

26th February 2024

## Feedback on draft White Paper for Human Settlements provided by Project Preparation Trust (PPT)

### Contents

1.	Introduction .....	2
2.	Insufficient analysis of historical challenges and non-state housing supply .....	3
3.	No clear pathways to scale .....	3
4.	Incremental planning arrangements as required by SPLUMA .....	3
5.	Statutory and regulatory flexibility .....	4
6.	Alternative tenure solutions .....	4
7.	Land value capture and urban land reform .....	5
8.	Densification, dense housing typologies and an efficient urban form .....	5
9.	Role of CSOs and support NGOs .....	5
10.	Understanding barriers to incremental informal settlement upgrading .....	6
11.	Participatory approaches .....	6
12.	Alternative building methods and housing support .....	6
13.	Enabling non-state rental housing .....	7
14.	Operating and maintenance costs of basic services .....	7
15.	Special Housing Needs Policy adopted by NDHS in 2022 .....	8
16.	Useful Resources .....	8
a.	<i>eThekwini City-wide Incremental Upgrading Strategy 2022</i> .....	8
b.	<i>Programme Management Upgrading Toolkit for Metros 2017</i> .....	9
c.	<i>National Special Housing Needs policy adopted by NDHS November 2022</i> .....	9
d.	<i>NDHS ‘Rethink’ of the National Housing Programme 2012</i> .....	10
e.	<i>Community Development Programme (CDP) in eThekwini 2023/4</i> .....	10
f.	<i>iQhaza Lethu Incremental Upgrading Partnership Programme in eThekwini 2018-22</i> .....	11
g.	<i>Innovative lightweight, double-story ‘LIFT’ house 2020</i> .....	11
17.	PPT’s contact and organisational details .....	12

# 1. Introduction

Whilst the draft White Paper prioritises certain key human settlement focus areas (five of them) and appears to signal a welcome shift away from state-funded top-structure provision as the primary focus and a shift towards a more state-enabled approach, it does not adequately recognise and accommodate a range of key challenges which need to be addressed in order to effectively transform human settlements in South Africa and move to greater scale. The analysis offered is in some respects outdated and does not sufficiently assimilate extensive learning and feedback provided over the past decade by civil society and academic organisations and several Metros, especially relating to informal settlements, informality and incrementalism. Whilst it does recognise the importance of various indirect levers of change, these are too narrowly and conventionally-focussed. Unless different approaches to informality and incrementalism are rapidly established, including greater statutory and regulatory flexibility and incremental planning and tenure arrangements, and unless there is more effective mobilisation of civil society partnerships and unlocking of non-state housing supply, the good intentions of the White Paper are likely to remain unfulfilled.

It is widely recognised that, despite large-scale delivery of state-funded housing units in S.A., housing backlogs including informal settlements are bigger now than they were in 1994. Large scale urbanisation continues and government at local level is becoming increasingly over-whelmed and unable to adequately cope. The existing 'tools' and approaches are not working. State-funded housing units cannot be delivered at sufficient scale and limited fiscal resources need to be more effectively utilised. This recognition appears to be implicit in the White Paper, although it is not directly and unequivocally stated. What is missing is an adequate analysis of what needs to change so that the alternative policy thrusts and enabling levers can produce real change and impact at scale.

There is, for example, no recognition that conventional formalisation of settlements is unviable making use of traditional town planning and tenure processes, and conventional building, engineering and other standards. A different mind-set towards human settlement transformation is urgently required which is more realistic, flexible, incremental, partnership-based and resource-efficient and where government works with, rather than against informality in its many facets. The White Paper as it stands does not offer sufficient recognition and direction in this regard.

It is noted that PPT has participated in a joint submission on the draft White Paper by eight prominent and experienced South African CSOs which was submitted on 16th February by Planact, Isandla Institute, Development Action Group (DAG), Community Organisation Resource Centre (CORC), Centre for Affordable Housing Finance in Africa (CAHF), Built Environment Support Group (BESG), Afesis and PPT.

