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• IDP Transformation Priorities and MSDF alignment
• New Methodology: Spatial Transformation approach
• Chapter highlights
• Key changes made and implications
• Procedures for adoption
Section 22 of SPLUMA:

- “22. (1) A **Municipal Planning Tribunal or any other authority** required or mandated to make a land development decision ... **may not make a decision which is inconsistent with a municipal spatial development framework**.

- 2) ... **may depart from the provisions of a municipal spatial development framework only if site-specific circumstances** justify a departure from the provisions of such municipal spatial development framework.”

Echoed in Section 9 of the MPB-L:

- “9. (1) ... the City may deviate from the provisions of the municipal spatial development framework **only if site specific circumstances justify the deviation**.
THE MSDF CONTENT

MSDF content required to:

• Analyse and contextualise political, economic, environmental, and social trends;

• Provide a long-term vision for the desired spatial form and structure;

• Align City’s spatial development goals, strategies and policies with national and provincial spatial principles, strategies and policies;

• Direct and support private and public investment by identifying priority investment areas; and

• Provide policy guidance to direct decision-making and investment.
THE SDF, IDP AND TRANSFORMATION PRIORITIES
THE SDF AND IDP

- MSDF required to reflect the IDP strategic objectives in spatial manner
- Note: Longertime horizon than IDP
- Legally required to provide a long-term spatial vision and policy context for the City
- Enables consistent and predictable decision-making, directing where the City will invest and allocate resources
1. Building an Inclusive, integrated, vibrant city

• Addresses and reverses the legacies of apartheid.

• Address existing imbalances in the distribution of different types of residential development, and avoid the creation of new structural imbalances in the delivery of services.

• Desired outcomes:
  – Mix of income groups, land uses, population density and;
  – Adequate and equitable provision of social facilities, recreational spaces etc.
2. Managing urban growth and create a balance between urban development and environmental protection

- Promoting urban form with higher densities and mixed land use patterns in a central development/urban core;

- Efficient transport corridors, a bus rapid transit (BRT) and rail network form integral part of urban core.

- Achieve outcomes such as:
  - more sustainable use of land and natural resources,
  - lower carbon emissions,
  - more efficient use of infrastructure;
  - effective public transport systems, social facilities and amenities.
3. Planning for employment and improve access to economic opportunities

• Extent to which the City realises its spatial development goals linked to ability to sustain employment-generating economic growth in the medium term and to reduce accessibility costs for the urban poor.

• Creates imperatives such as:
  – High quality urban management
  – Attracting “job rich” economic investment
  – Responding to spatial needs of the economy
  – Improving opportunities for urban poor;
KEY PLANNING ENVIRONMENT CHANGES SINCE 2012
PLANNING ENVIRONMENT CHANGES

• Powerful role of SDF in decision making - SDF to carry transversal policy messages to decision makers

• Transformation priorities of IDP with focus on Spatial Transformation

• Legislative change and clarity on institutional roles and functions in spatial planning- e.g. SPLUMA, SDF Guidelines and IUDF as well as organisational changes in the City

• City improvements in data informants & evidence based policy – ECAMP, DAMS, MTTIF etc.

• Greater focus on financial viability and sustainability

• Increased emphasis on informality as driver of urban growth

• Concept/ vision driven SDF as opposed to cadastrally defined

• No longer duality of approvals (Province AND City)
INTRO, CHAPTER 1 & TECH A
NEW LEGAL, POLICY AND INSTITUTIONAL ENVIRONMENT

2012 CTSDF

• Moving towards a policy driven land use management system
• Goals and Principles
• Legal Context
  – MSA
  – LUPO
• Governance arrangements for integration of state plans into CTSDF unclear
• Urban Policy spread across many policy documents

CTMSDF Review

• National urban spatial planning goals & priorities via IUDF
• Principles and policy review via SPLUMA, NDP and City policy.
• New legal context, SPLUMA, LUPO direct review content.
• Link between LUMS and Policy more integrated through by-law
• New institutional context-
• Transformation priorities, MPB-L, ODTP, TDA
• Municipal leadership in spatial planning.

