

# Social Housing Policy Implementation Challenges in South African Local Municipalities

**MG Madisha and P Khumalo**  
University of South Africa

**Abstract:** The purpose of this paper is to present and discuss the barriers to secure affordable rental social housing at municipal level. There are challenges that are inherent in the current social housing delivery implementation system. The paper emanates from an empirical study undertaken to assess the effectiveness and efficiency of intergovernmental relations system in Gauteng Province in the implementation of social housing using selected three metropolitan municipalities namely: Tshwane, Ekurhuleni, and Johannesburg. A mixed-method approach was used with questionnaires, interviews, and documentary analysis to collect data. The findings show that municipalities are faced with challenges of human settlement planning and land use; supply, release of land and provision of basic infrastructure; administrative and institutional capacity as policy implementation impediments to a system of financing social housing and financial planning; and coordination of social housing and intergovernmental relations functions and activities. The practical implication is that the challenges impact negatively on the delivery of social housing in South African municipalities. The challenges have a bearing on the current legislative framework which impact and influence the speedy release of land for social housing development, human settlement planning systems, financial and budgeting for the delivery of social units in South African municipalities. The paper contributes to the body of knowledge as it present the challenges in the implementation social housing policy and the impact of stakeholder management as social housing delivery cut across spheres of government and other government entities.

**Keywords:** Local government, Implementation, Human settlement planning, Social housing

## 1. Introduction

There are processes and specific activities at the municipal level that must function within a particular environment to improve the general welfare of society by providing products and services. The Local Government: Municipality Structures Act (No. 117 of 1998) defines a municipality as a state organ vested within the local government and consisting of political structures, office-bearers, and administrative staff. The slow delivery of social housing is due to lack of a coordinated approach, administrative, institutional, management capacity, inadequate financial planning across spheres of government and state agencies and a lack of sustainable social housing programme (Gauteng Rental Housing Strategy, 2017). Seto and Dhakal (2014:34) identified challenges common in the implementation of human settlements as lack of coordination among local land management and infrastructure departments. The role of the municipality is very broad, and the main challenges are coordination of all social housing related activities

to implement social housing policy which includes legal, regulatory, fiscal, political, programmatic, and administrative aspects at all levels of government.

## 2. Theoretical Framework of Social Housing Policy Implementation

This paper used two theoretical approaches to provide the basis for understanding and fully exploring social housing policy implementation. A theoretical framework is discussed to ensure a more comprehensive understanding of the workings of local government in the delivery of social housing units. Awotona (1999:174) highlights the importance of bottom-up approaches in the implementation of a policy, citing the case where a community in District Six in Cape Town, South Africa, was able to take efforts, participated in the debate and influenced policy in the development of urban areas in which the communities had an interest. The systematic application of bottom-up theory implies mediating and coordinating social housing policy implementation processes as municipal level.

The bottom-up theory uses new planning tools such as needs assessment, planning, participatory evaluations, and project management principles. The approach emphasises the importance of respecting, considering ideas of communities and local people, including the beneficiaries of the projects (Manomano et al., 2016:113). The advent of democracy in South Africa meant that focus was removed from the bureaucratic form of public service administration to a people-driven process in which communities make their inputs through integrated development planning. The bottom-up approach plays an important part in ensuring that targets and priorities are quantified from the bottom which is at local government level. This theory advocates the local needs and service delivery demands, as inputs informing the local government planning system.

The second theory is the social development which emphasise the involvement of stakeholders in the implementation of social housing programme to contribute in reaching their goals (Manomano et al., 2016:113). The post-apartheid government used the social development approach in improving social well-being of the community through social planning, social housing subsidies and grants. This approach advocates the participation of communities as part of empowerment and transformative social change. According to Oskan, Goksin and Erkan (2021:3) empowering communities to establish their own needs and wishes can be considered as the highest level of participation. Social development is concerned with social housing projects, programmes, policies, and plans that promote progressive change (Midgley, 2013:3).

