

## ANNEXURE A

### Tabulated reasons for individual amendments.

Section reference	Reasoning or motivation for amendments
Index 15	This is more fully addressed in section 68, but it is a result of the view that not all application types listed in section 15 are SPLUMA land development applications and do therefore not necessarily have to be considered by the MPT or AO.
Index 25	Improved wording as the word “amenities” is used throughout the by-law and not “social facilities”.
Index 68	Details appear in section 68, but is the result the realisation that not all application types listed in section 15(2) are SPLUMA land development applications and do therefore not necessarily have to be considered by the MPT or AO.
Index 80	Improved wording as there is only one procedure.
Index 83	Development charges are linked to engineering infrastructure, whereas there may also be other contributions as well.
Definitions	
Agent	This change appears throughout the by-law. The reason is that LUPA already defines “owner” as the person registered in a deeds registry as the owner of land or who is the beneficial owner in law, thus owner is already described as owner of land hence there is no need to repeat it every time. This comment will only be made once and is applicable in all instances where the by-law refers to “owner of land”.
Applicable period	The reason for deleting the words “condition of” is because not all applicable periods are contained in conditions of approval. The sections referred to in this definition does not refer to the conditions of approval but actually form part of the decision itself. If there is a need to extend the validity period the application is therefore for an extension of the validity period in terms of Section 15(2)(h) and not an application for the amendment of a condition in terms of Section 15(2)(i), unless specific validity period were imposed as conditions of approval.
Notes ( <i>in general</i> )	All “notes” are to be deleted from the by-laws, as these are just notes to municipalities and do not form part of the regulatory instrument. It is not repeated in all instances, but is applicable in all instances.
Commencement	This newly inserted term refers only to the instances where it is linked to the lapsing of approved land use rights in respect of section 17 (Rezoning), section 18 (Departure) and section 19 (Consent use)
Emergency	Improved wording to provide more clarity.
Municipal Manager	This change occurs throughout this document and will not be repeated again, the reasons is proper use of capitalisation of the official position of Municipal Manager.
Occasional use	The definition was deleted as it is only a type of temporary departure, more clarity appears in section 18(4).
Overlay zone	Change “or” to “and” because if it remains an “or” it will mean either one of the two are applicable whereas there may very well be situations where both are required.
Overlay zone Base zoning	Deleted as base zoning is not part of an overlay zone.
Overlay zone Local areas	The word “local areas” has been deleted as it is vague and adds no value to this concept.
Overlay zone Coastal setback lines	Deleted the words “where coastlines are involved” for the reason that coastal set back lines can only apply where coastlines are involved.
Spatial Planning and Land Use Regulations	Improved the wording.
3(1)(a)	To make it more clear that it involves the SDF itself as well as amendments thereto.
3(1)(b)(ii)	Deleted words which are actually duplicated by “the process contemplated in subsection (2)(a)(ii)”.
4(1)	Changed “must” to “may” to provide for an option to establish a project committee

