SERVICE DELIVERY PARTY

SDP HOUSING POLICY
CAPE TOWN

A Comprehensive Housing and Spatial Transformation Policy for Cape Town and the Western Cape

2027 to 2047

Preface

This is the Service Delivery Party's housing policy for Cape Town and the Western Cape. It proposes a fundamental reordering of how the city understands, finances and delivers housing. It proceeds from a single governing principle. Housing flourishes when the conditions for housing are created first. That principle challenges three decades of conventional practice. It demands new institutions, new instruments and new measures of success. Above all it demands that housing be treated not as a product to be delivered but as critical infrastructure upon which every other form of human flourishing depends.

This policy is written primarily for Cape Town, where the institutions, sites and figures named below sit. Its delivery model, the production system rather than the isolated project, is designed to be replicated by other municipalities across the Western Cape facing the same production crisis, and the Party will pursue that replication as capacity allows.

This policy names the enabling instruments. It specifies the institutional mechanisms. It confronts the political economy of reform. It states the fiscal scale honestly. It positions itself relative to existing legislation. It treats informal settlements as a parallel track of equal weight to greenfield and brownfield delivery.

Executive Summary

Cape Town is building a successful city that its own workers cannot afford. The city attracts investment, tourism, remote workers and international capital. Yet the people who clean homes, staff hospitals, teach children and drive buses are increasingly excluded from living near the opportunities they sustain. More than 450,000 households remain on the housing waiting list. Delivery has fallen from over 8,000 homes in 2019/20 to roughly 3,000 in 2024/25. The mathematics is unforgiving. More households enter the queue each year than leave it.

The crisis is not a funding crisis. It is a production crisis. Additional budget allocations cannot repair a system that converts public investment into completed homes too slowly. The persistent return of unspent housing funds demonstrates this point. Money sitting in a government account houses nobody. The constraint lies in the institutions responsible for transforming budgets into neighbourhoods.

This policy proposes a comprehensive alternative. It treats housing as critical infrastructure. It establishes a permanent housing production system rather than isolated projects. It releases public land at scale through named intergovernmental mechanisms. It standardises construction through the FRAME system. It enables incremental ownership through modular expansion. It creates a local construction economy through performance-based contractor registers. It measures success by household outcomes rather than units announced.

The policy is organised around ten pillars, five platform components, three implementation horizons and a single philosophical centre. That centre is the conviction that government does not build finished lives. It builds the conditions within which lives can flourish.

PART ONE

The Crisis We Have Created

Chapter One: A City Its Workers Cannot Afford

Cape Town has become one of the most unequal cities on earth. This is not an accident of geography. It is the result of political choices about land, investment and who benefits from urban development. The city's global brand depends upon the labour of people who cannot afford to live within it.

Consider the domestic worker from Khayelitsha who spends four hours each day travelling to Sea Point. Consider the nurse who leaves Christiaan Barnard Memorial Hospital to commute to Delft. Consider the teacher who cannot afford the neighbourhood in which she grew up. These are not anecdotal inconveniences. They are structural features of a housing system that has failed.

A globally competitive city cannot remain globally competitive if its own workforce cannot afford to live in it. The contradiction is unsustainable. It corrodes social cohesion. It imposes crushing transport costs on the poorest households. It entrenches apartheid geography three decades after apartheid ended.

The housing waiting list exceeds 450,000 households. This figure represents families, pensioners, workers, young people and people living with disabilities. Behind every number is a life shaped by the absence of secure housing. The city's own projections suggest that over one million additional housing units will be required by 2050. Seventy per cent of that demand will fall within the affordable housing bracket.

The current pipeline of approximately 14,000 affordable units is welcome. However, it represents a fraction of what is required. It is also structured predominantly as market-linked development. Rentals of R7,000 to R10,000 per month are classified as affordable. For a security guard earning R6,000 per month this classification is meaningless. Affordability has been redefined to suit developers rather than residents.

Chapter Two: The Failure of the Existing System

The existing housing delivery model is broken. It is not merely underperforming. It is structurally incapable of meeting demand at the required scale. This must be stated plainly because the alternative is continued faith in a system that has failed for three decades.

Government still procures housing as though every development were a unique public works project. Land is assembled. Consultants are appointed. Tenders are issued. Construction begins years later. Delays follow. Contractors fail. Costs escalate. No globally competitive industry functions this way. Modern manufacturing depends upon standardisation, predictable production pipelines and continuous improvement.

