



A FLAGSHIP POLICY OF THE SDP

Cape Town High-Risk Settlement Management Framework

*Identifying danger. Upgrading where possible.
Relocating where necessary. Preventing the next disaster.*



A FLAGSHIP POLICY OF THE SDP

Cape Town High-Risk Settlement Management Framework

Identifying danger. Upgrading where possible. Relocating where necessary. Preventing the next disaster.

Executive Summary

Cape Town cannot solve informal settlement challenges through eviction, demolition, emergency relief or the construction of temporary accommodation alone. The City needs a permanent system for identifying where people are living at unacceptable risk, determining whether those settlements can be made safe and providing a credible pathway to safer accommodation where they cannot.

The Cape Town High-Risk Settlement Management Framework establishes such a system, built on five principles. No household should knowingly be left where a material and preventable risk to life exists. Relocation should not be the default response to informality, and where settlements can safely be upgraded in place, upgrading should be prioritised. Where relocation is necessary, residents must move to a safe, serviced and properly planned site, connected to a permanent housing pathway rather than becoming permanent temporary accommodation. And the City must prevent the repeated occupation of land already identified as unsuitable for human habitation.

The framework links human settlements, spatial planning, stormwater management, disaster risk reduction, infrastructure planning, land acquisition, budgeting and community participation into a single system. South Africa's existing Informal Settlements Upgrading Programme already distinguishes settlements that can be upgraded in situ from those that must be relocated out of disaster-prone areas and provides for consultation, interim services, permanent services and security of tenure. This framework applies those principles systematically and consistently across Cape Town.

SECTION 01

The Policy Challenge

Cape Town's informal settlement challenge is not simply a shortage of houses. It is also a spatial risk problem. Some households occupy land affected by flooding, stormwater channels, wetlands, detention and retention ponds, dam safety areas, unstable slopes, erosion, infrastructure reserves, road and railway reserves, bulk water and sewer infrastructure, electricity infrastructure and other environmental or engineering hazards.

The City's own settlement mapping and hazard assessments, together with its recurring disaster response record, point to a consistent pattern of informal occupation on land exposed to flooding or below established flood lines. The scale of that exposure is precisely why a permanent risk register is proposed in Section 5 below, rather than relying on ad hoc assessment after each incident. In the absence of such a register, the City is left with a recurring cycle: occupation leads to flooding or another hazard, emergency response follows, damage is assessed, temporary relocation or rebuilding occurs and reoccupation follows until another emergency occurs.

This cycle is expensive for the City and dangerous for residents. It also means public money is repeatedly spent responding to the same risk rather than eliminating or reducing it. The framework seeks to break that cycle.

SECTION 02

Policy Principle

The central principle is that relocation without prevention is futile. If households are relocated from dangerous land but the land is subsequently reoccupied, the problem has not been solved. Equally, prevention without a human housing solution is inadequate: preventing people from occupying dangerous land cannot become a substitute for providing realistic housing pathways.

The policy therefore combines risk identification, risk reduction, in-situ upgrading, managed relocation, housing delivery, prevention of reoccupation and public accountability, each depending on the others. No single element is sufficient on its own.

"Relocation without prevention is futile. Prevention without a housing solution is inadequate."

SECTION 03

Constitutional and Legal Foundation

The framework operates within South Africa's constitutional and statutory framework. Section 26 of the Constitution recognises everyone's right of access to adequate housing and requires the state to take reasonable legislative and other measures towards the progressive realisation of that right. Section 26(3) protects people against eviction or demolition without a court order made after considering all relevant circumstances.

The Constitutional Court has given that protection practical content that this framework is bound to follow, not merely to cite. In *Government of the Republic of South Africa v Grootboom* (2000), the Court established that housing policy must be reasonable in both conception and implementation and cannot ignore the needs of those in desperate circumstances. In *Occupiers of 51 Olivia Road v City of Johannesburg* (2008), the Court held that meaningful engagement with affected residents, conducted genuinely and before decisions are finalised, is a precondition for lawful eviction or relocation, not an optional courtesy. In *Residents of Joe Slovo Community v Thubelisha Homes* (2009), the Court confirmed that even a lawful, upgrading-linked relocation must be accompanied by adequate consultation, suitable alternative accommodation and a credible return or resettlement pathway. This framework's classification, engagement and relocation provisions (Sections 6, 7, 10 and 13) are designed to satisfy that standard as a floor, not a ceiling.