### 3. Research Methodology

The paper emanates from an empirical study undertaken to assess the effectiveness and efficiency of intergovernmental relations system in Gauteng Province in the implementation of social housing using selected three metropolitan municipalities namely: Tshwane, Ekurhuleni, and Johannesburg. A mixed-method research approach was used, and the study adopted pragmatism, phenomenology, and positivism as research philosophies. The unit of analysis included all implementers of social housing from strategic, planning, and operational in the three spheres of government, state agencies and non-government agencies taking part in the delivery of social housing. A purposive sampling strategy

was used for qualitative and cluster sampling was used for quantitative approach. The semi-structured interviews were conducted with officials performing strategic and planning tasks at the national, provincial, the three metropolitan municipalities, municipal social housing entities, state agencies and social housing advocacy organisations. The content analysis focused on annual performance reports, annual strategic plans, policy guidelines, research reports, books, accredited journals and was used as data collection method for qualitative.

The questionnaires were administered to operational officials in the three metropolitan municipalities, national and provincial and it was used for quantitative research method. In all data collection methods prior consent and permission was requested and it was granted by all research participants. In terms of quantitative research, the data collected was captured in Microsoft Excel spreadsheets, and exported to Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) for analysis. All documents were scrutinised in relation to its authenticity, credibility, accuracy and quality. The data analysis software called Atlas.ti Version 8 was used to analyse qualitative data and the procedure was to find the real meanings of, and the relationships between the key concepts in this study, namely intergovernmental relations and challenges in implementing social housing.

## 4. Observations and Discussions

The paper discussed key factors that would inhibit effective social housing policy implementation and provide an analysis of how these factors impact on the delivery of social housing. This section discusses five key challenges in implementing social housing at municipal level.

### 4.1 Human Settlements Planning and Land Use

Human settlements planning addresses rapid urbanisation and is defined as a self-conscious effort to imagine or re-imagine a town, city, urban region, or wider territory and to translate the results into priorities for area investment, conservation measures, new and upgraded areas of human settlements, strategic infrastructure investments and principles of land use regulation (Muchadenyika & Williams, 2017:10). Most municipalities do not have capacity to enforce land use plans and ensure compliance

to building code based on the housing act, norms and standards and applicable spatial planning regulations. The current municipal human settlements planning regime lacks institutional, legal, and regulatory policy frameworks, rationalities, techniques, and ideologies that inform and guide human settlements planning (Muchadenyika & Williams, 2017:10). Francis, Kurian and Thomas (2019:3) agreed with Muchadenyika & Williams (2017) that in municipalities there are inadequate regulatory frameworks that frame housing policies and schemes with respect to housing and lack of access to information from documented sources about successful measures of achieving sustainable human settlements.

This is supported by Lanoszka (2018:2), who mentioned that too many development plans did not produce the expected results due to not evaluating the requirements of people in need and overlooked the range of constraints surrounding them. Human settlements planning deals with the configuration of space for housing and human settlements development and the outcome is the best plan for advancing sustainable urbanisation especially in fast-growing cities (Muchadenyika & Williams, 2017:13). This will remain a challenge unless there is both the political will and the institutional capacity at municipal level. The ability to manage and respond to escalating demands for urban services, housing, human settlements, and infrastructure is limited to municipalities. There are multiple institutional shortcomings such as insufficiently trained and unskilled staff in human settlements planning.

Human settlements plan in most municipalities lack what Turok (2016:12) calls the 'urban land-infrastructure-finance nexuses. This logic rests in the institutions and mechanisms that allocate land to appropriate uses within urban areas, including clearly defining property development rights, adequate land valuation systems, and rules that control property development. These systems have a profound impact on human settlements planning as they contribute towards inefficient allocation of land for human settlements development, indicators which are not measurable, accurate and standards and rules in terms of which the local government regulates and integrates land use and housing development. There is lack of forward planning framework in most municipalities which guides the type and location of investment in infrastructure for the establishment of integrated sustainable human settlements (Turok, 2016:12).

Control measures in most municipalities are also lacking which ensure that implementation of social housing projects stays on track. This means that human settlements planning should be regarded as a very wide-ranging activity, encompassing all efforts to control, direct, influence and monitor the process of development. The absence of a credible housing chapter as a human settlement planning tool in the municipal IDP's contributes non-alignment of plans and strategies to fast track the delivery of social housing at municipal level. Housing chapters ensure there is coordination, alignment, and inter-organisational and bottom-up approach in the implementation of social housing policy. The non-existence of plans at municipal level contributes towards non-alignment and no integration of implementation processes to ensure a sound social housing delivery system.