VISION
Liveable, safe, resource-efficient cities and towns that are socially integrated, economically inclusive and globally competitive, where residents actively participate in urban life

TDA
CAPE TOWN

STRATEGIC GOALS
- Spatial integration
- Inclusion and access
- Growth
- Governance

LEVERS
- Integrated urban planning and management
- Integrated transport and mobility
- Integrated sustainable human settlements
- Integrated urban infrastructure
- Efficient land governance and management
- Inclusive economic development
- Empowered active communities
- Effective urban governance
- Sustainable finances

STRATEGIC PRIORITIES

CITY OF CAPE TOWN
ISIXEKO SASEKAPA
STAD KAAPSTAD

Making progress possible. Together.
INTRODUCTION AND CHAPTER 1

- Introduces new policy and legislation - SPLUMA/ LUPA
- Introduces transversal Policies and Strategies post 2012

[Diagram showing Corporate Planning, Spatial Planning, Temporal Planning, Resource Planning, and Capital Expenditure Framework]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional SDF</th>
<th>Post-SPLUMA SDF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corporate Planning</strong></td>
<td>Growth rationale and priority framed by strategy and targets / commitments made e.g. IDP / Energy 2040/ EGS/ SDS/ TOD SF/ IHSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spatial Planning</strong></td>
<td>Spatial informant for growth described via MSDF Strategies and Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temporal Planning</strong></td>
<td>Timing/ phasing/ sequencing of support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource Planning</strong></td>
<td>City's commitment to facilitate growth i.e. Money, Land, People etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 2: SPATIAL CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

(AND TECHNICAL SUPPLEMENTS B & D)
2. SPATIAL CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

2012 CTSDF - Drivers of growth

• Population growth scenarios baseline

• Spatial Structuring elements identified, however data more coarse

• Form of growth - critique of peripheral development

• Infrastructure focus on expansion - not maintenance, infrastructure risk considers present capacity risks

• Availability of land use - land consumption data limited

• Strong focus on environmental resource capacity

• Limited spatial analysis of economic data

2017 MSDF Review

• Historical context highlighted-frame the challenge of the spatial legacy of apartheid

• Spatial structuring elements based on updated policy and TOD Comprehensive model

• Density analysis reflects infrastructure life-cycle cost imperative and benefits of diversity

• Economic and Socio-Economic analysis more comprehensive & spatial trends reflected

• Transport and services data informants more detailed

• Summary of analysis and sources provided - with detailed info contained in Tech Supplement B

• Natural resource and energy efficiency highlighted in Tech Supplement B
KEY INSIGHTS: HISTORIC LEGACY

- >190,000 households located within informal settlements – as many in backyards (unofficial)?

- +/- 440,000 citizens are unemployed (2nd quarter 2016) 23% re: strict definition of unemployed

- > 500,000 people cannot access any transport due to income constraints.

- 95% of the public transport user group = low to low-medium income group

- **Low-income group spends an average of 43% of their income on access (WELL in excess of intl. norms)**

![Residential Density](image1.png)

![Employment Density](image2.png)
## 2. SPATIAL CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

### KEY VARIABLES PART 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Population (demographic profile and projections) | - A demographic transition with slowing population growth but alarming growth in household formation outstripping population growth  
- In-migration rates and projections uncertain |
| Spatial location and trends:  
  • Residential development | - A spatial transition from outward to inward growth, characterised by marginal, localised increases in density |
| Spatial location and trends:  
  • Non-residential development | - A spatial concentration of commercial activity to three business nodes (the CBD, Century City and Tyger Valley) – all have associated high levels of institutional management  
- A dispersion of “blue-collar” jobs to peripheral industrial nodes  
- In-migration outpacing job creation |
| Economy | - Economic consolidation, increased unemployment and timid economic growth centred in selected service-orientated industries |
| Infrastructure (provision and constraints) | - Rising efficiencies associated with water, electricity and land resources but evidence of climate change impact on regional scale.  
- Rising costs of transport due to congestion and declining levels-of-service for commuter rail |
## 2. SPATIAL CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES
### KEY VARIABLES PART 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Fiscal sustainability                         | • Cape Town’s performance score annually evaluated by internally and externally by National Treasury  
|                                               | • Contributes to stable credit rating and high borrowing ability to expand infrastructure investment                                     |
| Resource sustainability                       | • Notwithstanding bulk supply issues re: water / electricity evidence of increasing resource efficiency: decreasing consumption of electricity, water and land relative to the size of the economy or population.  
|                                               | • More to be done re: demand management                                                                                                  |
|                                               | • NB: Dramatic increase in fuel consumption during this period                                                                          |
| Housing supply and demand (quantum / spatial location and trends) | • A transition from formal, market-led housing supply to informal solutions  
|                                               | • Spatial implications for already dense residential areas and burdening infrastructure networks in older less established parts of the city |
| Physical growth and form (land consumption and density) | • Declining land consumption rates  
|                                               | • Marginal increases in density – not sufficient to support public transport thresholds                                                      |
2.2 INFORMANTS TO CITY STRUCTURE (+TECH B & D)

