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Abstract

Housing delivery and issues relating to housing delivery have long been a complicated subject for most SA municipalities and government departments tasked with these responsibilities. The aforementioned complications stem from our inherited apartheid planning that was mainly focused on inequality, racial segregation and spatial fragmentation of land use. Corruption, lack of skills, financial constraints and lack of resources are issues further considered to be contributors to the complications related to housing delivery.

The study to be conducted seeks to play a part in dealing with the complicated nature of housing delivery through being a tool of assessment. The study is in the form of an evaluation as it mainly deals with obtaining answers relating to the views of the respondents on the sustainable human settlement program implemented as part of the DVRI in the BCMM. In doing so it, seeks to provide answers to some of the challenges faced by municipalities and other government departments so as to ensure that going forward, best practices are adopted in the housing delivery process.

The findings from the study revealed primarily that, what is planned on paper is not often what is implemented on the ground. In evaluating the aims and objectives of the two sustainable human settlement pilot projects implemented as the BNG pilot projects through the DVRI, a considerable number of the objectives of the projects have not been met according to the beneficiaries. The reasons for the lack of satisfaction relating to the two projects as cited by the respondents included, amongst other things; dissatisfaction with the quality of the structure, lack of adequate services, lack of employment opportunities, lack of recreational facilities, lack of social facilities, lack of safe and reliable transportation and the general maintenance of the settlement.

Solutions to the identified issues include; improved and meaningful participation between government, planners and the beneficiaries of such housing projects, so as to ensure that the views of the beneficiaries are considered and that they have a considerable influence on the decisions taken, thus promoting a bottom-up approach to the housing delivery process. The
provision of key recreational and social amenities and the improved maintenance of the general settlement were also identified by the respondents as solutions.
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CHAPTER 1

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 SA Housing Context

During the apartheid era, South Africa (SA) was characterised by inequality, spatial segregation of land uses and racial segregation. Such segregation was re-enforced by various apartheid policies, including the Group Areas Act, Black Homeland Citizenship Act, Population Registration Act, Immorality Act and the Bantu Education Act. Huchzermeyer (2004) adds that, forms of fragmentation that existed included the exclusion of the poor (particularly black people) from large portions of the city and placing them in peripheral areas that lacked proper services, thus ensuring that the poor were kept poor as their access to economic opportunities was limited. As a direct result of such apartheid planning, “human settlements in South Africa are characterised by spatial separation of residential areas according to class and population groups, urban sprawl, a lack of access to basic services in many instances, and concentration of the poor on the urban periphery. These factors have led to human settlements being inequitable, highly inefficient and unsustainable” (Arenas, 2002:21).

The dawn of democracy in South Africa saw the end of the apartheid era, thus the abolishing of the apartheid laws. The abolishing of the apartheid laws that related particularly to settlement patterns (Group Areas Act and Black Homeland Citizenship Act) saw the rise in the amount of people flocking into urban areas in search of better livelihoods. Resulting from the aforementioned influx was a high demand for housing, particularly housing aimed at low income groups.

Similarly to all South African provinces, the Eastern Cape Province was also said to have high housing backlog. Its housing backlog was estimated at about 1.5 million units, with 48% of households lacking access to flush toilets/ventilated pit-latrines, 25% lacking access to safe potable water and 46% lacking access to electricity (HSRC 2010).
1.2 The Buffalo City Metropolitan Municipality

Buffalo City is a secondary city located in the Eastern Cape Province which had an estimated population of 921 281 in the year 2004. It has three urban centres namely; East London, uMdantsane and King Williams Town (Sam & Wise 2006; BCMM Housing Sector Plan 2008-2012).

Due to our inherited apartheid legacy, the biggest and most fundamental challenge that most South Africa Municipalities are battling with currently is provision of sustainable integrated human settlements and employment generation.

As mentioned above, the abolishing of the apartheid laws resulted in massive urbanisation. The BCMM is also faced with increasing rates of urbanisation, which is evident from the large numbers of informal settlements around the City. Large numbers of poor people in these informal settlements are faced with daily struggles of lack of adequate shelter, lack of services, lack of infrastructure, crime, poverty and limited employment opportunities.

The BCMM faces great problems as it has an estimated housing need of 75 000 homes ranging from all levels of income and housing types (excluding rural settlements) and a staggering 51% unemployment rate as calculated in 2001. The BCMM further has a fragmented character with the City’s majority residing in the urban centres. In addition, development in the BCMM has been restricted by its insufficient water capacity, lack of sewerage treatment plants as well as poverty and issues related to poverty (e.g. health) which are further exacerbated by limited access to employment opportunities and infrastructure services. Following from the aforementioned there is strain on the City’s human and financial resources (BCMM Housing Sector Plan 2008-2012; Sam & Wise 2010).

Various efforts have been undertaken to curb the BCMM’s development constraints, thus even determining the following housing vision as stated in the BCM Housing Sector Plan 2008-2010:04

“Buffalo City Municipality envisages a future whereby integrated communities will be living in a sustainable environment where all residents have access to a variety of accommodation opportunities; close to transport, social facilities and
employment. The Housing Policy sets out the policy framework, strategies, implementation actions and funding requirements to achieve this vision.”

The BCMM has invested considerably in housing development, however a considerable number of the planned housing developments are yet to see the light of day as they have been delayed due to the previously mentioned insufficient water supply capacity, lack of sewerage treatment plants, lack of bulk infrastructure capacity and delays in land transfers from the DLA (BCM Housing Sector Plan 2008-2010).

Below is a tabled summary of the various dwelling structures in the BCMM determined through an assessment of the spatial distribution of dwelling structures both formal and informal. The said assessment was done in 2007, it is noted that the assessment did not include the flats and town houses in multi-storey buildings, for this reason then the information below is not to be regarded as the conclusive number of dwelling units in the city (BCM Housing Sector Plan 2008-2010).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural Dwelling</td>
<td>89 694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backyard Shacks</td>
<td>7 972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Shacks</td>
<td>28 729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Dwellings</td>
<td>86 451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>212 846</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dwelling Count Messrs UWP 2007 in BCM Housing Sector Plan 2008-2010: 43

1.3 Research Problem

Attempts have been made to cater to the problem of adequate housing provision for low income earners, and according to the ECDHS (2010), housing delivery in all the 9 regions of the Eastern Cape has been significantly increasing over the years, with figures reaching 7 209 between the years 2007/2008, 15 000 between 2008/2009 and 17 308 between 2009/2010. From the aforementioned figures, it immediately becomes evident that a significant amount of work is
being put into delivering houses to those in need. However, the primary question is, can these houses be regarded as sustainable human settlements?

