

## Mixed-Income Housing, Urban Transformation and Social Cohesion in Post-apartheid South Africa

Lukhele T.M

Department of Development Planning and Management, University of Limpopo, Turfloop campus  
logweleja@gmail.com or themba.lukhele@ul.ac.za

Doi:10.5901/mjss.2014.v5n25p36

### Abstract

*One of the fundamental challenges facing the post-apartheid South Africa's urban settlement planning has been the requirement for social cohesion. One of the urban transformation interventions involved the construction of mixed-income housing, wherein social cohesion among low- and middle-income households could be enforced. Far from rhetoric and the drift of middle-income households into cities that were previously the preserves for white people, urban South Africa remains deeply segregated. Negligible progress has been made in transforming the apartheid spatial fragmentation and segregation. Mixed-income housing development is considered to be an innovative approach to housing delivery that could provide a mixture of housing products to suit a range of income groups in the cities. To this extent, this approach is assumed to hold social integrative properties, relevant to post-apartheid urban transformation. The paper maintains that the establishment of the mixed-income housing can lead to social cohesion whilst simultaneously correcting for the perception that the poor cannot cohabit with the middle-income households. There is a realistic potential that new culture, values and norms could manifest to create conditions for coexistence between the different income groups in the urban landscape. The race divide in South Africa appears to create an added complexity to urban social cohesion, though. This paper will use evidence from some cities in South Africa to affirm the argument that mixed-income housing has a potential to redress the socio-spatial divisions in the country. The paper concludes by arguing that mixed-income housing can foster the notion of inclusive compact city and socially integrated community where the low-income and middle-income households can live in harmony and mutually enjoying common sets of facilities and services. However, the race factor could render urban social cohesion in a democratic South Africa an unachievable dream.*

**Keywords:** Mixed-income housing; social cohesion; urban transformation; compact city

### 1. Introduction

One of the major challenges in current South Africa's urban development lies in the persistent socio-spatial division of cities (Landman, 2010; Onatu, 2010; Haferburg, 2013) which was intentionally created by the apartheid spatial planning. As a result, the poor household remain on the peripheries of the cities far from their places of work and have to travel for hours to and from work daily, at great cost and are paid meagre wages (Onatu, 2010). Overtime, the apartheid legacy has imbedded a misperception that the poor cannot cohabit with the middle-income class in the urban setting to form a socially cohesive society. In contrary, there is a realistic potential that new culture, values and norms could manifest to create conditions for coexistence between the different income groups in the urban landscape. Therefore, to denounce the undesirable perception, this article provides a theoretical argument based on the principles of the Comprehensive Plan for the Development of Sustainable Human Settlement, commonly known as the Breaking New Ground (BNG) program which promotes the building of mixed-income housing (Department of Housing, 2004). On this note, the article conceptualise the meaning and understanding of mixed-income housing within the South African context. Following that, the principles to assess the physical characteristics that are believed to enable the manifestation social cohesion in the mixed-income housing are also discussed hereunder. The article also discusses the domains of social cohesion through which social cohesion in the urban areas could manifest. The last section of the article highlights the successful experiences of mixed-income housing witnessed across the country. With this evidence based experiences, the article seeks to demonstrate the possibility of the manifestation of social cohesion in the post-apartheid urban South Africa's mixed residential space.

### 2. Understanding the Mixed-Income Housing Concept in South Africa's Context

In the South African context, mixed-income housing can be interpreted in many different ways. In some cases, mixed-

income housing refers to housing developments that combine only market-rate and public assisted units, for people with income levels ranging from above-moderate income to very low (Onatu, 2010). While in some instances mixed-income housing development includes some combination of fully subsidised low-income housing, rental housing/rent to purchase housing for the 'gap' market, and affordable housing for the private market (Klug, Rubin & Todes, 2013). The income range for the different income groups is illustrated as follows: houses for full government subsidies are available for households earning R3 500 or less per month; on the other hand, the 'gap market' housing is for households earning between R3 500 and R10 000 per month; and, the free market/affordable housing caters for households earning above R10 000 per month (Klug *et al.*, 2013). The general approach to this housing model is that a private developer constructs mixed-income housing projects in partnership with the government. However, the private property developer becomes the major player in this partnership arrangement. As Klug *et al.* (2013) indicate, the developer controls the entire value chain; that is the private developer owns the land, and is responsible for the construction and marketing of the housing project. While on the other hand, the government is required to provide with the basic services and infrastructure like water and sanitation, and electricity services. In addition, the private developer also derives some grants and incentives from various government departments to finance the entire residential development (Haferburg, 2013).

