

**Approved Minutes of the Meeting of the Impact Assessment Committee
of Heritage Western Cape held on Wednesday, 14 September 2016, at the 1st Floor
Boardroom, Protea Assurance Building, Green Market Square, Cape Town,
at 09h00**

1. Opening and Welcome

The Chairperson, Ms Cindy Postlethwayt opened the meeting at 09H10 and welcomed everyone present.

2. Attendance

Members

Ms Cindy Postlethwayt (Chairperson) (CP)
Dr Piet Claassen (PC)
Mr Siphiwo Mavumengwana (SM)
Mr Chris Snelling (CSn)
Mr Frik Vermeulen (FV)
Ms Mary Leslie (ML)
Mr Tim Hart (TH)
Ms Corlie Smart (CSm)
Mr Quinton Lawson (QL)
Mr Steven Walker (SW)

Staff

Mr Zwelibanzi Shiceka (ZS)
Ms Penny Meyer (PM)
Mr Guy Thomas (GT)
Ms Katherine Robinson (KR)
Mr Andrew September (AS)
Ms Waseefa Dhansay (WD)
Ms Heidi Boise (HB)
Mr Olwethu Dlova (OD)

Ms Quahnita Samie resigned on 15 August 2016.

Observers

None

Visitors

Dr Nicolas Baumann (NB)
Mr Dominic Touwen (DT)
Mr Mamiele Camara (MC)
Ms Saschae Camara (SC)
Mr Geoff Underwood (GU)
Prof Fabio Todeschini (FT)
Mr Chris Rousseau (CR)
Ms Karen Hansen (KH)
Mr Peter Stuart (PS)
Ms Marise Potgieter

Mr Rohan Young (RY)
Mr Johan Cornelius (JC)
Mr Anton van Loggerenberg (AvL)
Mr Mike Scurr (MS)
Mr Peter Buttgens (PB)
Adv Peter Kantor (PK)
Mr Jonathan Kaplan (JK)
Ms Zinda Berold
Mr H Marais (HM)
Ms Tarna Klitzner

3. Apologies

Dr Lita Webley (LW)
Ms Colette Scheermeyer (CSch)
Ms Lithalethu Mshoti (LM)

4. Approval of the Agenda

4.1 Dated 14 September 2016

The Committee resolved to approve the agenda dated 14 September 2016 with amendments.

5. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting

5.1 Dated 10 August 2016

The Committee agreed to adopt the minutes with no amendments.

6 Disclosure of Interest

- CSn: 13.2
- QL: 16.2 and 16.3
- TH: 16.1, 16.2 and 13.4
- CP: 16.6
- CSm: 13.5

7. Confidential Matters

7.1 None.

8. Appointments

8.1 The Committee noted the appointment of item 13.4 set for 13H30.

9 Administrative Matters

9.1 Outcome of the Appeals, Tribunal Committees and Court Cases

PM reported on the outcome of the following matters:

- Proposed Remedial Work, Erf 11306, Klein Constantia Street, Paarl: Section: 27
- Proposed Partial Demolition & Additions to existing structure, Erf 224, 2 Claire Street, Vredehoek: Section 34
- Proposed Alterations and Additions, Erf 8988, 22 Plein Street, Paarl: Section 34
- Proposed Alterations and Additions, Erf 3190, 4 Constantia Road, Oranjezicht: Section 34
- Proposed Total Demolition, Erf 177420, 21 Wheel Road, Newlands: Section 34
- Proposed Total Demolition, Erf 26939, 6 Roman Road, Observatory: Section 34

PM

9.2 Report back on the meeting with Deputy Director and Chairperson

CP reported back on her meeting with CSch. The following points were discussed:

- The responsibilities of the Committee members in respect of their attendance and contributions at meetings
- Consideration of staff presentations at the meetings being limited to essential information. The recommendations of the consultants should form part of the presentation but do not need to be read in detail.
- The case officer is to be given an opportunity to make a final comment prior to the Committee formulating recommendations

9.3 Standard Response Letter

SM raised concerns in respect of the standard letter of response to NID submissions which specify a requirement for comment only from the registered conservation bodies. It is understood that Council will be taking the issue of consultation further.

However, the DD is requested to investigate the possibility, in the interim, of amending the standard response in this regard.

