government acknowledge the importance of backyard accommodation in the urban housing market, however, it still emphasises that it does not conform to the building standards thus makes it difficult for the government to support it (Turok & Borel-Saladin, 2016). Gauteng Province (2015) add that

this is because the dwellings are constructed with low standard materials that compromise sustainable livelihood standards and the dwellings are constructed without approval from the local authority. Given that the construction of the dwelling does not follow the building standards, they lead to overcrowded housing and hence strain the infrastructure services beyond the capacity, which it was designed for (Poulsen & Silverman, 2016). Lategan (2012) argues that this is because the backyard accommodation is located in places, which were specifically designed to cater the pre-approved number of formal properties. Furthermore, Lategan (2012) argues that the informal densification of backyard structures causes public health hazard and fire risks from the illegal electric connections that are made of insubstantial materials.

2.10 Concluding Remarks

The national, provincial and local government spheres have not yet proposed a clear housing policy approach, direction and recognition of backyard rental accommodation. South African housing policies and law have a unique past, covered by the legacy of apartheid. This is a consequence of negative connotations and poor understanding associated with informality, property owners and tenants. An in-depth and detailed analysis of the key housing policy documents are presented in the next Chapter 4, detailing the history and current housing policies.

3. CHAPTER THREE: Contextualising Housing Policy and Backyard Accommodation

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a discussion on housing policy in South Africa through a critical and analytical summary of the current policy position on backyard accommodation. In the past 25 years, there have been many shifts in housing policy. The chapter focusses on housing policy nationally, provincially and locally that relates to backyard accommodation. This chapter answers sub-question 2: In what ways does City of Joburg policy recognize and support backyard rental accommodation? Or, what are the responses of the City of Johannesburg to backyard rental accommodation?

3.2 The South African Legislative, Policy and Regulatory Framework

South Africa's Constitution defines housing as a concurrent competency of national and provincial government. The following key legislation governs the implementation of Human Settlements. The Constitution of South Africa (1996) establishes the progressive right to housing, and outlines the powers and functions of national, provincial, local government and State-Owned Companies. Importantly, 'housing' is a Schedule 4, Part A function in the Constitution and a municipality only has executive authority over functions listed in Schedules 4 and 5 Part B, unless assigned a function by national or provincial government. Local government functions, however, do affect human settlements as they include aspects such as municipal planning, municipal roads, water and sanitation, refuse collection, electricity and gas, storm water, building regulations, municipal health services, cemeteries, municipal public transport, local amenities, sports facilities, parks and recreation, public places, to name some. These are executive functions of local government and provinces cannot override the decisions of municipalities or force provincial plans onto them, highlighting the importance of coordination and collaboration and good intergovernmental relations across all spheres of government.

In terms of the construction and design of homes there are acts such as, the National Building Regulations and Building Standards Act of 1977 (Act No. 103 of 1977); the Housing Consumers Protection Measure Act of 1998 (Act No. 95 0f 1998); the Construction Industry Development Board Act of 2000 (Act No. 38 of 2000); the Consumer Protection Act of 2008 (Act No. 68 of 2008); the National Regulator for Compulsory Specifications Act of 2008 (Act No. 5 of 2008). All the above pieces of legislation mainly regulate the construction industry to ensure that they deliver quality products, and to ensure the safety and health in new housing developments. Furthermore, to reinforce

these safety and health standards there are acts such as the Occupational Health and Safety Act of 1993 (Act No. 85 of 1993); the Pressure Equipment Regulations of 2009; and the Electrical Installation Regulations of 2011. All these legislations are there to ensure safety in new housing development although they implicitly include backyard structures in formal neighborhoods. They also guide municipalities in enforcing such laws so that the property owners, tenants/occupiers and the state can be protected. This means that the backyard sector should ideally be subject to these laws. The following sections presents legislations that governs the housing sector.

3.3 Housing Policies and Legislations Related to Backyard Accommodation since 1994

Since 1994, South Africa's new Constitution enshrined the right to 'adequate housing opportunities' for all (Republic of South Africa, 1996). To achieve its goal in housing provision, government formulated a number of policy documents. These include the White Paper on Housing in 1994, People's Housing Process (PHP) policy in 1998, and the Comprehensive Plan for the Development of Sustainable Human Settlements in 2004 (commonly known as Breaking New Ground) (Department of Housing, 2004; Department of Housing, 2005a). According to Charlton and Kihato (2006), the housing policy shifts that occurred since 1994 were mostly reactions to weaknesses in policy implementation and were driven by agendas such as political pressure and internal departmental politics. It is thus within the scope of this section not only briefly to discuss each of these policy documents.

3.3.1 White Paper on Housing (1994)

The government adopted the White Paper on Housing after the historic 1994 democratic elections, aiming to create viable, integrated settlements where households could access opportunities, infrastructure and services (Department of Housing, 1994). The state wanted rapid delivery to ensure broad access to housing and used individual, income linked state subsidies to achieve this goal (Charlton & Kihato, 2006). The National Housing Subsidy Scheme (NHSS) made once-off capital subsidies available to low-income households, working on a sliding scale depending on household income levels. According to Charlton and Kihato (2006), the subsidy is a once-off contribution by the state aimed at meeting the African National Congress' (ANC) objective of 'housing for all'. The National Housing Subsidy Scheme has furthermore been unable to deliver ownership opportunities at scale, with voids increasingly filled by informal backyard tenancy as a form of self-help accommodation.

3.3.2 New Housing Policy and Strategy for South Africa, 1994

The New Housing Policy and Strategy for South Africa focused on stabilizing the housing environment to transform the fragmented and racially based framework of apartheid cities by concurrently creating new systems to ensure delivery to address the housing backlog (Department of Housing, 1994). While, this policy contains no specific instrument to deal with backyard dwelling and informal settlements, it was assumed that backyard dwellings would be replaced by standard housing units delivered through capital subsidies (Department of Housing, 1994).

3.3.3 Extension of Security of Tenure Act, 1997 (no 62 of 1997)

This Act provides secure tenure for people living on other peoples' land in rural and peri-urban areas, and lays down procedures that must be followed prior to evicting people from their land (Republic of South Africa, 1997). The Act is applicable to backyard dwelling form of housing, which also need tenure security, because backyard dwellers could be evicted when they are not fulfilling their rental obligations towards property owner (Republic of South Africa, 1997).

3.3.4 People's Housing Process (1998)

The Minister of Housing adopted the People's Housing Process (PHP) in 1998 to assist communities to supervise and drive the housing delivery process by building their homes themselves, which is also known as self-help (Department of Housing, 1998). The idea of community participation had been part of the White Paper on Housing (Department of Housing, 1998; Department of Housing, 1994). Despite this provision, the meaning of community participation had not been clearly defined and its interpretation varied widely across projects (Department of Housing, 1998). The PHP aimed to work with non-governmental Organisations (NGOs) in the housing sector to assist communities in planning and implementing the construction of their own housing settlements through 'sweat equity' (Department of Housing, 1998). Sweat equity means that, beneficiaries use their own labour to build houses (Department of Housing, 1998). People's Housing Process allows communities to act as key decision makers in project planning, design, management and implementation, while the state provides only the initial project funding, training on project management and oversight during project implementation. The implications for backyard dwellings is PHP policy seems to be promoting a more state-dependent housing delivery system. Furthermore, PHP has further compromised the beneficiaries' ability to make choices regarding their diverse preferred architectural design. Giving effect to that (architectural design), the policy document (Department of Housing, 2005:35) states that 'when designing the house, attention by the builders and housing support centres must be given

to National Minimum Norms and Standards in respect of Permanent Residential Structures as prescribed'.

3.3.5 Prevention of Illegal Eviction and Unlawful Occupation of Land Act, 1998 (PIE)

This Act establishes the procedures and mechanisms for the eviction of informal occupation such as backyard dwelling and regulates the removal and eviction of people in a fair and just manner (Republic of South Africa, 1998). PIE (1998) requires property owners to find alternative accommodation for non-paying occupants of rental accommodation where they have been in the building for more than six months. This Act could be applicable in the backyard context, which lack tenure security, and backyard tenants could be evicted by the landlord without following due legal processes even when there is rental agreement between the backyard tenant and the landlord. The Act intends to ensure that no one is arbitrarily deprived of their home or property and that no one would be removed from their homes without due process and the completion of full court proceedings (Republic of South Africa, 1998).

3.3.6 Rental Housing Act 50 of 1999 (amended in Act 43 of 2007 and Act 35 of 2014)

The Rental Housing Act 50 of 1999 regulates the relationship between landlords and tenants in the rental-housing sector (Republic of South Africa, 1999). The Act defines the roles and responsibilities regarding rental housing by promoting access to adequate housing through creating mechanisms to ensure the proper functioning of the rental housing market (Republic of South Africa, 1999; Republic of South Africa, 2014). It encourages the use of existing infrastructures, discourages urban sprawl and promotes integrated cities (Republic of South Africa, 1999; Republic of South Africa, 2014). Some of the most important features of the Act include the establishment of Rental Housing Tribunals, the introduction of the Unfair Practices Regulations and the repeal of the Rent Control Act of 1976 (Republic of South Africa, 1999; Republic of South Africa, 2014). In 2007, the Act was amended concerning the criminalization of 'constructive evictions', that is, cutting off services without a court order (Republic of South Africa, 2014). Service provision is often at the center of a discord between the landlord and tenant particularly in backyard accommodation (Republic of South Africa, 2014). The Act could be applicable to backyard rental accommodation because as in informal settlements, those living in backyard accommodation often have no security of tenure. The lack of security of tenure exist because most of the backyard rental market's tenant-landlord relationships remain verbal and informal. Backyard rental tenants are not secured through written lease agreements as stipulated under the Rental Housing Act or any form of binding contractual agreement. This makes

this form of tenure a very precarious one and often tenants are taken advantage of because they are in desperate need for low cost accommodation. Under the Rental Housing Act, the tenant-landlord relationship will be regulated, and should the landlord decide to cancel the lease agreement with a tenant then he/she would be forced to enter into a new lease with a tenant relocated from elsewhere as stipulated in PIE Act of 1998.

3.3.7 Breaking New Ground: A Comprehensive Plan for the Development of Sustainable Human Settlements (2004)

Ten years after the New Housing Policy and Strategy for South Africa, the Department of Housing (now Department of Human Settlements), from 2002 to 2003 undertook a comprehensive review of the housing programme after recognizing a number of 'unintended consequences' of the existing programme (Charlton & Kihato, 2006; Tissington, 2010). The review process aimed at providing a new policy direction and establishing a research agenda to inform and support policy decision-making within the housing programme (Tissington, 2010). The Breaking New Ground (BNG) policy aimed at redressing apartheid spatial planning and development through the delivery of socially, economically and spatially integrated housing (Tissington, 2010; Department of Housing, 2004). The policy makes significant shifts in housing policy and puts South Africa progressively on the way to create sustainable human settlements, as opposed to merely providing houses (Department of Housing, 2004). However, the policy does not recognize or react to the growing phenomena of backyard dwellings (Department of Housing, 2004). One of the mechanisms to achieve BNG's key objectives, the policy document advocates progressive eradication of informal settlements through a phased in-situ upgrading programme (Department of Housing, 2004). Central to this concept is a consultative, phased process that intends to involve the community in determining, amongst key issues, their preferred housing typologies (Department of Housing, 2004). BNG encourages support and protection of traditional technologies and indigenous knowledge being used by communities to construct houses, which can be applied to the construction of backyard dwellings (Department of Housing, 2004).

3.3.8 Social Housing Policy for South Africa (2005)

The Social Housing Policy was passed in 2005, and has recently been included in the revised National Housing Code of 2009 (Department of Housing, 2005b; Department of Human Settlements, 2009). While Breaking New Ground (BNG) emphasizes the shift from the provision of housing to the creation of sustainable human settlements, Social Housing Policy introduces rental-housing

alternatives for low-income communities (Department of Housing, 2005b). Social housing is defined as 'a rental or co-operative housing option for low income persons at a level of scale and built form' (Department of Housing, 2005b). The objectives of the Social Housing Policy (2005b) are to address structural, economic, social and spatial dysfunctionalities thereby contributing to Government's vision of an economically empowered, non-racial, and integrated society living in sustainable human settlements. The policy has an indirect impact on backyard dwelling (Department of Housing, 2005b). It does not only offer the rental options for low-income people but also promote adequate access to basic services and economic opportunities within low-income communities including backyard dwellings (Department of Housing, 2005b).

3.3.9 The Social Housing Act, No. 16, 2008

The Social Housing Act has a number of intentions and is the primary piece of legislation for housing (Social Housing Foundation, 2010). It is closely aligned with the Rental Housing Act and the Housing Act and refers to sustainable social environment by providing clear-cut roles and responsibilities of both tenants and landlords and the establishment of social housing institutions in terms of all issues related to social housing (Social Housing Foundation, 2008). However, the Social Housing Act has different objectives to the Rental Housing Act. Social housing is considered to utilize rental as its primary tenure option and excludes ownership (Social Housing Foundation, 2008). The Rental Housing Act is a key piece of legislation that regulates most of the rental and rental related activities of the social housing sector (Republic of South Africa, 2014). The social housing sector comprises social housing that is rented or sold at prices that are not ruled by the market, but by the economic capacity of interested tenants. The target group for social housing is households with limited financial resources.

Recently there have been some creative attempts at both provincial and metropolitan level initiatives to address the issue of backyard infrastructure provision and upgrading. This aims to improve the lives of backyard dwellers by supporting municipalities to provide basic municipal services and facilities.

3.4 Provincial and Local Housing Policy in South Africa

South African provinces and municipalities have developed a range of housing policies, which are aligned with the National Department of Human Settlement's (NDoHS) policy frameworks and are adapted according to their specific realities and these policies will be explored in this section. Although some provinces and municipalities experience serious problems to comply with their

constitutional responsibilities, others have pro-actively defined housing programmes within national guidelines that deal with specific housing needs in new ways particularly related to backyard dwellings (Shapurjee, et al., 2014). Shapurjee, et al. (2014) point out that there are uneven approaches to backyard accommodation and suggests that there is a need for a uniform policy on rental housing. So far there is only one policy; the Gauteng Policy on Backyard housing (Gauteng Province, 2015), which was prepared by the Gauteng Department of Human Settlement, based on the Draft policy on National Housing for the Provision of Basic Services to Backyard Residents (Shapurjee, et al., 2014). This section probes the Gauteng backyard policy and Inclusionary Housing policy.

3.4.1 Gauteng Policy on Backyard Rental Housing, 2015

The Gauteng Department of Human Settlements developed backyard rental policy aimed at upgrading the existing backyard rental housing stock in Gauteng (Gauteng Province, 2015). The policy is based on the draft policy on National Housing for the Provision of Basic Services to Backyard Residents. The Gauteng Policy on Backyard accommodation provides responsibility arrangements of both the department and the municipality that addresses some of the issues that have been identified in general research about backyard rental accommodation and housing, such as the provision of basic services that accommodates future growth (Gauteng Province, 2015). The other responsibilities include promoting economies of scale for building material cases where communities want to construct backyard units for rental purposes and provide a conducive environment that could accommodate backyard accommodation (Gauteng Province, 2015). The Gauteng Policy on Backyard Rental Housing became effective in October 2015. The policy aims to support and encourage rental housing opportunities through various means, including the facilitation of the provision of basic infrastructure and the relaxation of restrictive by-laws to stimulate a viable and more robust backyard rental market (Gauteng Province, 2015). Furthermore, under this policy, the state recognizes the need to develop the backyard rental accommodation sector as one that provides alternative and affordable accommodation while also promoting the containment of urban sprawl as a form of densification, which makes effective use of existing infrastructure investments (Gauteng Province, 2015). Gauteng Policy on Backyard Rental Housing suggests intentions to recognize the rental function and support backyard dwellings in ways that are sustainable. The intention of the Gauteng Policy on Backyard Rental Housing is to formalize and eventually eradicate poverty through distribution of housing. However, the process of formalization is not efficient in addressing the issues of poverty, because even beneficiaries will continue to engage in informal activities such as backyard rental

accommodation to generate income. What is missing from the Gauteng Policy on Backyard Rental Housing is that the policy does not mention challenges of displacements of existing tenants.

3.4.2 Inclusionary Housing: Incentives, Regulations and Mechanisms (Policy), 2007

The Inclusionary Housing Policy initiative aims to achieve a 'more balanced outcome of built environment creation in the direction of more racially integrated and income inclusive residential environments' (Klug, et al., 2013; City of Johannesburg, 2019c). The goal of the policy is to incentivize or compel the private sector to provide accommodation opportunities for low-income and lower-middle income households in areas from which they might otherwise be excluded because of the dynamics of the land market (City of Johannesburg, 2019c). The policy also seeks to boost the supply of affordable rental and ownership housing (City of Johannesburg, 2019c). The policy has a two-fold approach that examines what would first, encourage the private sector to enter the government's housing market by either sanctions or incentives and second, encourage legal mechanisms through provincial legislation supported by municipal by-laws that set the minimum standards of compliance in new residential builds, conversions or major renovations (City of Johannesburg, 2019c). The inclusionary housing programme may have impact on improving conditions of backyard dwellers. It will increase the availability of rental housing units for low-income people living in the backyard who would not otherwise have access to either the quality of housing or the location that inclusionary housing could offer. The development of inclusionary housing could increase the supply of formal rental units and thus decrease the demand for rental accommodation in backyards.

3.4.3 Backyard Accommodation

The national Department of Human Settlements, with the assistance of the provincial and local housing departments has stated that it is committed to ensuring that the backyard rental environment is formalized, regulated and enhanced (City of Johannesburg, 2019b). In addition to this, provisions were made for affordable rental accommodation for those who are not able to own houses in Gauteng (City of Johannesburg, 2019b). The regulation of backyard accommodation will ensure that property owners do not exploit the public (City of Johannesburg, 2019b). Additionally, due to the biggest problem in housing, which is limited due to the availability of land, the use of backyard accommodation must have a great appeal because they occupy available land that is already privately owned (City of Johannesburg, 2019b). This reduces the need for the government to source out land for the construction of new housing solutions.

3.5 Priorities for future policy-development

The South African Integrated Urban Development Framework (IUDF) acknowledges that: 'Backyard rentals provide affordable rental accommodation for lower income groups and for people not needing permanent accommodation (Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs, 2016). 'A wider variety of affordable rental options is important in order to meet the need for flexible, easy-access accommodation for a mobile population, accompanied by a strong rental management approach' (Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs, 2016, p. 65). These rentals also offer owners income assets. Cities need to develop strategies to extend basic services to backyarders, assist with creating more permanent structures and enhance tenant security' (Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs, 2016, p. 65). These words provide clear direction, not only to large metropolitan authorities, but also to local municipalities, faced with housing shortfalls and growing populations. IUDF encourages local innovation.

