

## MEETING OF THE HERITAGE WESTERN CAPE, APPEALS COMMITTEE

Approved Minutes of a Meeting of the Appeals Committee of Heritage Western Cape held on Wednesday, 20 February 2019, at 09H30 in the 1st Floor Boardroom at the Protea Assurance Building, Greenmarket Square, Cape Town

---

### 1. Opening and Welcoming

The Chairperson Ms Corlie Smart officially opened the meeting at 9:35 and welcomed everyone present.

### 2. Attendance

#### Appeals Committee

Ms Corlie Smart (CSm)	Appeals Chairperson
Dr Andre van Graan (AvG)	Appeals Committee Member
Dr Nicolas Baumann (NB)	Appeals Committee Member
Mr Rowen Ruiters (RR)	Appeals Committee Member
Mr Tseliso Leshoro (TS)	Appeals Committee Member

#### HWC Staff

Dr Mxolisi Dlamuka (MD)	Director
Ms Penelope Meyer (PMe)	Legal Advisor
Mr Andrew September (AS)	Heritage Officer
Ms Heidi Boise (HB)	Heritage Officer
Ms Waseefa Dhansay (WD)	Acting Assistant Director
Ms Stephanie Barnardt (SB)	Heritage Officer
Ms Aneeqah Brown (AB)	Admin Clerk
Mr Lwazi Bhengu (LB)	Heritage Officer

#### Visitors

Mr Eward Grobler (EG)	Ms Clarice Arendse (CA)
Mr Johan Slee (JS)	Mr Andrew Duncan (AD)
Mr Cillie Malan (CM)	Mr Peter Truter (PT)
Mr Gus van der Spek (GvdS)	Ms Vanessa Weissenstein (VW)
Ms Michele Sandilands (MS)	Mr Mike Scurr (MS)
Mr Richard Summers (RS)	Mr Craig Scarterfield (CS)
Mr Peter Sutherland (PS)	Mr Philip Brink (PB)
Mr Simon van der Schans (SvdS)	Mr Zane De Decker (ZDD)
Ms Cathy Duncan (CD)	Mr Chris Snelling (CS)
Mr Jacques Jordaan (JJ)	Mr Jeff Dool (JD)
Mr Peter Buttgens (PB)	Mr Nicolas Smith (NS)
Ms Mandy Ritchie (MR)	Ms Luise Swiel (LS)
Ms Melissa Groenink (MG)	Ms Kathy Dumbrell (KD)
Ms Pieter Van Coller (PVC)	Adv Winston Erasmus (WE)
Mr Mogamat Noor Osman (NO)	Ms Jacky Poking (JP)
Mr Theo Kruger (TK)	Ms Vimtha Matthews (VM)
Ms Nabeweya Arend (NA)	Ms Zaidah Davis (ZD)
Ms Gabeebah Jassiem (GJ)	Ms Faeza Salaau (FS)
Ms Baderoeniesa Bosch (BB)	Mr Noor Ajam (NA)
Ms Sharifa Davids (SD)	Ms Nadeema Oosterndorp (NO)
Mr Anton Slabbert (AS)	Dr Stephan Townsend (ST)

## **Observers**

None

### **3. Apologies**

Ms Colette Scheermeyer (CSc)

### **4. Approval of agenda**

The Appeals Committee resolved to approve the agenda dated 20 February 2019 with amendments.

### **5. Approval of minutes of the previous meeting**

#### **5.1 Dated 23 January 2019**

The Committee resolved to approve the previous minutes dated 21 November 2018.

### **6. Disclosure of interest**

6.1 None

### **7. Confidential Matters**

7.1 None

### **8. Administrative Matters**

#### **8.1 Outcomes of the Tribunal Committee and Recent Court Decisions**

None

**Penelope Meyer**

#### **8.2 Outcomes of Court Decisions**

None

#### **8.3 Site Visits**

- Item 9.1: Remainder of ERF 49306, The Cannon Brewery, Cannon Street, Newlands
- Item 9.2: Erf 944, 126 High Level Road, Green Point
- Item 9.3: Erf 3032, 150 Buitengracht Street, Bo-Kaap
- Item 9.4: Erf 290, 29 Ocean View Drive Green Point

#### **8.4 Potential Site Visits**

- Item 10.1: Erf 2657, 62-66 Wale Street, City Centre CBD

### **9. Matters Arising**

**9.1 Proposed Development on the Remainder of Erf 49306, The Cannon Brewery, Cannon Street, Newlands: Section 38 (4)**

**Case No: 17022304AS0306E**

Mr Andrew September gave a PowerPoint presentation

Mr Gus Van Der Spek, Ms Michele Sandilands, Mr Richard Summers(RS), Ms Clarice Arendse, Mr Andrew Duncan (AD), Mr Peter Truter (PT), Mr Peter Sutherland (PS), Ms Vanessa Weissenstein (VW), Mr Mike Scurr(MS), Mr Simon van der Schans and Mr Craig Scarterfield was present and took part in the discussion.