CSch

10 Standing Items

10.1 Site Inspections

Nothing to report.

PM

10.2 Report back from ExCo, Council and any other Committees

It was noted that the Minimum Standards Guide for Archaeological and Palaeontological Reports was approved at Council. The one relevant to section 38 had been circulated to IACom by OD.

IACom are unclear as to the implications for their term of office as a result of the extension of Council's term. PM to request the CEO to inform the Committee.

CSch to consider closer working relationships between IGIC and IACom in the future.

PC/JL

MATTERS TO BE DISCUSSED

11 SECTION 38(2) RESPONSES TO NOTIFICATION OF INTENT TO DEVELOP

11.1 None

12 SECTION 38(1) INTERIM COMMENT

12.1 None

13 SECTION 38(4) RECORD OF DECISION

**13.1 Revised Proposal for the Redevelopment and Construction of Two Additional Floors on Erven 327, 333, & 334, The Warwick, 22-24 Main Road, Green Point:
NM
HM/GREEN POINT/ERVEN 327, 333 & 334**

Case No: 14070814AS0715E

Heritage Statement on the revised proposal and previous case documents prepared by Johan Cornelius were tabled.

Mr Andrew September made a power-point presentation.

Mr Johan Cornelius was present and took part in the discussion.

In discussion it was noted:

- The CoCT HRM have supported the proposal
- The heritage indicators provided in the previous approved HIA have been utilised as a basis for assessing the revised proposals.
- This submission is the subject of a new application in terms of S 38(4)
- The Committee was generally of the view that the two additional storeys would not impact further on the significance of the heritage resource, particularly in the context of the changing development profile of Green Point.

RECORD OF DECISION

The provisions of Section 38 (3) have been satisfied. The revised proposals as submitted are approved.

AS

13.2 Proposed Total Demolition, Erven 177651 (5044, 5046, 5047, 5048, 5050, 5052 & 5053), 44, 46 & 48 Commercial Street, Cape Town CBD: NM HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/Erven 177651 (5044, 5046, 5047, 5048, 5050, 5052 & 5053)

Case No: 16021507KR0804M

Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by Chris Snelling was tabled.

CSn recused himself.

Ms Katherine Robinson made a power-point presentation.

Mr Mamiele Camara, Mr Anton van Loggerenberg and Ms Saschae Camara tabled a document dated 14 September 2016, were present and took part in discussion. Mr Snelling was also present and took part on the discussion. He left the room when the decision was taken by the Committee.

In discussion it was noted:

- The concerns raised by Dr Townsend and the representatives of Perspectives Body Corporate were noted. It was further noted that CIBRA had chosen not to comment, having been given more than 30 days.
- The CoCT E&HRM supported the proposal.
- The Rules and Code of Conduct governing the recusal of Committee members have been complied with.
- The mapping of heritage resources incorporates all relevant information and may differ from the City's grading audit particularly if such audit has not been formally approved. The HIA complies with Section 38 (3) in this respect.
- The regulations governing the participation of conservation bodies have been complied with. HWC cannot require conservation bodies to comment. The HIA complies with Section 38 (3) in this respect.
- Whilst the Committee shares Dr Townsend's concerns regarding recent decision making by the CoCT in respect of HPOZs, the heritage context is taken into account when IACom considers the impact upon heritage resources and in this case, the context is not considered to be sensitive or significant.
- The Committee is of the view that archaeological monitoring will not be sufficient in this instance and that trial excavations should be required.

- The Committee is of the view that no known heritage resources are negatively impacted by the proposed demolition or re-development of the site

RECORD OF DECISION

The Committee endorses this report as having met the requirements of Section 38 (3) of the NHRA.

The proposed demolitions and re-development outlined in Option 2 are approved on condition that:

- Final development drawings are generally in accordance with those pertaining to Option2 as contained within the HIA.
- Through-the-floor archaeological test excavations, in any building without basements, must precede development. Further::
 - A work-plan must be approved by HWC;
 - Any finds must be reported immediately;
 - Recommendations must be discussed in the work-plan report.

KR

13.3 Proposed Security Fence on Klein Constantia Wine Estate, Portion 6 of Farm 1121, Constantia: NM HM/CONSTANTIA/PORCION 6 OF FARM 1121

Case No: 14102719AS110E

Integrated Heritage Impact Assessment and addendum prepared by Mike Scurr were tabled.