3.6 Concluding Remarks

Backyard accommodation presents a unique housing typology. Policy and legislation should be proposed to react directly to the challenges of backyard accommodation. Policies have mostly discounted the informal backyard rental sector and have referenced the sector to a minimal extent, as observed from the textual analysis of housing policies and programmes included in this review.

4. CHAPTER FOUR: Situation Analysis of the Urban Periphery: Case Study of Dube Township, Johannesburg

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a situation analysis of the Dube Township in Region D of the City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality. The chapter offers a locational background of the area, reasons for choosing the township as a study area. To position the research in place and time, it is useful to understand the context of the study area and the constituencies of the study area through a general background (Yin, 2003). Here follows a journey of exploration into the story of the Dube Township, Soweto's own zebra. Dube is the name of a popular township in Soweto, but also a well-known Nguni surname. However, in the zoo and game reserves the name belongs to an animal, *e-dube*, a lovely, cheeky one with bold black and white stripes, called the zebra.

4.2 Locational Background of the Study Area

This section presents a locational background of the study from provincial, municipal, regional, and local level.

4.2.1 City of Johannesburg, Region D and Soweto

The City of Johannesburg is demarcated into seven regions namely: Region A to the north, Region B at the center, Region C in the East, Region D in the south-west, Region E in the east, Region F in the southeast and Region G in the south. Region D is described as the western gateway of the City, which is seen to link two local municipalities namely: Rand West City Municipality in the west and Mogale City Municipality in the west with the remainder of the City of Johannesburg as illustrated on Figure 2 (City of Johannesburg, 2019a). Region D is made up of multiple residential suburbs which consist of both middle-income settlements and low-income or marginalized and highly informal township areas that together make up the Greater Soweto and covers an area of 150 km^2 (City of Johannesburg, 2019a). Soweto, Doornkop, Dobsonville and Protea Glen are the major townships in Region D.



Figure 2: Gauteng, City of Johannesburg Metropolitan

The map above illustrates the location of Soweto, within the context of the City of Johannesburg Metropolitan and Gauteng Province.

The dynamics of urban development were not taken into consideration when Soweto and other historically disadvantaged areas were created. With a history that did not allow the creation of major employment centres within Soweto, almost all its working people have to commute to work to other areas. As a result, there is sufficient road infrastructure in many parts of the region, with busy highways running to the Johannesburg Central Business District (CBD) to ensure that black workers

could be transported as efficiently as possible to places of work. Commuters are largely reliant on private vehicles, buses, trains and taxis.

4.2.2 Greater Soweto

Soweto hardly needs an introduction. Soweto is an iconic township and its name resonates through South African political history and is known internationally (Harrison & Harrison, 2014). The name Soweto is a derivation of the name South Western Township. As the name indicates, Soweto lies southwest of the City of Johannesburg and it is now the most populous black urban residential area in the country, with a population of over one million (City of Johannesburg, 2019a; StatsSA, 2011). The area continues to attract new migrants to Johannesburg because of various opportunities. Greater Soweto covers an area of approximately 150 km², which is just over 9% of the 1 644 km² of the metropolitan area (City of Johannesburg, 2019b; Harrison & Harrison, 2014) yet is home to 24.4% of the City of Johannesburg's population (City of Johannesburg, 2019a). .

The three principal townships of Soweto, Diepmeadow and Dobsonville are further subdivided into thirteen local administrative areas: nine in Soweto, three in Diepmeadow and Dobsonville (Table 2). In total, Greater Soweto consists of 34 suburbs as illustrated in Figure 3.

Table 2: Structure of Greater Soweto

Local administration areas	**Township local boundary** (illustrated in Figure 3)
Soweto	
Chiawelo	Chiawelo Extensions 1-5, Dlamini, Dlamini Extensions 1-2; Protea, Protea North, Protea South, and Protea South Extension 1
Mofolo/Zondi	Mofolo Central, Mofolo North, Mofolo South; Zondi; and Central Western Jabavu
Senaoane	Senaoane; Phiri, Mapetla; Mapetla Extension and Molapo Extension
Pimville/Klipspruit	Pimville Zones 1-7; Klipspruit and Klipspruit Extensions 1-2
Tladi	Tladi; Moletsane; Jabulani Extension; Jabulani Flats; Naledi and Naledi Extensions 1-2
Orlando East	Orlando East Extensions 1-3
Orlando West	Orlando West Extensions 1-3 and **Dube**
Moroka/Jabavu	Moroka; Moroka North; Central Western Jabavu; and Jabavu Extensions 1-3
Zola	Zola North; Zola South; Zola Buffer; Jabulani; Emdeni South; Emdeni Extension and Emdeni Buffer
Diepmeadow	
Meadowlands East	Meadowlands East Zones 1-5

Local administration areas	**Township local boundary** (illustrated in Figure 3)
Soweto	
Meadowlands West	Meadowlands West Zones 6-10
Diepkloof	Diepkloof Zones 1-6, and Diepkloof Extension
Dobsonville	
Dobsonville	Dobsonville, and Dobsonville Extensions 1-3

4.2.3 Geographical Location of Dube

Geographically, Dube Township is located in Orlando West within the Soweto area. Dube Township covers an area of 3.5 km^2, is situated approximately 20 km from the Johannesburg CBD, and forms part of electoral ward 38 of the City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality. It has been identified as a key municipal development node in recent years. Since its inception, large-scale construction of state-subsidized low-income housing has expanded the footprint of the township, which has included road infrastructure, and several new retail and commercial developments. Although there have been some infrastructural developments in Dube, the township is still in need of more economic and social development, such as formal education facilities and businesses that will provide employment opportunities for the local residents to improve their quality of life.

The map below illustrates townships in Greater Soweto, and the study area of Dube Township is highlighted in relation to other townships in Soweto.



Figure 3: Map of Greater Soweto (Modified: https://eservices.joburg.org.za/cgis/ProductsAndServices/Soweto_base.pdf)



Figure 4: Dube Township (Source: Googlemaps.com)



Figure 5: Dube Township (Modified: https://eservices.joburg.org.za/cgis/ProductsAndServices/Soweto_base.pdf)



Figure 6: Backyard accommodation in Dube Township (Modified: https://eservices.joburg.org.za)

The maps above (Figure 4, 5 and 6) illustrates Dube Township in relation to surrounding townships in Soweto. Dube Township is well-located in terms of access to social and community facilities and transport routes. Dube Township has a variety of prominent area such as the Dube Hostels, shopping areas and is connected by variety of transport networks such as the railway (Dube Station highlighted in Figure 4), BRT routes (highlighted in yellow lines in Figure 5,) and Dube Taxi Rank (highlighted in Figure 5, picture 2). The shopping areas are quite small in scale and serve a small area as highlighted in Figure 5 (Dube Shoprite picture 3 and Ndofaya Mall picture 1). There are also the South African Revenue Service (SARS) offices (Figure 5, picture 4), the Johannesburg Metro Police Department (JMPD), and the Dube Vocational and South West Gauteng TVET College (George Tabor Campus) (Figure 5, picture 4).

The railway line that runs from Park Station in central Johannesburg to Soweto's Naledi Station, that is adjacent to Dube Hostel, demarcates the northern section of the township. Dube comprises of brick low-income housing with many backyard dwellings made from corrugated iron or bricks. The map above is a detailed illustration of Dube Township showing an aerial view of backyard rental accommodation structures that are highlighted in red adjacent to the main structure.

4.3 Brief historical background of Dube Township.

Dube Township has a very interesting history. The area, which only became known as Soweto in 1963, began with the relocation of black people from the Brickfields area (now Newtown) to what was called the Klipspruit Settlement on the farm of Klipspruit (Lewis, 1963; City of Johannesburg, 2014). By 1937 most of this settlement became part of what today is known as Kliptown as well as Pimville (Lewis, 1963). The African housing crisis in Johannesburg in the 1940s due to a rise of industrialization and manufacturing during/after World War 2 requiring a stable and more skilled workforce prompted the Johannesburg City Council (JCC) to lead the way in implementing a new housing policy for the small number of African households who could afford home-ownership, and who might be tempted to relocate voluntarily from the Western Areas (Parnell, 1991; The Heritage Portal, 2018). By 1946, additional 'native settlements', as these areas under control of the JCC were called, were developed and comprised Orlando East and Orlando West, Mofolo and Jabuvu (known as White City) (Lewis, 1963; The Heritage Portal, 2018).

The Dube project, which began in 1946, attracted very few middle-class Africans because of the bureaucracy in attaining tenure, most of whom wanted freehold tenure or a 99-year lease (Parnell, 1991). The JCC proposed that Dube Native Village be established as a new home-ownership housing scheme under the Natives (Urban Areas) Act (NUAA) of 1923 (Parnell, 1991). For this reason, a portion of land adjacent to the first townships like Orlando West on the Klipspruit farm, was identified (Parnell, 1991). The year 1946 was also the year in which John Langalibalele Dube, a remarkable South African leader died, his memory was honored by naming the township Dube Native Village, for hope for a better living dispensation (Parnell, 1991; Bester, 2018; The Heritage Portal, 2018).

Land was set aside for 1500 sites to house between six and seven thousand people who could afford to pay one sixth of their income towards housing (Parnell, 1991; The Heritage Portal, 2018). Sites of 15 by 30 meters (464m²) were laid out, allowing a lower density than elsewhere (normally 6 by 6 meters) (Parnell, 1991). The promise of home-ownership of a 99-year lease for Dube Native Village was never fulfilled because the title deeds on which Dube was to be developed, excluded Africans from being the registered freehold owners of property and this could be linked to the 1948 electoral victory of the National Party (Parnell, 1991). Instead, leases were restricted to 30 years duration and were made non-renewable (Parnell, 1991).

When Dube eventually became a township in 1954, it was not exactly the idealized 'better living dispensation' as an integral and special part of Soweto as initially stated by the JCC (Parnell, 1991;

The Heritage Portal, 2018). Additionally, the Dube story reveals how the JCC hoped for a more upmarket 'native village' to accommodate 'elite African people' with 'fair education' who could afford middle class houses with freehold rights on stands of 464m² (The Heritage Portal, 2018; Bester, 2018). A single-sex hostel (men only) for migrant laborers was also erected in 1955, which shaped the landscape and exclusiveness of Dube as a male dominant residential township (The Heritage Portal, 2018; City of Johannesburg, 2014). A most important characteristic of Dube are the government-provided houses (51/9 and 51/6) commonly known as the matchbox (Figure 7) houses in Soweto constructed under the apartheid regime for the mass removals of black residents from urban neighborhoods such as Sophiatown to Soweto (The Heritage Portal, 2018).



Figure 7: Three roomed matchbox house (LizatLancaster, 2018)

The wake-up call from the Youth Revolution in 1976, and the apartheid government accepting the permanency of urban black residents in the 1980s, full Title Deeds and home-ownership were transferred to residents (Bester, 2018; The Heritage Portal, 2018; City of Johannesburg, 2014). Transferring of full Tittle Deeds was part of a strategy to entrench middle class values in townships and divide residents along class lines. Initially, houses were transferred to registered tenants of the 30-year lease free of charge with a modest payment for the Erf (Bester, 2018). In terms of the

Conversion Act of 1988 (amended), self-built houses or properties could be transferred with a Title Deed completely free of charge (Bester, 2018). It did however not happen automatically, since applications are subject to a process of claim with supporting documents (Bester, 2018). The majority of the housing properties in Dube Township are therefore currently privately owned (Bester, 2018; The Heritage Portal, 2018). Ownership of properties has greatly contributed to the stabilization of the Dube Township which also serves as a collateral and government-subsidized houses can be sold at half a million rand and more (Bester, 2018; The Heritage Portal, 2018).

4.4 Socio-economic characteristics

Understanding the socio-economic characteristics, such as the age as well as anticipated population growth of the City of Johannesburg and of Dube Township assists in planning for anticipated demand for services and job opportunities (City of Johannesburg, 2019b). Gauteng is the most populous province in the country with Johannesburg contributing an estimated 5.05 million people to the total population of the province. Over the period 2016-2021 Gauteng is expected to receive the largest inflow of people from other provinces and countries, approximately 1.04 million people (City of Johannesburg, 2019b). The influx of migrants has contributed to Johannesburg's population growth rate averaging 3% over the past 10 years (City of Johannesburg, 2019b). This is double that of the national average, with Johannesburg's population doubling since 1996 (City of Johannesburg, 2019b). It is estimated that Johannesburg's population could reach 5.3 million by 2021 (City of Johannesburg, 2019b). This requires sufficient plans for the City to deal with the challenges of an increasing city population (City of Johannesburg, 2019b).

4.4.1 Population

The City of Johannesburg has a population of approximately 4.4 million people (City of Johannesburg, 2018). The population is made up primarily of a youthful population aged between 30 and 39 years (City of Johannesburg, 2018). The total population translates into roughly 1.4 million households based on an average household size of three persons (City of Johannesburg, 2019b; City of Johannesburg, 2018). At a regional level, Region D is the most densely populated region in the City with 24.4% of the overall population of the City of Johannesburg (City of Johannesburg, 2019b; City of Johannesburg, 2018). Dube Township has a population of 21 716 people, which is 2% of Soweto. The density of Dube Township is 6183.2 people per square kilometre. In terms of gender, 51.4% are male and 48.6% are female (StatsSA, 2011; Census, 2011). The Majority of the population are black at 99.7% (21 647) and other at 0.3%, which is Coloured at 33, Indian or Asian at 12, White

at 17 and Unspecified at 7 people (StatsSA, 2011; Census, 2011). The predominant languages within the township are IsiZulu at 53%, followed by Sesotho at 16%, Setswana at 8%, Sepedi at 4%, English at 4% and other at 9% (StatsSA, 2011; Census, 2011). Below is a graph indicating population of Dube by age range:



Figure 8: Population by age range (StatsSA, 2011)

Age 20 to 29 (23.1%) years has the largest population in Dube followed by age rage 30 to 39 (16.7%), while the least age range is 80+ (2.1%) (StatsSA, 2011; Census, 2011). The census data shows that 69% of the population in Dube is 39 years and below, while 9.3% of the total population is over 60 years of age (StatsSA, 2011; Census, 2011).

4.4.2 Migration

Cross border migration is small in comparison to domestic migration, which is people migrating from other provinces in South Africa to Johannesburg. In terms of province of birth of Dube's population, approximately 32.4% is made up of people who were born in other provinces and only about 0.3% was born outside of South Africa (StatsSA, 2011; Census, 2011). Approximately 67.3% of the population of Dube was born in Gauteng (StatsSA, 2011; Census, 2011). There is no formal documentation that has reported migration patterns of tenants who are renting backyard accommodation in Dube.

Population mobility defined by the migration of people within a population will continue to shape Johannesburg's development trajectory given its economic position in the country and across the

continent. The city will continue to attract migrants as long as it ensures successful poverty alleviation and employment opportunities. This requires mainstreaming accurate population data into policy, planning and budgeting to produce forward-looking tools and agendas.

4.5 Access to Services, Infrastructure Backlogs and Environmental Challenges

It is a constitutional mandate for the City of Johannesburg to ensure that all households have adequate access to basic services. This section present challenges related to access to housing, basic services and infrastructure. Access to basic services is a Constitutional right and is vital to health and safety. Access through main dwellings may produce metering and payment difficulties and complicates the delivery of basic service packages by authorities. Increased densities may also hamper service provision.

4.5.1 Access to Basic Services

Provision of basic services to the community of Johannesburg is high with the majority of households (both formal and informal) enjoying access to piped water (98.4%), sanitation (95.1%), and electricity (90.8%) (City of Johannesburg, 2019b). However, there continues to be a deficit, as the number of households in the City of Johannesburg has increased by an average annual rate of 3% from 2007 to 2017 (City of Johannesburg, 2019b). As the number of households' increase, extra strain is put on the existing infrastructure. In the short to medium term, this can make delivery of services difficult because the provision and maintenance of formal household infrastructure takes time.

The housing backlog is a major concern for the City of Johannesburg. The formal dwelling backlog (number of households not living in a formal dwelling) is currently at 18.5% (City of Johannesburg, 2019b). This has improved from 21.5% in 2016 (City of Johannesburg, 2019b). To add to the figures, not only has the number of households living informally increased but the backlog as a proportion of total household dwelling units has been growing at a rate of about 1.81% annually (City of Johannesburg, 2019b). Improving housing provision is a central driver in the City's plan to delivery basic services, as people residing in formal dwellings generally have better access to water, electricity and waste removal (City of Johannesburg, 2019b).

The housing backlog is made of informal settlements, overcrowding in the public hostels, the non-regulated backyard rental, inner city overcrowding, the housing waiting list, and homeless people in general. The City is making a concerted effort to meet the housing demand and tackle this backlog. However, this will require the up scaling of housing delivery, further collaborating with the private

sector, and meaningful engagement with communities (City of Johannesburg, 2019b). The City has a number of key projects, such as the upgrading of informal settlements by re-blocking, alignment of shacks and providing basic services; construction of mixed income housing opportunities; the construction of social housing and rental accommodation within the inner city and urban core; the construction of housing opportunities along the transport corridors (City of Johannesburg, 2019b).

4.5.2 Government-subsidized housing

The City of Johannesburg housing landscape has seen innovations in recent times. These include new policies, which address the city's most visible housing challenges such as informality. Areas in Region D are largely composed of the old 'matchbox' houses built to provide cheap accommodation for Johannesburg's workers during the apartheid era. Many inhabitants of the 'matchbox' dwellings take pride in improving and extending their homes as well as creating pretty gardens. Dube has mixture of housing including bonded houses, government-subsidized houses (51/9 and 51/6) and rooms in the backyards. Due to this mixture of housing, the housing typology of Dube has the ability to accommodate wider housing needs.

4.5.3 Hostels

The apartheid era government created a housing system of hostels in order to house migrant workers. The hostel housing system exists in Dube, and according to Mpehle (2012), hostels are perceived as destructive to families and to the social fibre of societies. Mpehle (2012) adds that there is a need to convert hostels into housing that could accommodate family units. The conversion of hostels into family unit apartments will not only assist in bringing family together, but it will also aid in the reduction of the housing backlog in the country (Mpehle, 2012). This is therefore an alternative housing solution, especially because these hostels already exist and there is no land required (Mpehle, 2012). Many of these have been improved through the Hostels Upgrading Programme and the Community Residential Units Programme by the state and now accommodate couples and families. The Community Residential Units Programme aims to facilitate the provision of secure, stable rental tenure for lower income persons/households (Republic of South Africa, 2012; Mpehle, 2012).