In summary it was noted in discussion that:

- The chairperson provided all the parties to the appeal to make submissions and they were requested to keep their submission as brief as possible.
- That IACom approved the HIA with conditions
- VW submitted that the parameters set was not met and that the garden will be damaged by the proposed development;
- AD submitted that the proposal before the committee contained too many double-story structures and that the excavations of the parking garage will have a negative impact on the garden and trees; that the development has no regard to the heritage significance of the site;
- PS submitted that the damage to the garden is a long term issue; the draining of the water as a result of the excavations will have an impact on the trees in future;
- The Iacom decision did not contain enough conditions the preservation of the trees on the site and that a study regarding the possible impact of the draining of the water should have been done before a decision could be made by Iacom;
- PT submitted that the development will permanently destroy the garden
- RS made submissions in response to the above as well as the owner/appellant's submissions regarding the owner / Appellant's appeal.
- RS submitted that:
- The requirements by IACom for a meaningful setback has been achieved. As motivated by applicant's appeal for the revised design.
- IACom's decision entailed a blanket refusal of the forecourt intervention; the refusal is not supported by the findings of the heritage practitioner which indicated that potential impact area can be mitigated by an appropriate intervention; The IIIA grading of the site will not be adversely affected; The design the buildings will achieve an appropriate integration of a modern design with old heritage buildings;

- IACom's response to limiting the design solution to two of a single story throughout or two separate buildings was premature.
- Mike Scurr and Claire Abrahamse confirmed the outcome of the new proposal is both appropriate and a sensitive heritage response.
- The design response regarding all three buildings does not affect the IIIA significance of the site.
- Requested the committee to approve the revised designs as part of the overall project approval;
- RS submitted in response to the other appellants' submissions that:
  - the HIA process has identified what is appropriate
  - The amount of new development allowed in terms of the HIA is less than initially proposed.
  - The nature and feel of the site in terms of its historic qualities and garden setting will not be negatively impacted.
  - The intent from the outset has been for a detailed Tree Protection & Management Plan to regulate this. An arboricultural expert, Riaan van Zyl, was engaged regarding the concern that trees will be permanently impacted
  - All impacts identified are preventable with appropriate mitigation and management.
  - Concern about impacts on the water table is avoided through the engineering design which retains and redistributes water on site.
  - The loss of canopy cover is less than 10-15% of the original cover there is no adverse impact heritage value of the landscape.
  - The extent of the public participation process, which was comprehensive. The I & AP's had several opportunities to engage with the documentation submitted to HWC.
  - Densification is needed and it is important for proposals that will intensify new development on the site not to impact adversely on heritage resources
  - The site's IIIA grading will not be negatively impacted.
  - There is no merit in the other appellants' submission that the process was flawed as the application was made as prescribed; Section 38 indicates that 'any person' may apply and the question of agency is not an issue.
  - In response the other appellants submitted:
    - The whole site will be negatively impacted on especially the garden;
    - The information put forward was incorrect and the plane trees were not shown on the plans;
    - The model does not show trees along the drive which is a concern.

- That the loss of coverage was more than 10% and that the applicant/appellant should provide the correct information to all parties.
- RS in response indicated:
- The tree mapping indicates which trees will be kept and which will not be kept
- That the tree management plan will be drafted and there will be engage with the I & AP's and Tree Keepers regarding the management plan.

In summary, the committee noted and took the following into account:

The homestead, which was adapted from the old brewery by the artist Gwelo Goodman, is spatially linked to the layout of the garden, particularly in relation to both the open space and the existing trees, which form an important element of the layout as devised by Goodman.