The additional commentary offered below will hopefully be of assistance to the NDHS and other stakeholders in charting a more viable way forward. The feedback provided has been kept at a high, overview level, for ease of access. PPT can provide additional information, documents, resources, case studies and analysis relating to these and other key issues on request. It is recommended that the NDHS refer to the resources listed in section 16, including eThekweni's City-wide Incremental Upgrading Strategy (adopted June 2022) and the national Special Housing Needs Policy adopted by the NDHS in November 2022 as a starting point. Further information and resources (including most listed in section 16) are available on PPT's website

[www.pptrust.org.za](http://www.pptrust.org.za) .

## 2. Insufficient analysis of historical challenges and non-state housing supply

**There is limited analysis of what has prevented more effective and at-scale housing provision in South Africa and no analysis and understanding of large-scale non-state housing supply:** Whilst there is a suggestion of a shift away from state-funded housing towards a more state-enabled approach, the White Paper is ambivalent in this regard when it comes to the identified policy priorities, and the enabling levers which have been identified are insufficiently focussed. This reflects a failure to adequately evaluate historical constraints and take stock of the current housing environment in South Africa in which most housing is being provided by means of various informal mechanisms and by the private sector in various ways. Most housing supply is organic, yet insufficiently understood, enabled or supported by government. There is no analysis of existing (large-scale) non-state housing supply in its many facets (e.g. informal settlements, rural housing on traditional land, informal or semi-formal rental). A key point of departure should be a clear recognition, understanding and analysis of this situation and the identification of key measures or levers which can more effectively enable, improve and optimise existing, non-state housing supply in its many forms. The fact that we appear to have no good data on the scale and characteristics of non-state housing supply in S.A. since 1994, especially in low income communities such as rural/traditional areas, townships and informal settlements, is a problem. As a result, there is inadequate understanding as to what measures can be taken by the state, working in concert with the private sector and CSO partners, to optimise the supply in terms of its quality, location and tenure security, and to thus unlock improved and more inclusive property markets, formal and less-formal.

## 3. No clear pathways to scale

**The selection of policy options shows promise, but there are critical gaps regarding how these can be implemented at scale:** The five key policy options selected appear to reflect a welcome shift away from direct state-funded top-structure delivery. The policy options presented are: (i) Spatial Planning and Demand Management; (ii) Land for Housing and Human Settlements; (iii) Informal Settlements Upgrading; (iv) Affordable Rental Housing; and (v) Affordable Housing. There are however significant gaps when it comes to the detail of how these can be more effectively implemented and in particular in respect of what specific enabling levers of change need to be addressed and activated. Some of these are touched on in the following sections.

## 4. Incremental planning arrangements as required by SPLUMA

**Spatial planning and demand management does not include incremental development areas – a major lost spatial and urban land reform opportunity:** There is a massive missed spatial planning, land reform and housing demand management opportunity by not including and addressing the establishment of incremental planning and land use arrangements for informal settlement upgrading, or at least referencing this. In cities like eThekweni, most informal settlements are well-located. If incremental planning and tenure arrangements can be established, this would constitute the most significant and at-scale urban restructuring and land reform opportunity in South Africa. Instead the focus appears to be mainly on townships and rural areas

which is disappointing. Although ‘differentiated norms and standards’ are mentioned these are in no way linked to the need for statutory and regulator flexibility in respect of such issues as land use planning, planning and building regulations, and environmental and water use regulations. Communities are building cities outside of existing (formal) regulations and controls and municipalities are being left behind whilst this happens. It is evident that formal planning, building and environmental processes are unworkable in the context of incremental upgrading. The same applies in many rural and peri-urban areas, including those under traditional leaders. More flexible approaches and solutions are accordingly necessary and urgently required. This will need to include promoting improved land use norms via social processes rather than regulation and enforcement. It is emphasised that SPLUMA requires municipalities to develop and implement incremental planning arrangements to better accommodate informal settlements and rural areas, but as yet, there has been no meaningful progress in moving this forward. There is no middle road between full formal processes and unmanaged informality. This is unsustainable into the future and must be addressed if change at scale is to be achieved along with more inclusive urbanisation, urban land reform and land value capture.