The framework must not be interpreted as authorising arbitrary eviction or demolition and must be implemented consistently with the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996, the Housing Act, 1997, the Prevention of Illegal Eviction from and Unlawful Occupation of Land Act, 1998, the Disaster Management Act, 2002, the Spatial Planning and Land Use Management Act, 2013, the Municipal Systems Act and the Municipal Finance Management Act. It must also align with the National Housing Code, the Informal Settlements Upgrading Programme, applicable environmental legislation, applicable

municipal by-laws, the City's Spatial Development Framework and Integrated Development Plan and relevant national and provincial human settlements programmes and conditional grants.

SECTION 04

Policy Objectives

The City shall pursue seven objectives, moving from evidence to accountability. The first is to know where the risk is, through a comprehensive spatial register identifying informal settlements and households located in materially hazardous areas. The second is to determine whether risk can be mitigated, by assessing every identified settlement for safe in-situ upgrading. The third is to relocate where risk cannot reasonably be mitigated, by developing safe, serviced relocation options for households that cannot remain safely in their existing locations.

The fourth is to prevent new occupation of dangerous land, by protecting identified high-risk land through appropriate physical, environmental, planning and enforcement measures. The fifth is to connect relocation to permanent housing, so that temporary accommodation does not become indefinite accommodation. The sixth is to reduce recurring disaster expenditure, by measuring the financial cost of repeated emergency response against the cost of permanent risk reduction. The seventh is to make progress publicly measurable, by publishing annual information showing what has been identified, upgraded, relocated and what remains outstanding.

SECTION 05

The Cape Town Settlement Risk Register

The City shall establish a publicly accessible Cape Town Settlement Risk Register. Every informal settlement shall receive a risk assessment based on objective criteria, recording settlement location, the estimated number of households, flood and stormwater infrastructure exposure, environmental constraints, slope and geotechnical risk, infrastructure encroachment, emergency access and fire risk.

The register shall also record proximity to schools, public transport and employment opportunities, the availability of municipal services, land ownership, suitability for in-situ upgrading, relocation requirement, the current

intervention, the responsible department, the budget allocation and the implementation status. The register shall be updated annually and shall form the verified baseline against which the five-year targets in Section 19 are measured.

SECTION 06

Three-Level Settlement Risk Classification

The City shall classify land using a three-level system. **Red** indicates high hazard and prohibited habitation: land where permanent residential occupation presents a material and unacceptable risk that cannot reasonably be mitigated, such as active floodways, critical stormwater infrastructure, certain dam safety zones, land with serious geotechnical instability, critical infrastructure reserves and areas where emergency access cannot reasonably be secured. Permanent settlement shall not be planned in these areas, and where existing households are present, the City shall develop a managed intervention plan consistent with the constitutional standard set out in Section 3 and subject to the independent review mechanism in Section 13.

Amber indicates conditional or managed risk: land where risk exists but may potentially be mitigated through engineering, re-blocking, drainage, environmental rehabilitation or other measures. Such areas shall be subject to technical assessment under the Upgrade-or-Relocate Test in Section 7.

Green indicates land suitable for settlement, subject to normal planning, environmental, engineering and infrastructure requirements. The existence of an informal settlement on suitable land shall not automatically trigger relocation; where feasible, in-situ upgrading shall be prioritised, consistent with the national upgrading framework's support for in-situ upgrading where appropriate and relocation only where settlements sit in disaster-prone areas.

Because a Red classification carries such consequence for the households affected, no classification takes effect until it has passed through the review process described in Section 13.

