

DELEGATION IN THE LAND USE PLANNING ORDINANCE

Helen C Ketelbey, Assistant Director of Planning

Penelope Cummins, Town Planner,

Town Planning Branch,
City Planner's Department,
Cape Town City Council.*

Die aanname dat die Ordonnansie op Grondgebruikbeplanning magte van die Kaapse Provinsiale Administrasie na plaaslike owerhede deleger en devoleer word ondersoek. Dit ontleed ook die magte wat verleen word (en die wat nie verleen word nie), en onder watter voorwaardes sodanige magte uitgeoefen kan word. Na aanleiding van 'n ontleding van die huidige sisteem word voorstelle vir moontlike verbetering gemaak. Dit blyk dat Provinsie voordele van delegasie en devolusie as belangrike argumente gebruik ter ondersteuning van die nuwe Ordonnansie, maar dat die Ordonnansie geen belangrike magte, soos algemeen verstaan onder 'devolusie', oordra nie. Ware devolusie sou behels die vergunning aan plaaslike owerhede om self te besluit hoe en waar ruimtelike ontwikkeling binne sy reggebied moet plaasvind.

Die gedelegeerde magte is nie werklik beplanningsgerig nie, maar hoofsaaklik ontwikkelingsbeheerfunksies. Die wetgewing het ook sekere leemtes wat die uitoefening van sommige van die gedelegeerde magte beperk. Die wyses waarop ontwikkelingsbeheer gedelegeer is toon leemtes wat waarskynlik beide die publieke en private sektore sal ontrief.

Om 'n effektiewe beplanningsinstansie te wees, simpatiek aan die behoeftes van die plaaslike gemeenskap, moet 'n plaaslike bestuur by magte wees om besluite te kan neem, en te kan deurvoer, wat in die fisiese, sosiale en ekonomiese behoeftes van al die inwoners sal voorsien.

During the period that the Land Use Planning Ordinance, No 15 of 1985 (LUPO) was in preparation, and in subsequent official notices, the statement has often been made that one of the aims of the Ordinance was to devolve some of the powers of Provincial Government to local authorities. References to the regulations promulgated in terms of LUPO are all prefaced by 'PN' (see CPA 1986b, c, d, f). An approved structure plan, unless otherwise stated, is one approved in terms of section 4(6) of LUPO.

The purpose of this paper is to examine those claims, and to establish what powers are conferred, how this is achieved and what the benefits might be for local authorities and for the public.

Some scepticism about the de facto extent of the delegation or devolution of powers under LUPO is pardonable in the context of contemporary legislation and political events. For instance, similar claims have been made in support of the creation of regional services councils (RSC); yet key decisions concerning the extent of RSC's jurisdiction, the scope of their authority, and which municipal services they will assume are presently being made by the Administrator in consultation with central government (see also Todes and Watson 1986).

And since the abolition of elected provincial councils, many decisions previously made at a lower tier of government are now made by Central Government. Non-elected Joint Management Committees are assuming decisions and administrative responsibilities previously undertaken at local or provincial level.

On the other hand, the *White Paper on Urbanisation* requires local autho-

rities to enforce central government urbanisation policy; to police migration and enforce anti-squatting measures under the Slums Act. (see RSA 1986a, Pars 4.3.1.3; 5.3.1.2; 5.3.1.6; 5.3.1.7; 6.9; 12.5; 14.3.).

Devolution of real planning powers to local authorities would require transfer of control over the spatial arrangement of land uses and activities within a functioning area. This includes power over the release of land for industrial and other non-agricultural purposes, the location of commercial, industrial and residential sites; the power to determine an integrated housing policy for the entire local population, including blacks; and the location and provision of health services and other community facilities. However, to achieve this, many government agencies would have to be dismantled and a wide range of national legislation would have to be materially amended, e.g. the Black (Urban Affairs) Consolidation Act (25/1945); the Community Development Act 3/1966; the Group Areas Act (36/1966); the Physical Planning Act (88/1976); the Reservation of Separate Amenities Act (49/1953); the Urban Transport Act (78/1977); and the Roads Ordinance (19/1979).