## 5. Statutory and regulatory flexibility

### **Statutory and regulatory flexibility is not recognised as a critical, cross-cutting enabling lever of change:**

As outlined above, there is no recognition anywhere in the White Paper that, without significant statutory and regulatory flexibility, no progress can be made in respect of incremental development and owner-driven housing consolidation, not only in the context of informal settlement upgrading but also rural areas. Regulatory flexibility is required in multiple areas including incremental planning and land use arrangements, less formal building standards, and more streamlined environmental and water use licence processes.

## 6. Alternative tenure solutions

**Tenure security – alternative, incremental tenure solutions are not recognised or prioritised (as an alternative to title deeds):** Despite correctly identifying ‘secure land tenure’ as being key to upgrading and recognising that this obstructs the ability of households to upgrade their dwellings, there is no recognition that conventional, formal tenure (title deeds) are unworkable in most incremental upgrades (due amongst other things to the impossibility of achieving formal town planning, environmental, engineering services, building and other approvals). It is recognised that a lack of household-level tenure security in informal settlements in eThekweni Municipality (and elsewhere) constitutes a key barrier to the comprehensive, incremental upgrading of informal settlements and urban change management in the Municipality. Unless the urban poor enjoy secure and transferable rights to the land they occupy, they cannot be empowered as co-drivers in upgrading, working more collaboratively with the Municipality and upgrading support organisations. Because residents currently lack secure tenure rights, they currently have little or no incentive to invest in their own improved housing, re-organise space or pay for services such as electricity. They are also deprived of the opportunity of building property assets. Vast tracts of well-located land therefore remain un-improved with significant health, safety and environmental threats (e.g. fire, faecal and solid waste contamination of the environment). Without tenure security, settlements will continue to densify and living conditions deteriorate.

## 7. Land value capture and urban land reform

**Incremental tenure and planning arrangements can unlock land value capture, owner-driven housing investments, spatial reform and large scale urban land reform:** As outlined in the preceding sections, incremental planning and alternative tenure arrangements, coupled with appropriate statutory and regulatory flexibility, re-blocking to establish service access ways and the provision of better integrated less interim services, are the key to unlocking spatial change, urban land reform and land value capture. It is critical that real tenure rights (linked to particular rights holders and spatially defined sites (polygons) be established as rapidly as possible. Without this no meaningful change can be achieved. The urban poor will remain landless and without assets they can improve, invest in and leverage. They will also be unable to enter into cooperative relationships with Municipalities and be incentivised to become more responsible and engaged citizens (e.g. by paying for services and desisting from illegal connections), but will instead remain outsiders of the City in the most material dimensions.

## 8. Densification, dense housing typologies and an efficient urban form

**Informal settlements already constitute amongst the most-dense, if not the most-dense, precincts in many cities, especially in those areas which are well-located:** Densities in informal settlements in eThekweni typically vary from 150-300 dwelling units per hectare (and often more). If the services, layouts and housing quality in informal settlements can be improved then these high settlement densities can be largely retained, limiting or avoiding relocations. This is especially so if partially pedestrianised layouts are accepted and utilised and some households can start investing in double-story houses in order to liberate more space for service access ways (e.g. using building methods such as the innovative lightweight, double story, timber frame 'LIFT' housing unit developed collaboratively for steep slopes in eThekweni and described in more detail section 16e).