Mr Andrew September made a power-point presentation.

Mr Mike Scurr and Ms Tarna Klitzner.were present and took part in the discussion.

In discussion it was noted:

- The comments of the I&APs and the CoCT E&HRM were noted.
- The HIA provides a very comprehensive assessment of the security considerations and the potential for impact on the heritage resources

RECORD OF DECISION

The Committee endorses the report as having complied with S 38 (3) of the NHRA.

Option 2 as presented in the HIA is approved subject to:

- The specification of a Clearvu invisible wall (or equal) 1.8m high with 600mm electric wires above. No razor wire or other barrier systems can be considered. The colour should be charcoal grey or “anthracite” not black.
- An archaeologist must monitor the digging of holes for the post footings

AS

13.4 Proposed Development Rem of Portion 12 of the Vergenoegd Farm No 653: MA HM/ CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ SOMERSET WEST/ RE OF PORTION 12 OF THE VERGENOEGD FARM NO 653

Case No: 16012507WD0210M

Heritage Impact Assessment; CoCT comments; I&APs comments and additional information were tabled.

TH recused himself and left the room when the decision was taken by the Committee.

Ms Waseefa Dhansay made a power-point presentation.

Ms Marise Potgieter, Mr Peter Stuart and Mr Peter Buttgens were present and took part in the discussion.

In discussion it was noted:

- A Section 27 application must be made in respect of any work within the PHS precinct. This should be considered by BELCom. Representation from IACom is recommended.
- The HIA with accompanying Urban Design Report are highly commended by this Committee.

RECORD OF DECISION

The Committee endorses the HIA as complying with section 38 (3) of NHRA.

The Committee approves the proposals contained within the HIA, subject to the following conditions:

- The Masterplan is supported in principle with the exception of the proposed restaurant to the east of the dam.
- Inclusion of the winery complex into the Provincial Heritage Site;
- A detailed Landscape Plan must be provided by a Landscape Architect with experience in historic sites , which includes the design of all surfaces in the farmstead (including all werfs in which paving and hard surface treatments are proposed), detail design of parking areas which need to be screened with sufficient trees to limit visual impacts. In addition all planting proposed for screening and otherwise to be included in the Landscape Plan;
- Detail design of the conservatory building, entrance structure, and ceremonial building to be submitted to HWC for approval;
- Design principles of the new homestead to be submitted to HWC for approval with accordance with heritage indicators contained within HIA
- Revised location of the proposed Cellar extension, which should not protrude beyond the existing werf setback line on the western side
- Prior to any earthworks, a session must be held with the Archaeologist to explain the processes required if any finds are uncovered;
- Bulk earthworks and excavations in, and immediately surrounding the Vergenoegd homestead/farm werf must be monitored by a professional archaeologist. This includes removal of any inappropriate buildings and structures. Sites 1, 2 and 7 are deemed to be potentially sensitive areas and must be the focus of a watching brief (i. e. monitoring).

- Any trench digging or alterations within the ringmuur of the farm should be monitored by an archaeologist. The rear of the stables may also be archaeologically sensitive as a possible structure may have existed here;
- Any expected finds of midden material (as previously described) or old stone footings anywhere on the farm must be reported to an archaeologist.

WD

**13.5 Proposed Guest House, Restaurant and Associated Development on Erf 548, La Cotte Farm, Franschoek: NM
HM/FRANSCHHOEK/REMAINDER OF ERF 548**

Case No: 15070201AS0706M

Heritage Impact Assessment and addendum prepared by Nicolas Baumann were tabled.

CSm recused herself and took part in discussion as a member of the public. CSm left the room when the decision was taken.

Mr Andrew September made a power-point presentation

Dr Nicolas Baumann, Mr Rohan Young and Mr Dominic Touwen were present and took part in the discussion.