The Breaking New Ground Housing Policy defines sustainable human settlements as “well-managed entities in which economic growth and social development are in balance with the carrying capacity of the natural systems on which they depend for their existence and result in sustainable development, wealth creation, poverty alleviation and equity” (NDoH 2004: 04).

From the given definition, it becomes apparent that housing provision goes further than mere building of a shelter, but includes various components that work toward improving the lives of the poor, providing them with the tools to be self-sufficient without jeopardising the ability of future generations to do so as well.

The main reason behind choosing this research is the lack of evidence indicating that there have been ‘evaluation processes’ to assess whether housing programs implemented yielded their identified objectives. In doing this research I will determine whether the theorising behind housing provision yields the identified ‘successes’ in practise.

1.4 Research Question

Have sustainable human settlement programs aimed at low income earners implemented within BCMM achieved their objectives according to their beneficiaries?

1.5 Research Aims and Objectives

The primary aims of the research are;

- To determine how the implemented sustainable human settlement programs have affected the lives of the beneficiaries.
- Assess whether the sustainable human settlement programs implemented are considered successful by the beneficiaries.
In exploring these aims, the intention is to;

- Evaluate the satisfaction of beneficiaries with various issues relating to the quality of the structure (size, material used, etc.).
- Assess possible problems that might have arisen in acquiring the house (housing allocation, corruption, participation with officials, etc.).
- Assess their access to services (electricity, water, sewerage removal and solid waste removal), social amenities (clinics/hospitals, community wellness centres, etc.), recreational facilities (parks, playgrounds, community development centres, etc.).
- Assess their access to effective and efficient transportation (i.e. a safe and readily available transport system).
- Assess whether their livelihoods have improved (access to economic opportunities, grants, entrepreneurial activity, etc.).
- Assess whether racial integration occurred in the said settlements.
- Assess whether they consider their settlement as being an integrated sustainable human settlement.
- Obtain information from the beneficiaries as to whether their needs have been met.

In identifying all the above mentioned, development practitioners (in the Housing Department and other planners) will be in a position to:

- Ensure that housing delivery is aimed at meeting the needs of the beneficiary, thus promoting the bottom-up approach to planning.
- Improve relations and collaboration between the housing department (and other planners tasked with housing provision) and citizens.
- Offer meaningful service delivery.
- Offer improved resource management.
- Improve planning and policy formation.
- Do away with ‘bad’ practices and adopt ‘best’ practices in housing delivery.
- Improve decision making processes as the data obtained will be used to inform future programs.
1.6 **Structure of the Report**

Chapter 2 of the report (Literature Review) introduces the concept of sustainable human settlement, highlights its significance in development, factors in support of the concept, factors that hinder as well as a look at what the Constitution of SA mentions in relation to it.

Chapter 3 of the report (Methodology) provides a brief history of the Duncan Village Settlement, highlights the project design, the research process followed, and the methods of data analysis utilised. It further highlights problems encountered when conducting the research as well as how the findings will be verified to determine validity and how such findings will be communicated.

Chapter 4 of the report (Findings) is a brief analysis of the findings of the study, highlighting the demographics of the two pilot projects, responses obtained from the sample group and their key issues of reasoning.

Chapter 5 of the report (Conclusion) provides a brief overview of the findings as well as recommendations going forward.
CHAPTER 2

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Background

Various housing policies and strategies have been formulated by the South African government since 1994 in dealing with housing and service delivery issues and while these housing policies and strategies having strong points, not all of them result in the desired or anticipated outcomes. With that said, however, it is clear that a significant amount of ground has been covered by such policies and strategies because according to the DLGH (2005) approximately 6.5 million people benefited from Government investing an amount totalling R27 billion between 1994 and 2004 that yielded more than 1.6 million houses. Although such efforts were done and such high numbers of housing structures were provided, the housing backlog was seen to consistently rise. Such an increase was attributed to issues of population growth, urbanisation and a number of shortfalls in the previously implemented housing policies and strategies.

The DLGH (2005:08-09), goes further and mentions a number of other problems that came about in the delivering of housing through the policy implemented in 1994:

- “Widespread and acute poverty, coupled with the lack of skills transfer and economic empowerment in housing projects have resulted in many beneficiaries being unable to afford the on-going costs of housing;
- Many new housing projects lack essential facilities and consist of houses only;
- The location of new housing projects has tended to reinforce apartheid urban patterns and existing inequities;
- The poor location and low residential densities of many of these housing projects cannot support a wide range of activities and services in a sustainable way. (The DoH’s Guidelines for Human Settlement Planning and Design suggest a minimum gross residential density of 50 dwelling units/ha, is appropriate to ensure a sufficiently wide range of activities, and yet most housing projects consist of freestanding single-
storey dwellings and have gross residential densities of between 10 and 30 dwelling units/hectare.);

- There are problems of poor construction quality and urban amenity of many new subsidised housing projects;
- While social housing (rental and co-operative housing) projects are often better located and of better quality than other projects, there are severe affordability problems and high levels of non-payment as relatively high rents and levies are needed in order to cover operational costs and loan repayments;
- The vast majority of people are excluded from the formal housing market – only 15% of households are able to benefit from the potential asset value of housing through being able to buy and sell property through the formal housing market;
- The PHP approach (assisted self-help housing delivery) is capable of providing bigger and better houses and empowering communities, but has been a small proportion of total delivery, due to a general lack of capacity to provide effective support to communities.”