The extent of income and tenure variation in the mixed-income housing projects may or may not be reflected on the layout and design of the residential precinct. In some cases, a clear distinction between houses for different groups could be easily made, particular where the mixed residential blocks are grouped together in the same development where it is visually evident that there is a difference between the costs or tenure of the residential units (Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR), 2011), for example the Cosmo City in Johannesburg. However, in some cases, mixed residential options may be incorporated into a development where it would not be possible to distinguish easily between the different housing options (CSIR, 2011), for example the Cornubia project in Durban. In addition, mixed-income housing may also imply the availability of different functions in the same building or in a separate building. In this regard, the Thornhill residential development in Polokwane can be a good example. Despite the variances in income and tenure combination, the bottom line is that most, if not all, of the mixed-income housing projects in the South African cities are strategically located on the old buffer strips, along major corridors and adjacent to economic nodes in order to support spatial restructuring (Landman, 2010).

### **3. The Principles to Assess the Physical Characteristics Deemed to Facilitate the Manifestation Social Cohesion in the Mixed-Income Housing Projects in South Africa**

Landman, Matsebe & Mmonwa (2009) identify the principles to measure the physical characteristics which are believed to enable the manifestation of social cohesion in the mixed-income housing in South Africa's context. These physical characteristics have been identified as the fundamental factors that could positively influence the success of the mixed-income housing development in terms of ensuring an inclusive residential environment in the urban areas. As such, the principles discussed hereunder are as follows: integration, accessibility, efficiency, image and aesthetics, surveillance, ownership and territoriality, and target hardening.

#### *3.1 Integration*

There is a variety of factors that should be considered in order to ensure integration in the mixed-income housing development. Perhaps most important, integration can be achieved through a well-integrated mix of adequate houses of different types, tenure and price in a defined geographical area to facilitate a variety of household sizes, ages and income groups in close proximity to well-functioning services and facilities (Landman *et al.*, 2009). In essence, integration contains the principles of inclusion whereby the entire mixed-income housing development includes some combination of fully subsidised low-income housing, rental housing or rent to purchase housing, also known as gap housing, for households earning between R3 500 and R7 500 per month, and affordable housing for the private market (Klug *et al.*, 2013). Therefore, the combination of different housing units for different people is considered important for creating an inclusionary environment in the urban area where all the residents would have equal access to the available social and economic opportunities in their area.

#### *3.2 Accessibility*

In the context of mixed-income housing, accessibility could refer mainly to the availability of two spatial features. Firstly, it may refer to the residential area's street based patterns of connection that are pedestrian, cyclist and vehicular oriented.

The residential precinct should be designed in a manner that it can be user friendly to various modes of transport with spaces that are easy to approach or enter through the provision of convenient movement without compromising safety and security (Landman *et al.*, 2009) in the residential area. Secondly, accessibility may also refer to a residential area where the basic services and infrastructure like transport and facilities such as shopping centre and schools are allocated in close proximity to that residential area. In such urban residential areas, Landman (2010) conclude that the residents are likely to enjoy a higher quality of life because the places to live, work and play in close proximity to each other, thus contribute to the efficiency of land use in the urban areas.

### 3.3 Efficiency

In general, efficiency seeks to strike a balance between the natural and built environment in the residential area. As such, "efficiency would imply buildings that can meet different needs over time, sufficient in size, scale and density and the appropriate design to support basic amenities in the development or neighbourhood to ensure efficient use of land, materials and energy" (Landman *et al.*, 2009:22). For example, housing units with solar panels are considered to be energy efficient, and in addition, installing showers instead of bath basin in these housing units could also save both water and energy. To some extent, efficiency could also require local procurement of the construction materials used in building the house infrastructure. The locally sourced building material may include steel and wooden framed windows and solid wooden doors, tiled and corrugated iron roofs to ensure transportation efficiency (Landman *et al.*, 2009). To this extent, it is clear that the way in which mixed-income housing is design does not only aim to meet the socioeconomic needs of the residents but also seeks to ensure ecology friendly as an integral part of it image and aesthetic appearance.