#### **4.2 Supply, Release of Land and Provision of Infrastructure**

Land supply factors have a significant impact on the implementation of affordable social housing, given that land is a resource that is a prerequisite of any housing development initiative. As social housing production is contingent on the availability of land, a political economy of land supply and release by local government can influence the quantity of land supplied for housing development (Li, Wong & Cheung, 2016:12). The processes of releasing land are lengthy and cumbersome and must satisfy different social, environmental, and economic needs, which to some extent may be mutually exclusive. Cai & Wei-Ning Wu (2019:947) mentioned that land scarcity and reliance on land-related revenues are the main obstacles in implementing affordable rental housing policies. A generally consensus definition of affordable rental housing is centred on the idea of a household should pay no more than 30% of their income for housing (Baqutaya, Ariffin & Raji, 2016:433).

There are indirect land release control processes, such as zoning and planning at the municipal level, that influence the speedy release of land. The major issues in land acquisition include conversion from agricultural to non-agricultural use, market price, compensation for acquired land, and rezoning and subdivision matters. Another challenge is the administrative nature of applicable legislation requirements of both the Municipal Finance Management Act (MFMA) and the Public

Finance Management Act (PFMA), which governs the operations of the spheres of governments differently.

According to Li, Wong and Cheung, (2016:12) there are several stakeholders involved in the housing market, each with competing expectations and agendas. Municipalities are unable to develop land release policies, and this affects the smooth supply and release of land for social housing development. The urban development policies, including land release and land use policies are products of different spatial characteristics with intricate connections among different actors and institutions. This network of relationships affects the speedy release of land and limits the coordination between actors and institutions in the social housing delivery market. At the municipal level there is lack of a robust, broader spatial targeting approach which is supported by higher levels of investment, alternative financing, a projects pipeline, and involvement by sector departments within in a municipality.

The practical challenge is the institutional arrangement for public land supply channels. Li *et al.* (2016:12) maintained that, if the channels of land release are not streamlined, the government as the largest supplier of land for housing cannot supply land for various end-users such as real estate developers, developers for supplying housing units and developers for affordable rental social housing units. Ultimately, developers get frustrated, as this demand-driven approach lags the expectations of the public, and the delivery of social housing are affected by the limited supply of land. Maas (2013:575) highlights the role of the local government as the initiator of social housing projects since municipalities must identify and quantify the demand for social housing and the restructuring zones.

The constraints posed by the inaccessibility of land have reduced the supply of affordable rental housing in most municipalities. Lack of adequate land for urban development, particularly for low rental housing, is the single most important impediment in achieving the goal of providing shelter for all. In most municipalities, scarcity of land has led to overcrowding in existing neighbourhoods, illegal invasion of vacant land, occupation of vacant buildings and growth of squatter settlements. The challenge facing municipalities is that suitable land for social housing development is scarce and

expensive. Land prices in more desirable locations near the main transport nodes and employment cores are invariably higher than large pieces of land situated on the periphery (Ogra, 2013:12). Lack of access to suitable land represents the most important challenges for social housing production. Municipalities do not have a framework for coordinating land identification and acquisition processes to facilitate the achievement of the goal of integrated human settlements. The myriad of policies and legislative frameworks that have served as strategic guidelines in the identification and acquisition of well-located land in the municipalities are cumbersome and not user-friendly.

The process of identifying and acquiring land is currently fragmented and there are no effective and efficient facilitation processes to eliminate the acquisition of land at exorbitant prices. There is no coordination of the various sector departments within a municipality to ensure contribution and a coherent land acquisition programme that seeks to enhance the delivery of sustainable human settlements including the land reform programme. Land acquisition is a complex process, and most municipalities are struggling to fast track the transfer of land to social housing institutions and private sector delivery agents (Karmakar, 2017:14).

#### **4.3 Lack of Administrative and Institutional Capacity to Implement Social Housing Policy**

The administration and delivery of social housing is facing organisational challenges and is complex, with a rural and highly mobile urban population. As noted by Dunlop, Radaelli and Trein (2018:168), the South African housing system has experienced quite a number of administrative procedures and institutional changes, and this has impacted negatively on the implementation of social housing policy, low-income housing policy formulation, and funding mechanisms to address different housing needs at local government level. The clarification of the roles and responsibilities of the three spheres of government has an impact on the administrative networks within the government housing system which are, to a large extent, slow and cumbersome.