SECTION 07

The Upgrade-or-Relocate Test

Relocation shall not be the automatic response to informal settlement. Every high-risk settlement shall undergo a documented Upgrade-or-Relocate Assessment answering ten questions: can the flood or other hazard be practically mitigated; can stormwater infrastructure be safely upgraded; can emergency vehicle access be established; can basic and permanent services be provided; can environmental impacts be appropriately managed; can the settlement be re-blocked; can sufficient land be made available; would upgrading expose residents to continuing unacceptable risk; would relocation create greater social and economic hardship; and is a suitable alternative site available. The assessment and its conclusion shall be published in full.

SECTION 08

In-Situ Upgrading

Where a settlement can safely remain in place, the City shall prioritise an upgrading programme that may include re-blocking, improved access roads, stormwater drainage, water supply, sanitation, electricity, refuse removal, fire access, public lighting, social facilities, secure tenure and permanent serviced sites.

The programme shall follow the applicable phases of the Informal Settlements Upgrading Programme, which identifies planning, feasibility, land acquisition, interim services, engineering design, township establishment and permanent infrastructure as components of the upgrading process.

SECTION 09

High-Risk Relocation

Where an independent technical assessment determines that a settlement cannot safely remain in its current location, the City shall develop a managed relocation programme that is lawful, transparent, phased where appropriate, properly documented, community-engaged, adequately funded and linked to a permanent housing pathway.

The City shall not use the designation of a settlement as high risk as a mechanism to circumvent constitutional or statutory protections. Relocation shall be a last resort, undertaken only after all reasonable alternatives have been exhausted and the *Joe Slovo* standard of adequate consultation and suitable alternative accommodation has been met.

SECTION 10

Relocation Site Suitability Test

No relocation site shall be approved merely because land is available. Every proposed relocation site shall pass a Relocation Site Suitability Test examining safety (is the site outside material flood, fire, environmental and geotechnical hazards), water (can a reliable supply be provided), sanitation (can adequate sanitation be provided), stormwater (can it be safely managed), electricity (can it be provided), roads (can emergency and public transport access be provided), transport (can residents reach employment and education opportunities), schools (are existing schools accessible or can capacity be provided), healthcare (are services reasonably accessible), livelihoods (will relocation unnecessarily destroy household livelihoods), security (can the site be safely managed) and permanent potential (can the site form part of a permanent housing solution). A site failing this assessment shall not be used for planned relocation.

SECTION 11

Temporary Relocation Areas

Temporary Relocation Areas shall be treated as transitional housing infrastructure, never as permanent destinations. Every household entering one shall receive a documented Relocation Case Record containing household identification, the number of household members, the previous location and reason for relocation, the date of relocation and temporary location, housing eligibility status and permanent housing pathway, the responsible municipal official and the next review date. The City shall publish aggregated progress data while protecting personal information, per Section 26.

SECTION 12

The Permanent Housing Pathway

Every household relocated from a high-risk area shall be assessed for an appropriate permanent housing pathway, which may include in-situ upgrading where subsequently feasible, serviced sites, subsidised housing, social housing, affordable rental housing, incremental housing or other appropriate housing programmes.

Temporary accommodation shall not become an indefinite administrative holding category. Each household shall carry a defined status: awaiting assessment, eligible and awaiting allocation, permanent solution identified, permanent solution under development or permanent solution completed.

SECTION 13

Relocation, Community Participation and Independent Review

The City shall undertake meaningful engagement before relocation wherever circumstances permit, in the sense established by *Olivia Road*: genuine engagement conducted before decisions are finalised, not consultation staged to ratify a decision already made. Engagement shall include door-to-door engagement, community meetings, household information sessions, written notices, multilingual information, community liaison structures and independent social facilitation where appropriate.

Residents shall be shown the evidence supporting a risk classification wherever reasonably possible. The City shall explain why the area is considered dangerous; why mitigation is or is not possible; where residents would move and what services would be available; what the permanent housing pathway is; and who is responsible and when the next decision will be made.

Settlement Classification Review Panel. Because a Red classification determines whether a household may remain in its home, no classification becomes final without a right of review. The City shall establish an independent Settlement Classification Review Panel, comprising technical specialists and community representatives who are not part of the assessing department, to hear objections to a proposed Red or Amber classification before it is confirmed. Affected residents and their representatives may lodge an objection, supported by their own evidence where available, and receive a

written, reasoned decision within a defined statutory period. The Panel's decisions shall be published, subject to the personal information protections in Section 26.