4.6 Economic Profile

As the industrial and commercial heartland of South Africa, the City of Johannesburg has been a magnet for people from across the country. However massive challenges in terms of urban poverty, inequality, social exclusion and underdevelopment remain. The City of Johannesburg's economy is driven primarily by four economic sectors, which are: (a) finance and business services, (b)

community services, (c) manufacturing, and (d) trade. These four economic sectors collectively account for more than 82% of economic activity within the City (City of Johannesburg, 2019b). These sectors also account for the highest levels of formal and informal employment.

4.6.1 Unemployment

Linked to the issue of economic growth is that of employment. Unemployment is one of the biggest challenges in the municipality. Employment analysis of Dube population is as follows:



Figure 9: Population by employment status (StatsSA, 2011)

In Dube Township, the majority of the population are employed at 40.8%, unemployed at 27.1%, not economically active at 26.6% and discouraged work-seeker at 5.6% (StatsSA, 2011; Census, 2011). Youth unemployment remains a major challenge both nationally and for the City of Johannesburg (City of Johannesburg, 2019b). Low education levels and slow formal sector growth are two of the major causes of youth unemployment (City of Johannesburg, 2019b). The vast majority of the youthful population in Johannesburg has only a matric certificate preventing access to the skilled labour market. Unemployment has a negative impact on society, which might eventually result in an increase in crime, grant dependency, and non-payment of services.

4.6.2 Education

The education sector is significant in the contribution of economic development of the area. Education and literacy levels are generally low in the municipality. The educational status of Dube population is as follows:



Figure 10: Population by highest educational level (StatsSA, 2011)

In terms of education within Dube Township, of those 20 years and older 6.3% had some primary schooling, 3.3% have completed primary school, 34.4% have some secondary education, 48.5% have completed matric, 4% have some form of higher education, and 3.6% of those aged 20 years and older have no form of schooling (StatsSA, 2011; Census, 2011).

The high statistic of low educational and literacy levels could be attributed to poor financial backgrounds, in that most of students after matric do not have the financial means to further their studies. This suggest the need for more efforts to educate residents within the township about the significance of the role of education on community development.

4.6.3 Income Distribution

Income distribution of Dube population is as follows:



Figure 11: Annual employees and household income (StatsSA, 2011)

The figure above shows that the highest individual earning annually is 24.9% which is a population earning R20 001 – R40 000 annually (StatsSA, 2011; Census, 2011). Individuals earning no income is at 8.7% annually (StatsSA, 2011; Census, 2011). The highest household earning annually is 17.6% that is the population earning R20 001 – R40 000 annually and 24.3% of the population earning no income (StatsSA, 2011; Census, 2011).

4.7 Concluding Remarks

The chapter aimed at looking at the study area and the reasons for choosing the area of study. The chapter presented the locational background, history, socio-economic profile, political situation and access to services, infrastructural backlogs and environmental challenges.

5. CHAPTER FIVE: Exploring Hidden Spaces on the Urban Periphery

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the findings that emerged from the research process. Interviews were conducted qualitatively to explore policy reaction to hidden spaces on the urban periphery focusing on the case of backyard accommodation in Dube Township, Johannesburg, as well as, to understand how state actors perceive and conceptualize the backyard rental-housing phenomenon. The chapter presents the combined findings of three different groups of people, government officials, property owners and backyard dwellers. The findings from the City of Johannesburg municipal officials will give a background of backyard accommodation as well as to state some of the policy objectives of the municipality in dealing with backyard accommodation. The findings also present information gained from backyard dwellers and property owners, who may not necessarily experience backyard dwelling the same but who have both experienced this type of backyard-rental phenomenon. Data is presented from the perspective and perception of respondents and provides an analysis of the data in light of (a) overall understanding of Dube (Chapter 4), (b) the policies and responses (Chapter 3) and (c) key themes emerging from the literature (Chapter 2). The chapter answers sub-question 3: What are the expectations, benefits and challenges affecting property owners and tenants?

The this chapter presents the following key themes: (a) who are the tenants and landlords, (b) location and area, (c) types of dwellings, (d) advantages and disadvantages, (e) landlord-tenant relationships, (f) broader implications for planning on the urban periphery.

5.2 Research Process

Engagements with backyard accommodation tenants (backyard dwellers), property owners (landlords) and municipal officials as key research participants were held from June to November 2019. A series of twenty-four (24) site visits to Dube Township and three visits to the City of Johannesburg's Department of Human Settlement (Research and Development: Housing Department) to engage the research participants were conducted as prescribed in Chapter 1. These engagements were part of Phase 2: Semi-structured Interviews, and Phase 3: Observation. A Purposive sampling method was adopted because the researcher relied on his own judgment when choosing members of population to participate in the study (Neuman, 2011; Punch, 2000; Patton & Cochran, 2002). According to Neuman (2011), this method is used in exploratory research to select a sample that is informative and knowledgeable about the research topic, in this case a municipal official who has knowledge about housing policy, tenants who are renting in backyard

accommodation and property owners who own property with backyard accommodation dwellings. This chapter presents the details of the findings from the engagements. The methodology and question guide used for this research is included in Chapter 1 (Section B: Data Collection tools and Research Methods) and as appendix 6.

Municipal officials had relevant experience about policy and backyard accommodation as employees of the City of Johannesburg Municipality. Further engagements were held to gather input from ten property owners and twenty tenants from Dube Township. .

The findings are organized and coded into different themes. The findings are presented as follows; (a) giving a brief introduction of the notion of backyard accommodation in Dube Township and how they managed to obtain backyard housing; (b) biographical presentation of participants; (c) Common day-to-day challenges of backyard accommodation; (d) understanding the landlord-tenant relationship; (e) Implementation strategy of Housing Policy in Dube Township and support available for the landlords from the municipality; (f) Social wellbeing; and the quality of backyard accommodation. Additional emerging themes also reveals the external relationships that exist between the tenants and the way they use their internal and external housing space. This is because there are multiple people or households in the yard that share facilities such as; the physical infrastructure and services in the yard and social, cultural aspects such as sharing space on the outside for leisure purposes.

5.3 Types of Backyard Accommodation in Dube Township

The nature of backyard accommodation in Dube Township is similar to that described by Turok and Borel-Saladin (2016) because backyard dwellings are randomly situated around the yard and are not just at the back of the house, but they surround the main house depending on the availability of space within the yard. From the observations made during the various site visits to Dube Township, the minimum number of backyard dwellings that can be found in one yard is two backyard dwellings while the maximum backyard dwellings vary depending on the size of the yard and main house. The number of backyard dwellings within a yard or plot are also dependent to the types of materials that are used for construction. In some cases, the government subsidized houses or the main dwellings have been converted to make space for backyard rental accommodation and in a minority of cases, the government-subsidized house has been reconfigured.

Generally, three types of backyard rental accommodation were identified which drive the demand for the supply and nature of the backyard accommodation: letting of yard space (usually in a form of shacks constructed by tenants), backyard shacks (constructed by tenants) and brick rooms owned by landlords. Most shacks are one-room structures that are subdivided into two to make a bedroom and a living area, which is also used as the kitchen area. The term 'backyard shack' is used in this section to make a distinction to a backyard 'brick room'. Letting of yard space refers to shacks built by tenants on spaces rented from the landlord, while backyard shack and brick room are those build by the landlord with intent to rent to tenants. The letting of yard space (of the 14 properties visited, eight let yard space) is a more dominant type of backyard accommodation that is evident in Dube Township and is rented at a monthly rental of R300 to R450 per month. While shacks built by landlords are R400-R450 depending on the size and quality of the shacks. The rooms (some have showers and toilets in the rooms) are rented at R750-R1900 per month depending on the size and the amenities inside the rooms. Renting out a room in the back or even making enough space for a tenant to erect their own structure can enable a vital income stream for those who own a house but are simply unable to find formal employment. In most cases, the landlord and the tenants share the amenities such as the taps and toilets. There is also an occurrence of double storey rental rooms that have showers and toilets in the rooms. Generally, the rooms are considered more conducive and comfortable in terms of privacy in the rooms and because tenants do not have to share the amenities (showers, toilets, taps, etc.) with the property owner and other tenants when compared to tenants who rent shacks.

5.4 Biographical Information of Landlords and Tenants

The first theme was explored through the introductory questions on the questionnaires, which revealed the biographical information of participants and more information such as place of origin, reasons for renting in Dube, etc., are some of the major contributing factors to the South African housing crisis that lead to the establishment of backyard accommodation. The researcher noted the following biographical information of participants: gender, age group, ethnicity, home language and occupation status. The results with regard to biographical information are demonstrated below.

5.4.1 Gender of participants

This section asked the respondents in terms of gender. Probing of gender in research is significant to ensure that perceptions obtained from studies are not gender biased. The finding on gender of tenants in this study appeared as follows:



Figure 12: Gender and Ethnicity of Participants (Tenants) in Percentages (Chabalala, 2019)

The above figure portrays the gender of the twenty tenants. The figure above shows that a slight majority of 11 of the tenants were men, with 9 women.

The finding on gender of landlords in this study appeared as follows:



Figure 13: Gender and Ethnicity of Participants (Landlords) in Percentages (Chabalala, 2019)

The above figure portrays the gender representation of the respondents. Ten landlords participated in the research. The figure above shows that 7 landlords were men, and only 3 were women. The figures on gender relate to the researcher's observations of the study are and bears out patterns of home ownership in South Africa, which 59% are male (StatsSA, 2011).

5.4.2 Age Profile of landlords and tenants

The age profile of participants is significant because it relate to the trend of the youthful urban population. This means that for the future demand for housing, policy should aim to cater for the younger generation in terms of homeownership. The age groups of the respondents in this regard were as follows:



Figure 14: Age Profile of Participants in Percentages (Chabalala, 2019)

In terms of the above graph, the majority of tenants' respondents ranged from 30-34 years amounting to 35%, then 40-44 years with 20%. The majority of landlords' respondents ranged from 50-54 years amounting to 30%. From what can be drawn from the above trends is that all tenants are of working age with a predominance of those aged between 30-50 years of age (16 of 20). Their age range is younger than that of the landlords, with the predominance of landlords between 60-64 years of age (7 of 10).

5.4.3 Employment Status of landlords and tenants

The employment status of respondents is as follows:



Figure 15: Employment Status of Participants (Chabalala, 2019)

The above figure shows that 15 of 20 of the tenants' respondents are employed. Tenants who are self-employed are at 5, no tenants are unemployed or are pensioners (receiving social grants). However, only half of the landlords' are employed, 4 are pensioners (in recipients of pension), and the remaining landlord is self-employed. The predominance of high employment rate does not reflect the socio-economic profile presented in the previous chapter.

5.5 Reasons for Renting Backyard Accommodation in Dube

The literature indicates that the rapid growth of backyard accommodation on the urban periphery can be attributed to the increase in urban population, which is not met by the concomitant provision of affordable housing.

5.5.1 Area of origin of Tenants

The tenants were asked whether they are originally from Dube Township. The reason for including this question in the interviews allows the researcher to get data to ascertain whether the people residing in backyard accommodation is comprised of people who originally come from that particular area, are they related to the property owners (landlords) or is created by migration into urban areas. The areas of origin of the tenants are as follows:



Figure 16: Area of origin of research participants (tenants) (Chabalala, 2019)

The figure above shows that majority of the tenants migrated into the area. Overall, 18 of the respondents said they were not originally from Gauteng or Dube Township and two of the respondents were originally from Gauteng, specifically from Dube and they are related to the landlords. Most (14 tenants) of the respondents moved to Gauteng from other provinces, with a high proportion coming from Limpopo (9) and the remaining tenants came from either Mozambique (3) and Zimbabwe (1). High proportion of tenants from Limpopo is noteworthy because of family networks that they have with other tenants, and this makes it easier for them to find backyard accommodation in Dube.

5.5.2 Reasons for choosing Dube Township

It is gathered from the data that most of the respondents moved to Gauteng in search for jobs and other economic opportunities for the betterment of their lives. It is therefore clear that the growth of backyard accommodation is caused by urban migration, which is not equally met by the provision of housing by government.

The general response from the respondents for choosing Dube Township was that accommodation is affordable and offers more choices compared to other townships. Tenants can either build their own dwellings/shelter on land rented from the property owner or rent a backyard structure (shack or brick room) from the property owner. Brick rooms are referred to as 'decent' type of accommodation (and presumably more desirable).

5.5.3 Renting backyard accommodation

The figures below indicate advertisements for backyard accommodation in Dube Township:



Figure 17: Shoprite Community Noticeboard (Photo by Chabalala, 2019)



Figure 18: Room availability notice in Dube (Photo by Chabalala, 2019)

Acquiring backyard rooms in Dube is very simple and the tenants acquire backyard rooms in various ways. To acquire a shack backyard room, some tenants (4 of 20) first buy a prefabricated structure and then start negotiating with the landlord to place their shacks in their yard, if there is space and how much rent they would have to pay. Some tenants (2) first find a site, negotiate with the landlord in terms of rental price and then buy prefabricated structures. After buying the structure, they will then assemble it in the yard. The other way of getting rooms is through advertisements (2) on the walls of Shoprite or people referring (1) each other to landlords who owns backyard shack rooms and are ready to rent them out.

Landlords also build rooms in their backyards using traditional material (brick and mortar) as well as an outside toilet, this makes it easier for them to rent to people (9 of 20 tenants rented brick rooms), as they own the backyard rooms themselves. For tenants to acquire brick and mortar rooms is by responding to rooms advertised (5) on the walls of Shoprite or referring (4) each other to landlords who own brick rooms. The other two tenants are family members and are related to the property owners.

Tenant 10 (rent a shack) and Tenant 5 (rent a brick room) said that they were related (children) to their respective landlords. The landlords can be said to be the catalyst in the supply and advertising of rental spaces and brick rooms to tenants as supported by the figures illustrated above.

5.5.4 Locational advantages

According to respondents, Dube Township is well located as it is close to Johannesburg CBD (as the economic hub), and various industries (such as Crown Mines) especially because of the availability of various modes of transport.

The tenants and landlords both indicated that it is easy to get to public transport, which is not very expensive. One said that Dube Township also offers a variety of transport modes such as the Rea Vaya bus system, Metro Bus, train and taxis, and they use routes that are close to their homes. Taxis pick up some of them right in front of their homes, while some have to walk a few minutes to get to the end of the street they live in to get a taxi. In addition, some of the tenants and landlords indicated that there are a number of good local schools for their children in terms of the quality of education and facilities that are available at schools. These include nursery schools, junior secondary schools, and senior secondary schools.

The figure below (Figure 19 and 20) shows a Rea Vaya bus station and an aerial photograph of Dube Train Station:



Figure 19: Rea Vaya Station (Photo by Chabalala, 2019)

Dube Township can be accessed by a Rea Vaya Feeder Bus (F4), which runs from the Trunk Route (T1, T2 and T3) at Boomtown Station via Vilakazi Street then Dube and ends at Mofolo Central.



Figure 20: Dube Train Station (Accessed from googlemaps.com)

Metrorail trains can also access Dube Township, which runs from Park Station (Johannesburg CBD) to Naledi Station (Soweto).



Figure 21: Dube facilities (Accessed from googlemaps.com)

They also mentioned that they have access to sporting facilities within a 5-kilometre radius. They also mentioned that they could access the local clinic, South African Revenue Service (SARS) offices,

Johannesburg Metro Police Department (JMPD) Dube Vocational and South West Gauteng TVET College (George Tabor Campus). Therefore, the Dube is a very convenient township and well-connected, because the availability of public transport brings in the elimination of distance by time, so being on the urban periphery is not necessarily a disadvantage.

The figure below shows an aerial photograph some of the abovementioned facilities:



Figure 22: Arial photograph of Dube Township (Accessed from googlemaps.com)

Moreover, the backyard accommodation provides a sense of safety and the tenants feel that their belongings are much safer in the backyard than in the informal settlement. This assertion implies that some of the tenants have lived in informal settlements. It suggests that the rise in backyard accommodation may also be explained by people moving out of informal settlements in search of safer and more secure living environments (i.e. not just because the state has been removing informal settlements).

The other tenants expressed that the reason they chose to stay in Dube Township is because they have relatives in the place and hence they are more familiar with Dube than elsewhere. For them it makes sense to live with people they know rather than going to a new place and living with strangers that you do not know and this contributes to a greater sense of security. For instance, Tenant 13 and Tenant 17 made the similar assertions that:

Tenant 13: "*I come from Mozambique, and I moved to this area because I knew someone from home, so it was easy for me to find a place to stay … but now I can choose a place for myself, but I prefer Dube because I'm most familiar with it*".

Tenant 17: "*I'm from Mozambique and I chose Dube backyard accommodation because some of my relatives have shacks around Soweto (Dube), and when I first came to South Africa I was squatting with them while I was looking for employment*".

Tenant 4 said "*I'm from Limpopo, here in Gauteng there are lots of business opportunities … I have started my own business as an informal trader and I sell various products such as fat cakes by the Dube Train Station in the morning for those going to work … I'm also selling Kota in the afternoon and other products … It is very convenient for me because most of my customers are from around Dube Township and they know me*".

Tenant 1, Tenant 7, Tenant 11 and Tenant 18 shared the same sentiments by saying that they have moved from their provinces of origin to Gauteng because of the lack of development back at home in terms of infrastructure, and where their children walk long distances to school. Therefore, they came to Johannesburg in search for better opportunities, which, in relation to Tenant 4's assertion, also relate to locational advantages (benefit of being close to pedestrian traffic). Tenant 5 and Tenant 10 said that they are from Dube Township and they moved out of their main houses because they had their own families or wives so they needed more space and privacy.

Some landlords are motivated for social reasons to provide accommodation to family or friends. Backyard rental often provides space for children who have grown older but cannot afford to move out, or extended family members who want to stay on the same property. In such situations, backyard rental may reinforce social cohesion and may enable vital support networks for vulnerable households.

5.5.5 The quality and amenity of backyard structure dwellings in Dube Township

The quality of backyard accommodation structures differs based on the materials that are used by the tenants or the property owners. Tenant 1, said that she felt like backyard accommodation offers more freedom than sharing a room with the landlord in the main structure, and that backyard structures are safer than living in informal settlements. Tenant 9 said that backyard structures, especially the brick rooms found in Dube Township, are generally of good quality compared to those found in other townships. Tenant 4 said that she was also motivated to live in the backyard structures because it is

more flexible (not tied to one property), she can move to another place anytime she needs to move and because of the nature of her job as an informal trader.

Here we see that tenants see backyard structures as an accessible, safer, and more flexible form of housing than other housing options. The field visits and interviews conducted in Dube Township also reveals distinct construction approaches and materials used. According Landlord 5:

"*The most important thing to construct 'umkhukhu' (poorly constructed and shanty shacks) is zinc and wood … to construct a backyard rooms you need bricks and mortar*".