Through assessing the above-mentioned problems relating to the policy implemented from 1994 and its implementation, it was clear that a different policy and/or strategy needed to be devised. DLGH (2005) argues that following the revision of the said policy, a new housing strategy was introduced by the DoH toward the end of 2004, that being, the BNG. Such a strategy took positive pointers from the previously implemented housing policy and redirected and promoted these to ensure that its delivery was more responsive and effective thus attempting to achieve sustainable human settlements and quality housing. Through its aims of ensuring that “present and future residents of such settlements will live in a safe and secure environment with sufficient access to economic opportunities, a combination of safe and secure housing and tenure types, reliable basic services and educational, environmental, cultural, health, welfare and police services” (DLGH 2005:10), thus sustainable human settlements.

The HSRC (2010:41) further adds that “the BNG emphasises meaningful participation of other sector departments especially those in the built environment, and demonstrates and moves away from a supply-centred model to a demand-centred model. In addition, there is a shift towards building integrated sustainable human settlements, with access to a range of facilities and amenities.
The Four Strategic Pillars of BNG:

a. Financial Interventions
   • Subsidy instruments
   • State asset management
   • Rectification of RDP stock - 1994 to 2002
   • Social and economic amenities
   • Accreditation of municipalities
   • Unblocking of blocked projects

b. Incremental Housing Programmes
   • New phased approach
   • Peoples housing process
   • Informal settlement upgrading
   • Emergency housing assistance

c. Social and Rental Housing Programmes
   • Social housing
   • Rental housing
   • State rental housing
   • Backyard rental programme
   • HIV/Aids

c. Rural Housing Programme
   • Farm worker housing assistance
   • Rural subsidy.”

The BNG strategy’s main objectives include;

• “Accelerating the delivery of housing as a key strategy for poverty alleviation;
• Utilising provision of housing as a major job creation strategy;
- Ensuring property can be accessed by all as an asset for wealth creation and empowerment;
- Leveraging growth in the economy;
- Combating crime, promoting social cohesion and improving quality of life for the poor;
- Supporting the function of the entire single residential property market to reduce duality within the sector by breaking the barriers between the first economy residential property boom and the second economy slump;
- Utilising housing as an instrument for the development of sustainable human settlements, in support of spatial restructuring;
- Promoting and facilitating an affordable rental and social housing market;
- Promoting upgrading of informal settlements;
- Providing community supporting facilities through housing delivery.” (DLGH 2005:10).

Now that some background has been given in terms of how the BNG strategy came into place and its aims, I will now move on to sustainable human settlements, which are the BNG strategy’s main objective.

The section to follow provides a definition for the concept of sustainable human settlements, their significance, factors hindering the effective realisation of such settlements, factors supporting such settlements, and a brief review of what the Constitution states in relation to sustainable human settlements and their provision.

2.2 The Concept of Sustainable Human Settlements

Human settlement policies in the 1970s focused primarily on housing the poor through the implementation of strategies relating to squatter-settlement upgrading. In addition, planning focused on land uses and transportation networks, that is, the physical aspects of planning and such planning is referred to as indicative planning (UNCHS 1987). The BNG approach (sustainable human settlement approach) moves a step further as emphasis is not primarily placed on mere living conditions, that is, mere personal environment but extends to the physical environment and how the inhabitants interact with it. Charlton (2004:03) supports this statement as he argues that it;
“…includes the infrastructure and services that supply the house. These include the nature of the water, sanitation, energy and access (roads, footpaths, etc.)… In addition, the neighbourhood in which the house is situated is significant. The living experience of a residential environment is dependent upon the availability and accessibility of facilities and amenities (schools, clinics, police stations, sporting facilities, etc.) in urban settings. The connection between housing and income generation is also crucial… How convenient, safe and affordable are the means of moving from home to work or to other facilities.”

The sustainable human settlements concept therefore has its basis on a holistic way of looking at housing provision, it not only considers the structure but the people inhabiting the structure and how will they interact with the environment around them in devising a life for themselves. In exploring this concept further, the term ‘sustainable human settlements’ immediately draws one’s attention is to the most recognisable buzz word in the realm of development academics, that being, ‘sustainable’. It becomes important to note that sustainable human settlements are mainly rooted in the concept of sustainability and/or sustainable development. Such a concept is defined according to Warburt (ed. 1998) as humanity developing in a way that enables them to meets its current needs without compromising the ability of future generations meeting theirs.

Following the definition of the concept of sustainability, it is now linked to development, specifically, housing development. Sustainable human settlements as defined by Government in its plan to achieve more responsive and effective delivery, the BNG strategy, are;

- well-managed entities in which economic growth and social development are in balance with the carrying capacity of the natural systems on which they depend for their existence and result in sustainable development, wealth creation, poverty alleviation and equity.

An alternative definition of the term sustainable human settlements as provided by the UNCHS (1987) is that, human settlements are settlements where organised human activity occurs. From these two given definitions it becomes immediately clear that sustainable human settlements are centred on organisation and structure, they are primarily focused on organised
and structured daily living, housing patterns, activities, etc. The UNCHS (1987) also adds that they are therefore not mere physical housing structures but an interrelated combination of human activity processes such as residence, employment, leisure, health, culture, education, etc. Furthermore, it focuses on dwellings and their related services, the dwelling’s immediate surroundings, community facilities, transport, communication networks, leisure, etc. Such settlements are aimed at providing their inhabitants with the said ‘human processes’ through achieving settlements that are centred on 5 main points, those being; durable and liveable housing structures, safe and efficient transport, energy consciousness, economy of inhabitancy, promoting self-reliance and self-efficiency that does not have a negative impact of the environment. According to Khan (2003), these arguments were further supported by the South African Minister of Housing as he argued that provision of housing goes further than a house that is the structure, it goes further as to involve issues relating to the availability of land, affordability, access to credit, economic growth, social development and the environment. Sustainable human settlements are structured in a way that they provide their inhabitants with access to economic opportunities, a variety in housing and tenure types that is secure and safe, reliable basic services, recreational and social facilities (DLGH 2005).

It is important to note that the main distinction between the housing delivery strategy previously implemented and the sustainable human settlements approach is that, the latter considers sustainability in issues relating to ecology, the economy, social, technical, institutional and political aspects and its main principles include; local economic development and poverty eradication, social and spatial integration, sustainability across the board, quality living environments, considering needs in a holistic manner and assuming an integrated development approach (DLGH 2005). Burgoyne (2008) also mentions that the BNG strategy’s main aims and objectives as identified by the DLGH are; crime prevention, encouraging social cohesion, improving quality of life for the poor, bringing about sustainable human settlements through the use of housing as a tool, promoting spatial reconstruction, promoting and facilitating an affordable rental and social housing market and the upgrading of informal settlements.