Delegation confers much more limited authority. Moreover, it is important to distinguish between the delegation of powers, which entails the exercise of judgement and discretion, albeit subject to review, and the delegation of tasks, where a subordinate is not called upon to exercise discretion but simply to execute decisions previously made.

Although the terms delegation and devolution are often used in conversations, explanatory circulars from

* The opinions expressed in this article do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Cape Town City Council.

the Director of Local Government, papers, the *Manual for Structure Planning* (CPA, 1986a) and other non-statutory material, they do not occur in the Land Use Planning Ordinance.

Readers should also be aware that the Provincial Administration officials use idiosyncratic interpretations of the terms 'delegation' and 'devolution', depending on which law confers the powers being referred to. Their use of 'delegation' refers to powers conferred in terms of the Delegation of Powers Ordinance (13/1965), which authorises the Administrator to delegate his powers. 'Devolution' as it is used by Province refers to powers conferred in terms of any specific Ordinance (in this case LUPO). Both the delegated and devolved powers may or may not be reviewable by the Administrator. Thus, in Province's terminology there are no delegated powers arising from LUPO; all the powers are devolved, with only some minor ones not being reviewable. The powers discussed in this paper are all subject to review by the Administrator. It is important to understand Province's particular use of language, because the words 'delegation' and 'devolution' are used frequently by Province in discussions and in their circulars and explanatory memoranda. Except where otherwise specified, the Provincial Administration's use of the terms is not used in this paper.

THE ORIGINS OF DELEGATION IN LUPO

Because devolution and delegation are central to the arguments in support of LUPO, it is necessary to understand how and when they came to be used in this context. The first time the word delegation appears in connection with this most recent effort to revise the law of town and regional planning in the Cape Province is in a Master's thesis by Mr C J van Tonder, Assistant Director: Local Government, (Van Tonder, 1981). This thesis reviews representations made at the request of the Director of Local Government in 1974 to propose amendments to the Townships Ordinance (33/1934), and concludes with a proposal for a new draft Ordinance. But although Van Tonder uses the

term 'delegation' in his draft Ordinance, he does not explicitly use either delegation or devolution as one of his twelve guiding norms (op. cit. 98). In general terms he advocates 'political supremacy in decision-making', which is equivalent to devolution in the generally accepted meaning of the word, but in his draft Ordinance he merely proposes a limited delegation of power to approve subdivisions (op. cit. 203).

Neither devolution nor delegation appear as one of the nine guiding norms in the subsequent report of the Provincial Working Committee on the Ordinance (Van Tonder, 1982:5). However, devolution suddenly appears in 1984 as one of the four major objectives of the Ordinance, according to an explanatory circular from Province to local authorities (CPA, 1984). Moreover, the circular states (p.9) that 'the emphasis in the most recent Draft shifts from delegation to devolution' (in Province's terminology, i.e. greater emphasis on the granting of powers in terms of the Land Use Planning Ordinance instead of under the Delegation of Powers Ordinance).

The written record indicates a disjuncture between 1982 and 1984. In late 1982 there is no mention of the words delegation or devolution, yet they appear in the circular of early 1984 in a way which suggests that a degree of debate had occurred in the intervening period about the concepts, plus a rethink on the major objectives of the Land Use Planning Ordinance. What has happened in the interim?

The publication in November 1983 of the Third Report of the Commission of Enquiry into Township Establishment and Related Matters (Venter Commission, 1983) may provide the answer. The Commission recommended the delegation of powers to local authorities, specifically in township establishment (via subdivisions). It considered that local authorities were best placed to evaluate the desirability of new townships and the time would be saved by no longer requiring the duplicate evaluation of applications by Province and the local authority. These advantages were held to outweigh the disadvantages of delegation, which included the possibility

that local authorities might set their own standards, they might not always be objective in providing services to developers, they might undertake development themselves and compete with the private developer, that it would be more difficult for them to apply the policies of higher-level authorities, and that they could have insufficient administrative expertise and organisational infrastructure to process large subdivisions (townships) without delays (CPA, 1986a:3).