2012 CTSDF

• Structuring elements included natural assets, multi-direction accessibility grid, areas of land use intensification.
• 2012 Long term structuring elements presenting diagrammatic informed by now rescinded policies and laws.
• Informed by trends and prescripts of the time.

2016 Long term structuring elements based on:

• Connectivity concepts from integrated transport planning and transit oriented development policy;
• Alignment to IUDF levers;
• Data-driven modelling (incl. TOD-C);
• Updated and in-depth analysis of variables.
2.2 STRUCTURING ELEMENTS
BIOPHYSICAL

2012 CTSDF

Informed by:

- MOSS study
- Agricultural land study
- Biodiversity planning
- Diagram - not linked to spatial data

2017 CTMSDF Review

Informed by:

- 2016 Bioregional plan
- 2015 Integrated coastal management plan
- 2016 Review of agricultural land value by Dept. of Agriculture
- Water course data,
- Linked to GIS data
2.2 STRUCTURING ELEMENTS

TRANSPORT

2012 CTSDF

Connected City based on a multi-directional accessibility grid concept

2106/17 CTMSDF Review

Connected City: based on IPTN 2032
Land use intensity models informed by: updated land use data & trip direction data modelling. Was not available in 2012.

Aim of achieving balance of **density** and **diversity** of residential and non-residential land uses for optimised land use informs spatial concept.
CHAPTER 3: SPATIAL CONCEPT (TECHNICAL SUPPLEMENTS D, E & H)
2012 SPATIAL CONCEPT
Conceptual development corridors and urban nodes (existing and emerging) shown in relation to the existing and planned IPTN (2032)
CHAPTER 4: SPATIAL VISION, STRATEGIES AND POLICIES

(TECHNICAL SUPPLEMENT G)
SPATIAL VISION

The City is intent on building a more inclusive, integrated and vibrant city that addresses the legacies of apartheid, rectifies existing imbalances in the distribution of different types of residential development, and avoids the creation of new structural imbalances in the delivery of services.

Key to achieving this spatial transformation is transit-oriented development (TOD) and associated diversification and densification.
4. SPATIAL VISION, STRATEGIES AND POLICIES

- Strategies x 3 retained in alignment with IDP
- Policies updated with extensive inputs from relevant departments, to reflect all new policy adopted by Council since 2012
- Policies consolidated and reduced in number from 50 to 42
- Policy statements and maps contained in Tech. G.
- 8 Maps based on stronger data and reflecting updated policy and law
- Urban edge and land use aspect of Spatial Planning Category policy statements removed – coastal edge retained
- Priority areas for development discussed in Chapter 5
CHAPTER 5 *NEW*:
DIRECTING SPATIAL TRANSFORMATION
5. DIRECTING SPATIAL TRANSFORMATION

Spatial Transformation requires the creation of **ACCESS TO MORE OPPORTUNITIES FOR MORE PEOPLE.**

To achieve this, we need:

- an **inward growth focus and investment** to support dense, diverse and transit oriented land uses.

IDP & BEPP Both commit to this ...
CHANGING THE SDF NARRATIVE AND “USE” OF THE DOCUMENT

From… a largely prescriptive tool

• Used to argue merits / demerits of development outside urban edge or changes in Spatial Planning Categories - SPCs to allow development.
• Mapping informed by SPCs (highly detailed and technical, resulting in duplicating land use processes).

To… a facilitative tool

• Used to promote development in priority spatial locations; supported and guided by legal framework and adaptable land use management system.