### 3.4 Image and aesthetics

The image and aesthetics appeal of the residential development could be enhanced through the management and maintenance of both the interior and exterior parts of the buildings and house units. With regard to the exterior part, image and aesthetic appearance could refer to a safe and healthy local environment with well-designed living, public and green space and physical features and landscaping designed (Landman *et al.*, 2009). As such, a good landscaping design will include both the hard (paving) and soft (plants) landscaping features. Unusually, landscaping is considered to be the most noticeable exterior aesthetic feature of the residential development. However, it must be complemented with the interior furnishes of the housing units which include the use of moderate to high quality finishes such as vinyl tiles and carpets. Such interior finishes are of significance in adding value to the image of the development, which in turn attracts potential tenants which include high and low-income groups (Landman *et al.*, 2009). Therefore, both the exterior and interior aesthetic features are equally important and could develop a strong sense of place attachment to the residents, and importantly, the residents should be able to make surveillance to the exterior spatial features.

### 3.5 Surveillance

Surveillance refers to residential places where all publicly or commonly accessibly spaces can be overlooked by residents, visitors or security personnel (Landman *et al.*, 2009). To this extent, surveillance may include oversight of social spaces like walkways, streets, car parking, parks, and entries and exits points at the residential development. On the other hand, the social space could foster interaction among the residents. For example, at a jungle gym where children play, the children's parents could as well interact with each other; in a sense that the parents would like to know the parents of the children their children are playing with at that social facility. Therefore, in order to ensure high surveillance of the social space by residence, consideration in the design and layout of the housing units in relation to windows, doors and balconies installation, should be made in order to allow the residents to oversee all people who are entering and leaving their residential area. Importantly, oversight from prime rooms such as kitchen, dining, or living room should be available, and upper floor balconies need to be useable, however, taking care to minimise overlook to private space of other neighbours below (Macdonald, 2005). Therefore, in most cases mixed-income housing has been design to enable the residents to make surveillance over the common spaces inside and around their residential area (Landman *et al.*, 2009). In essence, surveillance of public spaces implies that the residents should take responsibility and ownership of their territory.

#### 4. Ownership and Territoriality

According to Landman et al. (2009) ownership and territoriality refers to a residential environment that promotes a sense of ownership, respect, territorial responsibility, and privacy, as well as effective engagement and participation of local people in maintenance of their physical infrastructure. Therefore, in order to promote the sense of ownership, respect and privacy, there must be a clear demarcation between public and private spaces in the residential area. In most instances, features like fencing, paving and vegetation are used to maintain a clear separation between the private and public space in order to ensure that the outdoor or public space like parks, open space and footpaths are well signified so that the community and visitors do not confuse the public space with the private one. Warningly, in this respect place ownership does not mean tenure options in the residential development (Landman et al., 2009), but it refers to the residents' relationship with their immediate living environment (Dekker & Bolt, 2005) and its people. That is, being attached to their neighbourhood. On this note, it can therefore be argued that the residents in the mixed-income housing development are seen to have relationships not only with their fellow neighbours, but also with their residential built infrastructure which ultimately enhance their sense of place attachment and identity with the entire neighbourhood. Equally important, the issue of safety and security in the mixed-income residential development is a major concern to the residents.

##### 4.1 Target-hardening

Target-hardening refers to measures that enhance security and control access into an area without compromising any of the other principles, for example security locks and burglar bars on windows, security gates, and security wall (Landman et al., 2009). However, the security features provided in and around the residential development should be made in such a way that it does not obscure the aesthetic view of the housing infrastructure, mainly from the front and sideward views. Therefore, appropriate security features required because most residential development with target-hardening measures seem to attract residents who are searching for a sense of community, identity, and security (Grant & Mittelsteadt, 2004).

#### 5. The Manifestation of Social Cohesion in Urban Areas

Social cohesion is multi-dimensional and can exist or manifest at various social scales or levels, along a continuum from localized, highly personal micro interactions to more generalized, societal level macro interactions (Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute (AHURI), 2007). In this regard, the discussion of this article focuses on the personal micro interaction scale in the urban neighborhood given that cities are considered to have problems associated with lack of social cohesion as a result of diversity of culture, class and race (Haferburg, 2013; Mugnano & Palvarini, 2013; Rosen & Walks, 2013; Landman, 2012). Therefore, to examine the manifestation of social cohesion, the five prominent dimensions or domains proposed by Forrest & Kearns (2001) will be adopted because of their multidimensionality and applicability at different spatial scales. The five dimensions of social cohesion as proposed by the authors are as follows: social order and control; shared values and civil culture; social solidarity; social networks and connectedness; and a sense of place attachment and identity in the urban area.