2.3 The Significance of Sustainable Human Settlements.

There are various advantages associated with sustainable human settlement provision, apart from the obvious of the betterment of people’s lives, providing adequate serviced housing, with access
to recreational facilities and economic opportunities thus fostering pride and security to those in need as well as addressing the housing backlog resulting from our apartheid past in a sustainable way. The UNCHS (1987) further argues that there is an economic role associated with sustainable human settlements because they are viewed as not only indicators of societal achievement but are also viewed as a country’s capital asset. Government investing in such settlements promotes informal sector income activity, investing in housing allows for conservation of foreign exchange because housing has a low import component and development in such settlements allows for population management, which is a huge factor in economic development.

In developing countries, particularly in local governmental authorities, such settlements not only indicate that a said municipality has managed to achieve its goals of basic needs delivery to all its deserving inhabitants, provision of accessible employment opportunities, sustainable living, etc., but further means income generation because people are able to access work (location of settlement near employment opportunities), reach such work in time (efficient and effective transportation), have lower stress levels, thus perform better (access to health services, recreational facilities, etc.) and so forth, thus all resulting in an income generating nation.

It is important to further note that in housing provision, government’s main beneficiaries are often low income earners and/or the unemployed and such people often rely on the environment for resources or partake in informal sector activities in order to derive a living. Such people benefit the most from sustainable human settlements programs because through them they are placed in housing development that are near or contain areas of employment, social amenities, recreational facilities, etc. Such people would otherwise not be in a position to access these as they often do not have the luxury of travelling to areas with such facilities due to economic constraints. Therefore, sustainable human settlements also play a role in meeting government’s development objectives. The UNCHS (1987:108) concurs with this argument as it mentions that “efficient settlements do not only mean improved conditions within the settlements themselves: they are also crucial to achieving national development goals”

Sustainable human settlements also fight against issues emitting from our inherited apartheid legacy, such as, fragmentation, unequal and racially stratified settlement patterns (Burgoyne 2008), wasteful allocation of resources, sprawl, environmental degradation, etc., as they allow for efficiency through the integration of physical planning and resource management (UNCHS
1987). Such settlements are not only seen to bring about integration merely in land-uses but in race and income groups as well.

2.4 Factors Hindering Sustainable Human Settlements

It is pivotal to note that there are a number of issues affecting the realisation of sustainable human settlements, these are suggested by Burgoyne (2008) together with the DoH (2004) as; financial constraints from government, lack of skills and/or capacity issues that often lead to under-spending of available budgets, poor resource allocation and limited suitable land, slow transfer of state land to Municipalities for such development, minimum team work between municipalities and traditional leaders as well as the presence and expansion of informal settlements. Attitude and mind-set of the beneficiaries also plays a pivotal role on the success and sustainability of such developments.

In order to bring about sustainable solutions in urban planning, the communities that inhabit such spaces must assume some form of responsibility for the urban space (Gaines & Jager 2009). Such responsibility in sustainable human settlement programmes is fostered by participation, because if the beneficiaries are involved in all the processes relating to such programmes then they acquire some form of ownership of the programme, e.g. if beneficiaries are involved in actually determining what is to be provided for them or the construction of the house, they will take responsibility for the house as they were involved in the processes as opposed to merely receiving a structure of which they had not put any effort in acquiring it. For this reason then it becomes clear that participation is vital to issues of sustainable human settlements. The issue of sustainability in human settlements cannot only be driven by one entity, for example, government, but government in association with the communities because mere provision of the factors that allow for sustainability do not automatically equal sustainable living but the communities utilising such factors must also drive the notion of sustainability in their everyday living.

It is important to note that participation is a hard process to achieve effectively and there is a wide range of evidence in the literature that highlights the difficulties surrounding issues of participation in housing improvement programs such as sustainable human settlement programs. Such difficulties are primarily focused on the limitations of promoting a ‘top-down’ approach to
participation (Moser and Peake ed. 1987). In such cases of participation you often find government and/or development officials responsible for the project excluding the beneficiaries from the decision making processes and only including them artificially because their say is often not acknowledged to a point that affects the decisions made. The process of participation is also difficult to implement effectively because it is time consuming (more so at local levels), often requires flexibility and commitment (Moser and Peake ed. 1987) from the stakeholders involved, and is very expensive to see through.

Lack of clarity on objectives and resources are also identified as factors hindering the success of housing programs (Malpas & Murie 1990).

2.5 Factors Supporting Sustainable Human Settlements

Following the above-mentioned constraints, a clear and immediate solution would be to provide a response to the above-mentioned factors. The UNCHS (1987) also suggests that, for effective settlement strategies, two main issues are to be considered, thus, the fusing of settlement-wide action with local initiative because for such strategies to be effective, they have to respond to two main challenges, that is, problems associated with dealing with large numbers of the urban poor and providing for operative autonomy of community-based groups.

2.6 The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa No 108 of 1996 & Sustainable Human Settlements

Section 26 of the Constitution mentions that;

Housing:
(1) Everyone has the right to have access to adequate housing.
(2) The state must take reasonable legislative and other measures, within its available resources, to achieve the progressive realisation of this right.

It continues and also mentions in Section 27;

Healthcare, food, water and social security:
Everyone has the right to have access to - (a) Health care services…

It is further mentioned in the BCM Housing Sector Plan 2008-2012: 18-19 that, “the Constitution also describes the objectives of local government, including regional council as:-

- The provision of services to communities in a sustainable manner;
- The promotion of social and economic development;
- The promotion of safe and healthy environments; and
- The encouragement of community and community organization involvement in matters of local government”

This section goes on to state that a municipality must strive, within its financial and administrative capacity, to achieve the above objectives. With regard to the development duties of local government, “a municipality must:

- Structure and manage its administration and budgeting and planning processes to give priority to the basic needs of the community, and to promote the social and economic development of the community; and
- Participate in national and provincial development programmes.”