- This relationship is carefully balanced so that the house is read against the existing landscaping.
- The landscaping creates a buffer between the house and the adjacent properties.
- The conditions set out in the Iacom decision were correct and are supported.
- The impact of the basement and its effects on the water table and the negative impact it might have on the trees in future were of concern to the Committee.
- The information that was provided regarding the existing and future planting was not sufficient and concerns were raised regarding the loss of canopy cover on the site.
- The setbacks of the proposed new structures will impact negatively on the landmark setting of the main building and its stand-alone quality of this structure. Particularly in terms of its setting and the relation to the treed landscape.
- The double story buildings visually constitute a single entity and the massing and form will compete with the core building.
- The interventions, including the buildings and the parking garage with the changing levels, will have a negative impact on both the visual ensemble of the building and garden setting and the existing figure ground relationship.

Regarding the appeal by A and IP's – the committee requires further information in order to make a decision.

#### **FURTHER REQUIREMENTS**

1. A comprehensive Tree Management Plan which also addresses water management to be submitted.
2. A Landscape Framework Plan indicating existing and new planting which addresses the heritage significance of the site to be submitted.

## **DECISION**

The appeal by the owner/applicant against the conditions imposed by IACOM is dismissed.

**Andrew September**

### **9.2 Proposed Total Demolition at Erf 944, 126 High Level Road, Green Point: Section 34**

**Case No: 18050315HB0606M**

Ms Heidi Boise gave a PowerPoint presentation

Ms Mandy Ritchie, Ms Melissa Groenink (MG) , Ms Kathy Dumbrell (KD), Ms Luise Swiel, Ms Pieter Van Coller (PvC), Mr Richard Summers (RS), Ms Clarice Arendse, Mr Jacques Jordaan and Mr Chris Snelling (CSn) was present and took part in the discussion.

In summary it was noted in discussion that:

- RS submitted:
- The appeal contains subjective and personal views concerning the qualities of the urban environment.
- I should be considered whether it is appropriate for HWC to consider the restriction of a development on the site to section 34.
- Belcom required the applicant do undertake a contextual study in order to assist BELCom to reach an decision and to establish whether the area is worthy of protection from a heritage perspective.
- The study indicated that was no well-defined heritage context that required HWC intervention on this site.
- No heritage resources exist or will be impacted upon by development of the site.
- The appeal relies Ms. Dumbrell study commissioned by the Appellants
- The study does not motivate why the streetscape or townscape warrant protection. Additional concerns regarding Ms. Dumbrell's
- The broader context is not a sensitive heritage area.

- There is no impact on identified heritage resources and there is no historic area affected.
- As a result there is no lawful basis to control the proposed development.
- MG submitted:
- Ms Drumbrell was appointed by the appellant undertook a study regarding the heritage significance of the area
- BELCom erred in its decision to grant unconditional demolition approval without any appropriate conditions.
- Belcom failed to understand the heritage significance of the site and its context;
- Belcom erred in finding that the replacement building is only a planning issue;
- the Applicant failed to comply with BELCom's instructions; and
- there was a lack of continuity and consistency in BELCOM, resulting in a process which was capricious in nature.
- At the BELCom meeting of August 2018, the Committee stipulated further requirements.
- The applicant was to submit a study the to identify the heritage qualities of the area and submit heritage design indicators which must inform the proposed development.
- The subsequent plans submitted to BELCom similar in design and the Appellant believed them to be exactly the same as the original plans submitted.
- Referred to committee to the Gees judgement
- Section 48(2)(c) mandates HWC to in its discretion impose conditions
- Ms Dumbrell report indicates that the townscape and streetscape should be protected and provided reasons why protection of this small pocket of Three Anchor Bay and the applicable section of High Level Road should be protected.
- Ms Dumbrell report indicates that there are suitable heritage indicators and resources to ensure the protection of the area even though it is not situated within a HPOZ.
- There was a change in composition of half of the committee, as well as a change in the chairmanship

- There was a noticeable change in the attitude of the BELCom committees up to the August meeting and at the October meeting, resulting in a decision which was arbitrary and capricious
- The committee was urged to listen to the recordings of the two Belcom meetings.
- The minutes of the two meetings are irreconcilable.
- There is no evidence to suggest that the October BELCom took due regard of the context
- The Appellants requested but reasons for the Belcom decision but it was not provided to the appellants and their rights are reserved to supplement this appeal once the reasons are received.