Most of the respondents that participated in this study reported that their dwelling structures were conventionally built, and that they were in good condition. The figures showing density (Figure 23, 24, 25 and 26) and the figure below (Figure 29) shows evidence of these claims as they show how formally some of these buildings look structurally from the outside. Based on observation, the backyard structures are secure and livable. Other respondents complained about the high rates of crime, and drug abuse among the youth in the area.

Additionally, some tenants complained about safety issues they experienced when they lived in other backyard structures, such as the absence of "proper gates and proper palisade fencing" to deter criminals. While a few (3 of the 9 women) pointed out safety concerns especially woman as they have to go outside even at night in order to go to the toilet.

The majority of tenants complained about the small space they have available in their one-room backyard structures. Some of them stated living with children or other people diminishes one's privacy.

Nevertheless, the overall perceptions of the tenants were that backyard structures are much safer to live in than living in informal settlements, where there are more risks such as fires and flooding.

Tenant 20 explained that

"*My backyard shack does not have any roof leakages, and it does not flood during the rainy seasons, so I'm safe from outside weather conditions*"

She further explained that she has iron burglar bars in her windows and doors, so she feel safe. However, backyard shacks are more prone to leakages during heavy rainfalls. Tenant 19 said that

"...moving frequently from one place to another has damaged my corrugated irons ... my shack is always leaking nowadays, but I will make a plan and buy new building materials".

Tenant 13 added, "*I have just moved into this shack (from brick room) ... the materials are still in good condition ... very safe as you can see that I have put a burglar [gate and bars] on the door and on the windows for safety reasons*".

The figure below is a picture of backyard shack structures with safety features such as steel burglar gates.



Figure 23: Steel burglar doors and windows (Photo by Chabalala, 2019)

One of the respondents complained about having to pay rent, stating that it would be better if they owned their own homes that the government promises them especially during elections time (Tenant 2).

There can be little doubt that the quality of backyard accommodation in South Africa is deficient in many respects. It is overcrowded, services are largely inadequate, there is a lack of privacy and sometimes there is tension between property owners and their tenants. The response to backyard accommodation by tenants is that it is wholly undesirable and people should be provided with better kinds of accommodation.

5.6 The Landlord-Tenant Relationship

This section presents the opinions of both the tenants and property owners about the type of relationships that exist, how it works and how it helps facilitate the backyard rentals. This finding of understanding the landlord-tenant relationship is derived from question 11, 12, 13 and 19 of the research guide questions.

Physical conditions in the backyards are clearly not good in terms of the provision of services, maintenance of facilities and the use of facilities such as toilets and water taps, and might be expected to generate tensions between property owners and their tenants and amongst tenants themselves. In practice, however, there is limited evidence to suggest that there are tensions amongst themselves. The majority of the tenants replied that they had had no disagreements with the property owner. Some mentioned that even though they have good relationships with their landlords it is still not easy as an adult to comply with and live according to someone else's rules. For instance, Tenant 6 who rents a brick room from Landlord 4 said,

"*I have a good relationship with my landlord (Landlord 4) because there are no conflicts between us… I also have a good relationship with other tenants … My room is very safe and the amount that I am paying is very reasonable*".

Tenant 13 and Tenant 14 who both rent shacks also said that they also have a good relationship with the landlord and other tenants. However, they said that on weekends there are problems because some tenants come back drunk at night and start making a noise and playing loud music. Tenant 3 shared similar sentiments by saying,

"*I have a good relationship with the landlord and other tenants but I get annoyed when others are playing loud music at night especially when the landlord (Landlord 3 who is a security guard) is working nightshift … some of the problems also arise when I am unable to pay my rent on time … For me as an informal trader, I do not generate a fixed income so it is very difficult … However, I do speak with the landlord and he is very understanding because of the nature of my job*".

To probe more deeply in order to find out some of the conflicts that exist in backyard accommodation arrangements was to finding out why the respondents left their previous accommodation. In the case of former backyard dwellers (People who came from other backyard accommodation), there was a wide mix of reasons for tenants to have moved or relocated to their current dwellings. These motives for leaving backyard accommodation were grouped according to whether or not they entailed

voluntary or involuntary departure. The former includes attempts to improve the quality of accommodation or to change the nature of the accommodation from shacks to brick rooms by the landlords or tenants voluntarily wanting to upgrade or downgrade; the latter includes any reason that reflects some kind of pressure placed on the tenant from the landlord. A third category includes other kinds of motive unconnected with the type of dwelling per se but with the relationship with the landlord (family) or they have not moved from their current dwellings. The assessment found that more people moved out of a backyard for voluntary reasons (55%) than did so because they were in some sense forced out (15%), and 30% gave reasons that they have not moved from their current dwellings since they moved to Gauteng and others said that they were members of the family. These findings provide a very interesting picture of tenants moving from one form of rental accommodation to another to improve the quality of their life.

Looking at the specific causes of voluntary moves, the most common reasons why most tenants renting brick room have moved from their previous accommodation to the current dwellings was that they wanted to upgrade from shacks to brick rooms. Tenant 16 who rents a brick room said:

"*I have been staying in this room for more than 2 years, but overall, I have been renting in backyard accommodation for close to 4 years … I was staying in a shack … I moved from my previous dwelling because I wanted a more secure space*".

Tenant 3 said that he initially rented with a relative and then moved to his own shack (after about 1 year and 6 months) because he wanted more privacy.

Looking at the specific causes of involuntary moves, by far the most important factor was eviction. The second reason was an inability to pay the rent. Tenant 13 who moved from a brick room to a shack said that he has been staying in his current accommodation for the past 6 months and he moved from his previous dwelling because he could not afford the monthly rental payments, because he is self-employed and has an irregular income flow.

Another reason for them to have moved was that the landlord wanted to build brick rooms and remove all the shacks. Some tenants attested that whenever a landlord says that they want to build brick rooms, it is actually a common language that landlords use to evict tenants. Because after a few months when you pass by the very same yard, you will find new shacks standing constructed by new tenants.

Backyard tenants do not move very often. The mean occupancy in the current accommodation from the respondents is 2.4 years. While 8 tenants have occupied the backyard for less than 2 years, 10

tenants have been there for between two and five years and almost 2 tenants for more than five years. These figures exclude respondents who are family or related to the landlords. Tenant 1 said

"*I have been renting for 11 years in the very same yard and I have a very good relationship with my landlord … we are like family now… I do not want to move because the shack might be damaged when I disassemble it and it will be expensive for me to hire man-power to rebuild the shack*".

The majority of the landlords also believed that they have a good relationship with the tenants and some stated that their tenants are like a family to them. The landlords expressed that this is because of the living arrangement and the sharing of the basic services, which forces a daily contact and communication with the tenants. Some landlords also expressed that the relationship with the tenants is very helpful and supportive in times of need. Landlord 1 said,

"*I have a good relationship with my tenants … We have been staying together for a very long time and they have not moved out … so it shows that I'm taking good care of them … When they are unable to pay rent, they tell me on time and I allow them to stay but they have to pay double in the following month*".

However, there were some concerns raised by the landlords that some tenants are disrespectful and do not cooperate with other tenants in the yard. Landlord 7 said

"*Some tenants come back at night with their drunk friends and play loud music without considering the other people in the yard*".

Landlord 3 added the following

"*… male tenants are the ones who always give me problems because they sometimes come with their friends and the place becomes overcrowded … in weekends it is worse because they sometimes make noise … some tenants refuses to pay, especially when they know that they are about to leave … I also have a new tenant (Tenant 4) who has just moved in about 2 or 3 months ago, so I cannot really tell how our relationship will be … ooh I did not even ask her about the reasons she moved from her previous place*".

Landlord 5 who owns brick rooms and shack dwellings also expressed a similar concern that his tenants who live in the informal dwellings do not always pay on time. However, he regarded those who are staying in the brick rooms as "*well behaved*" and pay their rent on time.

Landlord 5 is thinking of converting the shacks to brick rooms. He added

"... I have been thinking of demolishing these 4 shacks and add more rooms ... If I add 2, they have to be big and I'll rent them at R900 each ... if its 3 they will be R650 because they will be small" (Landlord 5).

The above assertion presents an interesting discussion that the landlord is maximizing his asset (land) and reducing risk (higher paying and less risky tenants).

While the overall opinion of the landlords was that they have a good relationship with their tenants, they also experience some challenges. Their main concern is that if the tenants do not pay on time this badly affects the landlords' income flow, in other words, the landlords' livelihoods are dependent on their rental income and are not able to satisfy their monthly needs and wants at other times such as buying grocery. Another cause of tension is their perception that tenants misuse water and electricity. When tenants bring additional family members to stay with them (without their consent), utility costs rise. However identifying the tenant(s) responsible for increased electricity consumption is difficult. These issues are commonly resolved when the landlord calls up a meeting with the tenants. In sum, therefore, the results provide some evidence of tension in the relationship between landlords and tenants, but also the mechanisms to resolve the problems. Given that backyard accommodation is characterized by overcrowding, the amount of conflict is extremely low. There are expectations from the researcher that he expected far higher levels of antagonism but is surprised by the interpersonal relationships that actually existed between landlords and tenants.

The provincial government has established a Rental Tribunal to facilitate conflicts that arise in rental accommodation. The structure has been put in place to settle disputes between backyard dwellers and their landlords when they cannot resolve the conflicts themselves. The municipal official explained that when a tenant or a landlord has a problem they can report it to the City of Johannesburg's Department of Human Settlements that then sends the complaint to their Gauteng provincial offices. The tribunal sets a date, and then holds a hearing to resolve the matter with landlord and the tenant. However, the landlords are not aware about the Rental Tribunal or any housing policies or laws that governs or that regulates backyard accommodation. This is interesting because it shows that the concern to establish a policy does not derive from the landlords themselves. The concerns are from officials, planners, housing policy-makers, researchers, etc. Additionally, the concern also arises from the need to formalize or incorporate backyard accommodation into formal systems.

5.7 Housing Policy in Dube Township

This section probes how housing policy framework and legislative framework from the municipality's perspective reacts to backyard and from the perspective of property owners and tenants.

5.7.1 Density

The densities within backyard accommodation have significant implications when it comes to service delivery, health and safety of the tenants and property owners.

Generally, the houses in Dube Township are commonly four roomed houses (Post-1994 state-subsidized) with two bedrooms, a kitchen, a dining room and a small toilet with a bathtub or shower inside. While some are three roomed houses (51/9 and 51/6 provided over 50 years ago). However, some of the original 4 roomed houses have been extended over the years by owners to make rooms bigger and to increase the number of rooms to accommodate extended families and they have built external rooms (using corrugated iron or brick and mortar) to house tenants for rental purposes. Landlords who build brick and mortar structures, can only build 3 or 4 rooms because of space availability within the yard. The figure below shows backyard structures built using brick and mortar:



Figure 24: Brick and mortar backyard structures (Photo by Chabalala, 2019)

Property owners who built corrugated iron structures can build up to seven structures or even more because of space availability within their yard. More housing units or structures within a yard increases density of people and dwellings.

An increase in housing structures and thus the number of tenants, as stated by Landlord 7 who rents out corrugated iron shacks, is likely to create more conflicts and issues within the yard, as it is difficult to control the tenants. Landlords whose tenants rent brick rooms did not raise similar concerns.

Through observations and taking an aerial view of Dube Township, the plot size plays a significant role in determining the household size. For instance, a property that is located at the corner will house a larger number of backyard dwellings compared to other dwellings located in between two properties because the plot size is larger.

The figures below show proximity of the structures to one another:



Figure 25: Density of Backyard dwellings – Located at the Corner (Landlord 3) (Photos by Chabalala, 2019)



Figure 26: Backyard dwellings - Between properties (Tenant 13 and 14) (Photo by Chabalala, 2019)



Figure 27: Backyard dwellings - Between properties (Landlord 9) (Photo by Chabalala, 2019)

The majority of the landlord respondents said that they were from households of 3 to 7 individuals. Increased densities due to backyard rental can lead to problems related to on-site access by occupants to adequate services, and over-use of existing infrastructure networks. The number of people utilizing toilets, taps, drains and cooking facilities on a specific site and across neighborhoods can stretch the carrying capacity of the existing infrastructure. There has been a serious concern borne out in the literature around the contribution that backyard dwellings make to overcrowding and increasing densities beyond what existing infrastructure can cope with. However, there are also many incidences of suburbs with significant numbers of backyard units where infrastructure is coping with the added pressure. In other situations, the original infrastructure may have been significantly over-specified and is therefore able to handle significantly higher densities than at present. This observation should inform municipal infrastructure development policy in the future.

5.7.2 Service Delivery

Water, electricity and sewage disposal are the three main basic amenities and services that every household needs to maintain a healthy standard of living. These services are, however, not readily available to all South Africans. Research respondents were asked whether there are any challenges that they are facing with backyard accommodation. The respondents were also asked if there is any kind of support received concerning backyard rental accommodation from the municipality or government. Additionally, the respondents were also asked about the services that they have access to and how do they access those services. These questions were asked as to establish the extent to which government is making efforts to improve the welfare and living conditions of the people renting in backyard accommodation and the tenant's perceptions of the quality and quantity of the services that are being provided to them by the government. The landlord's position on the matter of service provision is significant because they play the middle person in making sure that the tenants receive these services.

The respondents, both the landlords and the tenants have stated that they have access to basic services such as electricity, water, free removal of solid waste, and sewage disposal, however, these services are cross-subsidized by the rates paid in other suburbs. The respondents generally consider these services to be inadequate especially solid waste removal. Some of the landlords and tenants mentioned that they have an issue of garbage disposal and solid waste removal. They state that there are certain weeks the municipality fails to collect their garbage and the garbage disposal plastic bags end up being torn apart by dogs and sometimes people looking for items they can sell, and they leave the

garbage on the ground while they are not around or they (tenants and landlords) are at work. Landlord 3 said

"*Pick it Up comes once per week on Tuesdays… after 4 days the bin is full of garbage again*".

Landlord 7 added

"… when the garbage bin is full (because of the number of people living on the plot), I have to come up with a plan to make sure that I empty it … I take it to the nearby open space to empty it there … I know it is illegal to dump rubbish everywhere, but there is nothing that I can do because when it is full. Insects such as flies just come and it's annoying".

Illegal dumping areas is shown in the figure below:



Figure 28: Dumping area (Photo by Chabalala, 2019)

Another challenge that is common within the backyard accommodation sector is water leakages and seepages of water from the taps. The tenants complained that they had to share one tap with more than three to seven dwellings that housed over three people each. This was a great inconvenience to most, as they sometimes have to wait for others to finish using the taps so that they can use it in other to get water. In addition, these communal taps (within a household) are not properly maintained by the landlords, and therefore sometimes leak and create ditches and puddles of dirty water, which are a breeding area for mosquitoes and which are also a health hazard to small children who sometimes play in this dirty water.

With regard to the connection of electricity, the majority of the respondents said that the way in which electricity is connected is hazardous and unsafe. This assertion was most common with tenants who rent in shacks than those who rent in brick rooms. The municipality would regard these connections as illegal and unsafe as a professional electrician did not install them. Some of the connections leave electric wires open in areas, which may be easily accessible by children or touch the iron materials that are used to build the shacks.

Moreover, the majority of property owners complained about the amounts they have to pay for municipal services claiming that they are very high for some of them while the services remain poor and inadequate to cater for extended families that are renting within their yard spaces. Some property owners, especially the unemployed pensioners also complained about rates, stating that they cannot afford to pay the amount that is required by the municipality for municipal services such as sewerage and garbage disposal, and extra money for electricity and sometimes for water every month. The landlords mentioned that they have been raising these issues in municipal meetings with their ward councillors over the years, yet there are still no plans in place to address these concerns.

The figure below shows how electricity is connected in one of the households from the main house to the tenants' rooms:



Figure 29: Electrical Connections to backyard rooms (Photo by Chabalala, 2019)

The respondents are not only concerned about unsafe connection of electricity, but they are also concerned about the need for streetlights in their neighborhoods. Most of the tenants of Dube Township use the train to go to work, thus they have to wake up early in the morning to go to work and return late at night. Additionally, their school-going children have to leave their homes in the early hours of the morning if they are to get to school on time. They sometimes have to cross train tracks as it saves them time by not using the limited pedestrian bridges over the train tracks because the fence along the railway lines/reserve are damaged and there are holes. The non-existence of streetlights makes it dangerous for these people to walk in the dark every morning especially in winter, as it leaves them at risk of being run over by cars and trains and at the mercy of criminals. Furthermore, respondents also pointed out that there is no local police station that deals with crime except the JMPD Dube Vocational area, which does not really cater for all the residents and does not have enough capacity to deal with all the crime in all the townships they are supposed to service. It is therefore clear from the data collected that the issues of service delivery in Dube Township needs to be addressed urgently by the municipality.

5.8 Challenges Faced by the Municipality Because of Backyard Accommodation

The municipal official (Official 1) stated that backyard accommodation places immense pressure on infrastructure. For example, sewer pipes are installed based on calculations, which are, calculated a household population typically of five (5) people per plot or household. Then due to backyard accommodation tenants, a single plot ends up having 10 to 15 people per plot. This creates a burden on infrastructure. He further explained that this is the same situation for the roads, health care facilities, refuse removal, where it was originally planned that there would be at most five people per household and the number ends up being more than that largely because of backyard tenants. This makes it difficult for the municipality to maintain the infrastructure adequately. The municipal official also explained that, another problem they have is that as a municipality they register a certain amount of electrical units (Mega Watts) demand with Eskom for each township that is distributed to various electrical substations. However, because they exceed that amount as result of backyard accommodation, and illegal connections, Eskom imposes heavy penalties on Johannesburg City Power and the municipality, because of the extra demand. These challenges all have a negative effect on maintenance of infrastructure, and for the municipality to keep up with payments they have to make to service providers such as Eskom. This is one of many important public policy challenges identified for many metropolitan municipalities in South Africa.

As existing bulk infrastructure networks reach the end of their expected life cycle, retrofitting or upgrading may be necessary. The municipal official added that upgrading systems to enable additional capacity is relatively less expensive than providing new infrastructure networks. This observation is significant to inform the components and mechanisms of the Municipal Infrastructure Grant (MIG). Municipalities may therefore consider at the outset designing all new settlements to cater for an expected level of densification. Incurring this additional capital cost at the outset will create a platform for planned and desirable densification via backyarding processes over time, which will then not require alterations to service capacity. However, the National Development Spatial Framework (NSDF) does not address the challenge of backyard accommodation (Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation, 2019). The NSDF should deal with the challenges of backyard accommodation and be in line with Chapter 8 of the NDP, “Transforming Human Settlement and the National Space Economy”. The manner in which a stand or township is laid out can affect the nature and direction of growth. The design and construction of original accommodation units (especially

government subsidized houses) should consider providing for later extensions or addition of second storeys, or that leaves space for the development of secondary accommodation for rental.

