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Abstract—The primary aim of this paper is to present a conceptual evaluation of the core housing delivery programmes currently being implemented in South Africa. The following programmes have been assessed: enhanced People’s Housing Process (ePHP), the Integrated Residential Development Programme (IRDP) and Social Housing Programme (SHP); based on the notion that the Department of Human Settlement (DHS) has identified them as the core programmes for housing delivery. A conceptual overview of the programmes is presented, inclusive of the challenges and problems of each of the programmes. The paper also evaluates which has been more successful in terms of human capital development in South Africa. One of the primary findings emanating from the study revealed that the People’s Housing Process (PHP) now enhanced (ePHP) has been more successful in terms of human capital development in South Africa, while the other programmes need more attention and improvement in order to meet up with the set policy objectives. It is thus recommended that ePHP should be adopted as a major programme by the Department of Human Settlement in order to overcome the ever growing housing backlog in the country and to develop and economically empower the disadvantaged groups in South Africa who are primarily the beneficiaries of the houses being delivered.
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I. INTRODUCTION

A substantial portion of the production of basic services and housing stock in the cities of the Global South lies in the ability to develop and tenaciously implement adequate housing policy programmes that will meet the demand of the present and of the future [1]. Hence the only way to intensify new and energize existing effort towards the demand of urbanisation for the Global South in the years to come is through better urban policies and practices. However, the concept of policy and it formulation has an overarching focus that is aimed to bring order and a better way of meeting housing demand in any society. Therefore, Anderson [2] defined policy as a guiding principle used to set direction in an organization. It can be a course of action to guide and influence decisions such as in housing development. Anderson [2] further informs that policy should be used as a guide to decision making under a given set of circumstances within the framework of objectives, goals and management philosophies as determined by management. Likewise, policy may also refer to as the process of making important organizational decisions, including the identification of different alternatives such as programs or spending priorities, and choosing among them on the basis of the impact they will have and on the specific context of implementation. Also, Jiboye [3] posits that a policy can be understood as political, management, financial, and administrative mechanisms arranged to reach explicit goals. It can be summarised as a plan of action, a statement of aims and ideas. Anderson [2] asserts that two types of policies exist in any setting. The first being rules: frequently used as employee policies, formulated by the management of an organisation guiding the conduct of all employees. The second is mini-mission statements frequently associated with procedures, which is the category that housing policy falls into, which is think rules versus missions. Policy is not usually used to denote what is actually done; but it is normally referred to as either procedure or protocol. However a policy will contain the ‘what’ and the ‘why’, while, procedures or protocols contain the ‘what’, the ‘how’, the ‘where’, and the ‘when’. Policies are generally adopted by the board of an entity or the governance within an organization or a national state when the content is at par with the development goals of the entity. Policies are thus well reasoned, carefully articulated and presented document [3].

Furthermore, a housing policy is a guideline provided by government through the negotiation of various bodies in the country as put together by the government, which is intended at meeting the housing need and demand of the people. This is normally done through a set of suitable approaches including fiscal, institutional framework, legal and regulatory frameworks [4]. Therefore, a housing policy provides a guide which defines action and sets goals but does not necessarily specify any defined strategies for achieving the goal other than broad strategies [4] [3]. Housing policy decisions usually (either written or implied) prompts the overall past and present work of government while others are goal statement or prescription of elemental rules for the conduct of personal or organizational affairs. Housing policy is fundamentally necessary as a guide or control on the various actors in the housing sector.