RS submitted:

- The minutes of the Belcom meeting and the reasons reflected in the RoD is sufficient for the purposes of the appeal.
- The contextual analysis as required by Belcom was done and responded to by the Applicant
- CSn indicated that the area has not been identified as conservation worthy
- KD requested that the following should the record reflect that consider during the course of this process, Mr Snelling's basis of analysis of her work was tantamount to questioning her integrity and her ability to do this work.

In summary, the committee noted and took the following into account:

- The house is not visible from the road. Access could not be gained to the property so the house itself was not inspected.
- The adjacent house to the east is single-storeyed, much lower than the road, and has a tiled roof.
- The houses to the west are a pair of early twentieth century houses with hipped tiled roofs, reading as a single storey at road level.
- The significant grouping of houses is the terrace of Victorian houses further along the road to the west.
- The houses across the road are also of the villa form and early twentieth century in terms of age. Most houses have had boundary walls added and/or garages
- The house itself has no heritage value and the immediate area within which it is situated is not worthy of conservation.

- The built environment context is hybrid in nature and lacks consistency in terms of massing and form and townscape quality.

## **DECISION**

The appeal was dismissed.

**Heidi Boise**

### **9.3 Proposed Total Demolition, Replacement Structure, Erf 3032, 150 Buitengracht Street, Bo-Kaap: Section 34**

**Case No: 18030611ZK0307E**

Ms Waseefa Dhansay gave a PowerPoint presentation

Mr Peter Buttgens (PB), Mr Nicolas Smith (NS), Adv Winston Erasmus (WE), Mr Mogamat Noor Osman, Ms Jacky Poking, Mr Theo Kruger , Ms Vimtha Matthews, Ms Nabeweya Arend, Ms Zaidah Davis , Ms Gabeebah Jassiem, Ms Faeenza Salaau, Ms Baderoeniesa Bosch, Mr Noor Ajam , Ms Sharifa Davids and Ms Nadeema Oosterndorp present and took part in the discussion.

In summary it was noted in discussion that:

- AvG reported back to the committee on the site visit conducted by members.
- NS on behalf of the Appellant / owner submitted:
- That the 2008 HWC decision remains valid as it has never been challenged and it was partially enacted through the demolition of the structure. The amended proposal is not a new proposal for a replacement building in the context of section 34, but an amendment of the existing HWC approved plans to incorporate the amended proposal.
- The amended proposal has significantly improved on the previous plans and is more sensitive to surrounding heritage resources.
- Should the Appeals Committee reject the amended proposal it would leave the appellant with no choice but to build the replacement building in accordance with the 2008 approved plans.
- BELCOM's refusal to approve the new proposal amounts to a decision confirming the appellant's right to build in accordance with the previous plans and as a result Belcom failed to act consistent with section 34 of the NHRA, being the preservation and management of heritage resources and the decision is therefore irrational.
- BELCOM's decision is unreasonable and unlawful due to BELCOM's failure to have proper regard to the principles of heritage resources management.

- The approval of the previous plans in 2008 conferred on the appellant certain right in terms of the height, massing and scale of the replacement building which rights remain entrenched.
- BELCOM was constrained to make a decision within the above parameters.
- The failure of BELCOM to approve the amended development in light of the negative impact in terms of height, massing and scale is unreasonable and unlawful.
- BELCOM misconstrued its mandate, which is limited to the amendment in question, but also failed to take into account the appellant's already existing rights.
- BELCOM failed to take proper account of the manner in which the new proposal significantly improves on the previous plans in terms of its sensitivity to its context and surrounding heritage resources and as a result the decision is irrational.
- Ms Matthews submitted:
  - The building will tower over the small homes and no effort has been made in considering the Heritage homes and the historical value of the Bo-Kapp and the residence.
  - Leeuwen Street has significant historical value.
  - The Bo-Kaap is characterized by similar, low scaled properties, cascading down the slopes with each property having historic views over the roof of the next.
  - The Bo-Kaap is a heritage resource of national importance.
  - The application will undermine the heritage significance of the whole area through its inappropriateness.
- Adv Erasmus submitted:
  - The Bo-Kaap is a unique historic area of national importance and is currently a Grade 1 area requiring a comment from SAHRA for all applications.
  - The appellant made no mention of the comment SAHRA gave in response to the advice requested in terms of Amendment to a section 34 Permit, partially fulfilled.
  - The SAHRA comment was that a new application should be made.
  - Even though it falls within SAHRA's constitutional mandate, their comment was not considered or included in the report by the applicant.