The consequences are visible across the city. Projects announced with great fanfare take years to commence. Sites handed over to developers remain vacant. Social housing tenants report unaffordable charges and insecure tenure. Informal settlements continue to grow. Homelessness remains a visible challenge. The housing crisis deepens even as announcements multiply.

The problem is not a shortage of money. It is a shortage of system. The city has land, planning expertise and access to funding mechanisms. What it lacks is an institutional architecture capable of converting these assets into completed homes at scale. It lacks a production system.

The distinction between funding and production changes everything. It shifts the question from how much money is available to why the existing system cannot spend it effectively. The answer lies in broken procurement, fragmented coordination and a culture of risk aversion that makes it safer to return money than to deliver housing.

PART TWO

A New Philosophy

Chapter Three: Housing as Critical Infrastructure

Infrastructure is conventionally understood as capital expenditure whose provision enables economic productivity or essential services. Roads, energy networks, water systems and hospitals all satisfy this definition. Housing does as well. Yet it is rarely classified alongside them.

Housing allows labour to be more productive. A secure home provides the stability from which a worker can engage in education or employment. These are not social welfare outcomes. They are economic productivity outcomes. Housing constitutes approximately eighty per cent of built environment investment. Yet health and educational facilities are referred to as infrastructure while residential housing is not.

Reclassification carries profound practical implications. Treasury currently treats housing expenditure as consumption. It competes with health, education and policing for scarce allocations. Under an infrastructure classification housing investment would be treated as capital formation. It would be evaluated against the returns it generates over decades rather than the cost it imposes in a single fiscal year.

The authority to reclassify sits with National Treasury through its Standard Chart of Accounts and the capital and current expenditure distinction. The Budget Facility for Infrastructure already evaluates projects on a long-horizon infrastructure logic. Housing should be admitted to that facility. The Human Settlements Development Grant, the Urban Settlements Development Grant and the Development Bank of Southern Africa provide existing vehicles. The policy should use them rather than inventing new ones.

Infrastructure demands different institutions than housing projects. It demands a rolling pipeline of identified sites. It demands a repeatable delivery model. It demands a fifty to seventy-five year stewardship horizon rather than a five-year development cycle. The build as real estate, hold as infrastructure pattern aligns asset risk with investor profiles and lowers the weighted cost of capital.

The deepest implication is philosophical. Infrastructure is the condition that makes other things possible. Roads make trade possible. Electricity makes production possible. Housing, understood as infrastructure, makes flourishing possible. The state does not build finished lives. It builds the conditions within which lives can flourish.

"The state does not build finished lives. It builds the conditions within which lives can flourish."

Chapter Four: The Conditions for Flourishing

This policy introduces a Cape Town Housing Conditions Framework. Every housing intervention should be measured against seven conditions. These conditions replace the conventional metrics of units delivered and budgets disbursed.

Affordability asks whether a household can realistically afford the home. This requires measuring housing cost against actual income rather than aspirational income bands. Location asks whether residents can reach jobs, schools, healthcare and services. Mobility asks what it costs to move between home and opportunity. Infrastructure asks whether water, sanitation, electricity and digital connectivity are reliable.

Community asks whether the development creates a functioning neighbourhood rather than merely providing shelter. Opportunity asks whether residents can access education, employment and enterprise. Permanence asks whether the housing will remain affordable for the next generation.

These seven conditions become the philosophical backbone of the policy. Every land release, every development approval and every budget allocation should be assessed against them. A project that scores poorly across these conditions cannot be considered successful regardless of its unit yield.

The framework introduces a further analytical tool. The True Cost of Home measures housing cost plus transport cost plus basic utilities. A R500,000 home far from work may be less affordable than an R800,000 home near employment. This calculation should fundamentally change where the city builds. Cheaper electricity matters. Reliable public transport matters. A family that receives an affordable home but cannot afford to power it has not escaped economic pressure.