## 9. Role of CSOs and support NGOs

**No specific provision made for the expanded involvement of CSOs and support NGOs** – CSO collaboration is entirely absent from the core sections of the White Paper dealing with policy options and policy enablers, despite commitments from the National Minister in December 2023 to partner more closely with the CSO sector (and similar commitments by the preceding Minister) and despite the important role of CSOs being referred to in general terms elsewhere in the White Paper (e.g. 1.7 indicates that the responsibility to give effect to the intent of the White Paper rests with a range of stakeholders including civil society organisations, non-governmental organisations, communities; Participation of the state, private sector, and, civil society organisations is recognised in the section on theoretical grounding page 38; mobilising communities, business, civil society, professional bodies, non-governmental organisations listed as being one of the mechanism for policy implementation on page 81). Without procurement and funding mechanisms to more effectively tap the critical capacity and expertise of CSOs and support NGOs, progress will remain severely hampered. This takes place against a long history of failures to establish effective CSO and NGO partnerships, dating back to the failed rejuvenation and optimising of PHP (at one point rebranded 'Community-driven Housing' or 'Enhanced PHP') and extensive related CSO engagement between 2009-2011 as well as a stalled National CSO Partnership Agreement signed off by the previous Minister early in the Covid19 lockdowns in

2020, but which failed at the implementation stage, despite the development of a comprehensive implementation framework (in the form of a CSO Engagement Plan) which entailed extensive engagement and consultation with the CSO sector.

## 10. Understanding barriers to incremental informal settlement upgrading

**Informal settlement upgrading – inadequate understanding of prevailing barriers to incremental upgrading at scale and what is required to overcome them:** It is heartening to see that there is recognition of the importance of incremental upgrading via UISP approaches and a commitment to increasing resource allocation in this regard (page 49). However, there is no recognition of any of the key barriers which have historically prevented the scaling up of incremental upgrading nor how these can be overcome, relating, for example, to: more effective participation and CSO partnerships; statutory and regulatory flexibility; incremental planning and tenure solutions; bulk services constraints; ongoing O&M costs of basic services provided being unsustainable for municipalities; insufficient buy-in to incremental upgrading and continued prioritisation of conventional housing delivery at insufficient scale to meet total demand/backlogs; dealing with private land and in particular utilising legal mechanisms (based on several Senior Counsel legal opinions) that enable the provision of basic services on incremental upgrades in advance of land acquisition subject to specified processes being followed (categorisation, landowner notices etc.). Extensive feedback on these barriers and issues have been provided to the NDHS on many occasions by both municipalities and civil society organisations. PPT can provide further information and documents on request. Suffice to say that the notion of conventionally upgrading all informal settlements in S.A. via township establishment and other formal processes is unrealistic and now acceptable as being unviable and unscaleable. Incremental upgrading is an ongoing process requiring significant flexibility. Given the scale and complexity of informal settlements, just providing secure tenure and basic services to all households will take decades and, as noted above, will necessitate, amongst other things, extensive regulatory flexibility and more effective community and CSO partnerships.

## 11. Participatory approaches

**Participatory approaches – no pathway defined to achieve this:** Whilst it is good to see that these are duly recognised in the Paper, there are no mechanisms or solutions offered for how this can be more effectively achieved in future and no analysis of why this has not occurred sufficiently historically (e.g. no framework for funding and procurement of CSO partnerships, insufficient funding for social facilitation and participation, tendency to see upgrading as a once-off project instead of an ongoing process which is socially-driven taking long periods of time). Refer also to section 9 above for further relevant details.

## 12. Alternative building methods and housing support

**Formal building standards are unrealistic and out of step with how people build their own housing – unless there is accommodation of alternative, ‘less-formal’ building methods, there will be no clear pathway to scale:** Ordinary people, including the poor, continue to build their own housing in South Africa. This is the pre-dominant form of housing supply. It is critical that ways are found to encourage and support people to build using better methods and materials, but at the same time is not realistic to expect low income

households to build to national building regulation standards. The focus should be on those aspects of building regulations and controls that relate to health and safety (e.g. structural integrity and fire safety). Additional factors such as building materials, floor-area per person, thermal performance, and cross ventilation, whilst desirable, should be approached in a more flexible manner. It is notable that there is no provision for mixed material structures (wood and metal) in the national building codes and that building with such materials, whilst common in many other countries (e.g. USA, Europe, Australia), has not been embraced in S.A. outside of informal settlements. Refer also to section 8, including the example of the LIFT housing unit.