The first dimension of social cohesion is the presence of social order and control in the neighbourhood. Social order and control refers to the absence of general conflict and incivility, a society where there is tolerance and respect for difference in intergroup diversity (Forrest & Kearns, 2001). The differences amongst the groups in the cities can be in terms of class, culture and race given the changing population composition in the urban areas. As Rosen & Walks (2013) indicate that 21 century cities are characterized by large population size, dense settlements and heterogeneity which result in a unique urban personality and lifestyle. Despite all these difference, it is important to maintain social order and control in the community system to ensure that all "the residents live peacefully with one another" (Mugnano & Palvarini, 2013; 42). The presence of social order and control could result to common values and culture in the neighbourhood.

The second important dimension to be considered for social cohesion is the presence of shared values and civic culture in the urban neighborhood. With regard to this dimension, Dekker & Bolt (2005) mention that the presence of a common set of values can be seen as one of the prerequisites of social cohesion that lead to mutual respect and understanding of each other in the urban areas. At the same time, it is likely that the presence of common values and culture in the neighborhood could ensure intergroup co-operation, and reduce hostility and prejudice on the basis of class, ethnic and gender within the residential urban area. However, given the persistence of social ills such as rising crime rates, youth unemployment, rising divorce rates and child-headed families, the formation of shared values and culture is constrained. Reason being that all these factors is considered as signs of an increasingly stressed society (Forrest & Kearns, 2001). Consequently, the affluent class turned to consider the socially strained group as having an

antisocial behaviour which in most cases result to social disorder in the urban neighborhood (Chaskin & Joseph, 2011). Therefore, it is important to promote the spirit of community solidarity so to limit the socioeconomic disparities in the community.

The third domain of social cohesion is the existence of strong social solidarity in the neighborhood. With regard to the social solidarity dimension, residents in the urban neighborhood are expected to take social obligations and be willing to assist each other (Forrest & Kearns, 2001) in case of need. The social obligation and the voluntary help may include sharing of information on available economic opportunities, particular by the affluent class to the poor group in the suburb. In this context, Chaskin & Joseph (2011) assume that the middle-income people have better access to both economic and political actors, thus they could assist in bringing change in the lives of the poor people in the urban landscape. Subsequently, when neighbours are supportive to each other, a sense of hope and security is created in the urban neighborhood. Therefore, social solidarity brings a sense of hope and security to the neighbours (Mugnano & Palvarini, 2013), and ultimately strengthens the social networks and connections in the cities.

The fourth dimension of social cohesion is the presence of social networks and connectedness in a neighborhood. In this regard, social networks and connectedness refers to social relationships between the people within a specific surrounding area in a city (Forrest & Kearns, 2001). According to the AHURI (2007) social networks and connectedness can be measured by variables such as participation in social activities, unpaid voluntary work and ability to access financial support from neighbours in an emergency situation. These measures indicate that social network and connectedness is physically oriented, thus personal contact of neighbours is the utmost way of building strong neighbourliness and friendships in the urban residential area. However, with the advancing of information technology, the nature of social network and connectedness has evolved. According to Forrest & Kearns (2001) the modern information technology social networks continuously erodes the bonds of spatial proximity and kinship in the society. Nonetheless, the bottom line is that both the physical and technological methods of social networking enable dialogue to take place between different people which could in turn develop a sense of place attachment and identity with the urban residential area.

The fifth domain of social cohesion is the felt sense of place attachment and identity with the housing and the entire built environment in the urban area. According to Dekker & Bolt (2005) the place attachment dimension encapsulates the idea that people have relationships not only with other people, but also with their immediate living environment. As such, the formation of place attachment and identity depends on two major factors. The first factor is the length of residence (Mugnano & Palvarini, 2013) and the second one is the housing tenure (Dekker & Bolt, 2005). With regard to the 'length of residence' factor, the elderly residents are more likely to have a strong feeling of place attachment and identity compared to the younger residents in the neighborhood. The reason for the elders to be strongly attached to their places is because of their physical limitations and also that they may have spent a long time in the area and usually do not expect to move in the short term (Dekker & Bolt, 2005). On the other hand, regarding the house tenure factor, home owners are perceived to have a strong sense of place attachment and identity than tenants. House owners have a strong feeling of place attachment and belonging than the renters who are inclined to think that they can leave the residence anytime to find another dwelling for lease (AHURI, 2007). In general, place attachment creates a feeling of security, builds self-esteem and self-image, provides a bond between people, cultures and experiences, and maintains group identity (Dekker & Bolt, 2005) which could lead to the building of social cohesion in mixed-income housing.