	<p>and not to make it compulsory.</p> <p>Also to provide that when the municipality does not opt have an intergovernmental steering committee, then it could use the project committee to do this work.</p>
4(2)(b)	Add "where relevant" because all departments may not be necessary in all cases, so these words add some flexibility depending on the situation at hand – therefore the words "at least" are also deleted.
5(1)	Improved wording because the Municipal Manager is not mentioned in the existing by-laws whereas the corresponding section 12 of LUPA does and it is to give improved effect to the LUPA requirements as well as to more clearly spell out the role of the Municipal Manager in this. Previous wording has been replaced by new wording.
6(1)	<p>This is to provide for the situation where the municipality does not establish a project committee, whereas it is really the function of the municipality to do this, but they may use a project committee for this purpose. This amendment occurs in various instances in sections 6-8 and will not be repeated.</p> <p>Insertion of "relevant area" - this is to provide for smaller or localised amendments to a SDF, where it may not be necessary to do a draft status quo report for the whole area, but just for a smaller relevant area. This amendment occurs in various instances in sections 6-8 and will not be repeated.</p>
6(5)	Replace "comments and representations" with only "comments" - this occurs in various instances in the document and will not be repeated. The reason is that "comments" is defined in section 1 which definition includes "representations" and it will be confusing if it is mentioned separately. This suggested change occurs in a number of instances and will not be repeated again.
7(2)	Improved referencing in order to provide more clarity and to provide a clear distinction between the two documents.
8(1)(a)	The municipality must ensure and not oversee. This amendment occurs in various instances in section 8 and will not be repeated
8(1)(f)(i)	Improved referencing.
8(2)(b)	To provide for instance if a project committee was established, which is now an option and not compulsory as it was in the previous version of the by-laws
9(2)(d)	The word "recommended" is better legislative grammar than "proposed", but it is also inserted to indicate and make it clear that the parameters in a local SDF as a policy document can only be proposed/recommended as a local SDF cannot give rights and development parameters - if the word "recommended" is not inserted it may be misconstrued as that it does.
13(3)	Change to be accepted. The reason is to make it very clear that - if after the "fact finding mission" it results in 2(e), i.e. no zoning could be determined, then the action which must be followed by municipality to give effect to 2(e) would be to rezone the land from "unknown" to its new zoning whatever it is to be, via a rezoning process, in which case the municipality will be the applicant and will have to comply with all relevant provisions of the by-law as set out in the new sections 15(5) and (6) and amended (7). Initially it was not clear what is to happen in such a case.
Heading of section 15	Inclusion of "and other approvals", as not all the matters in 15(2) are land development applications in terms of SPLUMA, some are not and hence the addition of "other approvals". Additional reasoning will be found in comments at section 68. This amendment to the heading is also to facilitate and enable the suggested amendments to section 68.
15(2) occasional use	Deleted occasional use as an application type as an "occasional use" is in essence a temporary departure for a specific occasion or event on a specific site and as such it is distinguished from the normal temporary departure as in section 18(4) provision is made that it may be granted more than once on a specific land unit and in section 66(2)(y) provision is made for specific conditions in this regard. As a result, occasional use as a specific application has been removed.
15(2) home owners' association	The word "home" was removed as industrial or business areas may also have owners' associations, so the new wording is a more generic term as home owners' associations are only linked to residential uses.

15(4)	Is it suggested that this section which refers to section 52 of SPLUMA be deleted in total. Firstly, is it only informative, but secondly it lends municipal credibility to a SPLUMA provision, the content of which is regarded unconstitutional. If section 52 of SPLUMA is challenged or amended, it may mean that the by-law will have to be amended as a result. Downstream re-numbering occurs as a result of this deletion.
15(4)	Renumbered
15(6)	<p>Renumbered and this section was inserted to make it clear that when the municipality rezones in terms of section 17, what the process is that must be followed and then links it to the new section 15(8) which provides that when the municipality rezones it is then an applicant and must adhere to all application requirements.</p> <p>Also Section 13(3) was inserted here as well as there may be instances where there is a need for a municipality to rezone as a result of an unsuccessful zoning determination and where no request from an owner is forthcoming and where it does not meet the requirements of section 17(1).</p>
15(7)	Renumbered and new wording inserted as some instances the municipality must be able to achieve a specific land development by means other than rezoning, especially with the options which new generation zoning schemes may provide for. As a result, provision has been made for other application types which may also be done by the municipality. As with subsection 15(5) above it is then made subject to the new section 15(7) which provides that when the municipality rezones land or does any of the other permitted actions it is then regarded as the applicant and must adhere to all application requirements.
15(8)	<p>Renumbered, deleted and replaced with new wording was inserted. Subsection 7(a) was inserted and reworded to make it clear that where the municipality is the applicant it must follow all procedures which an ordinary applicant would normally have to comply with in terms of the by-laws.</p> <p>The addition of subsection 7(b) is to ensure that, not only for rezoning, but also for other application types, where the municipality is the applicant, that the matter must be considered by the MPT and not by an AO, so as to ensure or build in some impartiality facilitated by the outside persons serving on a MPT</p>
17(5)	Insertion of "reckoned" the reason is improved wording to make it clearer.
17(6)	Improved wording to make it clearer.
17(6)(a)	The word "and" was replaced with to "or" to prevent the situation where compliance with one of the two provisions will keep the rights alive, which is not the intention.
18(4)	The new insertion is necessary due to the fact that an occasional use was removed as a separate application, due to it being a temporary departure, but it requires some kind of distinction from an ordinary temporary departure so that it can be granted more than once on a specific land unit. It thus describes the "occasional use as right to utilise land for a purpose granted on a temporary basis for a specific occasion or event.
21(1)(d)	This is to provide for an additional method to secure confirmation of the subdivision by means of a certificate of registered title and certificate of consolidated title to provide for circumstances where the economy is not conducive to selling of erven and can then save the subdivision from lapsing.
22(2)	Insertion to result in improved wording to make it clearer.
23(1)	Alternate wording to make it clearer.
23(4)	A total reword, the reason being to prevent the "stopping of the clock" by way of submitting an amended subdivision, however small the changes may be, as it can be abused to gain more time beyond the original validity period. The conservative approach suggested is favoured. This was confirmed at the Municipal Planning Heads Forum on 17 May 2017.
24(1)(f)(iii)	Improved grammar as a result of new (v)
24(1)(f)(iv)	Improved grammar as a result of new (v)
24(1)(f)(v)	New insertion, the reason is to provide for an additional exemption of a matter not really of municipal interest, to lessen the administrative burden and red-tape.
24(1)(g)(i)	Insertion of word "in the case of a subdivision" This insertion is the result of many