Hence, since 1994, the South African Government has initiated and implemented several housing delivery programmes and Housing Subsidy mechanisms to provide...
housing to its citizens thus eliminating the incidence of slum housing associated with poverty. Over the last seventeen years, the government has vigorously ensured that essential services were made available to advance the lives of the low income group. This is done to fulfil the housing vision for all South Africans and most specially to the poor, and the disadvantaged groups, which is reflected in the National Housing Policy framework (NHPF); to increase housing share in the total State budget to five percent and to increase housing delivery on a sustainable basis to a peak level of 338 000 units per annum, within a five year period, and to reach the target of the Government of National Unity of 1,000,000 houses in five years according to the South African Government, in 1994. The delivery of 1 million houses has since be surpassed and as at the end of 2010, the Department of Human Settlement (DHS) informed that government had given out 3,0 million houses, giving shelter to more than 13,5 million people, free of charge. Despite the quantum of delivery, approximately 70% of households in SA are still currently excluded from access to housing credit through the formal banking sector [5]. However, through the housing subsidy scheme which is one of the main policy instruments, the lower 40% of households, for which housing credit is not a viable option, are provided with a housing unit. The upper income bracket of the subsidy scheme, require end user finance to access a housing product. Thus 30% of the South Africa population are under- or un-served as a result of the conventional banking sector being unable to service them due to: structural incompatibilities; insufficient capacity in the emerging; increasingly successful but inadequately funded specialized lending sector; and insufficient focus by Government and the private sector on alternative tenure forms. Following intensive local and international research, the National Department of Human Settlements concluded that four mutually comprehensive and supportive approaches should be adopted in order to assist the under- and un-served portion of the population to access housing. The approaches include: government initiative aimed at facilitating and encouraging the formal banking sector to increase lending to the lower end of the housing market; proactive steps to foster growth and development of the emerging alternative lending sector; a major initiative to stimulate the provision of housing under a variety of tenure options; and mechanisms to substantially promote and expand the amount of personal savings mobilized in the housing process [6].

South Africa housing programme was redirected when the Breaking New Ground Policy (BNG) was enacted in 2004. BNG is also known as the Comprehensive Plan for the Development of Sustainable Human Settlements. This is the most recent major policy that was developed by the then National Department of Housing and adopted in September 2004. The plan builds on the 1994 White Paper on Housing, but shifts the focus of the national housing programme from simply ensuring the delivery of affordable housing units to qualifying beneficiaries, to ensuring that adequate housing are built in settlements that are both sustainable and pleasant and is available for all. The plan is intended to herald a shift in paradigm and approaches to national housing policy in the country. The main aim of the plan is to ensure the creation of sustainable human settlements. This according to the Plan will be achieved through the inclusion of social and economic amenities such as schools, clinics and community halls in future development, which is already been done in some housing projects constructed after the Plan was passed and by ensuring that housing becomes a major job creation sector for the poor and the country at large.

The South African state can be commended on the number of houses it has built over the years, notwithstanding the problems with them (not the emphasis of this study) given the enormous challenges that it faced in 1994 and the extent to which it has re-evaluated and reformulated its policies over time given weak assumptions, failures and new challenges [7]. However, Charlton and Kihato [8] argues that the housing policy shifts that have occurred since 1994 were most often reactions to weaknesses in policy implementation, or were driven by other agendas such as political pressure or internal departmental politics. Charlton and Kihato [8] further informs that the policies are not, however, explicitly rooted in a rigorous interrogation of the needs of the poor, such as the impact of housing programmes on livelihoods and economic activity of the poor beneficiaries. Also, Tissington [7] argues that the policies do not appear to have gone through a clear process of housing policy evolution underpinned by a rigorous conceptual framework. Nonetheless, it can be generally agreed that the housing policy in South Africa could deliver on the constitutional vision of housing provision when interpreted and implemented correctly. Hence, this paper evaluates the major housing delivery programmes currently being implemented in South Africa. The following programmes will be assessed: enhanced People’s Housing Process (ePHP), the Integrated Residential Development Programme (IRDP) and the Social Housing Programme (SHP) based on the notion that the Department of Human Settlement (DHS) has identified them as core programmes for housing delivery. Overviews of the programmes are presented. The paper also assesses which has been more successful in terms of human capital development in South Africa to date. The scope of the study is only focused on housing delivery programmes and housing related issues in South Africa in order to determine the most effective programme in meeting the objectives of the National Housing Policy.