The municipal official attributed the need to intervene and curb the growth of backyard dwellings because they infringe on municipal bylaws. Official 1 stressed that this applies to both brick and mortar structures and those constructed of corrugated iron. Unregulated development has resulted in pressure on bulk infrastructure systems and the electricity grid. Official 1 states that

"*The challenge with backyard dwellings is that they don't follow municipal by laws … Bulk infrastructure was to accommodate a certain number of population but with the landlords and tenants putting all those backyard shacks, they overload and overcrowd the system … Even electricity, it was capacitated to cater for a certain population*".

Official 1 recognized that there is a housing backlog within the City of Johannesburg municipality and the municipal Department of Human Settlements uses instruments introduced in the BNG to reduce the number of backyard structures. They also use the Finance Linked Individual Subsidy Program (FLISP) to cover the gap income group. FLISP is a programme developed by the Department of Human Settlements introduced in April 2012 meant to cover first time buyers who earn between R 3,501 and R 15,000 per month, who want to purchase homes in the formal property market who are South African permanent citizens.

Official 1 said that tenants renting in backyard accommodation are not necessarily included exclusively as a specific category of housing issue in their Integrated Development Plans (IDP). Nevertheless, when the department engages in informal settlements upgrading projects within the municipality, they consider backyard accommodation tenants and property owners if their sites are big enough. Generally, the municipality deals with the needs of tenants and property owners through the mechanism of their ward committees and ward councillors. Official 1 added that policy for backyard accommodation must be area specific. Additionally, the only requirement for involvement in the ward committee meetings is that you live within the ward.

However, the municipality (Housing Department) do take measures to make sure that the National Building Regulations are observed and property owners adhere to Building Standards when they construct their backyard structures within the City of Johannesburg municipality. In terms of running home based enterprises main structures or backyard structures property owners by law, are expected to apply for special consent or rezoning, and they are supposed to pay fees associated with such

processes. To do this, one needs to advertise that they want to run a business within their property so that the community can also know about the change. The community can then either support or object that application. Similar processes must be followed when the property owner wants to construct backyard accommodation within their yard; however, the municipality does not necessarily approve renting of space but support the construction of additional structures. This is an outline of the formal development application processes to obtain permission to go ahead with construction/change of use and can be linked to development management functions of municipality.

In terms of access to basic services by the tenants, the municipality does not directly intervene as these people rent in other people's private properties. Official 1 added that, with regard to on-site access by occupants: in worst case scenarios there are situations in which tenants are unable to consistently access formal ablutions and potable water sources. In some cases, where multiple informal units occupy one plot or a single unit is over-crowded, it can increase the risk of communicable disease and social ills. In turn, this means that health facilities will become strained due to an increased number of patients.

5.9 Concluding Remarks

The findings from the landlords, tenants and municipal official provide some support for backyard accommodation. Most backyard tenants are mostly migrants from outside the Gauteng province and most dwellings consist of a single brick room or shack structures. Backyard tenants seem to be slightly better off than freestanding shack dwellers (informal settlements) in several respects, suggesting many may have exercised a positive choice to live in backyard accommodation. Tenants have access to public services and they are more satisfied with their facilities.

6. CHAPTER SIX: Analysis of Hidden Spaces on the Urban Periphery

6.1 Introduction

This chapter analyses the findings from the interviews conducted and desktop data collected that have emerged out of the research process. Analysis will assist to better understand the dynamics that are at play and to examine how spatial planning initiatives from a housing policy and governance perspective on the urban periphery (Dube Township) effectively contribute to the trend of backyard rental accommodation. The chapter also demonstrates, through the findings, the disjuncture between the intentions of housing policy and some of the outcomes they actually produce. The findings are analysed first, with a particular focus on the themes that emerged from the respondents' replies. Broadly, as asserted by Lemanski (2009) and supported by Mabasa (2017) these themes are concerned with the neglect of backyard accommodation by the municipality and the fact that backyard rentals and other home based economic activities provide households with the platform to generate income for themselves while supplying affordable rental accommodation at the same time. Secondly, broader observations are made, relating to the issues brought up in the literature review. These observations relate to the approaches undertaken in the public policy frameworks in formulating housing policies and strategies that responds to day-to-day challenges that people face. Therefore, this chapter focuses on the landlord's rationale in supplying and investing in backyard accommodation and the tenants' motivations and experiences with a view to the role of the state in supporting and managing these local housing solutions.

6.2 Municipal People-Centric Elements for Sustainable Backyard Rental Accommodation

Housing beneficiaries, who have been at the receiving end of government-subsidized houses, have not remained passive in the face of the housing challenges in the country. Government-subsidized houses beneficiaries have devised a number of innovative strategies to improve their housing conditions. Some residents have focused on improving their current dwellings. Others have elected to build on additional rooms, so that their houses can better accommodate their particular household arrangements. Other property owners have chosen to turn their homes into income producing assets, transforming rooms into spaza shops, hairdressing salons and other types of home-businesses. Nevertheless, in other instances, beneficiaries have resorted to that well-established South African urban tradition – the erection of backyard rooms for rental purposes.

However, the mushrooming of informal structures, including the addition of backyard rooms, has been viewed in a negative and positive light by the authorities. The municipal official view backyard

accommodation negatively largely because of the increased occupancy and consumption of municipal services have placed unanticipated strain on existing infrastructural services. However, there are a number of positive aspects associated with backyard rooms. They takes cognisance of ongoing migrancy, where people come to cities to work, but maintain links with families elsewhere and the rooms are capable of accommodating extended families. From the tenants' perspective, it is often the only rental accommodation that they can afford. What is more evident from the interviews apart from affordability is that the structures are in a well-located and safer area and of a better quality, which indicates some choice and agency by the tenants. Furthermore, from a property owner's perspective, the addition of backyard rooms contributes to the property owner's revenue stream and in some instances, it seems like the primary income stream. Backyard rooms also enhances the property owner's house as an asset, although only one landlord is explicitly making investment decisions in a business-minded way.

There has been a shift to greater understanding and acknowledgement of the role of backyard accommodation plays and initial attempts have been made to support it. None of the participants (tenants) referred to being evicted by the authorities (Red Ants have not demolished their structures and landlords have not been fined, jailed, etc.). They have been overlooked, ignored or perhaps seen as a private arrangement on private land.

6.3 Biographical Analysis of Tenants and Landlords

This section presents an analysis, interpretation and synthesis of the profile of the property owners and tenants. It covers the following areas: gender, age and employment status of the participants. Interviews conducted with the property owners reveals that they rely on this income-generating potential to increase their earnings and to support their families and extended families.

6.3.1 Gender

The data collected reveals that male tenants dominate backyard accommodation with a small percentage difference to females. As with single-person households in general, men dominate the single-person shack rental segment. These findings are consistent with findings in most of the backyard rental accommodation literature (Gunter, 2014; Lemanski, 2009). Female tenants dominate the brick-room rental segment. Some of the men stay in these locations to work for their families as it was revealed from the data presented that majority of the tenants are from other provinces other than Gauteng, with majority of them from Limpopo Province. The male-headed households dominate the backyard housing rental sector as property owners. This type of gender dominance, which is

largely skewed towards male dominating the sector, is also noted elsewhere in South African townships (Crankshaw et al., 2000; Lemanski, 2009). Women-headed households also exist within Dube Township and elsewhere in the country, where women are the actual property owners in the absence of male breadwinners or in the contexts where their spouses are working in other provinces or are deceased.

6.3.2 Age

In as far as age was concerned for tenants, the significant number of participants aged 20- 44 years (75%) could be an indication that the youths and middle age people demonstrate economically active individuals. What we see is a more youthful population of working age who are employed and relatively mobile who prefer to live in places that are safe, serviced, and well-located (i.e. easy access to places of economic opportunity/employment and public transport). These are people who have some experience of living elsewhere – rural settlements, informal settlements, and other backyards – and this is what they prefer (given their affordability constraints and the lack of more formal alternatives).

The age ranges illustrated in Figure 8 are important to local and national government for planning and policy purposes. In this case, a larger percentage of the budget can be allocated to socio-economic development initiatives to cater for the needs of the youth, such as subsidized housing, education, skills development and creation of job opportunities. In as far as age was concerned for landlords, the significant number of participants aged above 50+ years (70%) could be an indication that age and experience is vital in property ownership and management especially of backyard accommodation. However, from the responses that property owners have provided, they are not knowledgeable about laws and policies that relates to rental housing.

6.3.3 Employment

None of the tenants and the property owners were unemployed. The graph (Figure 15) depicts a high employment rate of tenants respondents at 75% and 25% of the tenants are self-employed. The graph also shows that 50% of property owners are employed, 40% are pensioners who are earning social grant and 10% are self-employed. The employment status of property owners could be the main reason for letting out their yard space and renting backyard shacks because of the need for an income to supplement their current earnings.

The backyard rental provided important source of income considering that there is already a high demand of rental accommodation and space in Dube Township. The current sectors in the local economy in Dube and Soweto do not provide enough employment opportunities.

6.3.4 Relationship between property owners and backyard tenants

Property owners and their backyard tenants are either family members or unrelated stakeholders.

Good sustainable interventions in backyard housing can improve the quality of the environment and provide a better place for tenants to thrive and live. Though tenants appear satisfied, they have indicated the need for additional services within the context of backyard dwellings.

As was evident from the interviews, the working relationship between property owners and backyard tenants is generally good, making coordination of property management and maintenance easier. When problems or challenges within a unit arise, tenants inform the property owner, who ensures that these problems are addressed. In one instance, a mediation mechanism, a committee is set up.

Legislation to formalise the backyard tenant-landlord relationship is significant. For instance, when it comes to service delivery, backyard tenants do not have direct access to free basic services. Since policy such as Gauteng Policy on Backyard Accommodation provides some mechanism for backyard accommodation tenants to have access to free basic services, the lack of legislation, makes the control of this access difficult and backyard tenants are dependent on the good will of their landlords for access to these services such as electricity, refuse removal, water and sanitation services.

Some respondents expressed that they felt that their children and belongings were safe in backyard rental accommodation than in informal settlement.

6.4 Tenants, landlords and municipal's perceptions on backyard rental accommodation

This section seeks to understand the experience of living in backyard rental accommodation from the tenants' perspective; what tenants like the most about backyard rental accommodation; whether they are satisfied about their quality of their dwelling; the living arrangement; and how they feel about their relationships with the property owners and other tenants. It is apparent that convenient locations, employment opportunities and flexibility are some of the key drivers in tenants' choice of rental accommodation in Dube Township.

6.4.1 Affordability

The main advantage of living in backyard rental accommodation according to the tenants is the rent affordability. The tenants were happy about the cheap rent and expressed that, although it is not the

ideal type of accommodation they expected in Johannesburg. This could be because the tenants cannot afford the rental accommodation offered in the open market. For tenants, cheaper rent allows tenants to save money, buy groceries and send some money home, hence they prefers staying in Dube and for the tenants: it is a wise financial decision. It could be argued then that backyard rental accommodation are more convenient type of accommodation in terms of rent and also allows the tenants to life comfortable or rather have a better quality of life. This is because the cheap rent allows the tenants to use the remaining income in purchasing goods or services that improve their quality of life, such furniture and paying for school fees.

6.4.2 Flexibility and better service

Additionally, in understanding the tenants' choices regarding backyard rental accommodation in Dube, the overall response was that it is better in terms of services and flexibility in the tenure arrangement unlike in the informal settlements. This claim by the tenants support the arguments made by Sharpurjee and Charlton (2013) that backyard accommodation offers flexible tenure and has access to services unlike freestanding shacks in informal settlements.

A tenant said that if they are not happy with the living arrangement they could easily disassemble their shack and move to other places. The tenant did not necessarily mean moving to other townships but moving into another yard around Dube Township. Tenants who rent in backyard accommodation are flexible when it comes to relocations from one household to another. Structures are not all temporary or mobile in nature; backyard room are also constructed formally and built with bricks and mortar.

Owners who built backyard accommodation structures using bricks and mortar regard themselves as people who are investing significant amounts of money and they will find it difficult to demolish those structures. Unlike property owners who built their structures from corrugated zinc or iron, which can be demolished easily and tenants can moved from one yard to another.

6.4.3 Property owner's perspective

In understanding the landlords' motivations for renting backyard accommodation majority responded they were motivated by the need for income and some are responding to the high demand of rental accommodation in Dube. The landlords indicated that the income of backyard rental accommodation is guaranteed from their tenants, giving impressions that the income from backyard rental accommodation is reliable and the reasons to this was that there are no up and downs stress like

running a business. The income generated also helps to improve the ability for landlords to purchase households goods such as food and furniture.

This research did not originally set to examine the experiences of children and female-headed households. However, upon analysing the data, the realities of the young people (19-35 years) and female headed households became evident. The lack of street lighting heightens the specific vulnerability that women, young girls and children experience when they walk about at night.

6.4.4 Municipal official's perspective

According to the municipal official, the CoJ is only concerned with the formality of the backyard structure, not who live in it, and why they live there. The City of Johannesburg municipality plays the role of a regulator in the construction of additional structures in Dube Township. This is to insure minimum safety and quality requirements from the landlords.

In terms of the relationship between the landlord and the tenant, the municipality does not directly get involved. However, they do have a tribunals to settle disputes if a landlord or tenant are unable to do so themselves. This neutral position in dealing with the backyard landlords and tenants is in line with liberal and neoliberal principles which advocate for minimum state intervention in the housing market.

The City's concern for formalisation and standardisation is at odds with the people's need for access to affordable housing to survive. If the City were to provide the people with a better option that are within a similar rental range 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.

The key challenges for policy-makers and planners in the City of Johannesburg in deciding a policy direction are, what elements should be central to municipal interventions to foster supportive and sustainable backyard rental accommodation as well as the often-hidden designs and rationalities of ordinary people trying to survive and live meaningful lives on the urban periphery. The strong political will to plan for the poor and overarching policy intentions are apparent, but the understanding of the problem and intent does not translate well into the plans that the City develops. The intent is 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.

6.5 Implications of Policy

There is no doubt that the quality of backyard accommodation in South Africa is deficient in many respects. It is overcrowded, services are largely inadequate, there is lack of privacy and sometimes there are tensions between landlords and their tenants. There is a general consensus from the landlords and tenants that backyard accommodation is wholly undesirable and people should be provided with better kinds of accommodation or their current dwellings must be improved. Certainly, this is the implicit goal of South African housing policy since 1994 as highlighted in Chapter 4 however; the government policies that are implemented and proposed are not reacting to the issues that are faced by the landlords and tenants. The review of policy suggests that although there are mechanisms available to backyard accommodation dwellers in theory, such as a government subsidy to people earning R3500, the free basic services are also not enough.

According to Turok and Saladin (2016: 387), informal forms of rental accommodation such as the backyard rental sector are often not authorised, and lack access to basic services, and they are also vulnerable to flooding and other environmental hazards. In terms of access to basic services, flooding and environmental hazards, evidence from the case study of Dube Township shows that backyard tenants do not experience any of these problems. Tenants' backyard structures are built using conventional methods, and are located on fully serviced formal plots. Furthermore, backyard tenants during the interviews expressed that they have good access to basic services and social amenities. Case study analysis of Soweto suggest that the living conditions within the area are poor. Although, in general, backyard dwellers do appear to have access to basic services, however, the level of service differs. There are numerous cases of backyard dwellers waiting for years for housing grants and case study analysis of previous research by various scholars suggests that in some areas, backyard dwellers have lived in the backyard dwelling for over 10 years.

6.5.1 Electricity and water services

All the houses in this study had access to electricity. The shacks accessed electricity by means of 'illegal' connections such as extension cords from the main house. When these electrical wires, many of which are of the wrong technical specifications for building-to-building connections, make contact with the metal roof material, sparks fly in and can cause severe electrical shocks. Illegal electrical connections in the presence of flimsy building materials of the shacks (wood, corrugated iron sheets and even cardboard) considerably increases the risk of structural fires. Therefore, the hazardous nature of electricity supply to shacks in the backyard has implications for health care and fire services in the

City of Johannesburg. The damage to property and injuries caused through illegal electrical connections can potentially be preventable if municipal bylaws are strictly followed.

6.6 Demographic Trends, Literature Review and Policy

Backyard accommodation landlords and tenants are not homogeneous, yet broad patterns have been observed in existing literature (Watson, 2009: 5). Although a range of age groups occupy the sector (Lemanski, 2009: 476; Zweig, 2015: 5), tenants are commonly younger than landlords (Bank, 2007: 213; Watson, 2009: 5; Rubin & Gardner, 2013: 6; Shapurjee & Charlton, 2013: 658; Gunter, 2014: 99; Zweig, 2015: 5). Landlords may be well-established residents who are already or almost retired and pensioners (Rubin & Gardner, 2013: 31). Several studies have shown tenant households to be smaller than those of landlords (Lemanski, 2009: 476; Watson, 2009: 5; Rubin & Gardner, 2013: 31; Shapurjee & Charlton, 2013: 658). Landlords and their backyard tenants regularly exhibit comparatively low levels of household income (Morange, 2002: 14; Bank 2007: 214; Shapurjee & Charlton, 2013: 658), with tenants often presenting greater income security with permanent employment and even marginally higher incomes than landlords (Watson, 2009: 5; Rubin & Gardner, 2013: 31; Shapurjee & Charlton, 2013: 658).

7. CHAPTER SEVEN: Conclusion and Planning Recommendations

7.1 Introduction

This chapter presents conclusion points and planning recommendations.

7.2 Evaluating the Research Process

Despite commendable efforts from the government to design and implement housing policy, the housing backlog for South Africa's townships and the urban poor has been growing at a rapid rate despite massive rollout of state-subsidized housing units. Taking into account the pace of delivery and the resources available, as well as continued economic, population growth, and the rapid pace of urbanization, it could take the RSA government decades to eliminate the housing backlog and provide sufficient housing opportunities for low-income households.

7.3 Synopsis of the Study

This study shows that there is a direct relationship between the landlords and tenants, and that they are common when it comes to the supply and demand of housing within the City of Johannesburg. The biggest challenge is denying people the freedom to choose the type of accommodation that they can afford. Another challenge is denying people freedom by withholding information about their civic rights, especially when it comes to educating the tenants and landlords about policies and bylaws that govern backyard accommodation, property ownership and administration. Neither do tenants nor landlords know about legislation affecting them in the housing rental sector. This is reflected by the overwhelming response by participants that they have no idea about municipal tribunals, bylaws or policies about backyard accommodation.