	enquiries to ensure that consolidations of agricultural land are also exempted as it is not regulated by Act 70 of 1970 although Department of Agriculture Forestry and Fisheries regularly imposes consolidation as a condition of subdivision approval. The previous wording exempted only the subdivision but not the consolidation of farmland which was an unintended consequence and defeating the object.
24(1)(h)	This insertion is to provide for sectional title development scheme to be also exempted. Currently with the wording of the definitions of "land" in SPLUMA and LUPA includes a sectional title scheme (part of a real right), which again is an unintended consequence. Making it an exemption in the by-laws achieves the object easier than amending SPLUMA and LUPA.
24(4)	New section inserted. This insertion is necessary to ensure that where there is a court order, an expropriation or a sectional title scheme is applicable, that no certification of the municipality will be necessary. If the Courts have made a ruling, how can a municipality then still need to make a certification in order to achieve compliance with a court order?
Heading of section 25	The reason is improved wording to make it clearer and to ensure that the heading encompasses the content of 25(1) and (2) and be aligned with it - as the content addresses "amenities" whereas the heading referred to "social facilities" which may be confusing.
26(1)	Insertion of "its" - the reason is improved wording to make it clearer.
26(4)(b)	The reason is improved wording to make it clearer and to distinguish it from (c)
26(4)(c)	The reason is improved wording to make it clearer and to distinguish it from (b)
27(a)	This emanated from a historical situation and may not always be the case anymore. This is why the words "without compensation" has been removed and replaced with "as may reasonably be required".
28(1) and (2)	The changes emanated from the change in section 21 that a certificate of registered title and certificate of consolidated title should also be able to confirm a subdivision. Since this changes the status of land is necessary that the section 28 certification also be amplified by adding the certificate of registered title and certificate of consolidated title. Whilst this provides for more options for developer, it simultaneously increases the obligations and legal effect in that actions which would normally have followed registration of transfer. It is there necessary to subject these to certification as well, hence the insertion.
28(3)(b)	Improved wording to make it clearer.
28(3)(c), (c)(i), (d)(i)-(iii)	Improved wording to make it clearer and renumbering to improve numbering
28(3)(c)(ii)	This is to ensure that no land to be transferred to the owners' association is left in the hands of the developer/applicant and prevent many problems experienced in this regard in the past.
28(3)(d) and (d)(i)	This is to highlight and ensure that where confirmation of a subdivision via certificate of registered title and certificate of consolidated title occurs it will also result in these transfers where required.
29(3)	Improved wording to make it clearer.
29(5)	This is a logical amendment in that the constitution of the owners' association cannot take affect before the owners' association comes into being which as set out in section 28(3)(c) can only occur after registration of first land unit to a person different to the developer/applicant.
29(7)(b)	Improved wording for the same reasoning as for 29(5) above
30(1)	Deletion as it is already provided for in section 15(2)(p)
30(1)(a) and (b)	Improved referencing as number needed to be amended as "occasional use was taken out of the list in section 15(2).
30(2)	Improved referencing
33(1) and (1)(a) and (b)	This was deleted as it is now provided for and included in the new section 15(6) in order to result in an improved grouping of matters and to distinguish the permanent removal from those which may be suspended for a specific period.
33(1)(c)	Rewording to provide that the removal, suspension or amendment of a restrictive condition, can be made subject to conditions.
33(3), (3)(b), (4), (5) and (6)	Renumbering to (2) as a result of upstream adjustments and to improve wording to make it clearer.