From assessing what is mentioned in the Constitution, it becomes clear that issues relating to housing and health care are not to be considered a mere privileges but as a right. The (DLGH 2005:12), concurs as it argues that “housing is a basic human right that must meet the basic needs of people. It is therefore imperative that the principles of sustainability are taken into account.”

2.7 Conclusion

The sustainable human settlements program stems from the BNG strategy and is aimed at the provision of adequate housing with access to services, social amenities, and economic opportunities, and it further fosters integration on both economic and racial settings. Such programs are considered as a holistic way of tackling housing provision and driving development forward.
They are therefore considered to bring about betterment in human lives, contribute toward attaining government’s social development goals as well as economic development.
CHAPTER 3

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter the scope and scale of the research is explored. It further delves into the research design and the specific methods used in conducting the research. Following that, the research process is highlighted, methods of data analysis used, problems encountered in the process of obtaining the information, how such findings were verified and lastly how the findings from the research will be communicated to the respondents and other parties concerned.

Before proceeding, it is useful to reflect back to the research question and aims of this research as mentioned in Chapter 1 of this report.

Research Question:
Have sustainable human settlements programs aimed at low income earners implemented within BCMM achieved their objectives according to their beneficiaries?

Aims of the research:

- To determine how the implemented sustainable human settlements programs have affected the lives of the beneficiaries.
- Assess whether the sustainable human settlements programs implemented are considered successful by the beneficiaries.

3.2 Scope and Scale of the Project

The Duncan Village settlement is situated within the BCMM boundaries and is said to be the densest informal settlement in the City and comprises both formal and informal units, with the informal structures predominant. It is one of the many low income settlements within Buffalo
City, located 5km from the Buffalo City CBD (UFH 2004). Similar to all urban settlements occupied by low income earners, the main characteristics of this settlement are acute levels of poverty, crime, lack of services, social amenities and recreational spaces.

Figure 1: Aerial Photograph of the Duncan Village Settlement

BCM DVRI LSDF, Draft 7 (2008:05)
A table representing the summary of the dwelling types and number of dwelling types in relation to the population of the Duncan Village settlement;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling Types</th>
<th>Estimated No. of Dwelling Types</th>
<th>Derived Average Occupation Rate</th>
<th>Estimated Population Per Dwelling Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal dwelling</td>
<td>2 922</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14 610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backyard shack/flat</td>
<td>3 432</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10 296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freestanding shack</td>
<td>14 971</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44 913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>21 325</td>
<td>3,27</td>
<td>69 819</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The historical background of the Duncan Village settlement is immersed in political history as it was recognised to have had a most active community which successfully opposed the apartheid government in the EC pre 1994 (UFH 2004). According to Mazinyo (2009) and Bank (1996), during the apartheid era the inhabitants of the Duncan Village settlement were forcibly removed to Mdantsane, a low income settlement located 30km from the East London CBD. This was done as part of the apartheid government’s initiative of removing blacks in and close to the city centre.

Figure 1 (Forced Removals 1965) and Figure 2 (Forced Removals in Mzonyana & Ndende Streets 1975), respectively.
The Duncan Village community was said to have resisted such removals to the extent that during the 1960s and 1970s the apartheid government gave in and cancelled the removal of the Duncan Village community to Mdantsane, following violent riots, massive rent boycotts and protestations. Some of the remaining sections of the area that successfully resisted the relocation were converted into coloured and Indian residential areas and the rest remained unchanged as D-Hostel and C-Section that consists of thousands of informal dwellings. The apartheid’s government inability to successfully control the area resulted in large numbers of rural immigrants relocating from the outlying areas into the Duncan Village settlement in search of better livelihoods, due to its proximity to the East London CBD. Due to the shortage of housing to accommodate the influx of people into the area, shacks were built in public spaces and in backyards of municipal houses. The area was characterised by overcrowding and illegal connections to municipal services.

Post 1994, the situation worsened as urbanisation continued to occur. Mazinyo (2004) mentions that even though the Duncan Village is in close proximity with the CBD, a large number of its occupants are without income and live in shacks lacking municipal services. The area is a true reflection of poor management and a ‘living consequence’ of our apartheid past.

As means to address the above mentioned service issues and housing backlogs, various development initiatives were put into practice in the BCMM. Amongst these is the Duncan Village Redevelopment Initiative (DVRI), which was a programme undertaken in 2003 by the BCMM in association with the NDoH and the Eastern Cape Provincial Department of Housing, Local Government and Traditional Affairs aimed at uplifting the Duncan Village settlement through focused investment in identified Urban Renewal Zones and the construction of integrated dwelling units with appropriate access to infrastructure services, social facilities and adequate public transportation that allows for easy access to social and economic opportunities (BCM DVRI LSDF Draft 7, 2008). Of particular focus for the purpose of this study are the Toilet City and Reeston BNG pilot projects implemented as part of the DVRI aimed at providing adequate shelter whilst encompassing elements relating to services and social amenities (ECDHS 2010).

The upper part of the C-Section as indicated in Figure 1 – Aerial Photograph: Duncan Village Settlement was later formalised and became the Toilet City settlement, which was one of the sustainable human settlements pilot projects. The Reeston settlement, which is also one of the
sustainable human settlements pilot projects implemented cannot be seen in Figure 1 – Aerial Photograph: Duncan Village as it is amongst the settlements that were formed due to forced removals from the Duncan Village Settlement to the city outskirts. An aerial photograph of the Reeston Settlement can be seen on page 54.

A case study has been undertaken in Reeston and Toilet City, the two sustainable human settlement pilot projects implemented by the ECDHS as part of the DVRI. The case study is aimed at determining whether the said pilot project met its identified objectives as outlined in the BNG Policy, through assessing, amongst other things; access to an efficient and safe transportation network, service provision and whether the program improved the livelihoods of the residents.

3.3 Research Design and Methods

As mentioned above the study focused on BNG’s pilot projects implemented in the BCMM by the ECDHS in 2004. These particular pilot projects were chosen for the purposes of the study because they are amongst the most recent projects of such nature that have been implemented in the BCMM and aim to address the issue of housing provision with a focus on creating integrated, efficient and liveable human settlements.