7.4 Planning and Governance Recommendations to Dube and the City of Johannesburg

Analysis of case study (Dube), literature and policy review and interviews were interrogated to provide an in-depth view of the issues regarding backyard accommodation in Dube. The supply of backyard accommodation units offers a potential solution to the housing crisis facing the City of Johannesburg, while offering landlords an opportunity to generate income (a form of livelihoods support) and incrementally invest in their properties. Although there are many outstanding gaps in the knowledge and understanding of backyard housing, sufficient evidence has been presented in this research report to suggest that government policy should take a broadly positive rather than negative stance towards backyard accommodation. The study makes the following recommendations, noting that some interventions can be further developed through additional research:

7.4.1 Policy Recognition

As a first step, policy recognition is important to legitimise the role of backyard accommodation in the housing supply system. While backyard accommodation is yet to be recognized in municipal and provincial strategic documents, there is no formal policy for backyarding nor are there and dedicated funding instruments to support the sector. Important lessons can be learnt from the City of Cape Town's backyard accommodation programme, which has extended basic services to several thousand backyard tenants on council-owned land.

7.4.2 Controlling Norms and Standard

Many backyard accommodation units are incrementally, self-built by landlords and a proportion of informal units are tenant-built. These units may not meet all conventional building norms and standards, although that they may meet many basic shelter, service and health and safety requirements. There are alternatives open to municipalities, of which challenges may arise. Local municipalities can review conventional building and service standards to cater for backyard accommodation.

7.4.3 Relax, Simplify and Streamline laws and Regulatory Procedures

Relaxing regulations for certain areas appears to be a step into the right direction, but the study demonstrates that many landlords still do not follow formal procedures due to the complexity, costs and restrictive conditions associated with formalization. The Province could take a leading role by, for instance, establishing a dedicated forum of stakeholders to assess the appropriateness of existing rules and regulations and identify ways of streamlining procedures.

7.4.4 Awareness-raising and information dissemination

Formalization will not be achieved without investing more resources in education and capacity building among individuals, good governance and strengthening state community relations. Education initiatives to educate landlords and backyard dwellers on their roles, rights and responsibilities are absolutely necessary. Information on policy needs to be more accessible and ward councillors need to be educated to include backyard dwellers in the municipality's policy.

The City of Johannesburg can support self-build development in townships by training local artisans on housing quality and educating landlords on basic building practices. The aim is to provide knowledge on building practices, dealing with local builders, appointing builders/artisans, building management, building maintenance and managing incremental developments.

7.4.5 Government Acknowledgement

Backyard accommodation is an important part of the housing system in South African urban peripheral areas. In order to ensure that all households have access to free basic services, these dwellings have to be acknowledged by the government. This would require numerous community sessions with landlords, tenants and government officials from the municipality to ensure that there are increased understandings of the importance of backyard accommodation in South Africa. The City of Johannesburg should, with the support of private sector, embrace the use of alternative building material in the construction of backyard units.

The City of Johannesburg's Housing and Planning Department must plan for the long-term growth of human settlements by making efficient use of available land (Gardener, 2009).

7.4.6 Area-Based Municipal Policy Approach

The intervention of local authorities in the backyard sector should not be uniform across all cases where backyard accommodation is found or not found. Interventions should be targeted to best meet the needs of that particular neighbourhood. This means in some neighbourhood people can afford to build formal structures using bricks and mortar, while in some households, landlords cannot afford formally constructed buildings and they use cheaper materials such as corrugated iron and zinc materials. Therefore, the flexibility that the City of Johannesburg exhibits in enforcing building standards, and bylaws should be utilise as a strategy that allows low-income households to have more freedom to build, and improve their backyard structures incrementally over time.

The state should at least ensure basic health and safety measures have been taken: such as electricity that is connected safely, in order to reduce the chances of electrocution of people especially children, and the possibility of fires.

7.4.7 Capacity Building

Guidelines, templates and handbooks about better building practices could be developed in different languages and provided to property owners for free within the townships such as Dube. These could be accompanied by simple information sheets about the process of submitting building plans and the benefits of obtaining land use approval. A database could be developed where local accredited builders, architects, plumbers, electricians, warehouses, banks and others could register to develop a functioning system accessible to people. The database can also be used to advertise available backyard rooms for renting. Building inspectors could play a very useful role in providing advice to local communities and facilitating better building practices.

7.4.8 Assessing Municipal Infrastructure Capacity

Managing infrastructure capacity is a key issue facing most municipalities. Generally, an increase in backyard accommodation is associated with an over-burdening of existing infrastructure carrying capacity. The municipality should consider assessing the municipal infrastructural capacity and they must consider a range of factors such as household size, number of backyard units, investment capacity, and the cost. Therefore, infrastructure for new human settlements developments should be planned to cater for informal densification in future through pro-active design.

7.4.9 NSDF Pro-active Settlement Design, Stand and Township Layouts

Pro-active designs for backyard accommodation could include bigger stand sizes, improved site layouts, extra service connections and separate meter connections. Urban planners should pay more attention to understanding informal densification processes. Strategic decisions over bulk infrastructure investments should follow these realities on the ground where possible. A reactive settlement design approach in areas of existing backyard accommodation could be adopted through the redesign of infrastructure and social facilities, and strategic investments in public infrastructure can have a significant effect on improving living conditions in such areas.

The basis by which the NSDF tackles social housing is through spatial restructuring by focusing investment to designated Restructuring Zones (RZs), which are aligned with Urban Development Zones (UDZs), as well as other spatial planning instruments such as inner city revitalization strategies, development nodes and corridors. These in turn must be linked to the NSDF, Provincial Government Development Strategic (PGDS), Provincial and Municipal Spatial Development Plans (SDPs) and Integrated Development Plans (IDPs). Support mechanisms from the NSDF to address the challenges faced by backyard accommodation are required to encourage greater development activity and improved accommodation and services outcomes from the backyard rental market.

7.4.10 Research and Development

Finally, yet importantly, there is a dearth of current, accurate data on backyard accommodation in South Africa. In order to develop informed and nuanced policy responses for a housing sub-market that currently accommodates majority of the households, and delivers new accommodation to households, there is a need for better quality, more nuanced and more rigorous research. It is recommended that research institutions and the City of Johannesburg, as well as the provincial and national governments, commission primary research into the backyard accommodation housing sector in key municipalities, cities and towns. Such research should investigate at least the following:

- To gain a clearer sense of the size and structure of the backyard accommodation sector;
- To gain a better sense of tenant satisfaction and the acceptability of certain types of backyard products;
- To understand locational factors on where and how backyard accommodation develops;
- To conduct research on pro-active settlement design, stand and township layouts;
- To gain a greater sense of the housing typologies within the backyard accommodation sector such as the proportion of formal and informal units; and
- To assess structural changes in backyard accommodation materials in order to predict future changes in demand and supply.

7.5 Potential Policy Response Framework

From the abovementioned recommendations, the following potential key principles for policy response framework to inform a Backyard Policy for the City of Johannesburg is advocated for future policy consideration:

- **Lobby:** To exert pressure on national and provincial government to develop supporting and enabling policy relating to backyard accommodation by lobbying local municipal officials, property owners and tenants;
- **Research:** to undertake specific research necessary to better understand the dynamics and potentials of backyard accommodation, in order to inform policy and strategy at the municipal level and in order to develop frameworks for analysing and categorising backyard accommodation in each municipality;
- **Strategize:** to build a unified response into municipal strategy documents, specifically housing/ settlement plans, budgets and IDP processes;
- **Guide:** to ensure that land use and other urban management instruments are optimised for ensuring backyard accommodation processes lead to optimal outcomes;
- **Plan:** to promote pro-active and pre-emptive planning and preparation by municipalities for the inevitable outcomes that backyard accommodation will bring in their areas, in order to ensure urban areas can easily accommodate and adapt to backyard accommodation over time.
- **Invest:** to identify capital investment potentials for municipalities (and national and provincial governments, through municipalities) that will yield optimal outcomes from backyard accommodation processes;

- **Control:** to provide frameworks for municipalities to control where, how and to what extent backyard accommodation develops in their jurisdictions.
- **Support:** to develop and utlise mechanisms through which municipalities can themselves, or in partnership with other public, private and community organisations, encourage the optimal development of accommodation;
- **Remediate:** to identify approaches to managing sub-optimal or dangerous conditions resulting from backyard accommodation processes.
- **Research and Development:** There are still many unknowns about the exact conditions in the backyard accommodation sector. Further tasked research is required to better understand conditions within the backyard accommodation sector, and to disseminate information to municipal management that leads to a balanced response to backyard accommodation policy formulation.
- **Human Settlements Subsidy Approach:** Specific financing approaches to backyard accommodation have been attempted by Gauteng and the City of Cape Town. It is necessary to develop a subsidy framework that is more responsive to backyard accommodation.

7.6 Researcher's Perspective

From the researcher's perspective, what can be deduced from the research and case study is that the backyard sector suffers from a perceptual problem. In general terms, it is seen from a political standpoint to be a negative phenomenon requiring removal and remediation. It is viewed as a consequence of failure of national human settlement programmes rather than as a potential part of the human settlements solution in South Africa's urban areas. This often makes it a contentious issue for debate between political role players and municipal officials. Urban planning frameworks and legislation do not respond to the dynamics of backyard accommodation in general, and hence backyard structures are often in contravention of planning frameworks and building control regulations and requirements. Furthermore, backyard accommodation is generally not integrated into municipal human settlement plans and frameworks, and therefore cannot be responded to adequately at the municipal level. In addition, as backyard occupants generally access services from existing properties, they can create difficulties in metering, service consumption metering and payment, as well as the rollout of basic service packages by municipalities. High densities of backyard structures can also hamper service provision such as electrification and solid waste disposal. Therefore, the government should advance more responsive and supportive policy, programmes and ways of

regulirising informal housing in order to develop the sector into a robust and integral part of the urban housing system. One of the essential requirements is to shift the stance of government entities from merely reacting to events on the ground towards planning ahead and engaging in a more pro-active manner with the backyard accommodation sector.

7.7 Further Areas for Research and Concluding Remarks

In concluding this study, it is relevant to mention areas in need of further research (addition to sub-section 7.4.9), which emerged in the course of the researcher's engagement with the topic through literature and the fieldwork research. The interviews suggested that although municipalities and government departments acknowledge backyard tenants, the backyard accommodation sector is overlooked in legislation and policy. The difficulty in providing backyard dwellers with direct access to services is prohibitive and the backyard dwellers may remain dependent on their property owners for access to free basic services such as water, sanitation, refuse removal and the provision of electricity. Further research could be done in trying to understand the best practices for service delivery in the backyard accommodation sector. For instance, pilot programmes and a policy framework for addressing the needs of backyard tenants has been established by the City of Cape Town, which aims at providing tenants with access points to basic services, are entered into formal rental agreements, and are registered on the City's Housing Needs Register (HNR) (City of Cape Town, 2020). Thus, as seen in the initiatives underway in the City of Cape Town, providing backyard tenants with access to services may relieve the pressure on both infrastructure networks and landlord/tenant relationships. Therefore, further research within the City of Johannesburg will be useful to guide policy development.

Backyard accommodation offers tenants an affordable accommodation and consequently improves quality of life because the tenants can afford the rent and use remaining income to purchase necessities that improve their quality of life. Moreover, it offers tenants safe and flexible accommodation, and socially stable environment. At the same time, it provides property owners with income, not just to survive but also to improve their financial situation. It does not only provide property owners with income but also emotional and social support, thereby improving the quality of life of property owners.

As outlined in the introduction, this report has discussed the historical background including the socioeconomic conditions, which prevail in the case study area of Dube Township. Then the data collected from the field was discussed and analyzed using thematic analysis. The researcher then

discussed the salient issues of this study, and how the findings of this research link with the theories used for this study, and the literature.

8. Reference List

Allison, B., 1996. *Research Skills for Students.* London: Kogan Page.

Bank, L., 2007. The Rhythms of the Yards: Urbanism, Backyards and Housing Policy in South Africa. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies,* 25(2), pp. 205-228.

Bell, J., 2005. *Doing your Research Project.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Bester, E., 2018. *The Dube Story.* [Online]
Available at: https://www.uj.ac.za/library/informationsources/special-collections/Online-Exhibitions/Andrew-Mlangeni/Documents/THE%20DUBE%20STORY-edited.pdf
[Accessed June 2019].

Bogdan, R. & Biklen, S., 2007. *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods.* New York: Exclusive Books.

Bowen, G. A., 2009. Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method. *Qualitative Research Journal,* 9(2), pp. 27-40.

Carey, S., 2009. *Investigation into the proliferation of low-income private rental housing supply, and the development of recommendations concerning appropriate interventions / responses - Final Report,* Tshwane: Urban Landmark.

Census, 2011. *Dube Main Place 798026 from Census 2011.* [Online]
Available at: https://census2011.adrianfrith.com/place/798026045/map
[Accessed August 2019].

Charlton, S., 2014. 'Public housing in Johannesburg'. In: P. Harrison, A. Todes, G. Gotz & C. Wray, eds. *Changing Space, Changing City: Johannesburg after apartheid.* Johannesburg: Wits University Press, pp. 176-193.

Charlton, S., Gardner, D. & Rubin, M., 2014. *'Post-intervention analysis: the evolution of housing projects into sustainable human settlements', in South African Cities Network (ed) From Housing to Human Settlements: an evolving perspective.* Johannesburg, SACN.

Charlton, S. & Kihato, C., 2006. Reaching the Poor: An analysis of the influences on the evolution of South Africa's housing programme. In: U. Pillay, R. Tomlison & J. du Toit, eds. *Democracy and Delivery: Urban Policy in South Africa.* Cape Town: HSRC Publishers, p. 252–282.

Chetty, R. K., 2017. *Managing Informality Through Backyard Rental Structures: Towards a Hybrid Model for the City of Johannesburg,* Johannesburg: Wits University.

Cirolia, L., 2014. South Africa's Emergency Housing Programme: A Prism of Urban Contest. *Development Southern Africa,* 31(3), pp. 397-411.

City of Cape Town, 2020. *Draft Human Settlements Strategy: August 2020,* Cape Town: City of Cape Town.

City of Johannesburg, 2014. *The making of Soweto,* Johannesburg: s.n.

City of Johannesburg, 2018. *Population and People.* [Online]
Available at:
https://www.joburg.org.za/about_/Pages/About%20the%20City/About%20Joburg/Population-and-People.aspx
[Accessed August 2019].

City of Johannesburg, 2019a. *About Region D.* [Online]
Available at: https://www.joburg.org.za/about_/regions/Pages/Region%20D%20-%20Greater%20Soweto/about-us.aspx
[Accessed August 2019].

City of Johannesburg, 2019b. *City of Johannesburg IDP Review.* [Online]
Available at:
https://www.joburg.org.za/Documents/2019%20Notices/COUNCIL%20NOTED%202019-20%20DRAFT%20IDP%20REVIEW.pdf
[Accessed August 2019].

City of Johannesburg, 2019c. *Inclusionary Housing: Incentives, Regulations and Mechanisms (Policy),* City of Johannesburg: City of Johannesburg.

Cobbett, L., 2009. *The backyard dwellers of Cape Town rise up,* Cape Town: WASHplus.

Cohen, B., 2004. 'Urban growth in developing countries: A review of current trends and a caution regarding existing forecasts'. *World Development,* 32(1), p. 23–51.

Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs, 2016. *Integrated Urban Development Framework,* Pretoria: The Ministry of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs.

Crankshaw, O., Gilbert, A. & Morris, A., 2000. Backyard Soweto. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research,* 24(4), pp. 841-857.

Creswell, J., 2009. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

De Vos, A., Strydom, H., Fouche`, C. & Delport, C., 2011. *Research at Grassroots.* 4th ed. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y., 2005. *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research.* 3nd ed. London: Sage Publications.

Department of Housing, 1994. *White Paper: A New Housing Policy and Strategy for South Africa,* Pretoria: Government Printing Works.

Department of Housing, 1998. *People's Housing Process,* Pretoria: Government Printing Works.

Department of Housing, 2004. *Breaking New Ground: A Comprehensive Plan for the Development of Sustainable Human Settlements,* Pretoria: Government Printing Works.

Department of Housing, 2005a. *Housing Indaba: Social Contract for Rapid Housing Delivery.* Cape Town, Government Printing Works.

Department of Housing, 2005b. *Social Housing Policy for South Africa (June 2005),* Pretoria: Govenrment Printing Works.

Department of Human Settlement, 2000. *National Housing Code,* Pretoria: Government Printing Works.

Department of Human Settlements, 2009. *National Housing Code,* Pretoria: Government Printing Works.

Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation, 2019. *Draft National Spatial Development Framework (NSDF),* Cape Town: Parliamentary Monitoring Group.

Du Plooy-Cilliers, F., Davis, C. & Bezuidenhout, R., 2014. *Research Matters.* Cape Town: Juta.

Fay, M. & Wellenstein, A., 2005. Keeping a roof over one's head: improving access to safe and decent shelter. *The urban poor in Latin America,* 61(19), pp. 91-124.

First National Bank, 2016. *Property Barometer – Major Metro Former "Townships" House Price Index,* Johannesburg: FNB.

Gauteng City-Region Observatory, 2018. *Backyard and informal dwellings: 2001-2016.* [Online]
Available at: https://www.gcro.ac.za/outputs/map-of-the-month/detail/backyard-and-informal-dwellings-2001-2016/
[Accessed October 2020].

Gauteng Province, 2008. *Backyard rental policy: final draft,* Pretoria: Gauteng Department of Housing.

Gauteng Province, 2015. *Gauteng Policy on Backyard Rental Housing,* Pretoria: Gauteng Province.

Gauteng Province, 2015. *Gauteng Backyard Rental Housing Policy: Gauteng Province Department of Human Settlements.* [Online]
Available at: http://www.gdhs.gpg.gov.za/Policies/Documents/Approved%20Gauteng%20Backyard%20Housign%20Policy_2015.pdf
[Accessed 07 July 2019].

Gordon, R. & Nell, M., 2006. *Small-scale landlords: research findings and recommendations,* Pretoria: Shisaka Development Management Services (Pty) Ltd in Association with CSIR Built Environment.

Govender, T., Barnes, J. & Pieper, C., 2011. The impact of densification by means of informal shacks in the backyards of low-cost houses on the environment and service delivery in Cape Town, South Africa. *Environmental health insights,* Volume 5, pp. 23-52.

Gunter, A., 2014. Renting shacks: Landlords and tenants in the informal housing sector in Johannesburg South Africa. *Urbani Izziv,* Volume 25, pp. 96-107.

Harrison, P. & Harrison, K., 2014. Soweto: A study in socio-spatial differentiation. In: P. Harrison, G. Gotz, A. Todes & C. Wray, eds. *Changing Space, Changing City.* Johannesburg: Wits University Press, pp. 293-318.