In discussion it was noted that:

- Although a 2009 approval of a subdivision of a portion of the property into 11 erven was motivated on the grounds that this would fund the maintenance of the buildings, the property is now under different ownership and the erven have not been sold to date.
- The HIA contains an excellent and very thorough fabric analysis

RECORD OF DECISION

The Committee endorses the HIA as complying with Section 38(3) of the NHR Act. The proposed development is approved subject to:

- The final drawings being substantially in accordance with the revised site plan (drawing. 146-dd-002, dated 8 August 2016), and the plans, sections and elevations contained in the HIA report.
- A closeout report, including details and specs of all restoration work, undertaken to the existing buildings, by a suitably qualified and experienced heritage practitioner must be submitted to HWC within 3 months of practical completion.
- A suitably qualified archaeologist must be consulted where excavations are planned adjacent to or cutting through historic fabric and where earthworks occur on and around the werf. A monitoring report is required.

AS

14 SECTION 38(8) NEMA RESPONSE TO NOTIFICATION OF INTENT TO DEVELOP

14.1 None.

15 SECTION 38(8) NEMA INTERIM COMMENTS

15.1 None

16 SECTION 38(8) NEMA FINAL COMMENTS ON ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

**16.1 Proposed Housing Development on Farm 1633, 1339 and 1158, La Motte, Franschhoek: NM
HM/FRANSCHOEK /FARM 1633, 1339 AND 1158/1**

Case No: 14021805RN0313M

Revised Visual Impact Assessment, Heritage Impact Assessment, Interim Comment and addendum prepared by Henry Aikman were tabled.

Mr Andrew September made a power-point presentation

In discussion it was noted that:

- The current layout of the development does not respect the urban morphology and visual aesthetic of La Motte which has social, historical and built environment significance.

INTERIM COMMENT

The layout must be revised with individual erven being enlarged, so as to be more sympathetic to the typology of existing erven of La Motte.

The proposed north development site lies North West of an existing residential area (Bosbou hamlet), and about 30 meters to the cemetery. The close proximity of the development site to the cemetery requires protection (erection of fence, etc.) measures be taken to protect the graveyard during construction. This should include all access roads to the development site during construction. Access roads will be used by heavy construction vehicles.

AS

**16.2 Proposed Residential Estate and Associated Development on Mount Prospect, Erven 2641 And 2643, Constantia: MA
HM/CONSTANTIA/ERVEN 2641 AND 2643**

Case No: 15031706AS0422M

Updated Heritage Impact Assessment, proposal and addendum documents prepared by Bridget O'Donoghue were tabled.

QL and TH recused themselves. They left the room when the decision was taken by the Committee.

Mr Andrew September made a power-point presentation.

Mr Geoff Underwood, Mr Peter Buttgens, Prof Fabio Todeschini, Adv Peter Kantor and Mr Chris Rousseau were present and took part in the discussion.

FINAL COMMENT

The Committee does not support the proposal in its current form for the following reasons:

- Whilst the principle of densification is not opposed, nor is some form of development on the site opposed, there are concerns that insufficient consideration has been given to the impact on heritage resources
- The site is situated at the urban edge and adjourning the Constantia Winelands Cultural Landscape. The very high densities proposed are not appropriate, regardless of the visual mitigation proposed.
- The site has been graded IIIA. A nomination has been submitted for a PHS, however this has not yet been considered. The Committee therefore continues to assume a IIIA grading. In this regard, there are concerns that all the buildings proposed in the south-western quadrant will negatively impact upon the approach to the historically significant buildings and that the buildings proposed in the immediate vicinity (to the north and east) of the historically significant buildings in the werf are intrusive.
- Consideration of a building typology that is more appropriate in the remnant rural context continues to be a matter that the Committee feels should be expressly addressed.

AS

16.3 Proposed Splitting of the Sutherland Renewable Energy Facility into Three Mw Wind Energy Facilities: NM HM/ CENTRAL KAROO/ LAINGSBURG/ PORTION 1 OF FARM NO 10 BOSCHMANSKLOOF

Case No: 16041315WD0531M

Heritage Impact Assessment and additional information was tabled.

FV took the chair for this item.

TH and QL recused themselves and left the room.

Ms Waseefa Dhansay made a power-point presentation

In discussion it was noted:

- The findings of the heritage assessment have revealed that the study area is rich in a wide variety of both colonial and pre-colonial heritage sites. Parts of the study area enjoy very high aesthetic qualities and constitute a layered cultural landscape of remarkable intactness. The impact of the proposal is of moderate negative significance with respect to physical heritage but of medium – high significance with respect to cultural landscape.