OVERVIEW OF POWERS DELEGATED TO COUNCILS AND RETAINED BY THE ADMINISTRATOR

Nearly all powers conferred in terms of LUPO are reviewable by the Administrator, only a few minor powers are not; for instance: council's approval of a structure plan for its own use in terms of section 4(10); the responsibility to maintain a register in terms of section 12(1); its approval of the constitution of a Home Owners' Association in terms of section 29(2)(b) and certification that conditions pertaining to the subdivision of an erf have been complied with in terms of section 31(1). These powers are not discussed further because they are minor.

The more important powers, which are reviewable, include the approval of rezonings, subdivisions, departures, deemed zoning and any decision or action of a council. The right to approve rezonings is delegated in terms of a section 4(6) approved structure plan (see sect. 5(2)) and the right to approve departures and subdivisions in terms of the scheme regulations (sect. 9(1)) approved structure plan (see sect. 5(2)) and the right to approve departures and subdivisions in terms of the scheme regulations (sect. 9(1)). Powers are granted on sliding scales; with the greatest decision-making powers granted to the largest local authorities, and the least to the smallest local authorities.

Even though the local authority has the responsibility for preparing a structure plan, it must conform to the Department of Constitution and Planning's guide plan for the area (if one has already been prepared), and

the structure plan is subject to alteration by the Administrator (sect. 4(7)). The content of all the council's decisions are reviewable on appeal to the Administrator (sect. 49), as is the speed with which council processes applications (PN 333/1986: Regs. 12-14).

Even though, within strict limits, the authority to approve rezonings, departures and subdivisions (among others) is conferred on councils in specified circumstances, there are also a number of powers which the Administrator has reserved entirely for himself. It is important to keep these in mind when evaluating those powers which are delegated because the powers which are retained by the Administrator limit the degree to which a local authority can exercise any delegated powers obtained under LUPO.

The power to review any decision or action is retained in terms of sections 39(3) and 44, which state that the Administrator can direct the council to act, or may act for it as the case may be. His decision or action is then deemed to be a decision of the council (sect. 44(3)(c)). This power of intervention has the effect of nullifying the powers delegated to the local authority. Moreover, the Administrator is not required under LUPO to give reasons for his actions or decisions; and they are not subject to review except in a competent court.

In consultation with the local authorities concerned, the Administrator may establish or abolish joint committees, determine sources of funding and membership and confer any powers on them (sect. 3).

He may direct local authorities or joint committees to prepare or review structure plans, and may approve, amend or withdraw structure plans (sect. 4). He may make or amend scheme regulations in terms of sections 7(2), 8 and 9(2). He can also make regulations dealing with any other matters in LUPO (sect. 47(1)). He may direct local authorities to prepare a zoning map (sect. 10). He may establish the Planning Advisory Board, appoint its members, establish standing committees and refer matters to the Board for recommendations (Chapter III). The

Administrator shall, in consultation with the council, decide whether a contravention exists and what action should be taken (sect. 40). Appeal committees are established and members appointed by him in terms of section 43. Finally, the Administrator adjudicates appeals in terms of section 44 of LUPO, provisions that are discussed in detail later.

DELEGATION VIA STRUCTURE PLANS

Section 5(2) gives the power to a council to approve rezonings which conform with a structure plan approved by the Administrator in terms of section 4(6). Structure plans were not a feature of Ordinance 33 of 1934, and this limited power did not exist under the old Ordinance. The degree of freedom obtained by a council to approve rezonings under LUPO is determined by the level of detail and content of the approved 4(6) structure plan.

Where no approved 4(6) structure plan exists there is no delegation of power to approve rezonings; and all applications are submitted for decision by the Administrator, as under the previous Ordinance.