Harvey, D., 2005. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Henning, E., Van Rensburg, W. & Smit, B., 2004. *Finding Your Way in Qualitative Research.* Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Holloway, A; Chasi, V; de Waal, J; Drimie, S; Fortune, G; Mafuleka, G; Morojele, M; Penicela-Nhambiu, B; Randrianalijaona, M; Vogel, C; Zweig, P., 2013. *'Humanitarian trends in Southern Africa: Challenges and opportunities', Regional Interagency Standing Committee, Southern Africa,* Rome: FAO.

Hoogendoorn, G. & Nel, E., 2012. 'Exploring small town development dynamics in rural South Africa's post-productive landscapes'. In: R. Donaldson & L. Marais, eds. *Small town geographies in Africa: Experiences from Africa and elsewhere.* New York: ova Science Publishers Inc, p. 21–34.

Huchzermeyer, M., 2009. The struggle for in situ upgrading of informal settlements: a reflection on cases in Gauteng. *Development Southern Africa,* 26(1), pp. 59-73.

Huchzermeyer, M., 2011. *Cities with 'Slums': From informal settlement eradication to a right to.* Cape Town: UCT Press.

Huchzermeyer, M. & Karam, A., 2006. *Informal settlements: A perpetual challenge?.* Cape Town: Juta.

Klug, N., Rubin, M. & Todes, A., 2013. Inclusionary Housing Policy: a tool for reshaping South Africa's spatial legacy. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment,* 28(4), pp. 667-678.

Lategan, L., 2012. *A study of the current South African housing environment with specific reference to possible alternative approaches to improve living conditions (Doctoral dissertation),* Potchefstroom: North-West University.

Lategan, L., 2017. *Informality and Sustainability: Reflecting on South Africa's informal backyard rental sector from a palnning perspective,* Potchefstroom: North West University.

Lategan, L. & Cilliers, J., 2019. Informal backyard rentals through a social sustainability lens–a case study in Oudtshoorn, South Africa. *Town and Regional Planning,* Volume 74, pp. 64-78.

Lemanski, C., 2009. Augmented informality: South Africa's backyard dwellings as a by-product of formal housing policies. *Habitat International,* 33(4), pp. 472-484.

Lemanski, C., 2011. Moving up the ladder or stuck on the bottom rung? Homeownership as a solution to poverty in urban South Africa. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research,* 35(1), pp. 57-77.

Lewis, P., 1963. *A city within a city: The creation of Soweto,* Johannesburg: Wits University.

LizatLancaster, 2018. *#Jozi Walks 2018 Mooki Street Orlando East Rich Heritage.* [Online] Available at: https://www.lizatlancaster.co.za/blog/joziwalks-2018-mooki-street-orlando-east-rich-heritage
[Accessed 19 October 2020].

Mabasa, R., 2017. *Lived experiences of a physical shift: from informal settlements into mulit-storey RDP housed,* Johannesburg: University of the Witwatersrand.

Mail and Guardian, 2018. *RDP house buyers beware.* [Online]
Available at: https://mg.co.za/article/2018-08-03-00-rdp-house-buyers-beware/
[Accessed 15 October 2020].

Makamu, R., 2010. *Background of housing delivery in South Africa,* Polokwane: University of Limpopo.

Maree, K., 2007. *First steps in research.* Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Mayson, S. & Charlton, S., 2015. Accommodation and tenuous livelihoods in Johannesburg's inner city: the 'rooms' and 'spaces' typologies. *Urban Forum,* 26(3), pp. 43-372.

Merriam, S. B., 2009. *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Molope, A., 2017. *Do you qualify for a RDP house? Review Online.* [Online]
Available at: https://reviewonline.co.za/207297/qualify-rdp-house/
[Accessed 4 April 2019].

Monsod, T. C., 2012. *Rethinking Urban Housing Policy in the Philippines Rethinking Urban Housing Policy in the Philippines1,* Quezon City: The University of the Philippines.

Morange, M., 2002. Backyard shacks: the relative success of this housing option in Port Elizabeth. *Urban Forum,* 13(2), pp. 3-25.

Mouton, 2001. *How to succeed in your master's and doctoral studies: a South African guide and resource book.* Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Mouton, J. & Marais, H., 1994. *Basic concepts in the methodology of the Social Sciences.* Pretoria: HSRC.

Mpehle, Z., 2012. Perceptions of Hostel Dwellers The Conversion of Hostels into Family Units. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences,* 3(12), pp. 214-225.

Municipal Elections, 2016. *Electoral Commission of South Africa (IEC), Municipal election results.* [Online]
Available at: https://www.elections.org.za/lgedashboard2016/leaderboard.aspx#
[Accessed August 2019].

Napier, M. & Arendse, A., 2014. *Title Deeds Restoration Project Inception Report,* Pretoria: CSIR.

Narayanan, V., Pinches, G., Kelm, K. & Lander, D., 2000. The influence of voluntarily disclosed qualitative information. *Strategic Management Journal,* 21(7), pp. 707-722.

Neuman, W., 2011. *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches.* 7th ed. Boston: Pearson.

Nieuwenhuis, J., 2007. Qualitative research designs and data gathering techniques. In: K. Maree, ed. *First steps in research.* Pretoria: Van Schaik, pp. 69-97.

Pampanga, D., Majid, M. & Angel, C., 2015. Assessing the Compliance of Balanced Housing Policy in the Philippines: The Case of Davao City. *International Journal of Built Environment and Sustainability,* 2(2), pp. 93-100.

Parnell, S., 1991. The Ideology of African Home-Ownership: The establishment of Dube, Soweto, 1946-1955. *South African Geographical Journal,* Volume 73, pp. 69-76.

Patton, M. & Cochran, M., 2002. *A Guide to Using Qualitative Research Methodology.* London: Medecins Sans Frontiers.

Punch, K., 2000. *Developing Effective Research Proposals.* California: Sage Publications.

Republic of South Africa, 1996. *The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, Act 108 of 1996,* Pretoria: Government Printing Works.

Republic of South Africa, 1997. *Extension of Security of Tenure Act 62 of 1997,* Pretoria: Government Printing Works.

Republic of South Africa, 1998. *Prevention of Illegal Eviction and Unlawful Occupation of Land Act, 19 of 1998,* Pretoria: Government Printing Works.

Republic of South Africa, 1999. *Rental Housing Act 50 of 1999,* Pretoria: Government Printing Works.

Republic of South Africa, 2001. *Housing Amendment Act 04 of 2001,* Pretoria: Government Printing Works.

Republic of South Africa, 2008. *Social Housing Act 16 of 2008,* Pretoria: Government Print Works.

Republic of South Africa, 2012. *Community Residential Unit (CRU) Programme.* [Online] Available at: https://www.gcis.gov.za/content/resourcecentre/sa-info/yearbook2011-12 [Accessed October 2020].

Republic of South Africa, 2014. *Rental Housing Amendment Act, 35 of 2014,* Pretoria: Government Printing Works.

Republic of South Africa, 2020. *Human Settlements.* [Online] Available at: https://www.gov.za/about-sa/humansettlements [Accessed 19 October 2020].

Robins, S., 2002. Planning 'Suburban Bliss' in Joe Slovo Park, Cape Town. *Africa,* 74(2), p. 511–548.

Ross, L. & Pelletiere, D., 2014. Chile's New Rental Housing Subsidy and its Relevance to US Housing Choice Voucher Program Reform. *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research,* 16(2), p. 179.

Rubin, M. & Gardner, D., 2013. *Developing a Response to Backyarding for SALGA,* Johannesburg: SALGA.

Rust, K., Zack, T. & Napier, M., 2009. How a focus on asset performance might help 'Breaking New Ground' contribute towards poverty reduction and overcome the two economies divide. *SSB/TRP/MDM,* Volume 54, pp. 51-61.

Salvi, A., Adema, W., Frey, V. & Ferraro, V., 2016. *"Policies to promote access togood-quality affordable housing in OECD countries".* Paris: OECD Publishing.

Sebake, B. K., 2017. Neoliberalism in the South African Post-Apartheid Regime: Economic Policy Positions and Globalisation Impact. *The Independence of African States in the Age of Globalisation*, 26-28 July, pp. 1-8.

Shapurjee, Y. & Charlton, S., 2013. Transforming South Africa's low-income housing projects through backyard dwellings: Intersections with households and the state in Alexandra, Johannesburg. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment,* 28(4), pp. 653-666.

Shapurjee, Y., Le Roux, A. & Coetzee, M., 2014. Backyard housing in Gauteng: An analysis of spatial dynamics. *Town and Regional Planning,* Issue 64, pp. 19-30.

Shisaka Development Management Services, 2004. *Workings of Township Residential Property Markets: Report prepared as part of a study into housing resale markets for the FinMark Trust, Micro Finance Regulatory Council, Ford Foundation, National Treasury and National Housing Finance Corporation,* Johannesburg: Centre for Affordable Housing Finance Africa.

Simon, D., 2006. *Your questions answered? Conducting questionnaire surveys. In Desai, V. and Potter, R. (eds), Doing Development Research.* London: Sage.

Social Housing Foundation, 2008. *The Social Housing Foundation: Shack Rentals in South Africa,* Johannesburg: The Social Housing Foundation.

Social Housing Foundation, 2010. *A Reference Guide on the Legislative and Regulatory Environment Affecting Social Housing and the Implications for Social Housing Project Development and Management,* Johannesburg: Social Housing Foundation.

South African Cities Network, 2017. *The State of Urban Safety in South Africa Report 2017,* Johannesburg: South African Cities Network.

South African Institute of Race Relations, 2008. *'From bare fields to the back of private properties: The shifting pattern of informal dwelling erections'.* [Online]
Available at: http://www.sairr.org.za/press-office/archive/press_release_living_conditions_24_nov_2008.pdf
[Accessed 07 July 2019].

StatsSA, 2007. *Community Household Survey 2007.* [Online]
Available at: http://www.statssa.gov.za/community_new/content.asp
[Accessed 07 July 2019].

StatsSA, 2011. *Statistics South Africa.* [Online]
Available at: http://www.statssa.gov.za/?page_id=4286&id=11317
[Accessed August 2019].

The Heritage Portal, 2018. *The Dube Story.* [Online]
Available at: http://www.theheritageportal.co.za/article/dube-story
[Accessed August 2019].

Tissington, K., 2010. *A Review of Housing Policy and Development in South Africa since 1994,* Johannesburg: Socio-Economic Rights Institute of South Africa (SERI).

Todes, A., Charlton, S., Rubin, M. & Appelbaum, A., 2016. *Spatial Futures: Aspirations and Actions Regarding Form and Spatial Change in Johannesburg,* Johannesburg: University of the Witwatersrand.

Tshangana, A., 2014. *Local Government Position on Municipal Responses to Backyarders and Backyard Dwellings,* s.l.: South African Local Government Association (SALGA).

Turok, I., 2012. Urbanisation and development in South Africa: Economic imperatives, spatial distortions and strategic responses. *International Institute for Environment and Development,* pp. 1-66.

Turok, I. & Borel-Saladin, J., 2016. Backyard shacks, informality and the urban housing crisis in South Africa: Stopgap or prototype solution?. *Housing Studies,* 31(4), pp. 384-409.

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

UN-Habitat, 2015. *"Housing at the Centre of the New Urban Agenda", UN-Habitat policy paper. ,* Nairobi: UN-Habitat.

Van Waeyenberge, E., 2015. *"Crisis? What Crisis? The World Bank and Housing Finance for the Poor", SOAS Department of Economics Working Paper Series, No. 191,* London: The School of Oriental and African Studies-University of London.

Watson, V., 2009. 'The planned city sweeps the poor away...': Urban planning and 21st century urbanisation. *Progress in Planning,* Volume 72, p. 151–193.

Wessels, J., 1989. *Black housing in South Africa: the need for shelter. Paper presented at the Newick Park Conference.* Newick Park, s.n.

World Economic Forum, 2019. *Making Affordable Housing a Reality in Cities,* Cologny/Geneva: World Economic Forum.

Yin, R., 2003. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods.* London: Sage Publications.

Zack, T. & Silverman, M., 2007. *Using regulation as a tool for better urban management,* Pretoria: National Treasury.

Zuma, B., 2019. *Backyard not backward.* [Online]
Available at: https://www.wits.ac.za/news/latest-news/research-news/2019/2019-07/backyard-not-

backward.html
[Accessed October 2020].

Zweig, P., 2015. Everyday hazards and vulnerabilities amongst backyard dwellers: A case study of Vredendal North, Matzikama Municipality, South Africa. *Jàmbá: Journal of Disaster Risk Studies,* 7(1), pp. 1-8.

9. Appendices

9.1 Appendix 1: Table of Participants

Number of Landlords and Tenants	Landlord Name*	Gender of Landlord	Age of Landlord	Landlord Occupation	Number of shacks/ brick rooms in the yard	Tenant Name*	Gender of Tenant	Age of Tenant	Tenant Occupation	Place of Birth	Renting/ Family	Rental Amount per room	Type of dwelling Structure	Moved in and reason for moving
1 Tenant and 1 Landlord	Landlord 1	Female	55-59	Pensioner	4 Shacks	Tenant 1	Female	35-39	Employed (Day Care)	Limpopo	Renting	R 400	Shack room	Been here for 11 years, owns the shack and is afraid to move because the shack might be damaged
1 Tenant and 1 Landlord	Landlord 2	Female	60-64	Pensioner	3 Rooms	Tenant 2	Male	40-44	Employed	Limpopo	Renting	R 900	Brick room	Have not moved in 4 years
2 Tenants and 1 Landlord	Landlord 3	Male	50-54	Employed (Security)	7 Shacks	Tenant 3	Female	30-34	Informal Trader	Mozambique	Renting	R 350	2 Shack rooms	Initially rented with a relative, and i have not moved in about 1 year and 6 months
						Tenant 4	Female	45-49	Informal Trader	Limpopo	Renting	R 350		Been here for 3 months
2 Tenants and 1 Landlord	Landlord 4	Male	50-54	Informal trader	RDP Renting (3 rooms) + 5 Rooms = 8 rooms	Tenant 5	Male	40-44	Employed	Gauteng	Family	R 0	2 Brick room	Family, So have not moved
						Tenant 6	Female	25-29	Employed	Eastern Cape	Renting	R 1,500		More than 2 years
2 Tenants and 1 Landlord	Landlord 5	Male	30-34	Employed (Security)	3 Rooms	Tenant 7	Female	40-44	Employed	Eastern Cape	Renting	R 900	Brick room	More than 2 years
					4 Shacks	Tenant 8	Male	30-34	Self-employed	Zimbabwe	Renting	R 350	Shack Room	Moved in March 2018
2 Tenants and 1 Landlord	Landlord 6	Male	30-34	Employed (Storeman)	3 rooms	Tenant 9	Male	30-34	Employed (Security)	KZN	Renting	R 800	Brick room	1 year and 6 months
					1 shack	Tenant 10	Male	30-34	Employed (Security)	Gauteng	Family	R 0	Shack	Family, So have not moved
2 Tenants	None				4 Rooms	Tenant 11	Female	45-49	Employed	Limpopo	Renting	R 850	2 Brick room	More than 3 years
						Tenant 12	Female	45-49	Employed	Mpumalanga	Renting	R 850		2 years and more than 6 months
2 Tenants	None				6 shacks	Tenant 13	Male	30-34	Self-employed	Mozambique	Renting	R 300	2 Shacks	From Brick to shack, the past 6 months
						Tenant 14	Male	35-39	Employed	KZN	Renting	R 300		1 years and 3 months
2 Tenants	None				4 Rooms	Tenant 15	Male	30-34	Employed	Limpopo	Renting	R 750	2 Brick room	From a shark to room, 2 years 6 months
						Tenant 16	Male	25-29	Employed	Limpopo	Renting	R 750		Started on a Shark and moved to a room, he forgot when, but more than 2years
2 Tenants	None				6 shacks	Tenant 17	Male	30-34	Security	Mozambique	Renting	R 300	2 Shacks	Been here for 8 months
						Tenant 18	Female	50-54	Domestic Worker	Limpopo	Renting	R 300		More than 3 years
1 Tenant and 1 Landlord	Landlord 7	Male	50-54	Employed	6 Shacks	Tenant 19	Male	40-44	Security	Limpopo	Renting	R 300	Shack dwellings	Been here for 6 months, but 2 to 4 years overall
1 Tenant and 1 Landlord	Landlord 8	Male	40-44	Employed	3 Rooms	Tenant 20	Female	55-59	Informal Trader	Limpopo	Renting	R 850	Brick rooms	Moved in 3 years ago
1 Landlord	Landlord 9	Male	60-64	Pensioner	4 Shacks	None	None	None	None	None	None	R 350	Shack dwellings	None
1 Landlord	Landlord 10	Female	55-59	Pensioner	3 Rooms	None	None	None	None	None	None	R 900	Brick rooms	None

9.2 Appendix 2: Ethics Clearance Certificate



SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE AND PLANNING
HUMAN RESERCH ETHICS COMMITTEE

SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE & PLANNING

CLEARANCE CERTIFICATE
PROTOCOL NUMBER: SOAP049/06/2019

PROJECT TITLE:	Policy reaction to hidden spaces on the urban periphery: the case of backyard accommodation in Dube Township, Johannesburg.
INVESTIGATOR/S:	Tshepo Clement Chabalala (Student No: 832377)
SCHOOL:	Architecture and Planning
DEGREE PROGRAMME:	Master of Urban Studies (Urban Politics and Governance)
DATE CONSIDERED	03 September 2019
EXPIRY DATE:	03 September 2020
DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:	Approved

CHAIRPERSON BC Boshoff
(Dr Brian Boshoff)

DATE: 9/9/19

cc: Supervisor/s: Amanda Williamson

DECLARATION OF INVESTIGATORS
I/We fully understand the conditions under which I am/we are authorized to carry out the abovementioned research and I/we guarantee to endure compliance with these conditions. Should any departure to be contemplated from the research procedure as approved I/we undertake to resubmit the protocol to the Committee.

T.C. Chabalala
Signature

10 September 2019
Date

School of Architecture & Planning
University of the Witwatersrand
Private Bag 3 Wits 2050
Johannesburg South Africa
www.wits.ac.za

T +27 11 717 7623
F +27 11 717 7649

9.3 Appendix 3: Permission Letter

UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND, JOHANNESBURG | SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE PLANNING

18 June 2019

Dear Sir/Madam

Permission for a Wits student to conduct research

Mr Tshepo Chabalala (Student Number: 832377) is currently registered for a Masters of Urban Studies (Urban Politics and Governance) in the School of Architecture and Planning at the University of the Witwatersrand.

As part of his studies he is required to prepare a research report that will demonstrate his ability to conduct independent research, apply theoretical approaches to critically examine current planning and development issues, and formulate feasible recommendations.