## **6. Potential for Building Social Cohesion in Post-Apartheid Urban South Africa's Mixed Residential Space**

Mixed-income housing projects are gradually transforming the urban landscape in South Africa's cities; the projects allow greater integration and diversity in the country's urban neighbourhood (Landman, 2010; Landman, 2012; Haferburg, 2013, Klug *et al.*, 2013). However, such housing model is not popular in the country (Onatu, 2010; Department of Human Settlement, 2014), but they seem to contribute in redressing the country's socio-spatial divisions, and have a potential to facilitate the creation of a socially cohesive society, as witnessed in different cities across the provinces of the country.

### **6.1 In Gauteng Province**

In the Gauteng Province, the typical example of the mixed-income housing is the Cosmo City. This residential development provides housing opportunities for a range of income groups in the City of Johannesburg. The housing provision ranges from subsidised housing to market housing which includes 5000 low-income housing units for households with a less than R3 500 per month and 3000 credit linked houses for households with a monthly income of between R3 500 and R8 000, as well as 3300 bonded houses for households with an income of about R15 000 per

month (Onatu, 2010). Central to this mixed-income residential project is the idea that the people of different income groups will become neighbours and share the social and economic facilities in their location. However, with the erection of the double fence between the different houses in the precinct, the physical interaction between the residents of different incomes becomes limited (Haferburg, 2013). This separation result to the creation of spatial buffer between the market-bonded housing and government subsidized housing units in the neighbourhood. Nonetheless, the residents still maintain their interaction through sharing the socioeconomic facilities in the vicinity of their residential development. These facilities include parks and recreational areas, commercial and retail centre, and the basketball court and cricket net (Onatu, 2010).

## 6.2 In Western Cape Province

In the Western Cape Province, social cohesion is seen to be manifesting in the Westlake village which is situated in the leafy Constantia valley, bordered by golf estates, a wine farm, nature reserve, and flanked by the busy M3 highway leading directly to Cape Town's CBD (Lamenski, 2006). In this context, the Westlake village is in close proximity to Silvertree estate which is one of the wealthy suburbs in the City of Cape Town, and is also close to economic opportunities. In terms of economic status, 45 % of the households in the Westlake village have a monthly income of R3 200 or less (Statistics South Africa (Stats SA), 2012). This implies that almost a half of the households in the Westlake village qualify for the government subsidised social housing. While in terms of population distribution, the Westlake village comprises of mixed racial groups, yet the Black African group is the predominating racial group. According to (Stats SA) (2012), the Westlake's population was 6 452, in which the Black African make 50%, Coloured 26%, White 21%, and 3% is other racial groups. Despite the racial differences in the village, the residents have a strong sense of place attachment and also shared the same spaces of employment and their children shared spaces of schooling (Muyeba & Seekings, 2010). Thus, the sharing of common facilities reflects the extent of functional integration in the residential area. However, it is still "one of the city's challenges to transform its spatial and social legacy into a more integrated and compact city, with mixed-use zoning areas that bring residents closer to work and offer opportunities to break down the social barriers" (City of Cape Town, 2013; 18). As such, it could be suggested that the provision of mixed-income housing can be one of the strategic intervention in this regard.