## 13. Enabling non-state rental housing

**Rental housing – omission of the critical role of informal and other non-state funded rental housing and how these can be more effectively supported and enabled:** Although the prominence of informal rental housing is noted, there is no accommodation of informal and other non-state assisted rental housing within the policy. Non-state supported rental housing, including informal rental, is the dominant rental supply in the country, especially for poor and low income households, yet the policy offers no proactive and innovative ideas about how this core rental supply / market could be more effectively supported or enabled, both directly and indirectly. It is noted that directly-provided state-funded rental housing (e.g. social housing, CRUs) is not scale-able due amongst other things to difficulties in collecting rentals, a culture of non-payment, high operating and management costs, a lack of institutional capacity to manage stock, high capital investment requirements by the state etc. In this context, informal and other forms of non-state-provided rental stock are critical if scale is to be achieved. Government needs to carefully consider what actions it can take to support and optimise such rental housing, principally through various indirect means (e.g. more flexible land use norms and building standards; alternative forms of tenure security etc.).

## 14. Operating and maintenance costs of basic services

**The ongoing operating and maintenance costs of basic services, especially those provided as part of incremental upgrading, pose a severe constraint in moving to scale:** Municipalities such as eThekweni are unable to continue to sustain (not to mention scale up) basic services such as communal ablutions due to the prohibitive operating and maintenance (O&M) costs, including those of refurbishment and recapitalisation. The asset lifecycle costs of basic services infrastructure needs to be factored into Human Settlements plans and strategies (e.g. the average life of communal ablutions (CABs) in eThekweni is typically only around 10 years given the heavy use they incur and a certain level of irresponsible user behaviour). This critical issue needs to at least be referenced and acknowledged as a key constraint in the White Paper, even if the NDHS does not have an immediate solution to it within the sphere of its own resources and direct influence. Most low income communities are unable to contribute to any significant degree to basic services maintenance costs. Typically, the only service informal settlement residents pay for is pre-paid electricity, and even then, many if not most households in eThekweni still make use of illegal connections (despite the Municipality's progressive policy of electrifying informal structures wherever possible). This situation can potentially change over time as incremental planning and tenure arrangements are established and basic services access improve, however this will take time to achieve. If municipalities cannot sustain basic services provision, then the notion of more sustainable human settlements is fatally undermined.

## 15. Special Housing Needs Policy adopted by NDHS in 2022

**Most vulnerable people and Special Housing Needs Policy adopted by NDHS 2022:** Although it is welcomed that most-vulnerable persons are prioritised in principle in the White Paper, such groups are too narrowly defined. As it stands, only the elderly, women, child-headed families, people living with disabilities are specified and they are only positioned only within the framework of existing (conventional) subsidy mechanisms. There is no mention of the Special Housing Needs (SHN) Policy which was adopted by the Human Settlements Minister in late 2022. In addition to reconsidering how a broader spectrum of most-vulnerable persons can be better accommodated and prioritised within the key policy levers identified so as to limit exclusion of and prejudice to such persons, reference to the SHN policy would also be appropriate. The policy provides for group housing and care for, amongst others, orphans and vulnerable children, victims of domestic or gender based violence, persons with disabilities, older persons, terminally ill persons etc. It is housing provided principally by registered NPOs under the oversight of relevant oversight Departments (e.g. DSD and DOH) and under various statutory provisions (e.g. foster care homes, shelters and places of safety for victims of gender based violence, assisted living, frail care, child and youth care centres, homes for persons with disabilities etc.). The Policy enables NPOs to apply for capital grant funding to DHS with support of relevant oversight Department (e.g. DSD / DOH). Many stakeholders are not yet aware of this Policy and there has not yet been an official launch. There has however been advice to provincial HODs from the NDHS regarding the Policy and the DHS and DSD are collaborating in respect of support for implementation of the Policy making use of the SHN guidelines which have been developed.