His research is entitled, Policy reaction to hidden spaces on the urban periphery. His particular interests lie in exploring how the municipality is responding to the phenomenon of backyard accommodation in Dube Township, Soweto.

His research will be undertaken solely for academic purposes, and not for the benefit of any other institution or organisation.

As his research supervisor, I respectfully request whether you/your organisation provide Mr Chabalala with the assistance that he requires in order to successfully undertake his academic research. If you need further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully

AWilliamson

Amanda Williamson

Senior Lecturer
School of Architecture and Planning
T 011 717 7713
M 082 953 9306
E Amanda.Williamson@wits.ac.za

9.4 Appendix 4: Participation Information Sheet (PIS)

9.4.1 Tenants PIS



TENANTS PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET

Policy reaction to hidden spaces on the urban periphery: the case of backyard accommodation in Dube Township, Johannesburg.

SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE & PLANNING

Good day

I am Tshepo Chabalala, and currently registered for a Masters of Urban Studies (Urban Politics and Governance) in the School of Architecture and Planning at the University of the Witwatersrand. As part

of my studies, I am required to prepare a research report that demonstrate my ability to conduct independent research, apply theoretical approaches to critically examine current planning and development issues, and formulate feasible recommendations.

My research is entitled, Policy reaction to hidden spaces on the urban periphery. My interests is in exploring how the municipality is responding to backyard accommodation in Dube Township, Soweto.

I would like to invite you to take part in an interview by answering questions. This activity will take around 30 minutes of your time and will be conducted at a nearby public space. I am investigating Policy reaction to hidden spaces on the urban periphery: the case of backyard accommodation in Dube Township, Johannesburg. This research is about backyard rental accommodation and as you are a tenant I would like to understand more about your experience of living in backyard rental accommodation. I would also like to understand your relationship with other tenants and the property owner of the main house. I would also like to understand how rental accommodation has helped your quality of life. Additionally, I also like to understand the measures taken by authority such as the metro police or municipal leadership to condemn and discourage the practice of backyard rental accommodation. Lastly, I also like to understand the mechanism that are in place to support backyard accommodation.

I would like to record the interview by taking handwritten notes and using my cellphone. I will only audio-record the interview if you give me your consent to do so. I would also like to photograph your premises or surroundings but only if you give me your permission to do so. The photographs will be used to show the density of the backyard rooms.

Your participation is entirely voluntary, and you may refuse to answer any questions that make you uncomfortable and withdraw at any time without penalty or loss. You will receive no payment or other incentives for your participation. Apart from taking some of your time, your participation should not involve any costs or risks to yourself. You may withdraw at any time or not answer any question if you do not want to. Your participation will be completely anonymous and the results of the interview and your personal views will not be linked to you in the final report. Please note that your identity will not be revealed. In my final research report, I will refer to you as Tenant 1 if I use direct quotations from this interview. If you experience any distress or discomfort at any point in this process, we will stop the interview or resume another time. Any comments that you make that you deem 'off the record' or similar will not be quoted.

The research is being undertaken solely for academic purposes and the information from the interview will be kept confidential and will not be shared with anyone. It will be securely stored on a password protected computer. Once I have obtained all the necessary information, I will present and analyze my findings in a Research Report, which will be submitted for examination in February 2020. Once it is completed, it will be stored electronically on the Wits Library system.

I have a formal written consent form that I will like you to sign as an agreement from you to allow me to conduct the interviews with you. If however, you do not prefer to sign the consent form, but agrees to conduct the interviews with me. I will treat your verbal acquiescence as consent and I will write your name, surname on the informal consent form, tick, and circle the relevant options on the informal consent form on your behalf.

If you wish to receive a summary of this report, I will be happy to send it to you. If you have any concerns or complaints regarding the ethics of this study, you are welcome to contact the University Human Research Ethics Committee (Non-Medical), telephone +27(0)117171408, email hrec-medical.researchoffice@wits.ac.za.

If you have any questions, concerns, or comments or if you would like a copy of the final report, please feel free to contact me, email address 832377@students.wits.ac.za or my supervisor, Ms Amanda Williamson, telephone number 0117177713 and email Amanda.Williamson@wits.ac.za.

Thank you for your time and interest.

Yours sincerely
Tshepo Chabalala

Researcher:
Tshepo Clement Chabalala, Email: 832377@students.wits.ac.za
Master of Urban Studies (Urban Politics and Governance) candidate

Supervisor:
Ms Amanda Williamson, Phone: 0117177713, Email: Amanda.Williamson@wits.ac.za.

9.4.2 Property Owners PIS

PROPERTY OWNERS PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET

Policy reaction to hidden spaces on the urban periphery: the case of backyard accommodation in Dube Township, Johannesburg.

SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE & PLANNING

Good day

I am Tshepo Chabalala, and currently registered for a Masters of Urban Studies (Urban Politics and Governance) in the School of Architecture and Planning at the University of the Witwatersrand. As part of my studies, I am required to prepare a research report that demonstrate my ability to conduct independent research, apply theoretical approaches to critically examine current planning and development issues, and formulate feasible recommendations.

My research is entitled, Policy reaction to hidden spaces on the urban periphery. My interests is in exploring how the municipality is responding to backyard accommodation in Dube Township, Soweto.

I would like to invite you to take part in an interview by answering questions. This activity will take around 30 minutes of your time and will be conducted at a nearby public space and I want to understand your experience as a property owner or RDP housing beneficiary. I want to understand more about your experience about providing accommodation to tenants. I would also like to understand how rental income has affected your quality of life. Additionally, I also like to understand the measures taken by the authorities, such as the metro police or municipal leadership to condemn and discourage the practice of backyard rental accommodation. Lastly, I also like to understand the mechanism that are in place to support backyard accommodation by the municipality.

I would like to record the interview by taking handwritten notes and using my cellphone. I will only audio-record the interview if you give me your consent to do so. I would also like to photograph your premises or surroundings but only if you give me your permission to do so. The photographs will be used to show the density of the backyard rooms.

Your participation is entirely voluntary, and you may refuse to answer any questions that make you uncomfortable and withdraw at any time without penalty or loss. You will receive no payment or other incentives for your participation. Apart from taking some of your time, your participation should not involve any costs or risks to yourself. You may withdraw at any time or not answer any question if you do not want to.

Your participation will be completely anonymous and the results of the interview and your personal views will not be linked to you in the final report. Please note that your identity will not be revealed. In my final research report, I will refer to you as Landlord 1 if I use direct quotations from this interview. If you experience any distress or discomfort at any point in this process, we will stop the interview or resume another time. Any comments that you make that you deem 'off the record' or similar will not be quoted.

The research is being undertaken solely for academic purposes and the information from the interview will be kept confidential and will not be shared with anyone. It will be securely stored on a password protected computer. Once I have obtained all the necessary information, I will present and analyze my findings in a Research Report, which will be submitted for examination in February 2020. Once it is completed, it will be stored electronically on the Wits Library system.

I have a formal written consent form that I will like you to sign as an agreement from you to allow me to conduct the interviews with you. If however, you do not prefer to sign the consent form, but agrees to conduct the interviews with me. I will treat your verbal acquiescence as consent and I will write your name, surname on the informal consent form, tick, and circle the relevant options on the informal consent form on your behalf.

If you wish to receive a summary of this report, I will be happy to send it to you. If you have any concerns or complaints regarding the ethics of this study, you are welcome to contact the University Human Research Ethics Committee (Non-Medical), telephone +27(0) 11 717 1408 and email hrec-medical.researchoffice@wits.ac.za.

If you have any questions, concerns, or comments or if you would like a copy of the final report, please feel free to contact me, email address 832377@students.wits.ac.za or my supervisor, Ms Amanda Williamson, telephone number 0117177713 and email Amanda.Williamson@wits.ac.za.

Thank you for your time and interest.

Yours sincerely
Tshepo Chabalala

Researcher:
Tshepo Clement Chabalala, Email: 832377@students.wits.ac.za
Master of Urban Studies (Urban Politics and Governance) candidate

Supervisor:
Ms Amanda Williamson, Phone: 0117177713, Email: Amanda.Williamson@wits.ac.za.

9.4.3 Municipal Official's PIS

[redacted]

OFFICIAL'S PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET

Policy reaction to hidden spaces on the urban periphery: the case of backyard accommodation in Dube Township, Johannesburg.

SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE & PLANNING

Good day

I am Tshepo Chabalala, and currently registered for a Masters of Urban Studies (Urban Politics and Governance) in the School of Architecture and Planning at the University of the Witwatersrand. As part of my studies, I am required to prepare a research report that demonstrate my ability to conduct independent research, apply theoretical approaches to critically examine current planning and development issues, and formulate feasible recommendations.

My research is entitled, Policy reaction to hidden spaces on the urban periphery. My interests is in exploring how the municipality is responding to the phenomenon of backyard accommodation in Dube Township, Soweto.

I would like to invite you to take part in an interview by answering questions. This activity will take around 30 minutes of your time and will be conducted at your office with you as a City of Joburg Region D Housing Official. I would like to understand the measures taken by the City of Joburg from a policy perspective in dealing with backyard accommodation.

I would like to record the interview by taking handwritten notes and using my cellphone. I will only audio-record the interview if you give me your consent to do so.

Your participation is entirely voluntary, and you may refuse to answer any questions that make you uncomfortable and withdraw at any time without penalty or loss. You will receive no payment or other incentives for your participation. Apart from taking some of your time, your participation should not involve any costs or risks to yourself. You may withdraw at any time or not answer any question if you do not want to. Your participation will be completely anonymous and the results of the interview and your personal views will not be linked to you in the final report. However, your organization, the City of Johannesburg will be named and thus your identity may be guessed. I will be using a pseudonym (false name) to represent your participation in my final research report. If I use direct quotations from this interview, please note that your identity will not be revealed and I will refer to you as Official 1. If you experience any distress or discomfort at any point in this process, we will stop the interview or resume another time. Any comments that you make that you deem 'off the record' or similar will not be quoted. The research is being undertaken solely for academic purposes and the information from the interview will be kept confidential and will not be shared with anyone. It will be securely stored on a password protected computer. Once I have obtained all the necessary information, I will present and analyze my findings in a Research Report, which will be submitted for examination in February 2020. Once it is completed, it will be stored electronically on the Wits Library system.

I have a formal written consent form that I will like you to sign as an agreement from you to allow me to conduct the interviews with you. If however, you do not prefer to sign the consent form, but agrees to conduct the interviews with me. I will treat your verbal acquiescence as consent and I will write your name and surname on the informal consent form, tick, and circle the relevant options on the informal consent form on your behalf.

If you wish to receive a summary of this report, I will be happy to send it to you. If you have any concerns regarding the ethics of this study, you are welcome to contact the University Human Research Ethics Committee (Non-Medical), telephone +27(0)117171408, email hrec-medical.researchoffice@wits.ac.za.

If you have any questions, concerns, or comments or if you would like a copy of the final report, please feel free to contact me, email address 832377@students.wits.ac.za, or my supervisor, Ms Amanda Williamson, telephone number 0117177713 and email Amanda.Williamson@wits.ac.za.

Thank you for your time and interest.

Yours sincerely
Tshepo Chabalala

Researcher:
Tshepo Clement Chabalala,
Email: 832377@students.wits.ac.za
Master of Urban Studies (Urban Politics and Governance) candidate

Supervisor:
Ms Amanda Williamson,
Phone: 0117177713
Email: Amanda.Williamson@wits.ac.za.

9.5 Appendix 5: Participant Consent Form

9.5.1 Tenants and Property Owners Consent Form



TENANTS AND PROPERTY OWNERS FORMAL CONSENT FORM

SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE PLANNING

Tshepo Chabalala

Policy reaction to hidden spaces on the urban periphery: the case of backyard accommodation in Dube Township, Johannesburg.

I, ... hereby confirm that I have been informed by the student researcher of the purpose, procedures, and my rights as a participant. I have received and understand the Participant Information Sheet.

I have also been informed of:
(Please tick/circle the relevant options below).

- ☐ the reasons why I was selected to participate in the research project
- ☐ the nature of my participation in the form of a written interview
- ☐ the place and duration of the interview
- ☐ the voluntary nature, refusal to answer, and withdrawing from the interview
- ☐ no payment or incentives
- ☐ no loss of benefits or risks
- ☐ my identity will be kept anonymous
- ☐ the information I provide will be kept confidential
- ☐ how the information will be used and disseminated

I **AGREE / DO NOT AGREE** to participate by undertaking the interview.

I **AGREE / DO NOT AGREE** to audio recording of the interview.

I **AGREE / DO NOT AGREE** to my premises being photographed.

_____ _____

Participant's signature Date

9.5.2 Municipal Official's consent Form



OFFICIALS FORMAL CONSENT FORM

SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE & PLANNING

Tshepo Chabalala

Policy reaction to hidden spaces on the urban periphery: the case of backyard accommodation in Dube Township, Johannesburg.

I, ... hereby confirm that I have been informed by the student researcher of the purpose, procedures, and my rights as a participant. I have received and understand the Participant Information Sheet.

I have also been informed of:
(Please tick/circle the relevant options below).

- ☐ the reasons why I was selected to participate in the research project
- ☐ the nature of my participation in the form of a written interview
- ☐ the place and duration of the interview
- ☐ the voluntary nature, refusal to answer, and withdrawing from the interview
- ☐ no payment or incentives
- ☐ no loss of benefits or risks
- ☐ my identity will be kept anonymous, but my organisation will be named
- ☐ the information I provide will be kept confidential
- ☐ how the information will be used and disseminated

I **AGREE / DO NOT AGREE** to participate by undertaking the interview.

I **AGREE / DO NOT AGREE** to audio recording of the interview.

Participant's signature _____ Date _____

9.6 Appendix 6: Research Interview Guide

9.6.1 Tenants

Tshepo Chabalala, 832377
Master of Urban Studies in Urban Politics and Governance
Supervisor: Amanda Williamson

Policy reaction to hidden spaces on the urban periphery: the case of backyard accommodation in Dube Township, Johannesburg.

Participant: Tenants

1. Name?
2. Gender?
3. What is your age range?
4. What is your occupation?
5. Where are you from?
6. Why did you choose Dube Township backyard rental accommodation?
7. How is your experience of living in a backyard rental accommodation?
8. Describe your current housing structure?
9. Who constructed this backyard rental structure?
10. What was used as construction materials?
11. How many months have you been renting this structure?
12. How many people live in this backyard structure?
13. How is your relationship with other tenants?
14. What type of relationship do you have with the Landlord? How does it help with the backyard rental?

Questionnaire/ Interview Guide

Tshepo Chabalala, 832377
Master of Urban Studies in Urban Politics and Governance
Supervisor: Amanda Williamson

Policy reaction to hidden spaces on the urban periphery: the case of backyard accommodation in Dube Township, Johannesburg.

15. Please indicate your main source of income.

Full-time employment	
Part-time employment	
odd-jobs	
Subsidies	
None	

16. What kind of payment/service do you make if you are not able to pay with money?

17. What other forms of payment/ service do you use if you are not able to pay?

18. What challenges do you have with backyard rental accommodation?

19. What type of relationship do you have with the property owners? How does it help with the backyard rental?

20. What is the main reason that you rent in the informal backyard sector?

21. Is there any kind of support received concerning backyard rentals? If yes, who gives the support and what kind of support do they offer?

22. Do you have access to the following, and how? (indicate the applicable option)

Electricity			
Waste removal			
Water			
Sanitation			
Other			

23. What is your household's total monthly income on average (gross income)?

24. How much did it cost to build the backyard dwelling? / Where did you purchase/get the building materials?

Questionnaire/ Interview Guide

9.6.2 Property Owners

Tshepo Chabalala, 832377
Master of Urban Studies in Urban Politics and Governance
Supervisor: Amanda Williamson

Policy reaction to hidden spaces on the urban periphery: the case of backyard accommodation in Dube Township, Johannesburg.

Participant: Property Owner (Landlords)

1. Name?

2. Gender?

3. What is your age range?

4. Occupation?

5. How many rooms are there in the main house?

6. When did you build the backyard dwellings? In addition, why did you decide to start backyard rental accommodation?

7. How much did it cost to build the backyard dwelling? / Where did you purchase/get the building materials?

8. How much do you charge rent?

9. Please indicate your main source of income.

Full-time employment	1
Part-time employment	2
odd-jobs	3
Subsidies	4
None	5

Questionnaire/ Interview Guide

10. How many people living in the main house earn an income by working?

11. In what year was the house built?

12. How was the house obtained?

13. Have any loans been taken out at banks/mortgagers/other financial institutions with home as security?

Yes	1
No	2
Unsure	3
Not applicable (not home owner)	4

14. Do you find the following on your home unaffordable?

	Yes	No
Maintenance		
Water and electricity		
Taxes		

15. Has the house been extended or improved? If so, how?

16. How many backyard structures occupy this property?

17. How many tenants do you have?

18. What other forms of payment/ service do you accept when tenants are not able to pay?

19. What challenges do you have with backyard rental accommodation?

20. How long was the rental tenancy of your longest-staying tenant ever?

What type of relationship do you have with the tenants? How does it help with the backyard rental?

Tshepo Chabalala, 832377
Master of Urban Studies in Urban Politics and Governance
Supervisor: Amanda Williamson

Policy reaction to hidden spaces on the urban periphery: the case of backyard accommodation in Dube Township, Johannesburg.

21. Is there any kind of support received concerning backyard rentals? If yes, who gives the support and what kind of support do they offer?

22. How does the income from the backyard rental help you? Do you think it has improved your life, if yes in what way?

23. What is the main reason for providing backyard rentals?

24. Have you ever taken conflicts to a rental tribunal?

25. Do you have any future plans with backyard rental accommodation?

Questionnaire/ Interview Guide

9.6.3 City of Joburg Municipal Official

Tshepo Chabalala, 832377
Master of Urban Studies in Urban Politics and Governance
Supervisor: Amanda Williamson

Policy reaction to hidden spaces on the urban periphery: the case of backyard accommodation in Dube Township, Johannesburg.

Participant: City of Joburg Region D Municipal Official

1. Name?

2. Gender?

3. What is your age range?

4. What is your occupation?

5. Where are you from?

6. Have you experienced backyard accommodation from you place? If so, what are initiatives in place to support or discourage it?

7. How do you as a government officials deals with backyard housing?

8. What are the pilot programmes to support backyard accommodation?

9. Soweto has a rich history of rental housing; has the DoHS in the City of Joburg intervened in any other way towards backyard housing and backyard shacks in the area? The types of housing policies that are implemented or will be implemented?

10. What do you think is the way forward to addressing the housing problem in Gauteng? In addition, what do you think can be done to respond to the backyard-housing sector in future?

Questionnaire/ Interview Guide