- HWC considered all the material factors and the BELCOM decision was a rational decision not to approve the application which will harm the historical and present aesthetics of the Bo-Kaap.
- BELCOM's refusal to approve the application was reasonable and in line with heritage resource management principles.
- The development will be eroding access to the environment and will be directly in conflict with section 24 of the Constitution.
- Section 31 of the Constitution relates cultural, religious and linguistic communities. The Bo-Kaap community will be denied their rights in terms of section 31 of the Constitution to enjoy their culture and religion if the development is approved.

In summary, the committee noted and took the following into account:

- Site visit report:
- The graded house immediately adjacent to the rear of the site is a very important 18th-century house that retains its Baroque parapet.
- The streetscape is fine-grained with a complex interweaving of houses, single and double-storeyed with the Auwul mosque on the street corner.
- The area is characterised by the scale, materiality and architectural character of the existing buildings.
- The spatial inter-relationship between the site in question and the historic buildings is of considerable significance, particularly in relation to the views of the 18th-century house.
- The Bo-Kaap has been identified as a very significant heritage resource.
- The Bo-Kaap consists of narrow houses and streets.
- Heritage structures, sites or areas of various scales, individual buildings or urban landscapes, derive their significance and distinctive character from their meaningful relationships with their physical, visual, spiritual and other cultural context and settings.
- All the parties to the appeal confirmed that there is no dispute regarding the heritage value of the graded, protected structures and cultural landscape of the Bo-Kaap.
- The question of whether the NHRA makes provision for an application to amend conditions of a permit, which has been acted on, is lawful or not was not appealed by any of the parties and the Appeals Committee was not tasked to make a decision on that issue.

- The applicable condition the appellant seeks to be amended requires “*plans for the replacement building to be cleared by HWC*”.
- The committee was of the opinion that the approval of the previous development during 2008 bestowed only a right on the appellant to construct the building according to the plans approved by HWC.
- The appellant submitted that the approval during 2008 of the previously proposed development conferred on it rights in terms of height, massing and scale of the replacement building and that such rights remain entrenched
- The identification of heritage resources is a continuous process.
- Whether HWC considered the heritage resources now identified to be worthy of conservation and/or the impact on these heritage resources when the permit was issued during 2008 should not have an influence on the Appeals Committee’s own assessment of the potential impact on heritage resources of the proposed amended development.
- The appellant’s submission that the approval of the previous plans conferred on the appellant certain right in terms of the height, massing and scale of the replacement building was in the Appeals Committee’s opinion incorrect.
- The approval of the previous plans conferred only a right to build the specific building approved on the appellant.
- The Appeals Committee has the mandate to assess the impact of the amended proposal on the very significant heritage resources and it is not limited to only consider whether the amended proposal is more “sensitive” and “*responsive to heritage resources*”.
- The Appeals Committee must assess the impact on heritage resources of each proposed development (whether new or an amended version) on its own merits and in this instance it must assess the impact that the amended proposed development will have on the heritage resources identified currently.
- To assess the amended proposed development on the basis that it would be an improvement on the previously approved development and only consider whether it would have a ‘*more sensitive response*’ to heritage resources would have the effect that the committee did not fulfil its mandate and duties in terms of the NHRA.
- New (or amended) developments must respect the existing spatial layout and cultural landscape in terms of scale, bulk and design.

- The committee noted that a process is underway to have the Bo-Kaap area declared a Heritage Overlay Zone in terms of the City of Cape Town's Zoning Scheme Regulations. This is however a City of Cape Town process.
- The Bo-Kaap has a clearly identifiable architectural and social identity with social and religious practices of the Cape Muslim community and forms part of the cultural landscape.
- There are a number of conservation principles that must be taken into consideration:
  - It is important that new work should not distort or obscure the cultural significance of a place nor detract from its essential character. The character of the block is essentially that of single and double storey buildings that are closely interlinked.
  - The immediate context of the site is highly significant from a heritage perspective.
  - The heritage context has changed substantially since 2008 when the original plans were approved.
  - There are several very important heritage structures in the block. The Auwal Mosque, immediately to the north of the site, dates from 1794 and is the oldest mosque in the country. This is a landmark structure in the block and its landmark status needs to be respected and not overwhelmed by new interventions. The context needs to be respected.
  - The views towards the building with the curvilinear gable (erf 2838) from Buitengracht street were critical and contributed substantially to 'place character' in this portion of the Bo-Kaap.
  - The block has a relative consistency in terms of massing, scale, height, and form. Although the building typologies are hybrid in form they do not dominate the two key heritage resources referred to above.
  - Currently, the minaret clearly is a focal point in the block.
  - In addition, the late seventeenth-century single storey house with its Baroque wavy parapet is the oldest 18th century house of its form to remain in Cape Town and is of national significance.
  - Its scale and position need to be respected and complimented.
  - New work should respect, but not imitate or mimic the existing significant fabric.
  - It requires that the nature of the architecture of the block be taken into consideration.