Community participation shall be resourced with dedicated budget and personnel: skilled facilitators; materials in isiXhosa, Afrikaans and English; and venues and transport for community meetings. Without dedicated resources, participation and review commitments become box-ticking exercises.

SECTION 14

Special Protection for Vulnerable Households

Relocation planning shall identify households requiring additional assistance, including but not limited to households with children, older persons and persons with disabilities, households requiring access to healthcare, female-headed households and households dependent on nearby livelihoods. Relocation plans shall include appropriate transport, social facilitation and continuity-of-service arrangements for each.

The annual High-Risk Settlement Dashboard (Section 23) shall report vulnerable-household outcomes as a distinct line item, not folded into the general relocation count, so that the five-year targets in Section 19 can be checked against this group specifically and not only in aggregate.

SECTION 15

Prevention Through Visible Housing Delivery

Enforcement against reoccupation, described in Sections 16 and 17, only holds if residents can see that the City is providing a genuine alternative. A Land Protection Plan or an early-warning system that operates without visible, parallel progress on upgrading and relocation reads as policing poverty rather than managing risk and invites exactly the reoccupation it is meant to prevent. This framework therefore treats visible housing delivery as the primary prevention mechanism and physical and monitoring measures as the secondary, supporting mechanism, in that order of priority.

*Visible housing delivery is the primary prevention mechanism.
Fencing and monitoring are the supporting layer, never the
substitute.*

SECTION 16

Protecting High-Risk Land

Once an area has been formally designated as unsuitable for habitation, the City shall implement a Land Protection Plan appropriate to that specific site, drawn from measures such as fencing, palisades, bollards, berms, landscaping, wetland rehabilitation, drainage improvements, signage, lighting, access controls, patrols, environmental restoration and lawful enforcement.

The City shall select the most cost-effective combination of measures for each site's characteristics and shall treat protection as a permanent operational responsibility rather than a once-off capital project. As set out in Section 15, protection measures are the supporting layer; the deciding factor in whether reoccupation recurs is whether households can see real progress on housing delivery.

SECTION 17

New Occupation Prevention

The City shall establish a proactive early-warning system for new occupation of identified high-risk land, combining municipal inspections, satellite and aerial imagery, GIS monitoring, community reporting, infrastructure monitoring and environmental monitoring where lawful and appropriate, with the objective of intervening before a new settlement becomes established.

Because monitoring measures can be experienced as surveillance of vulnerable communities rather than protection of them, the City shall publish this system's purpose and scope alongside the housing delivery data in Section 23, so that residents can see prevention and provision reported together rather than prevention reported in isolation. The City shall publish

annual statistics on new high-risk occupations detected, interventions undertaken, sites protected, structures removed where legally authorised and successful prevention measures.

SECTION 18

Critical Infrastructure Protection

High-risk settlement management shall include land required to protect critical municipal infrastructure, including stormwater channels, bulk water pipelines, sewer infrastructure, electricity infrastructure, substations, transport reserves, road reserves, railway reserves, dams and detention facilities. The City shall identify infrastructure corridors where occupation creates direct risks to residents and corridors where occupation prevents the maintenance of essential services.

SECTION 19

Climate-Adjusted Planning

All high-risk settlement assessments shall consider future climate conditions rather than relying exclusively on historical flood information, including changing rainfall intensity and flood recurrence, sea-level rise where relevant, stormwater capacity, erosion, environmental degradation, heat exposure, fire risk and changing settlement patterns. The objective is to avoid relocating households today onto land that could become materially unsafe in the future.

SECTION 20

Five-Year Implementation Targets

The City shall adopt measurable five-year targets, reviewed annually against verified baseline data and not changed retrospectively. Because the Settlement Risk Register itself is a Year 1 deliverable, the household-reduction targets below are stated as indicative planning targets to be formally rebaselined against the Year 1 Register once it is published; the sequencing, milestones and reporting obligations are not conditional on that rebaselining and apply from Year 1 regardless.