PART THREE

The Ten Pillars

#	Pillar	Focus
1	**Release the Land**	Map, publish and release public land at scale through named intergovernmental mechanisms.
2	**Build a Housing Pipeline**	A permanent production system managed by an insulated Metropolitan Development Corporation.
3	**Build Faster and Cheaper**	Standardise construction through the FRAME modular system.
4	**Adopt Incremental Housing**	Serviced platforms that households finish and expand themselves.
5	**Make Housing Affordable to Live In**	The True Cost of Home embedded in every approval.
6	**Stabilise the Rental Market**	Predictable increases and protection against displacement.
7	**Inclusionary Housing and the Housing Fund**	Private development contributes to a ring-fenced affordable housing fund.
8	**Build Communities Not Housing Estates**	The courtyard as the organising principle of every development.
9	**Unlock Existing Housing**	Backyard rentals, empty buildings, densification and in-situ upgrading.
10	**Make Housing Politically Accountable**	A cross-party Housing Compact and an independently reviewed annual report.

Chapter Five: Pillar One, Release the Land

Public land is not merely an asset to be sold. It is a strategic instrument for repairing spatial inequality. The city should establish a Cape Town Land for Homes Programme. Every suitable parcel of public land should be mapped, categorised and published on a public dashboard.

The dashboard should show ownership, location, size, zoning, development potential, infrastructure requirements, proposed housing yield and development status. The public should be able to see exactly where every project stands at any moment. This transparency attacks one of the greatest problems in South African housing, namely the years between announcement and occupation.

Priority should be given to strategic sites. Wingfield, Ysterplaat and Youngsfield together comprise approximately 668 hectares of well-located urban land capable of accommodating tens of thousands of homes. These sites represent perhaps the most significant urban redevelopment opportunity Cape Town has seen in decades. Underused municipal land, vacant government buildings, obsolete industrial sites and land near transport corridors should also be prioritised.

The release of these sites is not a municipal decision. Wingfield, Ysterplaat and Youngsfield are national assets held by the South African National Defence Force and Transnet. The policy names the actual mechanisms. These include the State Land Disposal Act, the protocols on state land release, the role of the Minister of Public Works and Infrastructure and, where required, a presidential or ministerial directive to break the deadlock. A dedicated intergovernmental task team is established with a fixed reporting deadline of twelve months. Should terms not be settled within that window, the matter escalates automatically to the Human Settlements and Public Works ministerial cluster for a binding decision, so that the programme's timetable never depends indefinitely on a single stalled negotiation.

Ysterplaat carries an active defence function distinct from the other two sites. Its release proceeds through a dedicated Defence Estate Engagement Track, run jointly with the Department of Defence from the outset, so that operational and security requirements are resolved on their own terms rather than folded into the general land release process.

Every major public land disposal should pass a Social Value Test. The highest cash offer should not automatically win. The question should be what produces the greatest long-term social and economic value for Cape Town. This test should be applied transparently and its results published.

Chapter Six: Pillar Two, Build a Housing Pipeline

Cape Town needs a permanent housing production system. Not announcements. Not once-off developments. A pipeline. This requires a dedicated implementation unit responsible for coordinating land, planning approvals, infrastructure, finance, construction, social housing institutions, private developers and national and provincial partners.

Every major site should have a published timetable. The public should be able to see exactly where every project is in the system. Site identified. Land secured. Infrastructure funded. Planning approved. Construction begins. Residents move in. This visibility creates accountability. It also exposes bottlenecks before they become crises.

The pipeline should be managed by a Metropolitan Development Corporation. The corporation must be established through a municipal entity bylaw under the Municipal Systems Act. Its founding instrument must specify an independent appointment panel, a fixed ten-year board term and ring-fenced funding. Its chief executive should be selected through an open international search and remunerated competitively. The corporation should report to council rather than to a mayoral committee. It should be dissolved only through a supermajority vote.

The corporation should coordinate land assembly, infrastructure sequencing, planning approvals and long-term production agreements. Success should be measured by completed housing opportunities per rand invested rather than budgets disbursed or announcements made. Procurement systems should reward execution rather than procedural caution. Officials should never find it safer to return public money than to deliver public housing.

Chapter Seven: Pillar Three, Build Faster and Cheaper

The city should establish a Housing Innovation and Modern Methods Programme. This programme should test modular construction, prefabricated wall systems, factory-built plumbing and electrical systems, lightweight steel framing, advanced concrete technologies and rapid assembly techniques. The city should become a major purchaser that creates predictable demand.

That demand can help create a South African affordable housing manufacturing sector. The principle should be to build an industry capable of producing homes rather than importing houses. This could support local factories, fabrication, construction skills, apprenticeships, engineering and materials supply chains. Housing policy becomes industrial policy.