Guidelines for the preparation of structure plans have been published by Province (CPA 1986a). The manual distinguishes four categories of local authorities for which structure plans of graduated detail are required (op. cit. 4, 22, 24, 40). To date the local authorities have not been informed of their categories; but, in discussion, Provincial Administration officials have indicated that they intend to require the least detailed structure plans from the largest local authorities. This will mean that the largest local authorities will have the greatest freedom to approve rezonings and the smallest the least. This is an appropriate differentiation of powers if it is assumed that the largest local authorities have the greatest expertise to enable them to decide appropriately on planning matters.

Annexure C of the manual sets out the appropriate content for a local structure plan – the section 4(6) structure plans – in terms of which powers of approval are delegated (op.cit. 34-

36). The schedule in Annexure C must be read in the context of specifications in LUPO itself for the content of a structure plan to conform to guide plans. In section 4(11) LUPO is quite explicit: the structure plan may not be inconsistent 'in any way' with a guide plan approved under section 6A(10) or a plan approved under section 6A(13) of the Physical Planning Act (88/1967), in the opinion of the Administrator.

Of itself this provision is advisable because it makes sense to require a link between various levels of plan. However, there is a fundamental question about the assumptions in this provision: should the higher-order (i.e. guide plan) limit the content of the lower-order (i.e. structure plan) without the structure plan also informing the guide plan? Moreover, what happens if a guide plan is based on assumptions that are subsequently found to be incorrect?

The question is not merely academic. In the last two years draft guide plans for the Cape Peninsula and Stellenbosch have been circulated for comment (RSA, 1984; 1986b). On detailed examination it was found that assumptions about black population growth (and consequently demand for all related urban residential land, amenities and infrastructure) were inaccurate in both documents by a factor of approximately two and a half times (City of Cape Town, 1986a). A meaningful structure plan cannot be formulated in terms of a guide plan, if the assumptions underlying the guide plan are incorrect.

In those local authorities where approved guide plans already exist, they will be bound in terms of section 4(11) to design structure plans that conform to them. Where a guide plan is approved after a 4(6) structure plan has been approved, the 4(6) structure plan will have to be amended immediately to conform with the guide plans, or it will cease 'to exist in so far as it is inconsistent with such guide plan' (sect. 4(11)), and the delegated power to rezone will be lost.

The power to approve rezonings exists only if the proposed rezoning conforms with the approved 4(6) structure plan. If not, there is no delegated

authority and the Administrator must approve the application.

Consequently, the less detailed the 4(6) structure plan, and the better it anticipates the pressures of change, the greater the number of rezoning decisions which the local authority is empowered to make.

The more static a local authority, the more the rezoning applications are likely to conform to the 4(6) structure plan. Conversely, where a local authority is the locus of social or economic change, or unpredictable growth pressures, the 4(6) structure plan is less likely to anticipate future rezoning applications; and consequently a greater proportion of rezoning decisions must be referred to the Administrator.

In the circumstances, one must ask what proportion of rezoning applications can be sufficiently accurately anticipated to warrant the expenditure of time and resources in the preparation of structure plans solely for the purpose of obtaining delegated powers (sect. 4(6) structure plans) – unless these plans are so vague as to embrace all possibilities.

DELEGATION VIA SCHEME REGULATIONS

Section 9(1) of LUPO states that where the scheme regulations of a local authority permit, a council may approve departures and subdivisions within the limits specified in the scheme regulations. The details as to what may be approved by a council are contained in *Regulations to the Ordinance*: PN 334/1986, PN 353/1986 and PN 378/1986 (CPA 1986c, 1986d, 1986f). The Scheme Regulations cannot be changed by a council, only by the Administrator, who may do so without consulting anyone (sect. 9(2)).

The power to approve departures and subdivisions are conferred on local authorities on a sliding scale, with the largest local authorities having the greatest powers (largest local authorities may approve subdivisions of up to 100 erven).