The support of non-profit organisations such as the Social Housing Institutions (SHI) by the local government, which are mandated by legislation to deliver and manage social housing units, has become an administrative nightmare as each

sphere will prescribe its own administrative procedures. The SA housing system is comprised of more than five housing programmes, including (i) integrated residential; (ii) upgrading of informal settlements; (iii) housing assistance in emergencies; (iv) social and rental housing; and (v) rural housing. These programmes are delivered by a variety of public, private and/or third-sector organisations and at all levels. For the local government to implement housing programmes, there ought to be public officials who act as project managers in social housing development and management of integrated human settlements (Knipe & Van der Walt, 2010:135).

The working of government has public administration values and principles that must be adhered to. The Public Service Commission (PSC) was established to promote the values and principles in the public service as set out in Section 195 of the Constitution. In executing their duties, public officials must exercise what Gil-Garcia, Pardo & Luna-Reyes (2018:84) call administrative discretion, which should be embedded in administrative practices. Administrative discretion relates to the exercise of professional judgement and decision making in accordance with standards set by a particular authority which are not adequate in most municipalities.

The values and principles of public administration are applicable to all spheres of government, organs of state and public enterprises, however, the PSC has been established to promote these values and principles only to the public service which, in essence, consists of the national and provincial spheres of government. This leaves the local government, organs of state and public enterprises outside the mandate of the PSC. The fact that local government and organs of state are not regulated by this commission, creates a problem of fragmentation and lack of consistency in the promotion of values and principles in public administration. The number of organisations active in the authoritative allocation of values to society has increased and, to a large extent, government has become too big. The growth of public activities contributed to high degree of organisational fragmentation, which has led to uncoordinated housing tasks between the spheres of government. Uncoordinated policy making activities, the control of implementing organisations and lack of institutionalised values in the current bureaucracy is a challenge facing municipalities.

Oyebanji, Liyanage and Akintoye, (2017:23) conducted a study on critical success factors for achieving sustainable social housing from economic, environmental, and social perspectives. The findings shows lack of efficient sustainable development strategies linked to social housing policy objectives, legal and institutional frameworks for enhancing efficient implementation and control of social housing programme activities, awards of contracts, and distribution (Oyebanji et al., 2017:12) Lack of effective legal frameworks also contributes towards ineffective monitoring and evaluating systems to measure and account for the delivery of sustainable social housing projects at municipal level. The challenge in the implementation of the current social housing policy is the absence of institutional governance to ensure formal authority that will incorporate practices and performances by local government institutions and entities that interact with government (Tsenkova, 2014:12).

Municipalities experience challenges in terms of developing implementable development plans, providing quality infrastructure and, in most cases, are in financially constrained and unable to secure the necessary finance from local budgets or loans. Municipalities are failing to adapt to more complex and diverse social housing implementation functions, activities and requires a clear definition of responsibilities and the delegation of authority among government departments at both national and provincial levels. The social housing sector is governed by a relatively complex interaction between the state, the municipalities, the housing associations, and the tenants. The challenges facing municipalities is based on managing different actors in the implementation of local housing policy and decisions on approving new constructions (Nielsen & Haagerup, 2017:143). The national government has been consistently adjusting affordable housing policies, human settlements planning regimes, strategies, and funding models and this gave rise to inefficiencies, lack of sustainability, and failure to clearly define the mission of the housing policy. Given the lack of support and clear mission of the housing policy, local governments are reluctant or even resistant to further the development of affordable housing (Cai & Wei-Ning Wu, 2019:935). Municipalities are facing challenges to decides what is being built, size, how many units and where in the municipality and also to decides, in cooperation with the social housing associations, which of the tools must be employed: flexible allocation, combined

allocation, and municipal nomination above 25% (Nielsen & Haagerup, 2017:146).