II. HOUSING POLICY TRENDS IN SOUTH AFRICA

The housing environment in South Africa is complex, in large part due to the deliberate policy and legislative framework of socio-economic and spatial exclusion and marginalisation created during apartheid, but also due to failures and a full understanding of the created problems through the apartheid government on the part of the post-apartheid state to satisfactorily redress these problems since 1994. However, it must be genuinely acknowledged that the post-apartheid state governance has been actively involved in trying to create a level playground for the disadvantage and
also trying to repair the disadvantage condition created by the almost 42 years of the apartheid regime. As with other socio-economic rights, the legislative and policy framework created by the national government around housing is in fact quite progressive. However, implementation to date has been skewed and unable to address the land, housing and basic services needs of millions of poor South Africans who still lack adequate housing and other socio-economics amenities [9]. While the urban and rural spatial divide remains pronounced in respect of access to socio-economic goods and services, the phenomenon of the inadequately housed urban poor is increasing.

Much of the debate in respect of South Africa housing policy has been centred on the political-economic background of the policy itself. The policy has been described by some as an extension of World Bank neo-liberalism, while others have labelled it as economically conservative [10]. However the South Africa housing policy is rather the result of a mixed bag of international influences and local creativity- mostly due to the policy of spatial segregation in the apartheid state, which contributed to a policy which is defined in terms of “scan globally, reinvent locally” principle, [11]. Clearly seen, a number of World Bank policy elements comprise an integral part of the South Africa policy, for instance, the emphasis on incremental housing, economic conservatism, the once-off subsidy element and the instrumental role of formal ownership [12]. However, it should also be acknowledged that two important differences are discernible in the South Africa policy. Firstly, the South Africa policy suggests that only housing structures should be subsidised. Why the World Bank policy advice suggests that only site and services should be subsidised. Secondly, as the South African policy has developed, an increasing emphasis has been placed on housing size – a factor which does not comprise part of World Bank policy [12]. Redressing the inherited inequalities of the apartheid state has established a complex and challenging context for meeting basic needs in contemporary South Africa. Given the physical and political segregation of apartheid, meeting the demand for housing has been a central development challenge since 1994 [10]. However, apartheid alone cannot be held responsible for the housing conditions in South Africa but equally no account of housing policy and conditions can be credible if it does not take into account the history of South Africa and the colonial legacy of the African continent [13]. Likewise, Wilkinson [14] informs that certain key dimensions of the current policy framework cannot be fully grasped in isolation from an understanding of the legacy bequeathed by South Africa’s peculiar history. In a very direct sense, the problems of the past have profoundly shaped the situation to which the present policy seeks to respond.

Although it can be contended that the current South African housing policy was founded on the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) basic needs approach, which emphasizes providing the poor with basic shelter, public services and addressing the social inequality nature of the apartheid state. Contrariwise, the South African housing agenda has objectives that go beyond this. For instance, an important aim in the policy is that housing will contribute to the economy development. Also, in line with the World Bank’s view of the 1990’s, the South African housing policy also aims to enable the housing markets to work. Thus, the housing programme is expected to contribute to the development of urban citizenship with the creation of new communities of home owners helping to develop a democratic and integrated society. In plain terms, the objectives of the housing programme include demonstrating delivery, contributing to the economic performance and assisting with poverty alleviation [15]. Essentially, the white paper on housing outlines seven major programmes for housing in South Africa, namely: stabilizing the housing environment; mobilizing credit; providing subsidy assistance; supporting the people’s housing process; rationalizing institutional capacity; facilitating the release of land; and co-coordinating state investment. In summary, the South Africa housing policy is intended to serve broader economic and social development goals than merely the delivery of shelter. However, in the delivery of shelter, there are specific rules that apply to each subsidy programme and in some cases there are specific eligibility criteria that apply over and above the generic criteria, amongst these include: the beneficiary being a citizenship of South Africa, competent to contract, not yet benefited from government funding, first time property owner, married or financial dependants, the applicant’s gross monthly household income not exceeding R3 500, persons classified as military veterans, persons classified as aged, and persons classified as disabled. According to the Housing Code, housing policy, programmes and development should help “reinforce the wider economic impact and benefits to the economy at large” [16], which is one of the objectives of this paper. Hence, the next section of the papers assesses housing delivery programmes in South Africa.