As far as the power to approve departures goes, there is no material difference between that granted under the old Townships Ordinance and LUPO

except that all local authorities are enabled to permit departures for second dwellings up to a specified maximum size in single dwelling residential zones.

For subdivisions LUPO has increased the maximum number of erven that a local authority may approve in any one application. A sliding scale is applied, and the largest local authorities may approve subdivisions of up to 100 erven. Subdivisions may only be approved if the land has been (re)zoned for subdivision purposes (a zone which did not exist before LUPO); if the proposal conforms to the provisions of an existing structure plan; and conforms to the existing and proposed density and use of the area surrounding the proposed subdivision. Only the last restriction existed in the old Ordinance. Consequently, even though the number of erven which a local authority can approve in a subdivision has been increased, the limits within which that decision can be made have been narrowed because more of the criteria for approval have been written into the Ordinance.

A further important constraint has been imposed on the local authority's power to subdivide land in municipal housing scheme areas. In terms of PN 334/1986 : Reg. 3.2.4 and PN 353/1986 : Reg. 5.2.2(d), the local authority is obliged to conform to state policy (of whatever origin) in subdividing its municipal housing scheme areas. This requirement could be more properly described as merely passing the responsibility for implementation of central government policy down to the local authority, without conferring the concomitant power to influence the policy. It is the delegation of tasks rather than the delegation of powers.

DELEGATION AND THE APPEALS PROCEDURE

It must be emphasised that an appeals procedure is an extremely desirable component of planning legislation such as the Land Use Planning Ordinance. However, in the case of LUPO, the appeals procedure should support the principle of delegation while at the same time being fair and accessible to the public.

A detailed analysis of the appeals pro-

cedure in LUPO as it affects delegation is contained in the Appendix. It shows that in most situations, not everyone who might be prejudiced by a proposed development is likely to hear about it in time to exercise their right of appeal. This particularly applies to 'interested parties' who are not owners because they are unlikely to be informed by letter of a proposed scheme. In contrast, in the case of deemed zonings and rezonings initiated by the council, the right of appeal of aggrieved parties who are not informed of the council's decision seems never to lapse. Both these situations are undesirable; the first because in practice not everyone who is affected by a development will have the right of appeal. The second situation is undesirable because the local authority will never know whether a rezoning or a deemed zoning at its initiative has been concluded.

Although the grounds for appeal are explicitly set out in the case of an appeal once the council has made a decision, they are not set out in cases where an appeal is permitted during the processing of an application. In these cases the substance of the appeal and the permitted action arising as a consequence have not been specified. This is vague and will lead to confusion.

A detailed examination of the appeals procedure under LUPO will reveal vagueness in many of the provisions. If this vagueness is not addressed before court action results, Province, local authorities and the public will be bound by a judicial interpretation of the legislation, which could easily differ from the original intention of the Ordinance. In his own interests, the Administrator should propose amendments to the law before litigation starts, to ensure that his intended interpretation is confirmed.

CONCLUSIONS

The above analysis has shown that there is no devolution (handing over) of powers to the local authority in terms of LUPO. It would appear that the delegation of powers to local authorities under the LUPO does not effectively grant them greater freedom to decide or to act. Instead,

through the prior approval or rejection of 4(6) structure plans, the Administrator's control over local authority planning and policy changes is formalised and extended. Moreover, in exercising its powers, a local authority is more subject to intervention by the Administrator than it was in the past. A discussion of the reasons why central government, through its provincial arms, is intervening more at the local level than ever before must await an analysis of LUPO and other recent legislation in terms of the theory of the State. Such an analysis should also explain why so few real planning powers have been delegated to local authorities.

In the development control functions which have been delegated, procedural deficiencies have been identified which are likely to inconvenience the public and private sectors alike.