New institutions and agencies were established to facilitate the implementation of social housing policy, and to deal with specific housing challenges at municipal level. The social housing policy stressed the role of social housing institutions which act as social housing developers using their budget resources, public land, and loans to develop social housing units. Most of these institutions are in the early stages of development and even municipal entities lack the capacity to produce new rental stock, allocate and provide social housing opportunities. Agyemang and Morrison (2017:04) identify lack of central government commitment, weak enforcement of planning regulations, and low capacity of local authorities which are under-resourced in terms of staffing and finances as hindering the delivery of social housing. The new players in the social housing sector include non-governmental organisations (NGOs), which require support to act as effective intermediaries between the public sector and civil society.

Most municipalities lack capacity to influence social housing policy development and implementation. Few can deal with housing policy research, surveys, data collection, and social housing policy evaluation (Tsenkova, 2014:12). The Act has outlined the functions of local government in the implementation of social housing policy, and this means the devolution of housing responsibilities which to a larger extent contributed to loss of political support by provincial governments in the implementation of social housing policy. Local governments, in most cases mobilise funds for capital-intensive housing programmes. Furthermore, capacity constraints, political changes and unfunded mandates have become significant constraints for housing policy implementation at the local level (Tsenkova, 2014:9).

#### 4.4 System of Financing Social Housing and Financial Planning

The government uses a wide array of financial incentives to reduce the cost of housing, in the form of subsidies, grants, loans and equities. Subsidised housing is available to a wide range of different incomes, from those employed to those with no income at all under strict state control. The challenge facing municipalities is to finance and facilitate the provision of infrastructure to meet

the basic needs of many urban communities. This is, in most cases, owing to the high standards that make the provision of infrastructure very costly. Municipalities are struggling to find an adequate way to finance the social housing projects and to funding private social housing projects is not easy due to competing priorities at local government.

The supply wing of social housing is in the form of direct government grants and subsidies. This approach has been dominant since the approval of the social housing policy in 2005 and the subsequent passing of the Social Housing Act in 2008. Because of the broad social housing policy objectives and the country's ideological approach towards addressing the housing backlog, a move towards demand and supply side subsidies is still not possible. An analysis of the social housing sector shows that the supply side subsidies are being provided less explicitly, and as an inducement to encourage private investment to achieve government goals of providing affordable rental housing and integration of communities and urban renewal. The fact that the government provides grants, such as the restructuring capital grant and investment grant only to projects falling in the restructuring zones, is an indication that the target will not be met and will be difficult, if not impossible, to supply affordable rental housing in those areas outside the restructuring zones. The subsidies and grants target low- to moderate-income households as per the national social housing policy. The challenge is the failure of municipalities to define housing demand qualitatively and come up with quantitative measures and options for the supply side of affordable rental housing.

The challenge in the delivery of social housing is the lack of effective and efficient financial planning between the three spheres of government. Oosthuizen and Thornhill (2017:21) highlight that financial planning is an important requirement to ensure financial self-sufficiency to be able to meet the demands of society by means of funds generated from own resources. Although the objectives of the Division of Revenue Act (DORA), as set out in Section 2(a) are to ensure an equitable division of revenue between the three spheres of government, the challenge is that the financial years of the three spheres of government are not aligned. Both the national and provincial government's financial year runs from the first of April to the end of March and the local government's runs from the first of July to the end of June each year. In terms of financial

planning, this poses a challenge where the national, provincial, and local governments plan their budgets over a multi-year period which is not aligned to the national and provincial spheres.

For sound financial planning, it is imperative that the intergovernmental grants of the three spheres of governments as sources of funding, are predictable year after year, and that the municipalities get a consolidated grant for a year, as opposed to the efficiency with which the recipient has used the previous allocation. The following pieces of legislation are aimed at ensuring good and sound financial planning with the three spheres of government, namely: (i) the Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations Act (Act No. 97 of 1997); (ii) the PFMA (Act No. 1 of 1999); (iii) the DORA (Act No. 2 of 2013); and (iv) the MFMA (Act No. 1 of 2003). A challenge is the lack of creativity and innovation in integrating all legislation to ensure financial planning. Ultimately there is no coordination between policy, planning, and budgeting and this, to a large extent, affects service delivery.