III. HOUSING DELIVERY PROGRAMMES

The programmes assessed in this paper include: enhanced People’s Housing Process (ePHP), the Integrated Residential Development Programme (IRDP) and Social Housing Programme (SHP) based on the notion that the DHS has identified them as the principal programmes for housing delivery in South Africa.

A. Enhanced People’s Housing Process (ePHP)

When the South Africa State strengthened its role in low-cost housing delivery, a parallel process was created to increase beneficiary participation in the housing process by getting them involved in savings and construction. This parallel process brought about the adoption of the People’s Housing Process (PHP) by the then Minister of Housing in 1998 to assist individuals and communities in their efforts to fulfil their own housing needs and who wish to enhance the subsidies they receive from government by assisting them in accessing land, services and technical assistance in a way that leads to the empowerment of individual, communities and the transfer of skills [17].
However, Charlton and Kihato [8] inform that PHP scheme was developed partly in response to lobbying by grassroots organisations, such as the South African Homeless People’s Federation (SAHPF), for greater beneficiary participation and also because of pressure from international organisations, such as the UN, which had track record of beneficiary participation resulting in more responsive and effective low-cost housing delivery. The PHP scheme was intended to work with NGOs in the housing sector to support communities in planning and implementing the construction of their own housing settlements through “sweat equity” to offset against the National Housing Subsidy Scheme (NHSS) savings requirement. The central message from the PHP scheme is that many of those facing the greatest hardship are also the most resourceful in terms of meeting their housing needs. But mainly, it was to enable poor households overcome the affordability barrier and gain access to a house without the long wait to access housing finance.

Before the ePHP was adopted in 2009, the initial scheme (PHP) contributed 10 percent to the housing delivery budget as at 2007. This statistic serves as a clear indicator that, despite the huge potential benefits of this program, it was not implemented to such an extent that the inherent potential benefits in the schema was achieved. However, it was the only programme which had the aggregate interest of the housing policy, as it was thought that housing development should reinforce the wider economic impact and benefits to the economy at large. Despite the low level of delivery, the process was holistically supported by a number of South African development NGOs who later formed part of the PHP Reference Group that lobbied for changes to the programme on the basis that it would achieve more response and effective delivery. Moreover, the initial scheme was besieged with lots of critics of which the notable ones were that the programme shifted part of the building cost onto the poor. Another was that, there was a “fundamental dissonance between the collective nature of community-based processes” [8]. Additionally, Huchzermeyer [18] also informs that participation in the programme was only limited to housing construction, with little influence by beneficiaries over key issues like location of housing projects and layout around the existing patterns of land occupation. Huchzermeyer [18] further criticised that organised communities were not able to identify and manage infrastructure projects as they lacked the capacity to perform at that level.

As result of the above criticisms, the ePHP was adopted to replace the old PHP programme in July 2008. The new ePHP was rolled out in April 2009. This new programme was the result of lengthy and difficult negotiations between the PHP Reference Group and the then National Department of Housing dating back to 2004. The PHP Reference Group had for some time challenged the narrow definition of the PHP as ‘self-build’ housing involving contributions of ‘sweat equity’ as opposed to the use of contractors. They were of the notion that the PHP should fundamentally concern a collective, “community-based process of decision-making that would seek to address housing in the context of other social needs and community priorities” [19]. Currently, the ePHP adopts a broader definition of PHP, allowing for greater flexibility and choice while maintaining the central principles of people-centred development in any participatory process. In the new programme, the DHS [17] acknowledged that there are a number of different approaches to community development that needed to be accommodated with community involvement in the decision-making processes, community empowerment and the leveraging of additional resources being the determining factors for making it a project. The enlargement of the scope of the PHP, with a focus on the outcomes of the housing process as a whole rather than just how the housing product is delivered, informed the development of the ePHP [9]. ePHP allows for a process in which beneficiaries actively participate in decision-making over the housing process and housing product so as to: empower beneficiaries, create partnerships, mobilise and retain ‘social capital’, build ‘housing citizenship’, encourage beneficiaries who are aware of their rights and responsibilities, promote local economic development, foster stable communities, build houses that are better suited to the needs of individual households, involve women and youth more directly, and finally, create sustainable and inclusive human settlements which are more responsive to the needs of the community and thus guaranteeing housing satisfaction. The ePHP is fundamentally a community-driven process that takes place over a period of time and not orientated towards delivery at scale over limited time frames [17]. This Programme currently benefit persons who satisfies the generic housing qualifying criteria as outlined in the revised National Housing Code of 2009.