Simply for efficient development control, LUPO should be tidied up. For instance, the Administrator should not have such wide powers of review. In the first instance, review of decisions should rest with the local authority, and the Administrator should not have so extensive a power to substitute his action or decision for a council's. Where appeals are submitted early in the procession of applications, the Administrator should be empowered only to adjudicate on the point at issue, which is the expiry of time limits, rather than to make a decision on the content of the application. The duration of the right of appeal should be strictly limited to a reasonable period of weeks. However, it is suggested that a two-week limit is too stringent, because there will be many potential appellants who will not have been notified of a council's decision.

If there is concern that corruption might arise in the course of development control administration, it should be dealt with via the appropriate existing criminal legislation and not via LUPO.

However, development control is one of the least important aspects of spatial planning. Even if LUPO is amended, the power of a local authority to determine its future spatial form will remain limited by the many

planning functions presently reserved to other government agencies.

In the present political climate of social unrest and the consequent State of Emergency (January 1987) it is particularly urgent that local authorities should not simply function as administrative buffers between central government and the local populace. To be an effective planning body, responsive to the needs of the local community, a local authority must be empowered to undertake decisions and actions which genuinely address the physical, social and economic needs of all the inhabitants of its local area.

REFERENCES

- Cape Province (CPA), Cape Town:
 1984: Provincial Circular LG/PB 1/84, 11 January.
 1986a: *Manual for Structure Planning*.
 1986b: PN 333/1986, Provincial Gazette No. 4429, 6 June.
 1986c: PN 334/1986, Provincial Gazette No. 4429, 5 June.
 1986d: PN 353/1986, Provincial Gazette No. 4431, 20 June.
 1986e: Provincial Circular LG/PB 15/1986, 20 June.
 1986f: PN 378/1986 Provincial Gazette No. 4432, 27 June.
- City of Cape Town:
 1984: *Comments on Draft Land Use Planning Ordinance PN 773/1983 dated 23-12-1983 to Provincial Administration of the Cape of Good Hope*.
 1986a: *Comments on the 1984 Draft Guide Plan for the Cape Metropolitan Area*. Unpublished.
 1986b: *Comments on the White Paper on Urbanisation*. City Engineer's Dept, unpublished.
 1986c: *Council's Call for Dialogue: Report by His Worship the Mayor (Alderman Leon Markowitz) and the Chairman of the Executive Committee (Councillor John Muir)*.
- Rapport:13-07-1986. Editorial.
 Republic of South Africa (RSA), Pretoria:
 1984: *Draft Guide Plan for the Cape Metropolitan Area*. Vol. I, Peninsula.

1983: (Venter Commission) *Commission of inquiry into the establishment of townships and related matters*. Third Report.

1986a: *White Paper on Urbanisation*. Dept of Constitutional Development and Planning.

1986b: *Draft Guide Plan for the Cape Metropolitan Area*. Vol II, Stellenbosch.

Todes, A and Watson, V 1986: *Local Government reorganisation: government proposals and alternatives in Cape Town*. UCT, Urban Problems Research Unit, WP No. 34 (Occ. Paper 21).

Van Tonder, C J 1981: *An evaluation of physical planning administration in terms of provincial legislation in the Cape Province and preliminary proposals for the improvement thereof*. Unpublished thesis, UCT.

Van Tonder, C J (chairman) 1982: *Report of the Working Committee appointed to compile a Draft Land Use Planning Ordinance*. CPA, Cape Town.

APPENDIX: THE APPEALS PROCEDURE AS IT RELATES TO DELEGATION

There are three categories of potential appellants in LUPO: Firstly *an applicant or an objector* can appeal 'against the refusal, granting, or conditional granting of an application for rezoning' (sect. 44(1)(a)), giving rise to the anomaly that an applicant can apparently appeal against the granting of an application.

Secondly, a *person aggrieved* by a decision of council can appeal against:

- (i) a decision of council regarding a deemed zoning (sect. 44(1)(b)) and
- (ii) Rezoning decisions taken at the initiative of the local authority (sect. 44(1)(c)).