The FRAME system represents the practical expression of this pillar. FRAME stands for Flexible Residential Assembly Modular Environment. It draws upon three principles. The first is standardisation inspired by Lego, where standard modules click together in endless combinations. The second is structural connection inspired by Meccano, where strong structural components use standardised holes and fittings. The third is flat-pack assembly inspired by IKEA, where components are easy to transport and beautiful to assemble.

The FRAME system separates the permanent structure from the individual dwelling. The permanent layer includes foundations, structural steel frame, stairs, walkways, lifts where necessary, fire escapes, main electrical distribution, water and sewer infrastructure, drainage, fire infrastructure, common areas and landscaping. The modular layer includes factory-built dwelling modules delivered complete and ready to install.

Modules arrive on a flatbed truck. They are craned into place. They are connected. They are commissioned. The building is no longer a one-off construction project. It becomes a platform. The frame is designed for the full complement of units from day one. Modules can be installed incrementally as demand and financing permit. Eight modules. Then twelve. Then sixteen. Then twenty-four. The development responds to actual demand rather than requiring the developer to predict demand years in advance.

A standardised Cape Town Modular Housing System should be established. This acts as a municipal operating system for affordable housing. Standardised modules should include studio units, one-bedroom units, two-bedroom units, three-bedroom units, accessible units, family expansion modules, commercial or workspace modules and community facility modules.

Every approved module should have predetermined structural connection points, electrical connections, water connections, wastewater connections, ventilation, fire protection and data connections. A module manufactured by Company A should fit into a frame designed for Company B. This creates competition without creating chaos.

Interoperability standards are set by a named body. The South African Bureau of Standards develops and enforces the FRAME module standard, covering structural connections, service interfaces, fire performance, thermal performance and accessibility. Compliance is mandatory for any module installed in a publicly supported development, and an independent conformity assessment body certifies manufacturers and installers. Because a full national standard takes time to complete, Phoenix 24 proceeds under a provisional technical specification issued by the same body, so that Horizon One delivery is not gated on the standard's final certification.

Chapter Eight: Pillar Four, Adopt Incremental Housing

Chile's internationally recognised Elemental model offers a compelling alternative to conventional delivery. Rather than exhausting limited public subsidies constructing completed homes, government invests in the expensive elements households cannot realistically provide. Land assembly, structural frames, foundations, roofs, fire protection, water, sanitation and electricity are completed from the outset. Families then finish and expand their homes incrementally as finances permit.

The philosophy is elegantly simple. Government provides the platform. Citizens create the value. This principle deserves serious consideration across strategic sites. The objective should not be delivering identical finished apartments. The objective should be delivering serviced structural platforms upon which households can progressively build wealth.

The FRAME system extends this principle to multi-unit buildings. Residents can purchase a starter module and expand horizontally or vertically as finances permit. A young person buys a studio. Later they marry and need a one-bedroom. Later they have children and need two bedrooms. Instead of selling the entire property and moving across the city the housing configuration changes. The old module can be removed and replaced. The building survives. The dwelling changes.

Incremental housing requires a Growth Manual. Every household receives a simple architectural plan showing approved expansion phases. Phase one is the starter home. Phase two adds a bedroom. Phase three adds a second bedroom or living space. Phase four adds a second storey. Each extension has pre-approved parameters. Green means approved expansion. Amber requires technical approval. Red is not permitted. Incremental development becomes formalised rather than informalised.

The Growth Manual must be enforced through the title deed and the homeowners association constitution. Non-compliance should trigger a graduated response beginning with technical assistance and ending with legal enforcement. The objective is not punishment. The objective is preserving the liveability of the settlement for all residents.

Chapter Nine: Pillar Five, Make Housing Affordable to Live In

A house is not affordable merely because the purchase price is low. Housing affordability must include rent, electricity, water, transport, maintenance, municipal charges and security. The True Cost of Home calculation should be embedded in every development approval.

Every major affordable housing project should incorporate energy-efficient design, solar where viable, efficient water heating, reduced electricity demand, reliable public transport and affordable municipal services. A family that receives an affordable home but cannot afford to power it has not escaped economic pressure.

The rental sector requires particular attention. The majority of households on the waiting list cannot afford ownership even at subsidised rates. The deepest need lies in rental housing. The city should pursue a dual-track strategy. The platform model serves the missing middle. Deeply subsidised social housing and rental programmes continue supporting the most vulnerable. Enabling is not the same as abdicating.