Urban settlements development grants, human settlements development grants, municipal water infrastructure grants, national electrification programme grants, capacity building grants, integrated city development grants, energy efficiency and demand side management grants, and municipal demarcation transition grants constitute grants that are applicable to municipalities. These grants contribute towards ensuring the social housing delivery environment is conducive for the development of social housing. The main challenge is that all these grants have different targets, goals, plans, priorities, implementation challenges and difficult for the municipalities to align, integrate implementation processes, and ensure sound financial planning. The financial planning side in municipalities becomes uncertain where funding becomes uncoordinated and putting any planning exercise of local government in jeopardy (Sahasranaman, 2009:5).

#### **4.5 Coordination of Social Housing, IGR Functions and Activities**

The new governance in social housing goes beyond the formal authority and incorporates practices, activities, functions and performance by different institutions, entities, interest groups that interact with government in implementing social housing policy (Tsenkova, 2014:90). The government has

established the SHRA, the Housing Development Agency, the National Housing Finance Cooperation, and the National Home Builders Registration Council to facilitate the implementation of housing policies, address housing challenges and ensure the sector meet the building norms and standards. All this needs a high level of coordination of activities and functions to ensure implementation, financing, monitoring and evaluation. The challenge is lack of integrated action among different municipal agencies and stakeholders, including non-governmental organisations and civil society operating in the social housing sector at municipal level.

April (2014:18) acknowledges that the local government is currently faced with the critical challenges pertaining to the effective and sustainable provision of basic services, administrative capacity, and institutional performance to drive service delivery and the effective implementation of government policies and programmes. Oosthuizen & Thornhill (2017:12) states that sustainable provision of services in most municipalities is threatened by the neglect of routine maintenance, and the inability of municipalities to address service delivery backlogs because of rapid urbanisation and in-migration between municipalities. In the current dispensation there are weak capacities and mismanagement across government, and this has resulted in coordination failures and poor implementation of social housing policy (Turok, 2016:23).

The delivery of social housing is happening concurrently in all three spheres of government, whereby a collaborative exchange of, and decision-making between institutions at different levels of the political system needs to be managed. According to (Phillips, 2020:19) the governance of the housing sector is shared between the three spheres of government, with national government dealing with overall policy priorities, while local governments are generally responsible for the implementation of social housing programmes, the allocation of social housing, sustainable urban development, and spatial planning. The main challenge facing municipalities is how to manage output decisions and infrastructure financing of social housing provision (Phillips, 2020:19).

There is institutional overlap in terms of competencies and growing political, economic, and administrative dependencies between the three spheres of government. The gap is that between the

three spheres there are no multi-level governance processes in the implementation of social housing policy. The three spheres are unable to separate the political democratic element of governance from the managerial service producing sector of government. The three spheres are unable to negotiate and contextualise planning, budgeting, and implementation processes of social housing.

The challenge facing municipalities is how to coordinate and manage the relations between different stakeholders in the implementation of social housing policy. A lack of co-ordination across numerous actors at municipal level can contribute to some groups falling through the cracks of public support (Phillips, 2020:15). Social housing policy implementation focus on participation from different stakeholders including the three spheres of government, with the underlying assumption that their involvement provides a positive contribution to the policy implementation process. Municipalities are unable to facilitate horizontal as well as vertical coordination across the levels of government, as well as deregulation and managing social housing functions devolved as per the social housing act. The municipality is at the centre and must mobilise interest, resources, and involve different stakeholders such as social housing implementation agents and financiers to ensure that the vision, aims and objectives of the social housing policy are translated into social housing projects, and is where resistance and institutional pressures from external stakeholders are managed and side effects of the policy are addressed and attended to (Gil-Garcia et al., 2018:80).

Seto and Dhakal (2014:23) identify challenges in the implementation of human settlements as lack of coordination among local land management and infrastructure departments. This is institutional fragmentation which undermines the ability to coordinate urban services within and across sector departments in a municipality. Separating urban sector functions and plans into autonomous clusters leads to uni-sectoral actions and missed opportunities such the failure to implement a new social housing project near, for example, public transport facilities. Strategic planning, coordination of land use, urban management functions, visionary spatial planning, strong institutions, and political leadership are the most critical elements lacking in municipal human settlements planning. Urban redevelopment approached such as real

participation methods such as conciliation, partnership and empowerment as lacking in most municipalities (Ozkan, Goksin & Erkan, 2021:03).