The third category of appellant is *unspecified*. PN 333/1986 merely says that 'there shall be a right of appeal' in the following cases:

- (i) if agreement is not reached within six weeks between the applicant and Town Clerk (or equivalent) as to the required content of the application (PN 333/1986, Regs. 12 and 6);

- (ii) where the applicant is not notified of a council's decision within 4 months (PN 333/1986, Regs. 12 and 6);
- (iii) where the Director of Local Government is not notified of the council's decision within 4 months (PN 333/1986, Regs. 14 and 10).

Because there is no statement in the three cases arising from PN 333/1986 as to who can appeal, or what the substance of the appeal and the possible remedies might be, it must be assumed that anyone can appeal: the applicant, a council or any other person.

Where the right of appeal derives from section 44, sub-section (2) states that the Administrator shall adjudicate an appeal. When a decision is made or action taken by the Administrator arising from an appeal, it is deemed to be a decision or action of the council.

However, where the right of appeal derives from PN 333/1986, the procedure is specified in Regulations 15-19, which do not state what action can be taken. (It is possible that Province intends the subsequent action arising from an appeal in terms of PN 333/1986 to be directed by 44, but this is not made clear.)

In a rezoning application only the applicant and any persons who had already submitted objections to the application may appeal against the decision. Under Regulation 16 of PN 333/1986, this right of appeal extends for only two weeks after the applicant has been notified of the council's decision.

But in the case of deemed zoning and of rezonings initiated by a council, any aggrieved party may appeal against the decision (sects. 44(1)(b); 44(a)(c)). It would appear that if any potentially aggrieved party is not notified of the council's decision his right of appeal cannot lapse. (Similarly, the right of appeal on consent uses also persists.) Because of the way the advertisement system has been designed, it is highly probable that there will be aggrieved parties who will not have been informed of the council's decision (sect. 2(i), definition of 'advertise'.)

Deemed zonings will be difficult enough for the local authority to determine satisfactorily without the never-ending possibility of appeals in the air. Moreover, it will never be possible to determine whether a deemed zoning or a rezoning at the initiative of a council has been satisfactorily concluded because of the possibility of an appeal at some future date.

This appears to be utterly contradictory to the spirit of the Ordinance; one of the explicit intentions of which is to abolish rights in perpetuity associated with zoning; and to institute a planning system which hinges upon zoning deemed according to present land use.

Because appeals can be lodged at three points in the processing of an application, early appeal on points of procedure can pre-empt the possibility of later appeals against the final decision. Reading PN 333/1986 with section 44, appeals can be lodged six weeks after submission of an application, four months after submission and once a council has made a decision. In the first two instances the right of appeal is not related to the substance of a decision but to the expiry of time. Yet the Administrator is empowered to replace the council's action or decision with his own, rather than merely to adjudicate whether the council has exceeded the time limits (PN 333/1986: Regs. 15-19; sect. 44).

Consequently it is possible for a developer to exploit this loophole in the legislation with the intention of pre-empting council's decision or appeals from other quarters, or to avoid having to provide information requested by a council. It appears possible that a council could also appeal against the expiry of time for its own ends.

**PUBLISHED REGULATIONS OF THE LAND
USE PLANNING ORDINANCE**

P.N.333/1986, 6 June 1986:

Regulations made in terms of section 47(1).

P.N.334/1986, 6 June 1986:

Scheme regulations in terms of section 7(2).

P.N.353/1986, 20 June 1986:

Scheme regulations in terms of section 8.

P.N.364/1986, 20 June 1986:

Regulations in terms of section 47 relating to the procedure for submission of a question to an appeal committee, as contemplated by section 43(2)(a) and (b).

P.N.633/1986, 31 October 1986:

Amendment to scheme regulations in terms of section 7(2).

P.N.634/1986, 31 October 1986:

Amendment of scheme regulations in terms of section 8.

P.N.653/1986, 7 November 1986:

Amendment of regulations made in terms of section 47(1).