FINAL COMMENT

The Committee endorses the HIA as complying with Section 38(3) of the NHR Act.

The proposed development is supported, subject to the following recommendations:

Palaeontology

- Before any major construction commences a thorough field scoping survey of representative natural and artificial rock exposures within the study region as a whole should be undertaken by a qualified palaeontologist to identify specific areas or horizons of palaeontological sensitivity on the ground;
- On the basis of the field scoping survey, a realistic, collaborative mitigation programme and protocol should be drawn up by the palaeontologist in conjunction with the developer and SAHRA *plus* Heritage Western Cape. This mitigation would normally involve the recording and judicious collection of fossil material within the development area as well as the recording of relevant geological data, before or during the construction phase of the development;
- The palaeontologist involved in mitigation work will be required to obtain a palaeontological collection permit from SAHRA and if required a workplan approval from HWC and to arrange a suitable repository for any fossils collected (e.g. Iziko: South African Museum, Cape Town).

Archaeology

- Micro-siting of turbines and access roads will be required during the EMP to avoid significant impacts;
- If micro-siting is not possible, then monitoring and some physical mitigation in the form of archaeological excavations or collection with a workplan issued by Heritage Western Cape may be required.

Graves

- A more detailed survey must be conducted along the proposed access roads and connecting cable routes and turbine sites to ensure graves are not disturbed. If graveyards are discovered during the walk down phase, a buffer of at least 15 m should be employed around them;
- If unmarked graves are uncovered during construction, work should cease in that area and either SAHRA or HWC must be notified, depending on the location. A protocol to deal with accidentally discovered burials must be compiled for the construction phase.

The Built Environment:

- Micro-siting of turbines and access roads during the EMP will avoid significant impacts to the built environment.

Visual

The following are recommended as essential mitigation measures to reduce the visual impact ratings:

- A visual buffer zone of 500m for the wind turbines along the escarpment, this being the main landscape features;
- A visual buffer of 500m for the wind turbines from the local district roads;
- A 250m setback for the wind turbines from farm boundaries should be observed;
- The PV arrays, substation and O&M buildings to ideally be set back 250m from local district roads;
- Cables to be located underground as far as possible;
- The substation and O&M buildings to be grouped together as far as possible to minimise the scatter of buildings across the site;
- The design of the buildings to be compatible in scale and form with buildings of the surrounding rural area, and with the regional architecture;

- All yards and storage areas to be enclosed by masonry walls;
- The internal access roads should not be located in drainage courses. The roads should generally follow the grain of the land, and their alignments fine-tuned to fit the topography;
- Signage related to the enterprise to be discrete and confined to the entrance gates. No other corporate or advertising signage, particularly billboards, to be permitted.

CONSTRUCTION MITIGATION MEASURES

- The construction camp, material stores and lay-down area must be located in the vicinity of the proposed substation and O&M buildings to minimise unnecessary disturbance to the surrounding landscape;
- The extent of the construction camp and stores should be limited in area to only that which is essential;
- Disturbed areas rather than pristine or intact landscape areas should preferably be used for the construction camp;
- Measures to control wastes and litter should be included in the contract specification documents;
- Provision should be made for rehabilitation/ re-vegetation of areas damaged by construction activities;
- Borrow pits for the construction (which have not been identified), would be subject to permits from the relevant authorities.

OPERATIONAL MITIGATION MEASURES

- The footprint of the operations and maintenance facilities, as well as parking and vehicular circulation, should be clearly defined, and not be allowed to spill over into other areas of the site;
- The operations and maintenance areas should be screened by buildings, walls, hedges and/or tree planting, and should be kept in a tidy state to minimise further visual impact

The Committee was not quorate for this item; the decision was circulated by email and ratified.

WD

16.4 Proposed Additional Services and Infrastructure for the Jacobsbaai Abalone Farm, Portion 18 of Farm 108, Jacobs Bay, Saldanha Bay: NM HM/JACOBSBAAI/PTN 18 OF FARM 108

Case No: 16042212AS0517M

Heritage Impact Assessment and addendum prepared by Jenna Lavin was tabled.

Mr Andrew September made a power-point presentation

In discussion it was noted:

- There is continuous destruction of archaeological resources at Jacobsbaai, due to inadequate monitoring, survey and mitigation.