- The architecture of the surrounding historic buildings is a wall architecture, punctured by openings.
- The proposal uses an alien architectural language more appropriate to the Atlantic seaboard.
- If the bulk and scale of new work appear to be substantially larger than the significant structures, then it will overwhelm the place and diminish its significance and the appreciation of the resource.
- This is a crucial heritage consideration. An examination of the proposal from either the south or the north shows that it completely overwhelms the existing fabric of the area which has single and double storey residential buildings stepping up the hillside, responding to the topography of the area and establishing the massing and scale that any new development must respect.
- Notwithstanding the marginal improvements to the development proposal tabled at the meeting, the overall massing, scale, and height of the proposed development are considered to be inappropriate to the very sensitive heritage context. Negative heritage impacts would be high.
- Due to the negative impact of the amended development proposal on the highly significant identified heritage resources the Appeals Committee cannot approve the building plans as submitted by Object Architects as delivered in support of the amendment application and appeal.

#### **DECISION**

The appeal is dismissed.

**Waseefa Dhansay**

#### **9.4 Proposed Total Demolition at Erf 290, 29 Ocean View Drive Green Point: Section 34**

**Case No: 18071903HB0727E**

Ms Heidi Boise gave a PowerPoint presentation

Mr Theo Kruger, Mr Pieter Van Coller, Mr Anton Slabbert and Dr Stephan Townsend was present and took part in the discussion.

In summary it was noted in discussion that:

- ST submitted:
- The structure itself is not of sufficient significance to warrant protection and should be graded a IIIC.
- The area within which the structure is located does not warrant protection.

- That according to HWC policy the structure can only be protected if it contributes to the area if the area is worthy of protection.

In summary, the committee noted and took the following into account:

- The house is an early twentieth century villa with a pitched tiled roof, plastered walls, painted face brick plinth and retains the original fenestration.
- The interior of the house has had some alterations, including the opening up of the central rooms accessing the balcony, although most spaces are still original.
- The adjoining house to the east is a new house with a glazed western elevation and is divided into two units, with the upper unit accessed from the top road.
- Other than the above-mentioned house, the streetscape comprises several houses of similar character, with pitched tiled roofs
- The building itself is not worthy of protection.
- The area within which the building is situated does not have sufficient heritage value to warrant protection.

**DECISION**

The appeal is upheld.

**Heidi Boise**

**9.5 Stellenbosch University**

In summary it was noted in discussion that:  
HWC is still awaiting the information requested.

**DECISION:**

The matter is postponed.

Heidi Boise

**9.6 Proposed Addition & Alteration at Erf 191, 119 Buitenkant Street, Gardens:  
Section 34**

**Case No:** 18080204HB0806E

**COMMENT:**

1. The revised proposal does not respond adequately to the committee's previous request.
2. The Appeals Committee will provide the Appellant with written feedback regarding the new proposal.

**Heidi Boise**

**10. New Matters**

**10.1 Proposed Partial Demolition and Multi-Storey Addition on Erf 2657, 62-66  
Wale Street, City Centre CBD: Section 34**

**Case No: 18060514AS0627M**

Mr Eward Grobler, Mr Johan Slee and Mr Cillie Malan were present and took part in the discussion.

**DECISION**

The Committee resolved to undertake a site inspection on the 11<sup>th</sup> of March 2019 at 10:00am.

**Andrew September**

**11. Other Matters**

11.1 None.

**12. Adoption of decisions and additions**

The Appeals Committee resolved to adopt the decisions.

**13. Closure of the meeting**

The Chairperson closed the meeting at: 16:10

**14. Date of next meeting: 20 March 2019**

Chairperson's Signature.....

Date.....