33(7) and (8)	New clauses inserted as previously a land use application was done in terms of LUPO and the removal, suspension or amendment of a restrictive condition in terms of the Removal of Restrictions Act, 1967. Now they are all done in terms of the same legislation (as a result of the provisions of SPLUMA) and since this is the case these matters should be applied for and considered simultaneously, which is what these 2 new sections require and provide for.
34(1)	Improved referencing.
35(1)(b)(i)-(ii), and (d)	The reason is improved wording to make it clearer and to provide for more options.
35(2)(a)-(d) and (3)(b)	Improved grammar.
36(2)(c)	Improved grammar to not make it a closed list.
38(1)	This insertion is to improve the wording to provide for situations where perhaps not all the documents in this list are necessary for a specific application and to enable the outcome of the pre-consultation meeting in 38(2) to determine which documents may not be relevant or applicable.
38(1)(c) and (e)	The reason is improved wording to make it clearer.
38(1)(f)	The matters provided for in 65(a), (b), (d), (e) and (g) are not matters which can be addressed in a motivation for an application when it is first submitted as these matters and aspects follow only after submission of the application. As such these matters are now excluded as it would not be practically possible to comply with them.
38(1)(n)	Improved grammar
40	Improved referencing
41(1)(a) and (7)	Improved grammar
45(1)(a)	Partial deletion as it is now provided for in the new section 15(5)-(7) - there is no need to make this distinction.
45(5)	This section was deleted as it is now provided for in the new section 15(5)-(7)
46(1)(c) and (5)	Improved grammar
46(7)	This was deleted as it is now provided for in the new section 15(5)-(7)
47(g)	Improved grammar.
48(2)(e)	Removed "or" as improved grammar as any one or more of these possibilities could be opted for.
Heading of section 50	Improved grammar
51(1) and (2)	Improved referencing and grammar
51(2)(a) and (b)	To provide more clarity on dates and to improve wording to make it clearer and also to provide and regulate for a situation where a commenting body requires additional information to enable it to provide comments.
51(3)	This insertion is an attempt to improve accountability when there is non-performance by a commenting body in so far as provision of comments are concerned.
53(2)(a)	Delete "and" to ensure that either one or both can be required.
53(2)(b)	Improved wording to make it clear that where applicable other organs of state or service providers must again be notified.
54	Deletion of referencing as it is simpler to refer to this by-law rather than to list the section, as these may change in future, thus preventing unnecessary amendments to the by-laws.
55(5)	Amended wording to provide more clarity and regulation on how to obtain additional information or documents (and time) when it is needed as a result of comments received pursuant to the notification process which was followed.
55(6)	Amended wording as at this stage the application is already complete and processes have started. Section (5) above provides for such additional information or documents, but regulates that if it is not submitted, then consideration of the application must proceed without the relevant additional information or documents. The application process should not be further delayed as a result.
56(1)	Improved grammar and sentence construction.
57(1) and (2)	Improved grammar, referencing and sentence construction.
59(1) and (2)	The reason is to provide for a MPT member to also be able to inspect a property.