Chapter Ten: Pillar Six, Stabilise the Rental Market

Cape Town needs an affordable rental strategy. This should include a carefully designed Rent Stabilisation Framework for high-pressure areas particularly where long-standing residents face rapid displacement. This should not impose crude rent control. A poorly designed system can reduce housing supply.

The framework should be designed through a dedicated technical process with a fixed twelve-month timeline. It should include predictable annual rent increases tied to a published index. It should include protections against unjustified displacement through mandatory lease renewal except for specified grounds. It should include incentives for landlords who provide long-term affordable rentals such as rates rebates and expedited planning approvals. It should include affordable rental developments on public land with discounted leases. It should include conversion of underused commercial buildings through a fast-track approval process. It should include employer-supported housing through payroll-linked rental guarantees. It should include build-to-rent developments with institutional ownership and professional management.

The objective is stability. A family cannot flourish if every year brings the possibility of being forced out of its home. The framework should be reviewed after three years to assess its impact on supply and affordability.

Chapter Eleven: Pillar Seven, Inclusionary Housing and the Housing Fund

Private development must become part of the solution. Two mechanisms should be used. The first is inclusionary housing. Large developments above a certain threshold must include a defined proportion of affordable homes. The second is a housing contribution. Developers contribute approximately 2.5 per cent of qualifying development costs into a dedicated Cape Town Affordable Housing Fund.

The funds must be ring-fenced, publicly audited, transparently allocated and geographically targeted. The principle is simple. Those who benefit from the rising value of Cape Town should contribute towards ensuring that the city remains liveable for those who sustain it.

Pension funds, insurers and other long-term institutional investors collectively manage vast pools of South African savings seeking stable inflation-linked returns. A predictable pipeline of well-governed housing developments built on serviced public land could become precisely that investment opportunity. Housing policy should therefore be understood not only as social policy. It should also be recognised as capital market policy capable of crowding private finance into public priorities.

The financing structure requires named credit enhancement. The National Housing Finance Corporation should provide a first-loss tranche. The Development Bank of Southern Africa should provide a partial guarantee. The Housing Impact Fund should provide mezzanine finance. A national government guarantee should back the senior tranche. Without this structure no pension fund will subscribe at scale. The honest answer is that without a national guarantee the bond market will not deliver the required capital.

Chapter Twelve: Pillar Eight, Build Communities Not Housing Estates

People need more than a roof. Every large development should include safe public spaces, parks, sports facilities, community halls, early childhood development facilities, libraries or digital access centres, small business spaces, clinics or healthcare access and reliable public transport connections. A neighbourhood should create the conditions in which people can meet, learn, compete, create and belong.

The distinction is clear. Housing prevents homelessness. Community creates the conditions for flourishing. The courtyard is the organising principle. Four FRAME blocks should be arranged around a central civic courtyard. The courtyard becomes the living room of the neighbourhood. It contains trees, seating, children's play areas, community gardens and perhaps a small multipurpose building. It is designed, maintained and governed.

The courtyard creates natural surveillance. Children can play close to home. Neighbours can meet. Informal trading can occur. Community events can be held. The courtyard is not leftover space. It is the heart of the development.

Chapter Thirteen: Pillar Nine, Unlock Existing Housing

The crisis cannot be solved only by building new homes. Cape Town must unlock existing stock. This includes backyard rental support, empty building conversion, small-scale densification and safer informal settlement upgrading.

Backyard rental support should provide standardised plans, infrastructure support and low-cost finance for compliant backyard housing. Empty buildings should be identified and converted. Vacant offices, abandoned buildings, underused commercial properties and obsolete government buildings should be mapped and prioritised. Small-scale densification should enable second dwellings, subdivided properties, duplexes, walk-up apartments and small apartment buildings particularly near transport and employment.

Informal settlement upgrading should proceed through phased in-situ improvement wherever possible. Secure tenure, basic services and access pathways should be provided first. Households should be offered structural platforms rather than completed houses enabling them to improve their shelters incrementally. The principle should be to upgrade people where they live whenever possible rather than repeatedly uprooting them from the communities they have built.