## 16. Useful Resources

There are extensive useful resources which the NDHS can draw on in strengthening the White Paper. These include policies and strategies of the NDHS, Provincial DHSs, and Municipalities as well as extensive research and document project experience and learning by various CSOs and support NGOs in South Africa. A few of these outlined below.

### *a. eThekweni City-wide Incremental Upgrading Strategy 2022*

*eThekweni City-wide Incremental Upgrading Strategy adopted by eThekweni Municipality in June 2022:* This is a ground-breaking Strategy and the first of its kind in South Africa. It was informed amongst other things by extensive engagement with national government and other Metros and taking into account local and international best practice. Amongst other things it establishes the following progressive and necessary approaches and innovation: incremental planning and alternative tenure arrangements; legal mechanisms for providing basic services on private land in advance of land acquisition; optimised basic services provision including services frames and related re-blocking; community participation and CSO partnerships; differentiated city-wide pipeline planning. The Strategy is available from eThekweni Human Settlements Unit or from PPT upon request.



## *b. Programme Management Upgrading Toolkit for Metros 2017*

*A Programme Management Upgrading Toolkit for Metros* was developed collaboratively in 2016-2017 by Cities Support Programme (National Treasury), National Human Settlements, and the National Upgrading Support Programme (NUSP) with technical support by PPT and funded by the World Bank. The purpose was to enable municipalities and practitioners in South Africa (and elsewhere) to undertake incremental upgrading in a more programmatic, effective and scaled up (city-wide) fashion. The Toolkit is the first of its kind globally in terms of its programmatic orientation, its focus on the full spectrum of core upgrading issues and its comprehensive smart-referenced resource library containing 368 local and international upgrading resources. The toolkit is also distinct from prior toolkits in being focussed principally at the programme level and addressing the question of 'how to scale up' instead of being focussed at the project level and 'how to undertake an upgrading project'. The full Toolkit is available online on the CSP website at [https://csp.treasury.gov.za/Resource%20\\_Centre/Conferences/Pages/CSP-Tools.aspx](https://csp.treasury.gov.za/Resource%20_Centre/Conferences/Pages/CSP-Tools.aspx) (see item 2 Human Settlements). It is also available from PPT on request.

## *c. National Special Housing Needs policy adopted by NDHS*

*November 2022*

As outlined in section 15, the National Special Housing Needs Policy was adopted by the NDHS in November 2022 having been developed through a process of multi-stakeholder consultation in 2014/15 and with implementation guidelines having been developed in 2019/20. For the purposes of the National Housing Programme, special housing needs refers to housing opportunities for persons who, for a variety of reasons, are unable to live independently in normal housing or require assistance in terms of a safe, supportive and protected living environment and who need some level of care or protection, be it on a permanent or temporary basis. Special housing for purposes of the Programme refers to the following categories of persons who earn below R7 500 per month and includes: Orphans and vulnerable children (OVC's); Older persons; Persons with physical disabilities; Persons with intellectual and psycho social disabilities; Victims of domestic abuse and similar crimes; The terminally ill and frail persons (including those infected by HIV/AIDS); The homeless or destitute or those living on the street (including children); Those receiving substance abuse rehabilitation services; Other vulnerable people such as victims of serious crime and victims of human trafficking. The Programme will fund the development of a variety of housing typologies, adhering to the National Building Regulations, the Ministerial National Norms and Standards of the Department of Human Settlements and the building requirements imposed by the National Home Builders Registration Council and the Departments of Social Development and Health, (where applicable) and/or the Municipality. The facilities may comprise of the following, but not limited to: New multi-level residential units; New row houses and/or semi-detached units of various designs; New free standing units in close proximity and fenced off for security purposes; Refurbishing of existing units; and Conversion of non-residential buildings into residential use or existing residential properties for special needs purposes. More information can be obtained from the Policy and related Implementation Guidelines which are available within the NDHS.