By the end of **Year 1**, the City shall complete a city-wide baseline of informal settlements and estimated households exposed to material hazards, establish the public Settlement Risk Register and the Settlement Classification Review Panel, complete technical risk assessments for all identified priority high-risk settlements, identify land parcels suitable for relocation and upgrading and publish the first annual High-Risk Settlement Dashboard together with the indicative budget referred to in Annexure A.

By the end of **Year 2**, the City shall complete Upgrade-or-Relocate assessments for all priority high-risk settlements, secure land for the first tranche of relocation projects, begin infrastructure preparation for priority relocation areas, protect the highest-priority no-build areas and place every household approved for relocation onto a documented housing pathway.

By the end of **Year 3**, the City shall complete relocation of households facing the highest immediate life-safety risks, subject to lawful processes and the availability of suitable accommodation, complete priority in-situ upgrading projects where technically feasible, establish operational relocation areas with water, sanitation, stormwater, access and electricity where feasible and publish settlement-level progress data.

By the end of **Year 4**, the City shall reduce the number of households living in identified Red high-hazard areas by at least 60 per cent from the rebaselined Year 1 figure, complete protection measures for all priority Red zones, ensure every relocated household has a documented permanent housing pathway and demonstrate measurable reductions in repeat flood incidents at intervention sites.

By the end of **Year 5**, the City shall reduce households living in identified Red high-hazard areas by at least 80 per cent from the rebaselined Year 1 figure, subject to the availability of suitable land and lawful relocation processes, ensure 100 per cent of priority high-risk settlements have either an approved upgrading plan or relocation plan and ensure 100 per cent of planned relocation areas meet the City's approved site suitability requirements before occupation. The City shall also ensure 100 per cent of relocated households are recorded in the permanent housing pathway system, protect 100 per cent of identified critical infrastructure corridors exposed to settlement encroachment, publish five consecutive annual High-Risk Settlement Dashboards and commission an independent evaluation of the programme.

SECTION 21

Funding Model

The City shall establish a dedicated multi-year budget framework covering technical assessments, land acquisition, planning and community facilitation, interim services, permanent infrastructure, stormwater, access roads, relocation logistics, site security, land protection, monitoring and maintenance, drawing on municipal capital budgets, national conditional grants, provincial human settlements programmes, development finance institutions, climate finance, disaster risk reduction funding and other lawful public-private financing mechanisms. The existing national grant architecture already supports informal settlement upgrading and relocation from disaster-prone areas.

Annexure A sets out an indicative, order-of-magnitude budget envelope for each major intervention category. These figures are planning estimates only, intended to demonstrate fiscal seriousness and to anchor budget negotiations; they are not a substitute for the detailed, site-specific costing the City must still commission once the Year 1 Register and site assessments are complete.

SECTION 22

Cost of Inaction

The City shall introduce a Cost of Inaction Assessment for priority high-risk settlements, estimating emergency response expenditure, flood relief expenditure, infrastructure repair, repeated stormwater maintenance, service disruption, relocation costs and potential infrastructure losses, set against the proposed mitigation, upgrading or relocation costs for that same settlement.

The purpose is to compare repeated emergency expenditure against permanent risk reduction, informing annual budget decisions and reframing the debate from whether the City can afford to act to whether it can afford not to act.

SECTION 23

Institutional Responsibility

The framework shall be implemented through an interdepartmental programme with a single accountable lead. Human Settlements shall appoint a **Programme Director for High-Risk Settlements**, who chairs the High-Risk Settlement Steering Committee, holds cross-departmental sign-off authority over the annual implementation plan and is the one named official accountable to the Mayoral Committee and Council for overall delivery against the Section 20 targets. This does not replace departmental responsibility; it ensures that responsibility does not disperse across eight departments with nobody answerable for the whole.