59(2)(a)	Improved wording to make it clearer and to link the record, document or item to be produced, to the purpose of the investigation.
59(2)(c)	Delete “or” as there is no need to link these items with an “or” as the option should be there to do one, some or all of the options.
59(5)	Improved wording to make it clearer, but also to provide for an inspection where written consent could be obtained so that a warrant is not necessary.
60	Improved referencing
65	Renumbering as a result of deletion of section 65(2)
65(g)	This improved wording is to make it clear that it refers to the municipality’s planner’s assessment and that it is not a requirement that the relevant applications may only be submitted or must (as application) be accompanied by an assessment of a registered planner.
65(g)(vii)	This wording has been deleted, because if a zoning determination results in a rezoning it is already covered in 65(g)(i) and is also addressed in section 13(3) on the process of zoning determination.
65(j) (o), (r) and (s) and new (t)	Improved grammar and sentence construction and insertion of new (t) i.e. include restrictive title conditions if any, is to be a relevant consideration when determining a land use application.
65(2)	This whole section was removed, firstly because there may be other considerations or reasons on which a site development plan may not be acceptable. Secondly, as will appear more fully in section 15(2) and 68, a site development plan when following from a land use approval is not seen as a land development application.
66(2)(l)	No real purpose in referencing this section 31, there may even be other relevant sections and when the Deeds Registries Act is amended may then effect this section of the by-law, necessitating an unnecessary by-law amendment.
66(2)(y) and (y)(iii)	This links to the insertion in section 18(4) and provides for specific requirements/conditions which may be imposed as part of an occasional use seen as a temporary departure for a specific occasion or event, and to separate or distinguish it from an ordinary temporary departure.
66(2)(z)	The word “levy” has throughout been replaced with “penalty” as it is really a fine or punishment for a contravention as opposed to the previous dispensation under LUPO when payment of a contravention levy actually “bought” a person a right, which is not the case anymore. Even after payment of a contravention penalty will the submission of a suitable land use application be required.
66(3)	Improved wording to make it clearer.
66(11)	To provide that it may include a certificate of registered title and certificate of consolidated title as potential milestones where certain conditions must be complied with.
66(12)	This section was deleted as it is now provided for in the new section 15(5) -(7)
67(1)	Rewording to improve the understanding of the section and in which the link to section 43(2) of SPLUMA has been removed. This link was removed to provide for the instance that either SPLUMA section 43(2) is amended or if and when the Western Cape is granted exemption from this section of SPLUMA. Section 43(2) of the Spatial Planning and Land Use Management Act will remain applicable until the Act has been amended or an exemption has been granted.
Heading of section 68	This change in heading is necessary due to the separation of matters which are considered SPLUMA land development applications and those which are not considered as such. As such some of these may become Council/delegated decisions in which cases the MSA section 62 appeals may be applicable. This appears more fully in sections 68(a)-(e)
68	Since there can now be more than one appeal authority (as a result of MSA 62 and the interpretation above, it is necessary to specify appeals considerations as well.
68(a) & (b)	This is to identify the application types in 15(2) which are regarded as land development applications for the purpose of SPLUMA compliance. The lists in paragraphs (a) and (b) are the same, noting that paragraph (a) relates to the AO and paragraph (b) relates to the MPT. This same comment is applicable to (b) and will not be repeated there.
68(c)	This is to identify the application types in 15(2) which are not regarded as land

	development applications for the purpose of SPLUMA compliance and which may be considered by the Council or its delegate.
68(d)	This section determines that for those matters for consideration in (a) and (b) above, the SPLUMA defined Appeal Authority is the appeal authority.
68(e)	This section determines that for those matters for consideration in (c) above, the Council's MSA 62 Committee is the appeal authority if it was decided by a committee of the Council or a delegate of the Council. If the full Council decided on the matter, then there can be no MSA section 62 appeal.
69(1)	This provides for categorisation of those matters which for the purpose of SPLUMA compliance are regarded as land development applications to an AO
69(2)	This provides for categorisation of those matters which for the purpose of SPLUMA compliance are regarded as land development applications to the MPT.
71(1)	Improved referencing
71(3)(a)(vi)	Improved wording by replacing 'and' with 'or' to make it clear that it can be any of these
71(3)(a)(vii)	Improved referencing.
72(1)(b)	Improved referencing.
72(2)(c)	To provide for self-nomination which was not provided for before and which is not prohibited in SPLUMA.
72(2)(d)	To provide and regulate for a closing date for submission of nominations, which was not provided or regulated for before and not prohibited in terms of SPLUMA and provide for administrative certainty.
72(3)(a)	To provide for acceptance of nomination if it is not a self-nomination. A self-nomination is deemed to be accepted.
72(3)(c)	Improved grammar to provide for a complete list.
72(3)(d)	Improved grammar.
72(3)(e)	This was reworded and moved to 72(2)(d)
72(4) and (5)	The word skill was replaced with experience as this is the term used in SPLUMA to be aligned with it.
72(9)	Improved grammar – no need to refer to he/she as the introduction part of (9) already refers to "a person".
72(11)(c)	Improved referencing
73(2)(b)	The reason is improved wording to make it clear that when the chair resigns he/she must inform the Council as it is Council who appointed the Chair. Although the other members are also appointed by Council, the chair manages the MPT and needs to be aware of who resigns, the chair will then in the normal course of events inform the Council accordingly, but there is no practical purpose of when the chair resigns to inform anybody else other than the Council who appointed him/her.
73(7)(a)	Improved grammar and sentence construction.
73(7)(b)	Improved wording to make it clearer.
74(1)(b)	Improved use of capitalisation.
74(4)(a)	Spouse was omitted and is now included to be aligned with SPLUMA regulations, Schedule 3.
75(3)	Improvement of referencing, grammar and wording to make it clearer.
75(6)	Deletion of "simple" there is no point in making the majority a simple majority.
75(7)(a)	The initial wording did not really make sense. SPLUMA also does not regulate this, so just using the term majority will suffice.
75(7)(b)	Improved wording to make it clearer.
77(2)(a)	Improved wording to make it clearer. Applications are not filed with the MPT, they are submitted to the municipality and determined by the MPT.
79(3)	Improved wording to make it clearer as section 57 provides for 3 different periods whereas the initial wording did not recognise this.
79(4)	Improved wording and linking it directly to the provisions of section 80(1).
79(5)(a)	Improved referencing
80(1)(a)	Change required as a result of the interpretational challenges that the word "and" leads to – the intention is that either (a) or (b) should trigger an invalid appeal and not both combined as it would lead to an absurdity.
80(1)(b)	Improved wording to make it clearer of what an appeal should consist of.