Artificial intelligence could fundamentally transform how the city manages this opportunity. Rather than maintaining static asset registers the city should develop a living digital inventory of its entire municipal estate. Every property could be continuously assessed according to occupancy, maintenance costs, redevelopment potential, infrastructure capacity, transport accessibility and surrounding housing demand. Artificial intelligence would not replace planners. It would continuously identify opportunities they may otherwise overlook.

The FRAME system must also apply within existing informal settlements. Reblocking programmes should be integrated with FRAME installation. Serviced platforms should be provided incrementally within the existing fabric. Courtyards should be carved out of dense settlements where possible. Residents should participate in design and construction. Displacement should be avoided. The objective is progressive formalisation without relocation.

Chapter Fourteen: Pillar Ten, Make Housing Politically Accountable

A Cape Town Housing Compact should be created. Every political party and councillor candidate should be invited to support annual land release targets, annual housing delivery targets, affordability targets, informal settlement upgrading targets, rental housing targets and infrastructure delivery targets. Progress should be independently monitored.

Every year the city publishes a State of Housing Report, independently reviewed by the Auditor-General or an equivalent independent body rather than compiled solely by the departments it assesses. The public can ask what was promised, what was funded, what was delivered and what changed. Not just how much money was spent. Success is measured by homes completed rather than money budgetted.

The report should track housing outcomes. Average dwelling size. Maintenance. Expansion. Property value. Household disposable income. Rental burden. Employment. Household stability. Children's school attendance. Educational performance. Access to safe play. Crime. Social cohesion. Participation. Public space condition. Businesses established. Jobs created. Household investment. These are the metrics that matter.

PART FOUR

The Platform

Chapter Fifteen: The Five Components

The Cape Town Housing Platform consists of five components. The first is land. Identify underutilised land and buildings. The second is frame. Create standardised structural and infrastructure platforms. The third is modules. Approve a competitive ecosystem of locally manufactured dwelling modules. The fourth is market. Allow residents, employers, institutions and developers to acquire or rent units. The fifth is flourish. Design every development around the conditions that make a community successful.

These components operate as a system. Land is assembled. Frames are constructed. Modules are manufactured and installed. Markets connect supply and demand. Flourishing is the outcome. The system is designed to be replicated. Phoenix 24 is the prototype. It is a municipal housing laboratory. Test construction systems. Test financing models. Test incremental expansion. Test community governance. Test household outcomes. Measure for five years. Fix what does not work. Publish the design. Standardise procurement. Replicate across Cape Town.

Chapter Sixteen: FRAME Equity and Participation

Sweat equity is not a speculative idea. Habitat for Humanity has operated sweat equity programmes for decades. The United States Department of Housing and Urban Development has formalised them. South Africa's Enhanced People's Housing Process has institutional precedent. The evidence demonstrates that people will participate when participation is structured and rewarded.

FRAME Equity should be optional but rewarded. Three levels of participation should be recognised. Level one is community participation. Everyone can contribute through landscaping, planting, painting, community clean-up, courtyard preparation, homeowner education and administration. Level two is skilled participation. People with demonstrable skills can contribute substantially more. Electricians, plumbers, carpenters, tilers, bricklayers, welders and landscapers can have their work independently valued and credited. Level three is professional and SMME participation. Local qualified contractors can contribute services at agreed discounted rates in exchange for preferential future FRAME work, reputation points and future tender opportunities.

Every household receives a FRAME Equity Account. The account tracks maximum equity credit, current earned credit and remaining credit. Contributions are valued at rates established by the programme and aligned with applicable labour rules. Residents can contribute to other households. This creates solidarity. You are not simply building your own house. You are helping build the community you are joining.

The primary objective is not cost reduction. The cost saving is a secondary benefit. The primary objective is to turn residents from passive recipients of housing into participants in creating the asset they will own and the community in which they will live. Conditions create opportunity. Participation creates agency. Agency creates ownership. Ownership creates responsibility. Responsibility strengthens the system. A stronger system creates better conditions for the next generation to flourish.

FRAME Equity is piloted at Phoenix 24 and evaluated before being scaled, testing valuation methodologies, dispute resolution mechanisms and anti-fraud controls. Before the pilot begins, the programme secures a ruling from the South African Revenue Service on the tax treatment of equity credits and confirms alignment with the Basic Conditions of Employment Act, so that a resident who earns credit through skilled labour is not unexpectedly taxed on it. Scaling proceeds once the pilot demonstrates operational viability.