Within that structure, Informal Settlements Management conducts settlement assessments, community engagement and relocation coordination. Roads and Stormwater conducts flood-risk assessments and provides drainage and stormwater infrastructure. Spatial Planning and Urban Design conducts risk mapping and spatial planning and integrates the framework into land-use frameworks. Disaster Risk Management conducts hazard assessment and emergency preparedness and provides early-warning systems. Environmental Management addresses wetlands, environmental buffers and ecological risk. Legal Services provides lawful enforcement, litigation and legal compliance. Finance provides multi-year budgeting and financial monitoring. The City Manager provides overall cross-departmental implementation oversight.

The High-Risk Settlement Steering Committee reports quarterly to the Mayoral Committee and annually to Council.

SECTION 24

Public Accountability Dashboard

The City shall publish an annual High-Risk Settlement Dashboard reporting high-risk households identified, Red-zone households and households relocated, households receiving permanent solutions, settlements undergoing upgrading, no-build zones protected, critical infrastructure corridors protected, relocation sites operational; flood incidents at intervention sites; and emergency and capital expenditure, alongside the vulnerable-household outcomes required by Section 14 and the prevention statistics required by Section 17.

The dashboard shall clearly distinguish money budgeted, money spent, work completed and outcomes achieved. This distinction matters: many government reports conflate these categories, and this framework's credibility depends on not doing so.

SECTION 25

Independent Evaluation

At the end of Year 5, an independent evaluation shall assess whether households are safer, whether flood incidents have declined in intervention areas, whether relocation has produced sustainable housing outcomes, whether in-situ upgrading has improved living conditions and whether reoccupation of protected land has occurred.

The evaluation shall also assess whether emergency expenditure has declined, whether households have maintained access to employment, education and services, whether the programme has complied with constitutional and statutory obligations including the standards set out in Section 3, whether targets were achieved and what changes should be made for the following five-year cycle. The evaluation shall be made publicly available.

SECTION 26

Governance and Anti-Corruption Safeguards

All land acquisition, infrastructure procurement and relocation contracts shall be subject to applicable municipal procurement and financial controls. The City shall publish, where legally permissible, project name and location, approved budget and expenditure, contractor and implementation timetable, households affected, responsible department and completion status. Changes to project scope and material delays shall be recorded and explained.

Independent monitoring shall be appointed, and whistleblower protections shall be established consistent with the Protected Disclosures Act, 2000, giving officials and residents who report irregularities a lawful, protected channel to do so. Findings of the Auditor-General and the Public Protector concerning this programme shall be tabled at the Steering Committee within one reporting cycle of publication, with a documented response. Forensic audit provisions shall be included, and penalties for non-compliance shall be specified. Given the history of corruption in South African housing and infrastructure projects, these safeguards are essential, not optional.

SECTION 27

Data Protection

The Settlement Risk Register shall provide meaningful public information while protecting personal information. Household-level identifying information shall not be publicly disclosed unless legally authorised, and public reporting shall use aggregated data wherever possible.

SECTION 28

Land Acquisition Strategy

The City shall develop a dedicated land acquisition strategy addressing expropriation where necessary, state land release and partnerships with provincial and national government, community opposition to relocation sites and competition for well-located land within the urban edge.

Land acquisition is often the single greatest obstacle to relocation programmes. The strategy shall prioritise land acquisition relative to other capital projects, identify suitable parcels proactively rather than reactively and ensure that land is secured before relocation is promised.

SECTION 29

Annual Review

The framework shall be reviewed annually, examining changes in settlement patterns, new hazard information, climate projections, progress against targets, budget performance, relocation outcomes, housing delivery, community feedback and unintended consequences.

The five-year targets shall not be weakened simply because implementation has fallen behind. Where targets are not achieved, the responsible department shall provide a written explanation and corrective action plan to the Programme Director and the Steering Committee.

SECTION 30

Policy Outcome

The desired outcome is not simply fewer informal settlements. It is fewer households at risk. Cape Town should progressively move from a system in which government responds to disasters after they happen, to one in which risk is identified, communicated, mitigated and managed before disaster strikes.

A successful programme means fewer families rebuilding after floods, fewer homes destroyed, fewer emergency relocations and fewer people living over critical infrastructure. It means safer informal settlements where upgrading is possible and safer relocation where relocation is unavoidable. It means more predictable housing pathways, better use of municipal infrastructure, better protection of public land, lower recurring disaster costs and greater public accountability.