## 6.3 In Eastern Cape Province

The Amalinda residential project is one of the typical examples of mixed-income housing developments in the Eastern Cape Province. This residential development has a mix of building types with four types of dwelling units. This different building types vary in size; there are semi-detached or row houses and single house on a plot (Landman, 2012). The semi-detached houses are considered to be in a medium density form while the stand-alone singles houses are of a low density form. The housing variety also allows for greater choice to the residents and facilitates socioeconomic diversification. Furthermore, within the Amalinda residential development there is communal open space which serves as a recreational facility (Landman, 2012). The design and layout of this communal open space allows the residents to oversee from their houses, all the activities that are taking place at that facility. Apart from that, access to public transport services in the Amalinda residential development is facilitated with mini-bus taxis that drive through the development (Landman *et al.*, 2009). With this mode of transport, it becomes efficient for the Amalinda residents to commute from home to work. One of the key financiers of the Amalinda housing projects, the National Housing Finance Cooperation (NHFC), indicated that proximity to employment opportunities and public facilities was considered as a crucial factor during the design of the residential development (Landman, 2010). The NHFC is one of the institutions which were established by the government to search for new and better ways to mobilise finance for housing, from sources outside the State in partnership with the broadest range of private financial organisations (Department of Human Settlement, 2012). Therefore, the public-private partnership model is seen to be the effective and efficient method of delivering the mixed-income housing towards building a cohesive society (Haferburg, 2013; Klug *et al.*, 2013; Onatu, 2010).

## 6.4 In KwaZulu Natal Province

In the KwaZulu Natal Province, the Cornubia residential development is considered to be a model of mixed-income housing in the City of Durban. The Cornubia residential project is located within the Northern Corridor of Durban within the Municipality of eThekweni, approximately 25km from the Durban CBD and sits adjacent to the economic and investment nodes of uMhlanga in the east, Mount Edgecombe in the south, Ottawa and Phoenix in the west and Waterloo

in the north (Department of Human Settlements, 2014). It is bordered by the N2 freeway, M41 arterial and the Ohlanga River, 7km south of the new King Shaka International Airport (Department of Human Settlements, 2014). Therefore, it evidenced that the Cornubia settlement is strategically located since it is channelled into the two activity corridors and economic nodes. As such, the residents in the settlement are well linked to the major growth centres. Thus, the Cornubia residential project seems to have the potential to contribute to the integration of the Durban Metropolitan while redressing the spatial, economic and social historical urban design by bringing communities of different classes and race closer to socioeconomic opportunities in the urban area. Therefore, close proximity to socioeconomic infrastructure like shopping centres, government offices and transport facilities is important in a sense that it enables greater inclusion, provide more employment opportunities and reduce travel costs and time for the residents (Landman, 2010).

### 6.5 In Limpopo Province

The Thornhill residential development is a good example of a mixed-income housing development in the Limpopo Province. This privately owned residential property is situated on the outskirts of the Polokwane City; on an open space which was used by the apartheid government as a buffer strip to segregate settlement, adjacent to Bendor which is a previously "white-only" residential area, just along the N1 corridor (Polokwane Local Municipality, 2012). The Thornhill residential development comprises of four housing sections; Thornhill Estate, Fairview, The Village and The Willows. That is, the Thornhill Estate comprises 1 100 households and a clubhouse with a swimming pool, tennis court, squash court, gymnasium and entertainment area, as well as numerous landscaped walkways to all its residents; The village has 188 one-bedroom bachelor units and one and two-bedroom townhouses for rental purposes; Fairview offers 141 simplexes in two and three-storey walk-ups, and The Willows comprises 73 units of two to three-bedroom townhouses and 1.5-bedroom lofts (Landman, 2012). Therefore, this residential precinct provides different housing typologies for both ownership and rental tenure in order to accommodate people of various income, class and race in the Polokwane City. As such, the Thornhill residential development seems to engender socio-spatial integration, and thus create the potential for building social cohesion.

## 7. Conclusion

Based on the successful experiences of mixed-income housing projects in various cities in the country, it can be suggested that the establishment of the mixed-income housing has a potential to transform the socio-spatial division in the urban areas of the country. Subsequently, contributing to the creation of a compact inclusive cities where people of different incomes live in harmony and equally benefit from the social and economic opportunities available in the city. As a result, in this inclusive residential environment wherein the people from different socioeconomic backgrounds cooperatively interact, there are greater opportunities for building a cohesive urban society (Kearns & Mason, 2007 and Chaskin & Joseph, 2011). In this context, the consideration of the principles to measure the physical characteristics in the design of the residential build environment is important because, to a large extent, is believed to enable the manifestation of social cohesion. That is, the physical characteristics are considered as key success factor to the creation of inclusive mixed-income housing environment (Landman et al., 2009). Therefore, based on this premises, it could be maintained that mixed-income housing can foster the notion of inclusive compact city and socially cohesive community where the low-income and middle-income households can live in harmony and mutually enjoying the available socio-economic opportunities. However, the race factor could render urban social cohesion in a democratic South Africa an unachievable dream.