The research conducted was of both a quantitative and a qualitative nature, through the use of questionnaires, hereto attached as Appendix 1. This method of research is most appropriate to this type of research because is seen as a more flexible approach to gaining an understanding as it allows for questions to be asked by the respondents in the event of them not grasping the questions asked. It further allows the interviewer to probe further into the issue when certain questions are raised by the respondents that may interest the interviewer. Lastly, it allows for a dialogue between the interviewer and respondent.
3.4 Research Process

A total of 60 respondents, 25 from the Toilet City settlement and 35 from the Reeston settlement, comprising of both genders and aged between 18 and 56 were chosen through convenience sampling by choosing houses where there were residents at home at a given time.

Houses chosen however where 6 or 7 houses away from the respondents’ house interviewed thus ensuring that a large area of the settlement was covered and further ensuring that respondents interviewed were not isolated to a particular part of a given settlement.

The respondents interviewed comprised of both the household heads as well as dependents (i.e. teenagers, unemployed adults and pensioners). All interviews were conducted by me and conducted on-site (i.e. the respondents’ homes).

The type of data collected related to respondent’s attitude about the pilot project and their satisfaction in relation to the objectives of the pilot project.

Permission was sort from the BCMM to conduct the research, and proof of the permission granted is hereto attached as Appendix 4.

3.5 Methods of Data Analysis

The data collected was analysed and summarised into tables. Furthermore charts were also used to represent the outcome.

3.6 Problems Encountered in Conducting the Research

The main difficulty encountered in conducting the study was lack of trust. The researcher’s inability to gain the full trust of the community resulted in some of the respondents not being fully co-operative.
3.7 Verification of Findings

The data collected was verified by means of consultation with individuals who are part of the project but were not part of the sample group.

3.8 Communication of Findings

The findings of the study conducted will be communicated through providing the respondents and any other interested party with the research paper upon its conclusion.
CHAPTER 4

4. FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter deals with outlining the findings of the study defined in the previous chapter, the information gathered in the study will be analysed and represented in a table form. Lastly a summary of key issues identified by sample group the will be provided.

4.2 Demographics

The first part of the questionnaire intended to gather the demographic information of the sample group, such information is summarised and represented in a table below;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Distribution</th>
<th>Toilet City</th>
<th>Reeston</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 - 29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 45</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>51.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - 56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 &amp;&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Toilet City</th>
<th>Reeston</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Toilet City</th>
<th>Reeston</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>73.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26.70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above it becomes apparent that the majority of the sample group is between the ages 30 – 45, is unemployed and predominantly female.
### Table 4 – Summary of Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are you satisfied with the house/structure in terms of the quality, size, material used, etc.?</td>
<td>10 50 0</td>
<td>17% of the respondents are happy with the structures although they indicate that such structures could be improved. 83% of the respondents indicated that they are not happy with the structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have access to Municipal Services (water, electricity, refuse &amp; sewerage removal)?</td>
<td>60 0 0</td>
<td>All respondents indicated that they have access to municipal services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have access to social amenities (clinics/hospitals, police station, community wellness centres, etc.)?</td>
<td>0 60 0</td>
<td>All respondents indicated that they do not have access to social amenities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have access to recreational facilities (sports field, parks, community development centres, etc.)?</td>
<td>0 60 0</td>
<td>All respondents indicated that they do not have access to recreational facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have access to safe and efficient transportation?</td>
<td>5 55 0</td>
<td>8% of the respondents indicated that they have access to safe and efficient transportation. 92% of the respondents indicated that they do not have access to safe and efficient transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have access to economic opportunities in close proximity to the settlement?</td>
<td>8 52 0</td>
<td>13% of the respondents indicated that they have access to economic opportunities. 87% of the respondents indicated that they do not have access to economic opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you happy with the general location of the settlement?</td>
<td>58 2 0</td>
<td>97% of the respondents indicated that they are happy with the location. 3% of the respondents indicated that they are not happy with the location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you regard your settlement to be integrated in terms of various income groups?</td>
<td>24 36 0</td>
<td>40% of the respondents indicated that they regard their settlement to be integrated in terms of various income groups. 60% of the respondents indicated that they do not regard their settlement to be integrated in terms of various income groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTIONS</td>
<td>RESPONSES</td>
<td>ANALYSIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you regard your settlement as racially integrated?</td>
<td>9  48   3</td>
<td>9% of the respondents indicated that they do regard their settlement as racially integrated. 80% of the respondents indicated that they do not regard their settlement as racially integrated. 5% of the respondents indicated that they are not sure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where you involved in the strategic phases of the project i.e. project identification, project design, etc. through means of consultation, meetings and/or workshops?</td>
<td>0  60   0</td>
<td>All respondents indicated that they were not involved in this process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel that your voice was heard and that you had a considerable influence on the decisions taken?</td>
<td>0  60   0</td>
<td>All respondents indicated that they were not involved in this process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where you involved in the construction of the structures and/or any type of work related to the settlement?</td>
<td>2  58   0</td>
<td>3% of the respondents indicated that they were involved. 97% of the respondents indicated that they were not involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you approve of how the structures were allocated to beneficiaries?</td>
<td>3  57   0</td>
<td>5% of the respondents indicated that they were happy with the allocation process. 95% of the respondents indicated that they were not happy with the allocation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has your life been influenced in anyway by your relocation to the settlement?</td>
<td>55  0   5</td>
<td>92% of the respondents indicated that their lives had been influenced for the better. 8% of the respondents indicated that they are not sure of the type of influence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel that the overall objective was achieved, i.e. creating a Sustainable Human Settlement?</td>
<td>0  57   3</td>
<td>95% of the respondents indicated that they do not believe that the overall objective was achieved. 5% of the respondents indicated that they are not sure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 **Key Issues as Indicated by the Sample Group.**

From conducting the interviews, the following key issues were identified from both settlements;

- A minimal number of the sample group expressed that they were happy with the structure because it was a step up from their previous dwellings (shacks). The majority however expressed their unhappiness because;

  ✓ They are too small in size as most respondents have large families.
  ✓ They were built using low quality materials and that has resulted in them having cracks, leaks and mould.
  ✓ Poor workmanship thus affecting their strength and durability.