SECTION 31

The SDP Policy Test

The framework shall ultimately be judged by five questions that can be asked in a council meeting or a community gathering. Did we identify the risk, and can the City show where people are living in danger? Did we reduce the risk, upgrading settlements where possible rather than simply moving people? Did we move people safely, to suitable, serviced locations through lawful and transparent processes, where relocation was unavoidable? Did we provide a permanent pathway, so that temporary accommodation led somewhere? Did we stop the cycle, protecting dangerous land against repeated occupation?

SECTION 32

Conclusion

Cape Town cannot build a resilient city by repeatedly responding to the same disaster or by treating every informal settlement as a problem that must simply be removed. The city requires a more disciplined approach: where people can safely remain, upgrade the settlement; where risk can be mitigated, reduce the risk; where people cannot safely remain, relocate them humanely and lawfully; where land is demonstrably unsafe, protect it from reoccupation; and where people are relocated, provide a permanent housing pathway. Throughout, publish the evidence, the budget, the responsibility and the results.

The purpose of this framework is not to move people. It is to move Cape Town from reactive disaster management to proactive settlement management. The ultimate measure of success is simple: fewer people living in danger, fewer disasters repeated and more households moving towards safe, secure and dignified homes.

ANNEXURE

Annexure A: Indicative Budget Framework

The figures below are order-of-magnitude planning estimates in current Rand terms, drawn from typical South African informal settlement upgrading and relocation cost ranges. They are indicative only, intended to demonstrate fiscal seriousness and anchor budget negotiations pending the City's own detailed, site-specific costing once the Year 1 Register is complete. They are stated as a range per affected household or per settlement, since city-wide totals depend on the number and severity of settlements confirmed by the Register.

Category	Indicative order-of-magnitude range	Basis
Technical assessment and risk mapping (per settlement)	R150,000 to R400,000	Geotechnical, flood and social assessment per site
Land acquisition	Site-dependent; market or expropriation valuation	Single greatest cost variable; no reliable generic figure
In-situ upgrading, full services (per household)	R60,000 to R150,000	Water, sanitation, stormwater, electricity, access, per ISUP norms
Relocation site development, full services (per household)	R90,000 to R180,000	Serviced site plus access, stormwater and community facilities
Temporary Relocation Area, interim services (per household)	R25,000 to R45,000	Interim water, sanitation, electricity connection only
Land protection (fencing, signage, rehabilitation, per site)	R500,000 to R2,500,000	Site-dependent on size and terrain
Community facilitation and engagement (per settlement)	R80,000 to R200,000	Facilitators, translation, venues, transport over assessment period

Category	Indicative order-of-magnitude range	Basis
Monitoring and early-warning systems (city-wide, annual)	R5 million to R15 million	GIS, imagery licensing, inspection staffing
Independent evaluation (Year 5, once-off)	R2 million to R5 million	External evaluators, publication

This table shall be replaced with confirmed figures in the first annual High-Risk Settlement Dashboard once the Year 1 Register and site-specific costings are complete and shall not be presented in that later document as though it were the original policy commitment.

ANNEXURE

Annexure B: Glossary

High-risk land means land subject to frequent flooding, erosion or other hazards that endanger human life or health.

No-build zone means land identified as unsuitable for permanent human habitation due to flood risk, ecological sensitivity or infrastructure requirements.

Demarcated relocation area means a site identified, serviced and fenced by the City for the temporary accommodation of households relocated from high-risk land.

Temporary Relocation Area means a serviced site providing interim accommodation pending permanent housing solutions.

Upgrade-or-Relocate Assessment means a documented technical assessment determining whether a high-risk settlement can safely be upgraded in situ or must be relocated.

Relocation Site Suitability Test means an assessment determining whether a proposed relocation site meets the City's approved safety, service and sustainability requirements.



Settlement Classification Review Panel means the independent panel established under Section 13 to hear objections to a proposed Red or Amber classification before it is confirmed.

Programme Director for High-Risk Settlements means the single named official, appointed under Section 23, accountable for cross-departmental delivery of this framework.