**MEMBERS OF BOARD/COMMITTEES OF THE
ORDINANCE**

The Planning Advisory Board (Sec. 33)

J W A Walters, Chairman
B J van der Ross, Deputy Chairman
W D du Plooy
R Fox
J H Giliomee
N Naylor
R Njoli

The Appeals Committee (Sec. 43)

Justice W J Vos, Chairman
D E Chapman
J F H Haak
A C K Kannenberg
H B Malan
R S Martin
A Stassen
J P Venter

**GEPUBLISEERDE REGULASIES VAN DIE
ORDONNANSIE OP GRONDGEBRUIK-
BEPLANNING**

P.K.333/1986, 6 Junie 1986:

Regulasies uitgevaardig kragtens artikel 47(1).

P.K.334/1986, 6 Junie 1986:

Skemaregulasies ingevolge artikel 7(2).

P.K.353/1986, 20 Junie 1986:

Skemaregulasies ingevolge artikel 8.

P.K.364/1986, 20 Junie 1986:

Regulasies ingevolge artikel 47 insake die procedure vir die voorlegging van 'n vraag aan 'n appèlkomitee soos beoog by artikel 43(2)(a) en (b).

P.K.633/1986, 31 Oktober 1986:

Wysiging van skemaregulasies ingevolge artikel 7(2).

P.K.634/1986, 31 Oktober 1986:

Wysiging van skemaregulasies ingevolge artikel 8.

P.K.643/1986, 7 November 1986:

Wysiging van regulasies uitgevaardig kragtens artikel 47(1).

**LEDE VAN DIE RAAD/KOMITEES VAN DIE
ORDONNANSIE**

Die Beplanningsadviesraad (Art. 33)

J W A Walters, Voorsitter
B J van der Ross, Onder-voorsitter
W D du Plooy
R Fox
J H Giliomee
N Naylor
R Njoli

Die Appèlkomitee (Art. 43)

Regter W J Vos, Voorsitter
D E Chapman
J F H Haak
A C K Kannenberg
H B Malan
R S Martin
A Stassen
J P Venter

The Revision Committee

The Revision Committee was appointed to consider improvement of the Ordinance.

C J van Tonder, Chairman
P E Claassen
J Marshall
P O'Neill
C F Pohl
A Robertson
P N Tomalin

PUBLICATIONS ON THE LAND USE PLANNING ORDINANCE

- CPA 1986. *Manual for structure planning*.
Available from: Director of Local
Government, CPA Building, Whale Street,
Cape Town 8000. Price R10.
- SAITRP (Cape Branch) 1986. *Structure plans:
Their role in the development process*.
Proceedings of the annual conference.
Available from: PO Box 3885, Cape Town
8000. Price R10.
- SAITRP (Cape Branch) 1987. *Development
planning*. Proceedings of the annual
conference.
Available (from May 1987) from: PO Box
3885, Cape Town 8000. Price R10.

Die Hersieningskomitee

Die hersieningskomitee is ingestel om verbetering van die Ordonnansie te ondersoek.

C J van Tonder, Voorsitter
P E Claassen
J Marshall
P O'Neill
C F Pohl
A Robertson
P N Tomalin

PUBLIKASIES OOR DIE ORDONNANSIE OP GRONDGEBRUIKBEPLANNING

- KPA 1986. *Handleiding vir struktuurbeplanning*.
Verkrygbaar van: Direkteur van Plaaslike
Bestuur, KPA-Gebou, Waalstraat, Kaapstad
8000. Prys R10.
- SAISS (Kaapse Tak) 1986. *Struktuurplanne: Die
rol daarvan in die ontwikkelingsproses*.
Verrigtinge van die jaarlikse konferensie.
Verkrygbaar by Posbus 3885, Kaapstad
8000. Prys R10.
- SAISS (Kaapse Tak) 1987.
Ontwikkelingsbeplanning. Verrigtinge van
die jaarlikse konferensie.
Verkrygbaar vanaf Mei 1987 by
Posbus 3885, Kaapstad 8000. Prys R10.