- The entire sample group indicated that they have access to water (either through communal water taps or individual household taps depending on the location), electricity, sewerage and refuse removal. The majority however indicated that they are not satisfied with the condition and maintenance of such services because;

  ✓ The communal taps are often crowded and they introduce health hazards due to some of the leaking (stagnant water).
  ✓ Shared toilets (depending on the location) represent major health hazards, more so when they are misused and poorly maintained.
  ✓ Refuse often piles up in a central place before it gets collected.

- The majority of the sample group indicated that they have readily available transportation; however it cannot be regarded as efficient, reliable nor safe as it sometimes is not available, and worn down and old cars are used as means of transportation.

- The majority of the sample group indicated that although they live in relative close proximity to the CBD they still cannot acquire jobs thus remaining unemployed or family dependent.
• A large number of the sample group indicated that they are happy with the location of the settlements because they are considerably closer to the town in comparison to other similar forms of housing. Other respondents indicated that they are not happy as they often lack the means to get them to and from town.

• Almost half of the sample group indicated that they do perceive their settlements to be integrated in terms of various income groups, as both low and middle income earners reside in the settlements. Other respondents indicated that they do not because there are no high income earners residing in or near their settlements.

• The majority of the sample group indicated that they do perceive their settlements to be racially integrated because blacks, colours and migrants (from various upper African countries) reside in the settlements. Other respondents indicated that they do not, purely for the reason that not a single white person resides in the area.

• The entire sample group indicated that no form of meaningful participation occurred, because they were never consulted in any stage of the project. Some did however indicate that a meeting was held toward the end of the project where they were given an opportunity to choose between 3 already identified housing typologies, however, none of their choices were implemented when it came to the construction phase of project. Thus entire sample group agreed that they had no say.

• The majority of the sample group indicated that they were not involved in the construction phase of the projects as the labour was predominantly outsourced. This resulted in them not benefiting financially as no economic opportunities were presented to them, nor did they acquire any skill. A minimal number of the sample group indicated that they were involved in painting some of the housing structures.

• The majority of the sample group indicated that they were not pleased with the allocation process because of;

  ✓ Long time frames associated with acquiring a house.
✓ Corrupt officials allocating houses being bribed to release houses to less deserving individuals.

- The majority of the sample group indicated that their lives had changed for the better even though they are currently not satisfied with the structures and services available to them. A minimal number indicated that they were better off in the shacks as current conditions are fast replicating their previous conditions and their shacks were bigger in size in comparison to the structures provided.

- The majority of the sample group indicated that they do not believe that the overall objectives of the sustainable human settlement pilot projects implemented were achieved as most of the identified aims have never been met and those that have been met were poorly done so. A minimal number of the sample group agreed with the latter however they acknowledge that certain objectives where achieved; thus they cannot completely ‘write-off’ the projects as being a total failure.

After careful consideration and analysis of the consolidated findings from both settlements investigated, it can be concluded that the majority of the respondents are not happy with their settlements and do not believe that the overall objective of creating sustainable human settlements was achieved. This conclusion is attributed to the fact that, most, if not all the factors that make a settlement a sustainable human settlement as outlined in the DVRI do not exist in the both the settlements investigated, according to the respondents.

It is however noted that although valid, there are responses indicated by certain respondents as reasons not to be satisfied with the housing projects that do not necessarily relate to the issue of sustainable human settlements nor their objectives as identified by the DVRI.

In reflecting back to the aims and objectives of the study as stated in the earlier part of this report (Chapter 1), those being:

- To determine how the implemented sustainable human settlements programs have affected the lives of the beneficiaries.
• Assess whether the sustainable human settlements programs implemented are considered successful by the beneficiaries.

It can be concluded that both the identified aims reveal the beneficiaries of the implemented pilot projects are not pleased with the results.

Chart 1 – Aim 1

Has you life been influenced in any way by your relocation to the settlement?

- Yes: 92%
- No: 8%
- Other: 0%

From the above pie chart indicating the consolidated findings from both the settlements investigated, it is apparent that the pilot projects implemented have had a positive influence on the lives of the people interviewed, despite their challenges as they now have a permanent housing structure as opposed to the shack they previously lived in, they have access to municipal services and some have access to economic opportunities.
From the above piechart indicating the consolidated findings from both the settlements investigated, it is apparent that a large number of the people interviewed do not believe that the pilot projects have achieved their objectives.

From the ‘Key Issues as Indicated by the Sample Group’ section discussed above, the intentions of the study as mentioned in the earlier part of the report can be met as the aforementioned section highlights various reasons as raised by the beneficiaries that render the pilot projects unsatisfactory to them. Through careful analysis of this section, best practices in future projects of this manner can be determined.
CHAPTER 5

5. CONCLUSION

5.1 Introduction

The Toilet City and Reeston settlements which were pilot projects for the DVRI sustainable human settlement program were assessed against their identified aims and objectives by the beneficiaries. The assessment was conducted as a means to evaluate the beneficiaries’ satisfaction with a variety of factors relating to the identified aims and objectives, if and/or how their lives have changed upon being part of the programme as well as their views relating to the overall achievement of the said aims and objectives.

This chapter provides an overview of the findings of the study and highlights a way forward from the information obtained from the study.

5.2 Overview of Findings

The findings of the study revealed that the sample group did not believe that the overall aims of the DVRI through the implemented pilot projects were achieved, however they are grateful that some effort was put into improving their livelihoods.

5.3 Recommendations

Subsequent to careful consideration of the findings from the study, the following recommendations have been made;

The main issues that are evident in the pilot projects not meeting their objectives include the lack of communication and collaboration between government and the beneficiaries. It is therefore a recommendation that collaborative methods in housing development be implemented as
collaborative planning is about giving power to the people through information, dissemination and allowing them to be part of the decision making process (Healy 2003). In order to ensure that people are part of the process, participation is to be promoted. Participation is one of the most important factors of development (de Beer and Swanepoel 2000), however it is rather complex and not easily achieved. This can be attributed to the fact that not all stakeholders are willing to participate, they do not have adequate access to relevant information to allow them to participate effectively, stakeholders failing to reach consensus, government not allowing all stakeholders to be part of the process or including them superficially, etc. In the case of the pilot projects implemented, participation still remained a weak point. It is increasingly obvious that meaningful participation of the beneficiaries in projects should be made a priority as it promotes information sharing and communication amongst other things, from the strategic stages (project identification and inception), implementation stages (construction of structures), and right through to the very last stage, i.e. house allocation.