Whilst…Flagging potential risks!

• MSDF does not exempt applicants from considering maps reflecting developmental risks, flagged biodiversity aspects in need of verification, areas of agricultural significance etc.
# 5. DIRECTING SPATIAL TRANSFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spatial Transformation Area</th>
<th>Investment Premise</th>
<th>City CapEx</th>
<th>City OpEx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Inner Core</strong></td>
<td>City investment priority. Where spatial transformation is most achievable. Areas of co-investment between public and private sector.</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incremental Growth and Consolidation</strong></td>
<td>Maintenance and upgrading focus for the City and incremental growth in support of spatial transformation.</td>
<td>Subject to capacity.</td>
<td>Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speculative</strong></td>
<td>Beyond City’s investment horizons. Ability to achieve spatial transformation via development is considered unlikely. Privately funded areas. Achieving spatial transformation objectives require significant investment from developer.</td>
<td>Zero</td>
<td>Zero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protection</strong></td>
<td>Partnerships based on protecting asset.</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>To maintain asset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unique</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>May be high</td>
<td>May be high</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spatial Transformation Area

Urban Inner Core

City investment priority. Where spatial transformation is most achievable. Areas of co-investment between public and private sector.

Incremental Growth and Consolidation

Maintenance and upgrading focus for the City and incremental growth in support of spatial transformation.

Speculative

Beyond City’s investment horizons. Ability to achieve spatial transformation via development is considered unlikely.

Privately funded areas.

Achieving spatial transformation objectives require significant investment from developer.

Investment Premise

Spatial Protection

Partnerships based on protecting asset.
## 5. CITY’S INVESTMENT FOCUS: WITHIN AN URBAN INNER CORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFORMANT</th>
<th>EMPHASIS / DESIRED SPATIAL OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit Oriented Areas</td>
<td>- Inward growth and connectivity Diversification and Densification -TOD-Comprehensive Modelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Majority of Transit Accessible Precincts / PT Zone</td>
<td>- Leverage TOD opportunities via Integration, Density, Mixed Use Development and intermodal interchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Primary structuring elements = corridor structure as per Revised SDF (incl. IPTN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 4 of 5 Priority TOD projects and both Provincial TOD projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need</td>
<td>- Service upgrading, local economic development and poverty alleviation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Full extent of Urban Development Zone</td>
<td>- Range of human settlements interventions (delivery methods, partnerships, typologies etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Majority of “Very Needy” communities as identified in Socio-Economic Index</td>
<td>- Restructuring Zone Priority Area re: social / rental housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Incremental housing</td>
<td>- Facilitation of a range of human settlements interventions (delivery methods, partnerships, typologies etc.) and supportive of the realisation of Inclusionary Housing initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Restructuring Zone Priority Area re: social / rental housing</td>
<td>- Extension of effective urban management practices and programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Facilitation of a range of human settlements interventions (delivery methods, partnerships, typologies etc.) and supportive of the realisation of Inclusionary Housing initiatives</td>
<td>- Unlocking development of large-scale economic opportunities within close proximity to areas of social need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Potential Areas &amp; Public sector investment</td>
<td>- Maximising economic potential and job creation and building on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Majority of commercial and industrial node</td>
<td>- Supporting regeneration of underperforming inner city business areas, with special focus on area-based urban management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Inclusive of airport / ports and primary freight infrastructure</td>
<td>- Support continued inward investment in well-performing areas through partnership-based funding arrangements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Integration Zones</td>
<td>- Improving access to well-performing nodes through investment in connective infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Integration Zones</td>
<td>- Extension of effective urban management practice and incentives to areas of opportunity (under-performing, high-potential areas).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Extraordinary Conditions of Approval in Speculative Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONDITION OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>PRINCIPLE</th>
<th>HOW THIS IS ACHIEVED IN PRACTICE</th>
<th>PRINCIPLE OF FAIRNESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Determine cost and transfer cost back to applicant | City will not pay for any capital costs related to required infrastructure and will not pay for operating costs of infrastructure for a minimum of 20 years. | • The City requires the developer to pay all capital costs of utilities and social infrastructure.  
• The City requires the developer to pay for all operating costs for infrastructure constructed for a period for 20 years from completion phase. | • The City has limited capacity and has confirmed that its capacity will not be available in this area. |
| Mitigate against risk in the event that applicant does not / can not honour commitments | City will not carry speculative risks. | • The City will require a bank guarantee to cover the total operating cost of infrastructure for 20 years from completion phase. | • The City has an obligation to protect residents, should the developer default. |
| Protect public good | Despite this being a self-funded project, the City will insist on the creation of a liveable environment conducive to spatial transformation | • The developer required to ensure that residents in DIY developments have access to social infrastructure and employment opportunities through conditions requiring the provision of privately-funded social facilities (such as schools) and transport to places of employment. | • The City’s commitment to spatial transformation applies to all areas. |