Chapter Seventeen: The Contractor Ecosystem

The city should establish three registers. Register A is for approved frame contractors capable of constructing foundations, structural frames, services, stairs and communal infrastructure. Register B is for approved module manufacturers capable of manufacturing kitchens, bathrooms, walls, insulation, windows, electrical systems and complete dwelling modules. Register C is for approved installation contractors responsible for transportation, craning, connection, commissioning and finishing.

Every contractor receives a publicly visible performance score. The Contractor Performance Index measures quality, delivery on time, cost performance, defects, safety and resident satisfaction. Ratings determine future opportunity. Five stars indicates excellence. Four stars indicates good performance. Three stars indicates acceptable performance. Two stars indicates performance concerns. One star indicates suspension or review. The Index is administered by an appointed built-environment ombud independent of the contracting departments, and every contractor has a formal right of appeal against a scoring decision before it affects future opportunity.

Performance determines future opportunity. Not political connections. Not cadre deployment. Not who knows whom. Performance. This is the governance philosophy translated into procurement.

PART FIVE

Financing and Implementation

Chapter Eighteen: Funding the Transformation

Financing this transformation requires creative mechanisms. The state cannot fund twenty-five thousand units annually from its own budget alone. However, it can use its balance sheet to mobilise far larger private flows. The land itself represents enormous value. The bulk infrastructure investments generate future revenue streams through rates and service charges. The structural platforms create collateral that can support household borrowing.

The fiscal scale is stated honestly. Twenty-five thousand units per year at a conservative platform cost of R400,000 per unit implies a capital requirement in the order of ten billion rand annually before operating costs. This is the Horizon One steady state, not a ceiling. As the FRAME manufacturing base matures and Wingfield and Youngsfield come online, production ramps beyond this figure through Horizon Two, with the full ramp profile set and published by the Metropolitan Development Corporation as part of its rolling pipeline, so that annual capacity closes the gap against the waiting list and projected demand over the life of the policy rather than holding at a flat rate. The required capital is also a fraction of the R26 billion in private capital already committed to the existing pipeline. The question is not whether the capital exists. It is whether the institutional architecture can absorb it.

A dedicated housing delivery bond secured against future revenue streams from completed units raises capital from pension funds and insurers, offering inflation-linked returns matching the long-term liabilities of these institutions. Development impact bonds, which pay returns based on successful delivery outcomes, attract social impact investors seeking both financial and social returns.

The credit enhancement structure is staged rather than requested in full at the outset. Horizon One is funded through existing grant instruments and the municipal balance sheet, building a proven delivery track record at Phoenix 24 and the first tranche of priority sites. The National Housing Finance Corporation provides a first-loss tranche and the Development Bank of Southern Africa a partial guarantee from the outset. The national government guarantee backing the senior tranche is sought at the start of Horizon Two, once that track record exists, sized to the proven pipeline rather than the full programme. This sequencing gives Treasury a demonstrated delivery record to guarantee against, rather than a request made before the system has produced anything.

Public investment should concentrate upon enabling infrastructure before construction begins. Water, sanitation, substations, stormwater systems and transport corridors remain the binding constraints upon urban expansion. Sequencing these investments correctly allows private capital to perform construction far more efficiently than fragmented public procurement.

Chapter Nineteen: The Political Economy of Reform

No institution voluntarily surrenders discretion. No developer voluntarily accepts affordability conditions. No official voluntarily accepts performance-based dismissal. The policy must therefore confront the political economy of reform directly. It must identify who currently benefits from the status quo, who would support change and how the coalition for reform could be assembled.

The beneficiaries of the status quo are identifiable. Developers who profit from market-linked housing oppose inclusionary requirements. Contractors who benefit from large tenders oppose performance-based procurement. Officials who exercise discretion over allocations oppose transparent registers. Politicians who use housing announcements as electoral instruments oppose independent monitoring. These interests are powerful and they will resist.

The coalition for reform is also identifiable. Residents on the waiting list demand delivery. Social housing institutions demand predictable pipelines. Local manufacturers demand sustained orders. Pension funds demand investable opportunities. Civil society organisations demand accountability. These interests are fragmented but they are numerous. The policy must mobilise them.

The Metropolitan Development Corporation must be insulated from political pressure. Its enabling bylaw must specify an independent appointment panel, a fixed ten-year board term and ring-fenced funding. Its chief executive should be selected through an open international search. It should report to council rather than to a mayoral committee. It should be dissolved only through a supermajority vote. These mechanisms must be entrenched in the founding instrument and defended against amendment.