Participation should occur through consultation, workshops and meetings, in addition beneficiaries are to be given a meaningful opportunity to contribute through firstly being provided with information relating to the projects and their rights thus enabling them to have a voice and make decisions relating to the project. Such efforts play a major role in eliminating risk and possibilities of the beneficiaries rejecting the project.

Social capital is another important factor in the collaboration of the community and governmental departments. Grootaert (1998) supports this notion as he states social capital is significant to development policy as he argues that collective decision making is one of the aspects promoted by social capital. Putnam (2000: 19) defines social capital as the “connections among individuals – social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them. In that sense social capital is closely related to what some have called “civic virtue””. It is also considered to promote civic action as it facilitates co-operative types of social relations that are focused on collective action (Fahmy 2006). Such civic action is useful in promoting transparency and accountability in government officials. Civic action is also vital as a tool for poor communities to gain power and a voice over government officials who sometimes impose.
Corruption amongst governmental officials, developers and contractors is one the biggest constraints facing development to date. Millions of rands are lost due to the demolishing of substandard houses, tenders being awarded to undeserving contractors/officials who end up producing sub-stand work and the cutting of corners by contractors in order to save money. It is recommended that more stringent monitoring and evaluation measures be put into practice in order to assist in curbing corruption, in addition transparency is to be further promoted in the awarding of tenders and other processes related to tenders. Those that have been found guilty of being corrupt are to be accountable of their actions and stricter disciplinary steps are to be taken.

The bottom-up approach to project implementation is to be adopted. This type of approach will grant the beneficiaries the opportunities to be the drivers of the project thus being able to determine what they want, when they want it and how they want it. Government and other development practitioners are to have an understanding that they are merely facilitators of such projects and not the ‘bosses’ thus they are to promote and nurture what the beneficiaries have identified as their needs and wants.

It is evident from the study that issues relating to the maintenance of services and structures have a high impact on how settlements are viewed. The maintenance of services is primarily a municipal function and it is a recommendation that more effort and finance be put into dealing with issues of municipal infrastructure service delivery and the maintenance thereof. Furthermore threshold studies should be carefully considered as often services are dilapidated quickly if overused (e.g. one stand of communal taps supplying a large portion of a given settlement).

New and innovative ways are to be derived in dealing with housing provision, e.g. the appointment of contractors for housing construction linked to the maintenance and/or the guarantee of the structure.

The overall improvement of skills, education and rooted understanding of the above mentioned issues will ensure that development practitioners and planners are in a better position to plan housing projects in a way that it eliminates risks in the early stages of the project as it is clear that the implementation of what is written on paper vs. what is on the ground is difficult. The
improved understanding of these issues will further certify that what is being implemented is agreed upon by the beneficiaries, thus ensuring a more sustainable way of living.
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Appendix 1

AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH : TOILET CITY SETTLEMENT
Appendix 2

AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH : REESTON SETTLEMENT
Appendix 3

QUESTIONNAIRE
FACULTY OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMIC SCIENCES

Date ________________

Age
18 – 29 □
30 – 45 □
46 – 55 □
56 & above □

Gender
Female □
Male □

Income
Dependent _______  Unemployed _______  Employed _______  Other _______

Settlement

1. Are you satisfied with the house/structure in terms of the quality, size, material used, etc.?

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

2. Do you have access to Municipal Services (water, electricity, refuse & sewerage removal)?

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

3. Do you have access to social amenities (clinics/hospitals, police station, community wellness centres, etc.)?

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

4. Do you have access to recreational facilities (sports field, parks, community development centres, etc.)?

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
5. Do you have access to safe and efficient transportation?

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

6. Do you have access to economic opportunities in close proximity to the settlement?

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

7. Are you happy with the general location of the settlement?

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

8. Do you regard your settlement to be integrated in terms of various income groups?

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

9. Do you regard your settlement as racially integrated?

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

10. (a) Where you involved in the strategic phases of the project i.e. project identification, project design, etc. through means of consultation, meetings and/or workshops?

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

10 (b) Do you feel that your voice was heard and that you had a considerable influence on the decisions taken?

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

11. Where you involved in the construction of the structures and/or any type of work related to the settlement?
12. Your views on how the structures were allocated to beneficiaries

13. Has your life been influenced in anyway by your relocation to the settlement? If yes, how?

14. (a) Do you feel that the overall objective was achieved, i.e. creating a Sustainable Human Settlement?

14. (b) In your view, what should have been done differently or possible pointers going forward?
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BCMM APPROVAL
BUFFALO CITY METROPOLITAN MUNICIPALITY

MEMORANDUM

From: MANAGER: KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT, AND POLICY
To: MS THANDEKA MLAZA

Date: 28 October 2011

Our ref: Please ask for Your ref:
DR T NORUSHE (043) 705 9706

RE: REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH IN BCMM:
MS THANDEKA MLAZA

It is hereby acknowledged that Ms Thandeka Mlaza, a student at Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University doing a Master’s Degree in Development Studies has met the prerequisites for conducting research at Buffalo City Metropolitan Municipality (BCMM) for partial fulfillment of her degree. She has provided us with all the necessary documentation as per the BCMM Policy on External Students conducting research at the institution.

With reference to the letter to the Acting City Manager received on 14 September 2011, permission was requested to conduct research at BCMM for the Research Project, focusing on Have sustainable human settlements programmes aimed at Low income earners implemented within Buffalo City Metropolitan Municipality achieved their objectives according to their beneficiaries. This request was acknowledged by the Office of the Acting City Manager and forwarded to the Information, Knowledge and Research Unit for further assistance. Ms Mlaza was asked to provide the Unit with the necessary documentation, which she subsequently did.

The relevant Officials to assist in the research were identified and duly informed about the research, and the fact that Ms Mlaza has met the prerequisites. Their contact details have also been provided to Ms Mlaza and she was informed to contact them directly for assistance.

Wishing you good luck in your studies.

DR T F NORUSHE
MANAGER: KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT, RESEARCH AND POLICY