Bianchi and Peters (2018:12) identify a lack of qualitative and structural indicators of coordination as empirical attempts to measure coordination. Qualitative indicators of coordination describe criteria for coordination and examine the potential for coordination. The quantitative indicators assess the extent to which coordination is achieved. Municipalities lack qualitative indicators of coordination to measure interactions among organisations and individuals and more importantly measure the integration of policies. This is more relevant since there is an increasing number of actors in the social housing value chain. Berman (2005:15) identifies planning coordination in many municipalities as a major challenge in implementing human settlements programmes and sustainable social housing projects.

According to Ram (2016:12), actors and institutions associated with the provision of affordable rental housing are connected in a structure which produces outcomes regarding expected behaviour from actors. The current structure in all Provinces is called the Provincial Social Housing Steering Committee. The committee does not meet regularly and there are no relationships with strategic municipalities across the country. The absence of an effective coordinating structure leads to lack of understanding amongst SHIs, social housing projects financiers, the three spheres of government and developers. There is lack of effective intergovernmental structures to ensure both vertical and horizontal interaction among and between the three spheres of government. The committee must share information, integrate information systems, exchange technical expertise, drive transformation of the social housing sector, assist stakeholders in accessing interest free capital, land and buildings, discount land, and lastly, improve performance monitoring and evaluation of the sector.

## 5. Conclusion and Recommendations

The barriers to social housing implementation discussed are applicable to all municipalities in South Africa. The current human settlements planning regime is influenced by the current intergovernmental, legal, regulatory frameworks and institutional arrangements. The development plans are not aligned, and this has a great impact on human



settlements development indicators and investment on infrastructure for social housing development. The current land identification, supply, and release is impacted by different legislative frameworks in place because of the configuration of the current IGR system. Land supply and release in municipalities is regulated through the MFMA and the national and provincial government through the Public Finance Management Act. The current institutional land supply and release mechanisms are not aligned to fast track the speedy release of land for social housing development. The current IGR system does not allow movement of officials between the three spheres to execute social housing related functions.

The use of different funding sources as regulated by different pieces of legislation has a bearing on the current IGR as intergovernmental grants and financial planning for social housing is affected. The different financial years as reflected by different budget circles is because of the current IGR system. The current system needs some alignment to ensure a sound financial planning regime for social housing sector. The vertical nature of the IGR system does not incorporate elements of bottom-up approaches to ensure coordination and integration of social housing related activities. The system promotes under-utilisation of municipalities to deliver and implement national housing programmes. The side effects of lack of coordinated planning is manifested in lack of policies for the development of land for affordable rental housing, effective supply of land for human settlements, urban development planning systems, integration of plans with financial capacity, provision of infrastructure to connect new human settlements development, and lastly, social infrastructure.