80(3)	This is to make it clear that where appeal fees are payable that it must be paid within the period set out section 79(2) and not afterwards.
80(6), (9), (11)(a) & (b)	Improved wording to make it clearer.
80(16)	Owner was replaced by appellant as it is not only the owner who may submit an appeal.
81(6)	Improved wording to make it clearer.
81(8)	Improved grammar.
Heading of section 83	Improved wording to make it clearer. SPLUMA links development charges to engineering services whereas there may be charges for amenities as well. This heading will now be more aligned to the content of section 83, which has not been amended.
84(1)	Improved referencing.
85(1)(c) and (d)	Municipality is only to enforce the conditions imposed in terms of the by-laws and laws repealed by LUPA. It cannot be all title conditions as many of these may be so-called "contractual" conditions in which the municipality has no role to play. It is the statutory provisions which must be enforced by this, it is submitted that it will be covered by the proposed improved wording and the deletion of (d)
86(1)(a)	This change is as a result of a deletion of section 15(4) which resulted in 15(5) now becoming 15(4)
86(1)(c)	Change to be accepted. Just improved wording to make it clearer and to link this to amendment made in section 28(3)(c) relating to certification where an owners' association is involved.
86(2)	Improved wording to make it clearer as this deleted content is already included in the first part of this sentence.
86(4)	Change "must" to "may" to provide a municipal choice to adopt fines or not and not make it compulsory.
87(1) and (2)	The owner is not necessarily the contravener on who the notice must be served. The word owner is deleted to facilitate this.
87(2)(b)	Improved grammar.
87(6)	Improved wording to make it clearer.
88(1)(b)	Improved grammar as the word "concerned" adds no further meaning here and can be deleted.
89(1)	The owner is not necessarily the contravener on who the notice must be served. The word owner is deleted to facilitate this.
89(2)(a)	Improved grammar.
90(b)	Improved wording to make it clear that it can be the magistrate or other court as well. Courts have their own jurisdiction and it is not for the municipal by-laws to determine this and there is no need that this matter must be applied for at the High Court.
90(c)	To provide for additional methods for law enforcement.
92(2)	Improved wording to make it clear that it can be the magistrate or other court as well. Courts have their own jurisdiction and it is not for the municipal by-laws to determine this and there is no need that this matter must be applied for at the High Court.
93(1)	Improved wording to make it clearer and to improve the content.
94(1)	Improved grammar and referencing.
94(1)(a) and (c)	Improved wording to make it clearer.
95(2)	To provide for affirmation as well as an alternative to an oath.
97	Improved wording to make it clear that it can be the magistrate or other court as well. Courts have their own jurisdiction and it is not for the municipal by-laws to determine this and there is no need that this matter must be applied for at the High Court.
98(4)	Improved wording to make it clearer.
100	Wording amended as the amended by-law's implementation is now not dependant on LUPA implementation anymore.
Schedule 1	
1(a)	Improved grammar
1(c)	Improved grammar and sentence construction as it is implicit in the rest of this



	section that a MPT member is already a decision maker.
2(a) and (b)	Improved grammar and wording to make it clearer.
Schedule 2	Reminder to insert the municipality's current land use planning by-law details if the publish and repeal method is to be used – if not then there is no need to populate this table.