#### d. NDHS *'Rethink' of the National Housing Programme 2012*

As an input to a Human Settlements Green Paper which was intended for development in 2013, the NDHS's Policy Unit commissioned a *'Rethink' of the National Housing Programme* in 2011 and the policy piece was completed in 2012 (undertaken by a project team procured for the purpose consisting of PPT, Urban LandMark and a diverse team of professionals and supported by a carefully selected policy reference group). The Project arose from concerns within Government as to the current trajectory and effectiveness of the national housing programme which are shared by many within civil society and the private sector and related principally to what is typically referred to as the 'un-sustainability' of the current programme, not only in respect of its affordability to the fiscus but also in respect of the nature of the socio-economic benefits and leverages which were being achieved. Despite increasing housing expenditure and extensive delivery of state-subsidised houses, significant backlogs persisted, access to economic opportunities and social facilities were recognised as often not improving, subsidised housing quality was variable and there was a prevailing sense of beneficiary passivity. There was also broad-based recognition that certain fundamental human settlement challenges were not being adequately addressed or accommodated such as informality, spatial restructuring, land-access for the poor, and affordable rental housing. These persistent challenges were recognised as posing not only developmental but strategic threats to South Africa if they were not more effectively and rapidly responded to. Against this backdrop, the Project was set the ambitious goal of rethinking the national housing programme yet it was also limited in its scope and budget and based only on a desktop review of existing materials and bodies of work. It was therefore seen as a 'think-piece' and one of many inputs into the afore-mentioned Green Paper process. The Housing Rethink Policy project included a detailed situational analysis and various policy recommendations. Amongst other things it envisioned a shift away from a narrow, top-structure focussed approach to human settlements and an increased focus on public realm investments. The project documents are available from the Policy Section of the NDHS and copies can also be obtained from PPT who led the project. It is however noted that the project document is regarded as internal to the NDHS and was never released publically.

#### e. *Community Development Programme (CDP) in eThekweni 2023/4*

*Community Development Programme (CDP) in eThekweni* – CDP is a national partnership initiative involving informal settlement communities, civil society organisations (CSOs) and municipalities. The pilot phase is a partnership between the eThekweni Municipality, PPT and seven informal settlement communities (Quarry Road, Palmiet Drive, Havelock, Bhambayi Phase 3, Progress Place, Dakota Beach and Ezimbeleni). It supports incremental upgrading through improving basic services, reducing health and safety threats and strengthening local capacity and resilience. Local community members undertake various community-based functions including those relating to solid waste management, fire prevention, and planning and coordination. A total of 112 community workers have been appointed to date and are receiving basic stipends for solid waste collection, fire marshal and community coordination functions. The initiative focuses mainly on: solid waste management; fire prevention and response; incremental tenure and planning arrangements; owner-driven housing improvements and related re-blocking. Further information regarding the CDP in eThekweni is

available from eThekweni's Human Settlements Unit or from PPT and information on it is also contained on PPT's website [www.pptrust.org.za](http://www.pptrust.org.za) .