The policy must also anticipate resistance. It must prepare for legal challenges from developers. It must prepare for administrative obstruction from officials. It must prepare for political attacks from opponents. The coalition for reform must be organised before the policy is adopted. Civil society organisations, community-based movements and the media must be empowered to hold the corporation accountable.

The Party names this resistance in advance and builds against it from the outset, entrenching insulation in the founding instrument rather than treating it as a battle to be fought later. That is what distinguishes a system built to last from an announcement built to impress.

Chapter Twenty: Existing Legislation and Institutional Positioning

This policy does not propose a greenfield institutional landscape. It builds upon existing legislation and positions itself relative to existing instruments. The Social Housing Act provides the framework for social housing institutions. The Rental Housing Act provides the framework for rental regulation. The Municipal Systems Act provides the framework for municipal entities. The Spatial Planning and Land Use Management Act provides the framework for spatial planning.

The City's inclusionary housing framework already exists. The provincial Spatial Development Framework already exists. The national Human Settlements Development Grant already exists. The Urban Settlements Development Grant already exists. The policy should use these instruments rather than duplicating them. Where instruments are inadequate they should be amended. Where they are absent they should be created. The policy should specify which is which.

Every proposal in this policy is traceable to a legal authority, and every legal authority has been assessed for adequacy against what the policy requires of it. Where an existing instrument is sufficient, the policy uses it. Where an instrument requires amendment to carry the weight this policy places on it, that amendment is pursued alongside the policy's adoption rather than after it.

Chapter Twenty-One: The Three Horizons

Implementation should proceed through three horizons. Horizon one from 2027 to 2029 focuses on stabilisation. The land audit should be completed. Priority sites should be released. The housing delivery agency should be established. Fast-track approvals should be implemented. Modern construction pilots should commence. Informal settlement upgrades should begin. Vacant building conversion should be accelerated. Infrastructure planning should be finalised. The affordable rental programme should launch. The Rent Stabilisation Framework should be designed and adopted. The FRAME module standard should be developed. The credit enhancement structure should be negotiated. The objective is to get the housing system moving.

Horizon two from 2030 to 2035 focuses on building at scale. Wingfield should be developed. Youngsfield should be developed. Major transport-oriented developments should commence. Large-scale social housing should be delivered. Modular housing factories should be operational. Private sector partnerships should be expanded. Inclusionary housing should be enforced. Major rental developments should be completed. The FRAME system should be replicated across the city. The objective is to turn isolated projects into a housing production system.

Horizon three from 2036 to 2047 focuses on transforming the city. The objective is not simply to eliminate the housing backlog. It is to change the spatial structure of Cape Town. By 2047 workers should live closer to opportunity. Transport costs should consume less of household income. Public land should serve public purpose. Affordable housing should remain affordable. Informal settlements should progressively become functioning neighbourhoods. Communities should have places to gather and grow. Housing construction should support local industry. Energy costs should not undermine household affordability.

CONCLUSION

The Choice

Cape Town's housing crisis is not caused by a shortage of houses alone. It is caused by the absence of a functioning system capable of continuously producing affordable homes in the right places at the right price connected to the conditions people need to flourish. That is the intellectual centre of this policy. Everything else flows from it.

The state should stop trying to build every house. It should build the system through which millions of homes can emerge. Leadership in the twenty-first century is no longer measured by the number of projects government controls directly. It is measured by its ability to create institutions capable of coordinating public investment, private innovation, digital intelligence and citizen participation into a single productive system.

Until government begins measuring success by homes completed rather than money budgetted the mathematics will remain undefeated. Families will continue waiting. Public funds will continue underperforming. South Africa will continue confusing activity with progress while its housing crisis quietly deepens.

The country does not need a larger housing programme. It needs a more intelligent state. Cape Town does not need more announcements. It needs a system that delivers. The choice is no longer between different types of housing projects. It is between two fundamentally different philosophies of urban governance. One continues to treat housing as a product to be delivered. The other treats housing as a system to be cultivated. The former has been tried for three decades with accelerating failure. The latter remains a compelling and necessary experiment.

> *"We do not build the finished house. We build the conditions for the family to finish it. Everything that flourishes does so because the conditions for flourishing were created first."*