NB: Work to be done here during public participation period re: SOPs etc.
CONCLUSION

POTENTIAL IMPLICATIONS OF MAJOR CHANGES

• Will avoid the “challenge” of detail and categories on the SDF *Map “6.1”* – previously indicative of the Spatial Planning Categories (SPCs)

• **NB:** *Will not deter* aspiring developers to be “inside / outside” Urban Inner Core / Incremental Areas

• SDF directs prospective development to legislation with processes managed by national / provincial / local administrators – (not duplicating these).

• Reflects these aspects spatially (in detailed risk, agricultural environmental maps) but indicates that ground-truthing etc. would be required via the stipulated processes.

• “Speedbumps” and “Crown Jewels” protected by their own legislation and subject to their own statutory process
CHAPTER 6:
SPATIAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK
FROM FOCUS ON DEVELOPMENT INHIBITORS TO A FOCUS ON DEVELOPMENT PRIORITIES

2012 CTSDF

Spatial Planning Categories

- BPSPC Core 1
- BPSPC Core 2
- High Potential & Unique Agricultural Land
- Agricultural Areas of Significant Value
- BPSPC Buffer 1
- BPSPC Buffer 2
- Smallholding
- Urban Development
- Industrial Development
- Noxious Industry
- Koeberg Nuclear Power Station

Of 11 spatial planning categories, 9 focused on where development should not go. Of the 2 SPCS focused on where development should go, one was purely a representation of existing industrial zoning. SPCs resulted in a cadastral-specific designation that was subject to many applications for a change of SPC designation—resulting in excessive red tape.

2017 CTMSDF

- Incremental Growth Areas
- Urban inner Core
- Structuring Corridors
- Protected Areas
- Areas of Unique Agriculture/Heritage
- Coastal Edge
- Coastal Node
- Economic Areas (as per ECAMP)

5 of the SDF categories relate to “GO” areas and only two stops and one inhibiting category.
CHAPTER 7: IMPLEMENTATION PLAN
• Alignment between the MSDF, IDP and Budget critical to implementation

• Built Environment Performance Plan (BEPP) depicts and presents an annually configured three-year capital response.

• Spatial targeting - a departure point in the BEPP - implies that the City, Province and State Owned Entities will focus investment in corridors and nodes, connected with public transport.

• This MSDF has adopted this BEPP frame and adapted it to establish an Urban Inner Core
EXTENT OF CHANGE IN 2017 SDF COMPARED TO 2012
# PART 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTSDF 2012</th>
<th>MSDF Review 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Introduction</td>
<td>Executive Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Development and Policy context</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Drivers of Urban Growth</td>
<td>1. Legislative and Institutional Context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Long-term metropolitan spatial structure</td>
<td>2. Spatial Challenges and Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. The Spatial Development Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Implementation Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 89 Pages