- The comment from IRASA was noted; the Committee however, confines its evaluation to the impacts on heritage resources.

FINAL COMMENT

- The report meets the requirements of section 38(3) of the NHRA.
- The committee supports Alternative 3, subject to the following conditions:
 - Sufficient archaeological test excavations be conducted within the development footprint. A workplan must be submitted to HWC for approval.
- Alternative 3 is preferred in terms of impacts to heritage resources. The excavations for the construction of the New Dam must be monitored by an archaeologist.
- The excavations for the pipeline and channel must be monitored by an archaeologist.
- The excavations for the New Building must be monitored by an archaeologist.
- The HWC Fossil Finds Procedure must be implemented during the construction phase.

The Committee was not a quorate. The decision was circulated via email and ratified.

AS

16.5 Proposed Parking Lot at Koeberg Nuclear Power Station, Farm Duynefontyn 1552, Melkbosstrand: NM HM/MELKBOSSTRAND/FARM DUYNFONTYN 1552

Case No: 16052406AS0711E

Heritage Impact Assessment, addendum and Workplan prepared by Jayson Orton were tabled.

Mr Guy Thomas made a power-point presentation

In discussion it was noted:

- Because the natural ground surface was completely obscured by dumped material and the potentially highly significant Langebaan Formation underlies the site at unknown depth, it is recommended that a program of test excavations be carried out in order to determine the presence and significance of any buried heritage resources that might be present. Such excavations would be key in determining whether there may be any heritage resources present that could constitute a fatal flaw. Detailed recommendations can then be formulated once the results are available, although these will still include full time monitoring of earthworks to recover isolated fossils.

INTERIM COMMENT

The Committee notes the consultant's recommendations to undertake proposed test excavations in terms of the workplan approved by APM.

The Committee will not comment on the heritage impact assessment until the results of the test excavations have been finalised. Furthermore, the results of the test excavations and the recommendations of the test excavation report must be integrated in a revised heritage impact assessment covering the provisions of Section 38(3) of the NHRA.

The Committee was not a quorate. The decision was circulated via email and ratified.

GT

**16.6 Proposed Housing Development on Farm 948, Cape Columbine Road, Paternoster: NM
HM/PATERNOSTER/FARM 948**

Case No: 16042901AS0428M

Heritage Impact Assessment and addendum prepared by Jonathan Kaplan were tabled.

CP recused herself and FV took the chair for this item.

Mr Andrew September made a power-point presentation.

Mr Jonathan Kaplan and Ms Karen Hansen were present and took part in discussion.

In discussion it was noted:

- Some concerns were raised about the visual impact of the location of units 9, 10, 11, 12.
- Concern was also raised regarding the scattered nature of the layout and extent of service infrastructure that it would require.

FINAL COMMENT

The report meets the requirements of S 38 (3) of the NHRA. The development is supported subject to the following conditions:

- That the layout be revised by relocating units 9, 10, 11 and 12 to beyond the view shed of public areas and facilities along the coastline below.
- Archaeological test excavations must be undertaken prior to construction of the coastal units 9, 10, 11 and 12.
- There must be archaeological and palaeontological monitoring of all bulk services.
- A joint monitoring report must be submitted to HWC.

AS

17 SECTION 38(8) MPA ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN RESPONSES TO NOTIFICATION OF INTENT TO DEVELOP

17.1 None

18 SECTION 38(8) MPA ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN INTERIM COMMENT

18.1 None

19 SECTION 38(8) MPA ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN FINAL COMMENT

19.1 None

20 SECTION 38(8) OTHER LEGISLATION NOTIFICATION OF INTENT TO DEVELOP

20.1 None

21 SECTION 38(8) OTHER LEGISLATION INTERIM COMMENT

21.1 None

22 SECTION 38(8) OTHER LEGISLATION FINAL COMMENT

22.1 None

23 SECTION 42 – HERITAGE AGREEMENT

23.1 None

24. OTHER

24.1 None

25 Adoption of decisions and resolutions

25.1 The Committee agreed to adopt the decisions and resolutions, of which a number were ratified by e-mail.

26. **CLOSURE – 17H00**

27. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING: 12 October 2016**

CHAIRPERSON _____ **DATE** _____

SECRETARY _____ **DATE** _____