B. Integrated Residential Development Programme (IRDP)

One of the key lessons learnt in the review of the outcomes of housing programmes since 1994 is that, owing to an array of reasons, the initially developed low income settlements continued to be located on the urban periphery without the provision and consideration for social and economic amenities, as in the Apartheid era [7]. Hence, this initial challenge necessitated the introduction of the IRDP, which replaces the previous Project Linked Subsidy Programme, in order to facilitate the development of an all-inclusive human settlement in well-located areas that provide convenient access to urban amenities, including places of employment and creation of social cohesion. As stated on the IRDP document [20]:

“Existing housing policy programmes focus primarily on the development of subsidised housing and do not provide much scope for area wide settlement planning and the integration of a range of housing types and price categories, together with commercial and social amenities in a project. The IRDP provides a tool to plan and develop integrated settlements that include all the necessary land uses and housing types and price categories to become a truly integrated community”.

IRDP provides for the acquisition of land, servicing of stands for a variety of land uses including commercial,
recreational, schools and clinics, as well as residential stands for low, middle and high income groups. The land use and income group mix is based on local planning and needs assessment of the beneficiaries. The IRDP also provides for phased area-wide planning and development of integrated housing projects. The first phase allows for the provision of serviced stands, whereas the second phase provides for housing construction for qualifying low income beneficiaries and the sale of stands to persons who for various reasons, do not qualify for subsidies. However, IRDP thus moved away from the requirements found in the previous Project Linked Subsidy Programme which requires the identification of subsidised housing beneficiaries up front and provides for both subsidised, as well as finance-linked housing that only caters for households earning between R3 500 and R7 000 a month. IRDP now provides for social and rental housing, commercial, institutional and other land uses to be developed more than the scope of the previous programme. In the plans of the IRDP, a municipality assumes the role of the developer (where they lack financial, technical and managerial capacity, a provincial department can take on this role), undertaking all planning and project activities [9]. As developers the municipality appoint construction industry professionals (who design and establish the township, design and monitor the installation of services, and design the houses) and contractors (who construct the services and housing) to assist with the housing development process. All procurement processes must comply with the prescripts of relevant legislation and be fair, equitable, transparent and competitive. The municipalities apply for funding from the provincial Department of Human Settlement who approves project applications, reserves and distributes funds, as well as assesses and adjudicates various aspects of the project process. The Plans for projects undertaken within the scope of the IRDP are only based on approved housing chapters of the Integrated Development Plan (IDP). An IDP is a single, inclusive strategic plan for the development of a municipality. It incorporates, integrates and organises plans and take into account proposals for the development of the municipality.

According to Tissington [7] most provinces and municipalities had used the Turkey Contracting Strategy in the past, which transfers all the development duties to a private sector contractor, including the administration of beneficiaries. The previous model encountered numerous problems and gaps in policy and process of beneficiary registration and allocation. But in the present IRDP model, the developer must ensure that identified beneficiaries complete and sign the application form for the grant of an IRDP Individual Subsidy, which is submitted to the principal municipal department. The identification of beneficiaries to receive housing construction subsidies are undertaken before the design and housing construction planning phase commences which enable beneficiaries needs assessment to be conducted shifting away from the one size fit all system of the past. This ultimately will guarantee housing satisfaction as the variation between what they receive will be in-line to what they expected.