## f. *iQhaza Lethu Incremental Upgrading Partnership Programme in eThekweni 2018-22*

*iQhaza Lethu Incremental Upgrading Partnership Programme eThekweni 2018-2022:* iQhaza Lethu was a 4 year initiative which focused on establishing and mainstreaming incremental, partnership-based upgrading in eThekweni Municipality, with an emphasis on building the enabling capacity, institutional relationships, partnerships and methods for moving to scale. It has a two-pronged focus on pilot projects (in order to innovate and demonstrate alternative upgrading methods) and strengthening and optimising the overall city-wide upgrading programme. iQhaza Lethu means 'our initiative' and is co-funded by the European Union, eThekweni Municipality and PPT. The programme achieved multiple ground-breaking achievements and impacts including those relating to various upgrading innovations co-developed by local communities, PPT and the Municipality working in collaboration. Many of these helped inform eThekweni's City-wide Incremental Upgrading Strategy e.g. relating to incremental planning and tenure solutions; new double story lightweight LIFT housing typology; services frames and re-blocking; eThekweni informal settlement database and pipeline planning methods; use of drone aerial photography, structure mapping and socio-economic surveys to enable more effective and locally-responsive planning; strengthened municipal capacity and partnership arrangements. Further information regarding the iQhaza Lethu is available from eThekweni's Human Settlements Unit or from PPT and information on it is also contained on PPT's website [www.pptrust.org.za](http://www.pptrust.org.za) .

## g. *Innovative lightweight, double-story 'LIFT' house 2020*

*Double-story, lightweight, 'LIFT' house:* An innovative lightweight, low-cost, double-story housing typology was successfully developed by PPT and a team of architects and engineers working in collaboration with the Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC), eThekweni Municipality and local communities in 2019/2020. The unit type has been termed the 'LIFT' house type (this being the acronym for Light-weight, Improved, Fire-safe, Timber-frame) or 'Indlu-lamithi' in isiZulu (meaning 'the wood frame house which stands tall' like a giraffe). The house is compliant in all material respects with the building standards for a timber frame structure (SANs code 10082), is engineer-certified, and has been certified as safe from a fire safety point of view by an independent fire specialist. It is noted that there is no accommodation of alternative materials in current building regulations. The typology is a response to the need for a more appropriate building technology for steep, densely populated and well located informal settlements in order to optimise scarce land, open up space for services and to enable residents to improve their own housing over time. The foundations and weight of conventional housing render it unviable on these sites because it will typically destabilise the steep slopes. By contrast, the lightweight, timber-frame structure with micro-pile foundations and metal cladding does not require cut-and-fill excavations or retaining walls and can function safely with minimal disturbance to the site. It is also low-cost, utilising readily-available 'low-tech' materials and can be built by local builders and making use of building methods familiar to local residents and

community builders. Importantly the LIFT unit optimises scarce, well-located land. The units enable a more functional alternative urban form on eThekweni's typically steep sites, including in respect of improved space utilisation, health and safety. A demonstration unit of the LIFT house was built in Parkington informal settlement in 2020 and has survived a severe fire event since then which destroyed informal 'shack' structures. Although it was planned for rollout on de-densification relocation sites, various technical and institutional factors have delayed this, including some hesitance regarding the technology from certain officials and decision makers given that it falls outside of the conventional construction and NHBRC envelope. Further information regarding the LIFT house is available from eThekweni's Human Settlements Unit or from PPT and information on it is also contained on PPT's website [www.pptrust.org.za](http://www.pptrust.org.za) .

## 17. PPT's contact and organisational details

Project Preparation Trust of KwaZulu-Natal (PPT) is an independent non-profit organisation established in 1993 to help promote transformation and change in South Africa and in particular to assist in addressing a range of deeply entrenched development challenges. PPT specialises in developmental projects and initiatives for disadvantaged communities and special needs groups and works closely with communities, government, donors and other civil society organisations in achieving its mission. PPT prepares and manages projects at scale, develops policies and strategies and innovates based on real-world experience. PPT is a registered Trust (IT9609/1993), a registered Non-Profit Organisation (NPO 065-849) and a registered Public Benefit Organization (930026332).

For further information please refer to PPT's website [www.pptrust.org.za](http://www.pptrust.org.za) or contact PPT's CEO, Mark Misselhorn, at [markm@pptrust.co.za](mailto:markm@pptrust.co.za) .