## References

- Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute (AHURI), (2007). Housing and Social Cohesion: An Empirical Exploration: Final Report No. 100. AHURI: Canberra.
- Ballard, R. (2004). Middle class neighbourhoods or 'African Kraals'? The impact of informal settlements and vagrants on post-apartheid white identity. *Urban Forum*, 15 (1), 48-73.
- Chaskin, R.J., & Joseph, M.L. (2011). Social interaction in mixed-income developments: relational expectations and emerging reality. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 33(2), 209-237.
- City of Cape Town. (2013). *Integrated Development Plan 2013/14 Review*. The City of Cape Town: Cape Town.
- Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR), (2011). Focus on Medium-density Mixed Housing: An Important Component in the Transformation of South African Housing Environments, 2011. CSIR: Pretoria.
- Dekker, K., & Bolt, G. (2005). Social cohesion in post-war estates in the Netherlands: differences between socioeconomic and ethnic

- groups. *Urban Studies*, 42(13), 2447-2470.
- Department of Housing, (2004). *Breaking New Grounds: A Comprehensive Plan for the Development of Sustainable Human Settlements*, 2004. Department of Housing: Pretoria.
- Department of Human Settlement, (2013). *Programmes and Subsidies*. Department of Human Settlement: Pretoria.
- Department of Human Settlement, (2014). *Cornubia: Celebrating 20 Years of Building Dreams 2014*. Department of Human Settlement: Pretoria.
- Forrest, R., & Kearns, A. (2001). Social cohesion, social capital and the neighbourhood. *Urban Studies*, 38(12), 2125-2143.
- Grant, J., & Mittelsteadt, L. (2004). Types of gated communities. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, (31), 913-930.
- Haferburg, C. (2013). Townships of to-morrow? Cosmo City and inclusive visions for post-apartheid urban futures. *Habitat International*, 4(39), 261-268.
- Klug, N., Rubin, M., & Todes, A. (2013). Inclusionary housing policy: a tool for re-shaping South Africa's spatial legacy? *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 28(1), 667-678.
- Lemanski, C. (2006). The impact of residential desegregation on social integration: Evidence from a South African neighbourhood. *Geoforum*, 37:417-435.
- Landman, K. (2010). A home close to opportunities in South Africa: Top down vision or bottom up demand? *Town and Regional Planning*, 56:8-17.
- Landman, K. (2012). Urban space diversity in South Africa: Medium density mixed developments. *Open House International*, 37 (2), 53-62.
- Landman, K., Matsebe, G., & Mmonwa, M. (2009). Assessing the physical characteristics of medium density mixed housing in South Africa. *Town and Regional Planning*, 54, 15-26.
- Macdonald, E. (2005). Street-facing dwelling units and liveability: The impacts of emerging building types in Vancouver's new high-density residential neighborhoods. *Journal of Urban Design*, 10(1), 13-38.
- Mugnano, S., & Palvarini, P. (2013). "Sharing space without hanging together": A case study of social mix policy in Milan. *Cities*, 35:417-422.
- Muyeba, S., & Seekings, J. (2010). Inter-racial attitudes and interactions in racially-mixed low-income neighbourhoods in Cape Town, South Africa. Centre for Social Science Research (CSSR), Working Paper No. 275.
- Onatu, G.O. (2010). Mixed-income housing development strategy: perspective on Cosmo City, Johannesburg, South Africa. *International Journal of Housing Markets and Analysis*, 3(3), 203-215.
- Osman, A., & Herthogs, P. (2010). Medium-density mixed housing: sustainable design and construction of South African social housing. Conference Proceedings, Reference: BE03-PAF.
- Polokwane Local Municipality, (2012). *Integrated Development Plan (IDP) 2012-2015*. Polokwane Local Municipality: Polokwane.
- Rosen, G., & Walks, A. (2013). Rising cities: Condominium development and the private transformation of the metropolis. *Geoforum*, 49, 160-172.
- Statistics South Africa (Stats SA), (2012). *Census 2011*, Statistics South Africa: Pretoria.
- Urban Landmark, (2008). *Case Studies on Integration: Summarised Case Studies and Concluding Comments 2008*. Urban Landmark: Hatfield.