## References

- Agyemang, F. & Morrison, N. 2017. Recognising the barriers to securing affordable housing through the land use planning system in Sub-Saharan Africa: A perspective from Ghana. *Urban Studies*.
- April, F.Y. 2014. A comparative analysis of local government between South Africa and China. *Indo-Pacific Journal of Phenomenology*, 43(4):38-56.
- Awotona, A.A. 1999. Housing provision and bottom-up approaches: Family case studies from Africa, Asia, and South America. Ashgate: De Sitter Publishers.
- Baqutaya, S., Ariffin, A.S. & Raji, F. 2016. Affordable housing policy: Issues and challenges among middle-income groups. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 6(6):433-436.
- Berman, E.M. & Korosec, R.L. 2005. Planning to coordinate and coordinating the plan: Evidence from local governments. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 35(4):380-401.
- Bianchi, C. & Peters, B.G. 2018. Measuring Coordination and Coherence: Assessing Performance Across the Public Sector. In: Borgonovi, E., Anessi-Pessina, E. & Bianchi, C. (eds). Outcome-Based Performance Management in the Public Sector. *System Dynamics for Performance Management*, vol 2. Springer: Cham.
- Cai, X. & Wei-Ning, Wu. 2019. Affordable housing policy development: Public official perspectives. *International Journal of Housing Markets and Analysis*, 12(5):935-951.
- Chung, S.H., Kim, S.J., Park, S.Y. & Kim, J.H. 2020. Past, Present, and Future of Social Housing in Seoul: Where Is Social Housing Heading to? *Sustainability*, 12(19):8165.
- Dunlop, C.A., Radaelli, C.M. & Trein, P. 2018. Introduction: The Family Tree of Policy Learning in Dunlop, C.A., Radaelli, C.M. & Trein, P. (eds). *Learning in Public Policy: Analysis, Modes and Outcomes*. London: Palgrave.
- Francis, A., Kurian, J. & Thomas, A. 2019. Sustainable and Affordable Housing in India: Challenges and Prospects. *Geo Journal*, 79(4):433-447.
- Gil-Garcia, J.R., Pardo, T.A. & Luna-Reyes, L.F. 2018. Policy analytics: Definitions, components, methods, and illustrative examples. In *Policy analytics, modelling, and informatics*. Springer: Cham, 1-16.
- Karmakar, P. 2017. Politics of Development: Land Acquisition and Economic Development in India. *Journal of Land and Rural Studies*, 5(2):164-182.
- Knipe, A. & Van Der Walt, G. 2010. Project management for strategic change upliftment. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Lanoszka, A. 2018. International Development: Socio-economic theories, legacies and strategies. London: Routledge.
- Li, L.H., Wong, S.K.K. & Cheung, K.S. 2016. Land supply and housing prices in Hong Kong: The political economy of urban land policy. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 34(5):981-998.
- Maass, S.M. 2013. The South African social housing sector: A critical comparative analysis. *South African Journal on Human Rights*, 29(3):571-590.
- Manomano, T., Tanga, P.T. & Tanyi, P. 2016. Housing problems and programs in South Africa: A literature review. *Journal of Sociology and Social Anthropology*, 7(2):111-117.
- Midgley, J. 2013. Social development: Theory and practice. London: Sage Publications LTD.
- Muchadenyika, D. & Williams, J.J. 2017. *Politics and the practice of planning: The case of Zimbabwean cities*. *Cities*, 63:33-40.
- Nielsen, R.S. & Haagerup, C.D. 2017. The Danish social housing sector: Recent changes and future challenges. *Critical Housing Analysis*, 4(1):142-149.
- Ogra, A. & Onatu, G. 2013. March. Metropolitan Housing Development in Urban Fringe areas – A Case Study of Three Metropolitan Cities of South Africa: Johannesburg,

- Ekurhuleni and Tshwane. In 2<sup>nd</sup> International Conference on Infrastructural Development in Africa (ICIDA):17-19.
- Oosthuizen, M. & Thornhill, C. 2017. The grant system of financing the South African local government sphere: Can sustainable local government be promoted? *Journal of Local Government Studies*, 32(5):433-450.
- Özkan Töre, E., Gökşin, Z.A. & Erkan Yazıcı, Y. 2021. Participatory Approaches in Urban Redevelopment Projects: Gaziosmanpaşa Case. *Academia Letters*, Article 1085.
- Oyebanji, A.O., Liyanage, C. & Akintoye, A. 2017. Critical Success Factors (CSFs) for achieving sustainable social housing (SSH). *International Journal of Sustainable Built Environment*, 6(1):216-227.
- Phillips, L. 2020. Decentralisation and inter-governmental relations in the housing sector, OECD Working Papers on Fiscal Federalism, No. 32, OECD Publishing, Paris.
- Ram, P. & Needham, B. 2016. Why is public policy for affordable housing in India changing so slowly: Explaining institutional inertia. *Environment and Urbanization ASIA*, 7(2):177-195.
- Republic of South Africa. 1998. The Local Government: Municipality Structures Act (No. 117 of 1998). Pretoria: Government Printers
- Sahasranaman, A. 2009. Pragmatic municipal finance reform: Lessons from policy in South Africa, Brazil and select experiences in India.
- Seto, K. & Dhakal, S. 2014. Chapter 12: Human Settlements, Infrastructure and Spatial Planning. *Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change*.
- Tsenkova, S. 2014. The social housing sector in Prague and Warsaw: Trends and prospects.
- Turok, I. 2016. South Africa's new urban agenda: Transformation or compensation. *Journal of Human Settlements*, 31(2):9-27.