The previous Project Linked Subsidy Programme was the main programme used for housing delivery in South Africa aside the PHP scheme before it was revised to the IRDP. To date, the previous Project Linked Subsidy Programme regardless of the numerous problems associated with it implementation has delivered more houses than any other housing programme in South Africa. Despite the quantum of delivery through this programme in the past and the continuation in the IRDP, it implementation was void of success in fulfilling the objectives it was designed to accomplish. Prominent amongst these include: constructed new houses and infrastructure were of poor quality, and are rapidly deteriorating and require maintenance. The DHS informs in January 2011 that it will cost about R1.3-billion, or 10% of the department’s budget, to rectify the faulty houses. Also, the houses continue placing the poor and low-income blacks in ‘ghettos’ on urban peripheries, far from jobs and services; also people dislike the model of housing used, and would prefer larger houses (main model was first changed in 1998 when the then Department of Housing, now the Department of Human Settlement increased the minimum size of new houses to 30m2, and was further increased in 2004 during the launching of the Breaking New Ground Policy to 40m2). Because of these problems, beneficiaries often sell or rent out their RDP houses got through the subsidy, and move back to squatter or other informal settlements closer to economic activities.

This programme only benefits person who are lawful residents in South Africa (i.e. citizen of the Republic of South Africa or in possession of a permanent residence permit) and who also meets other generic criteria’s as listed above. At present the subsidy quantum for the IRDP is R55 706 for the construction of the housing unit. Those earning between R1 501 to R3 500 per month are mandated to contribute R2 479. The cost for the provision of internal municipal engineering services is financed from alternative sources and the use of the housing subsidy allocation for the financing of internal services are only approved as an option of last resort. If the latter is the case, a subsidy amount of R22 162 is available for the preparation of a serviced stand [20].

C. Social Housing Programme (SHP)

The security of tenure remains one of the fundamental ideologies of the South Africa housing policy because of the disadvantaged nature of the past policies against a majority of the citizens. Where most of the created policy programmes provide freehold tenure to households, there has been an increasing need for affordable rental units which provide security of tenure to households which prefer the mobility afforded by rental accommodation [21]. The Social Housing Policy for South Africa was approved in June 2005 and the Implementation Guidelines published in November 2006. According to the DHS (2009e), the policy has been included in the new National Housing Code of 2009 as the Social Housing Programme (SHP). The Social Housing Act provides the legal framework for the implementation of the Social
Housing Policy. According to the DHS, social housing is defined as:

“a rental or co-operative housing option for low income persons at a level of scale and built form which requires institutionalised management and which is provided by accredited social housing institutions or in accredited social housing projects in designated restructuring zones”.

The Social Housing Programme applies only to ‘restructuring zones’ which are identified by municipalities as areas of economic opportunity and where urban renewal/restructuring impacts can best be achieved. Designated restructuring zones are geographic areas identified by local authorities and supported by provincial government for targeted and focused investment. Restructuring zones were approved (as of 2006) in the following areas: Ekurhuleni Metropolitan Municipality, City of Cape Town, City of Johannesburg, eThekwini Metropolitan Municipality (Durban), Nelson Mandela Bay Municipality (Port Elizabeth), City of Tshwane ( Pretoria), Buffalo City Municipality (East London), Mangaung Local Municipality (Bloemfontein), Msunduzi Local Municipality (Pietermaritzburg), Polokwane, Potchefstroom, Kimberley and Nelspruit.

However, SHIs and social housing projects have been developed in South Africa since 1997 following the introduction of the Institutional Subsidy Scheme. The delivery models employed by SHIs have been diverse and vary from pure rental, to co-operative housing, instalment sale options, and hybrids of these delivery models [21]. While the notion of rental housing provided by institutions was included in the White Paper on Housing as one of the subsidy programmes, this form of housing has taken some time to get off the ground [8]. This Programme provides for grant funding to establish, capacitate and capitalise social housing institutions which may develop, hold and administer affordable rental units within identified restructuring zones. A major precondition for receiving capital grants is that social housing institutions need to be accredited and also access own capital contributions. Aside this, the Social housing projects need to demonstrate their viability in each specific settlement context, but always with the objective of achieving the goals of integration and restructuring [21].

Also, the subsidy funding is provided on a sliding scale based on the number of poor households accommodated. Each grant type has various accessibility requirements and is dealt with under the following headings: primary purpose; eligibility; grant quantum; application Procedures/Grant processes; disbursement procedures; and accountability arrangements.