All Maps and content in main document followed by appendices

*78 Pages in main document

Detailed Technical Info. And a number of Maps contained in Tech Supplements

Chapters with substantial changes in bold—detail of changes to follow
# PART 2: MAPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTSDF 2012</th>
<th>MSDF Review 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Major Infrastructure risk areas</td>
<td>• Transport Network (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Spatial implications of urban growth drivers Conceptual development framework</td>
<td>• Integrated Public Transportation Network (2032)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Major land extensive precautionary areas</td>
<td>• Conceptual Spatial Structuring Elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Biodiversity network</td>
<td>• Spatial Transformation / Growth Priority Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Aquatic network</td>
<td>• Spatial Development Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Agricultural areas to be protected</td>
<td>• Developed, developable and constrained land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Destination places, scenic routes,</td>
<td>• Current infrastructure constraints (as of 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cape Town Spatial Development Framework</td>
<td>• Social Facilities Investment Framework (2032)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transport &amp; Roads priority action areas</td>
<td>• Heritage Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Infrastructure and housing priority action areas</td>
<td>• Tourism Assets Precautionary Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social Facilities and Recreational open space priority action areas</td>
<td>• Biodiversity Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fire, Coastal and Aquatic Resource Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Agricultural Areas of Significance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# PART 3 TECHNICAL SUPPLEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTSDF 2012</th>
<th>MSDF Review 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Technical Supplements:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A: Regulatory Requirements and Informants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B: Provincial Planning Informants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C: City Approved Policies and Strategies Endorsed Since 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D: Analysis of Drivers of Urban Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E: Land Use Intensification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F: Integration Zone Overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G: MSDF Policy Statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land Use Modelling Overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brings page count to 207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PART 4 ANNEXURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTSDF 2012</th>
<th>MSDF Review 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A:</strong> List of documents to be withdrawn</td>
<td><strong>A:</strong> List of historical SDF Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B:</strong> Summary of related legislation, policies and studies</td>
<td><strong>B:</strong> Summary of sector related legislation, policies and studies that have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>informed the MSDF Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C:</strong> MOSS, CBA &amp; Prov Bio-Regional &amp; route designation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D:</strong> Strategic Impact Assessment Summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E:</strong> Overview of Env Impact Man Zones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F:</strong> Social Fac &amp; Rec Space Stds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G:</strong> Record of Amendments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTSDF 2012</td>
<td>MSDF Review 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>• Technical Supplement A: Regulatory Requirements and Informants of the MSDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Technical Supplement B: Provincial Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Technical Supplement C: City Approved Policies and Strategies Endorsed Since 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Technical Supplement D: Analysis of Drivers of Urban Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Technical Supplement E: Land Use Intensification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Technical Supplement F: Integration Zone Overview Technical Supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• G: MSDF Policy statements Technical Supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• H: Land Use Modelling Overview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
POTENTIAL IMPLICATIONS OF MAJOR CHANGES

Document is clear on principles for:

- ‘depicting the desired form and structure of the geographic area’,
- ‘land use management regarding the appropriate nature, form, scale and location of development’
- ‘contribute to spatial co-ordination’
- ‘guiding decision making on applications’

BUT

1. ‘Policy Consistency’ judgement by decision maker (MPT) is important. New guidelines to be produced. Absolute clarity required re process for non-compliant applications:
   - Requesting deviation from policy based on site-specific circumstances present: Current Guidelines to be reviewed
   - Requesting deviation from policy if no site-specific circumstances seems evident: Require Review Framework for evaluation of submissions received via IDP (possibly S 3(5) of MPB-L, i.e. procedures by MM)

2. Tools and efforts required to ensure coherent the implementation of principles, maybe more SOPs to guide technical departments and decision makers.

3. Document should establish closer links to implementation tools available (e.g. Council-approved density policy, District Plans), and tools under development (land use diversity/TOD implementation framework)
PROCEDURES FOR AMENDMENT AND ADOPTION
MSDF Review 2017-2022: Commenting period & Engagements

60-days commenting period
24 July – 26 Sept 2017
Full documents (& 3 language Executive Summaries) at libraries, sub-council offices and electronically on City’s webpage: ‘Have your Say’

Business Breakfast
Engagement 28 July 2017
Notification letter of process, document availability & Formal invitation to engagement

Consultation with inter-governmental and state owned entity representatives (national provincial and surrounding & SOE)
Engagement 4 August 2017
Invitation to engagement (incl. notification of process & document availability)

Consultation with Built Environment representatives (Academia, NGOs, Professional bodies & Business Sector)
Engagement 22 August 2017
Invitation via Area-Based Managers, SC Chair & Manager to engagement (incl. notification of process & document availability)

Consultation with subcouncil’s registered organisations
8 Engagements 23, 29, 31 August & 4 Sept 2017
Invitation to workshop

Consultation with Councilors (Sec 79 members and subcouncil chairs)
Engagement 5 Sept 2017

Draft reviewed MSDF document

Adoption process at Council

Legal compliance confirmation