According to the DHS, approximately 60 social housing institutions (SHIs) have been created to date, delivering approximately 30,332 units throughout the country. This is in contrast to the government promise to deliver 50 000 rental units by the end of 2000. However, the SHP did aim for the delivery of 22 500 units in the first three years and a total of 50 000 units within five years (as of 2005) as against the government forecast. Recently, the National Rental Housing Strategy proposes to deliver 100 000 units in 2012, of which 75 000 would be social housing units. The SHIs have developed social housing stock using the institutional subsidy together with donor funding from the NHFC and have relied on donor funding and local authority grant funding to cover institutional set-up and operational costs. This according to the DHS has resulted in an unsustainable situation where the majority of the SHIs that have been developed and those under construction currently depend on donor funding. This Programme also benefit persons who satisfies the generic housing qualifying criteria as outlined in the revised National Housing Code of 2009.

IV. FINDINGS

Findings emanating from the conceptual review of the housing policy programmes in South Africa revealed that the core South Africa housing delivery programmes (IRDP, ePHP and SHP) have not been totally successful in what each was designed to accomplish. But overall, the Project Linked Subsidy scheme now revised to IRDP has delivered more houses because it was adopted as the main housing delivery programme; but numerous problems have been associated with the houses delivered to date. Likewise, the PHP scheme now ePHP has also been successful in its own right contributing 10% to the total housing bundle in the country. Likewise the SHP has also been used in the delivery of houses, but has fallen short of the targeted plan. Despite all the programmes being major programmes of housing delivery in the country, they still need improvement and a better understanding coupled with patience for a full scale implementation to realize the original policy intentions.

However, the PHP now enhanced (ePHP) is inferred to have been more successful in the delivery of houses to the low-income group in South Africa despite its 10 percent contribution to the total housing delivery. This is because housing is not just about shelter provision, but involves the totality of the housing product in terms of the social and psychological aspects. These the PHP has succeeded in doing which has eluded the Project Linked Subsidy now IRDP. The process encourages and support individuals and community in their effort to fulfil their own housing needs by assisting them to access land, provide services and technical assistance. Also, beneficiaries save on labour costs by doing some of the building work themselves or by getting their neighbours, friends and families or other persons to help them which is a tradition of the previous system of housing construction in the Global South. They also avoid payment to developers and build their own houses and optimise their decisions by using opportunities for trade-offs. The programme maximizes beneficiaries’ participation which is a key development initiative in the present development framework, as development can truly be of the people if they are involved in decision making process. The PHP choice results in the construction of better quality houses than the Project Linked Subsidy now IRDP and the SHP. Also, the programme has also been relevant in the development of human resources, skill transfer and employment creation especially for women which impact positively on the economic freedom of the low-
income group and at the long run enables them to contribute to the total economy.

V. CONCLUSION

This paper set out to evaluate the major housing delivery programmes currently being implemented in South Africa. The enhanced People’s Housing Process (ePHP), the Integrated Residential Development Programme (IRDP) and Social Housing Programme (SHP) were assessed based on the notion that the Department of Human Settlement (DHS) has identified them as core programmes for housing delivery. Findings from the study revealed that all three programmes have delivered quite a sizable amount of housing to the needy (low-income and the disadvantaged group). However, a major dissonant among all the three programmes is that they have all had a fair share of challenges during their implementation, thus necessitating an overhaul to them with new names which reflects the changes to the programs and the new scope they are to accomplish. Further, findings also revealed that the PHP now enhanced (ePHP) has been more successful in meeting the objectives it was designed to accomplish, why the other programmes need more attention and improvement in order to meet up with the set policy objectives for each. It is thus recommended that ePHP should be adopted as a major programme by the Department of Human Settlement to help offset the ever growing housing backlog in the country. Also, the concept of needs assessment should be prioritised in the programmes as it is only now enshrined on the IRDP policy. The inclusion in all programmes will help to understand the dynamics of the citizens housing life cycle and will enable houses to be constructed that meet the needs of the people and the end product will eventually satisfy the occupants’.
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