

**Approved Minutes of the Meeting of Heritage Western Cape
Built Environment and Landscape Permit Committee (BELCom)
Commenced at 08:30 and held on Wednesday, 23 September 2026 via MS
Teams**



1. Opening and Welcome

The Chair, Ms Karin Dugmore-Strom, officially opened the meeting at 08:30 and welcomed everyone present.

2. Attendance

Committee Members:

Ms Heidi Boise (HB)
Ms Kate Foss (KF)
Mr Siphiso Mavumengwana (SM)
Mr Shawn Johnston (SJ)
Mr Graham Jacobs (GJ)
Ms Karin Dugmore-Strom (Chair)

Members of Staff:

Mr Olwethu Dlova (OD)
Ms Stephanie Barnardt (SB)
Ms Colette Scheermeyer (CSc)
Ms Sofia Briel (SBr)
Ms Corné Alexander (CA)
Ms Chiara Singh (CSi)
Mr Ruan Brand (RB)
Ms Xola Mlwandle (XM)
Ms Nosiphiwo Tafeni (NT)
Mr Yunus Ogier (YO)
Ms Jwalane Lekama (JL)
Ms Nuraan Vallie (NV)
Ms Chloe Petrus (CP)
Ms Waseefa Dhansay (WD)
Mr Francois Bosman (FB)
Mr Michael Peterson (MP)

Visitors:

Mr Chris Snelling
Ms Corlie Smart
Ms Patricia Botha
Ms Jenna Theron
Mr Cillie Malan
Mr Kuhle Mbemba
Mr Byron Nichles

Ms Katherine Robinson
Ms Nelia Bekker
Dr Andre van Graan
Mr Paul Oosthuizen
Mr Ashley Lillie
Ms Neliswa Toto
Mr Gerrit van Zyl

Apologies

None

Absent

None

4. Approval of Agenda

4.1 Dated 23 September 2026.

The Committee approved the agenda dated 23 September 2026.

5. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meetings

5.1 BELCom Minutes dated 26 August 2026

The Committee reviewed the minutes dated 26 August 2026 and resolved to approve them with minor amendments.

6. Disclosure of conflict of interest and acceptance of the code of conduct:

All Committee members have accepted the Code of Conduct and confirmed their conflicts of interest to disclose, see item 6.1.

It was noted that Advocate Michael Petersen, the DCAS Tribunal Secretariat, was present solely to provide temporary procedural support pending the appointment of an HWC Legal Advisor and took no part in deliberations, evaluation of merits or decision-making on matters.

6.1 Recusal

- GJ: items 11.1, 11.2 and 12.2

7. Confidential Matters

None

8. Administrative Matters

8.1 Outcome of the Appeals and Tribunal Committees

PM reported back on the following Appeals matters:

- Erf 33030, Cressy Road, Athlone
- Erf 96982, 10 Dumbarton Road, Rondebosch
- Erf 2067, 75 Kloof Street, Fresnaye
- Erf 100, 11 Mutley Road, Three Anchor Bay
- Erf 258, 4 Avenue De Longueville Avenue, Fresnaye

8.2 Report back on Stop Works Orders and Charges:

Nothing to report.

8.2.1 Erf 3236, 154 Bree Street, Cape Town CBD

Ms Corné Alexander introduced the case.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

1. The applicants' reasons as to why the permit should not be revoked.
2. The Committee expressed very strong reservations about not revoking the permit given the applicants' disregard for the law and the vulnerable state of the resource.
3. The Committee considered the structural and heritage implications of the existing concrete slab and the potential risks to the historic fabric in general. The Committee was advised that, provided the structural engineer is satisfied with the loading, the slab best be left 'as is', as its removal at this stage could threaten further destabilisation and damage. Committee concerns were also raised regarding the interface between the

concrete slab and the historic walls, noting the potential for future settlement and cracking. Further concerns were expressed regarding historic joinery that appeared to have been removed from the building. The Committee requested that the applicant clarify the whereabouts of any such material.

4. The need for appropriate monitoring and specialist oversight of the building was discussed. It was agreed that any monitoring should be undertaken by an appropriately experienced professional with specific knowledge of historic structures of the subject period and historic fabric. Concerns were also raised regarding the proposed underpinning, particularly the risk that localised underpinning could result in differential settlement and further cracking. The Committee considered that any structural interventions should therefore be carefully assessed and monitored by suitably qualified and experienced specialists.
5. Concern was expressed regarding the use of inappropriate Portland cement and derivative mortars on the historic fabric instead of appropriate lime mortars and renders. The Committee noted that inappropriate materials could result in long-term damage through moisture retention and deterioration of the historic masonry. The Committee considered it important that these issues be addressed as part of any mitigation measures.
6. The Committee then considered the applicant's history of non-compliance with previous advice and requirements. Concern was expressed that the applicant had undertaken unauthorised work despite previous guidance from the Committee which appears to have been ignored. The seriousness of the non-compliance was emphasised, with the Committee noting that the matter extended beyond technical problem-solving and raised questions of enforcement and accountability.
7. The Committee considered whether the existing permit should be revoked. While several members initially supported revocation, concern was raised that revocation could leave the heritage resource insufficiently protected while the applicant pursued an appeal or while further legal processes were undertaken. The Committee therefore considered whether a strictly controlled mitigation or heritage agreement would provide a more effective means of protecting the resource.
8. The Committee received legal advice confirming that Heritage Western Cape has the authority to revoke or suspend a permit where unauthorised work has been undertaken in contravention of the National Heritage Resources Act. It was also confirmed that a permit revocation decision is appealable. The Committee further noted that a mitigation or heritage agreement could be used to regulate urgent stabilisation and protective measures, while reserving the possibility of additional enforcement action in the event of further non-compliance.
9. Following discussion, the Committee reached a unanimous position in favour of proceeding with a strictly controlled mitigation agreement rather than immediately revoking the permit. The agreement should prioritise the protection and stabilisation of the historic resource, clearly define the permitted works, require appropriately qualified specialist involvement and monitoring, and provide clear consequences for any departure from the agreed measures.
10. The Committee further agreed that the mitigation agreement should not be interpreted as condoning the previous unauthorised work. The possibility of criminal charges or other enforcement action being made will remain where appropriate, particularly in the event of further non-compliance. It was noted that the mitigation agreement should make

provision for the applicable appeal period and must not be interpreted as authorising the immediate recommencement of works upon signature.

11. The Committee's decision was therefore directed primarily at securing the heritage resource while ensuring that the applicant is subject to clear, enforceable and appropriately monitored mitigation measures.

RECORD OF DECISION:

Given the flagrant disregard of the applicant to the work as issued in the S34 permit dated 11 December 2024.

The Committee resolved that:

1. The stop works order must remain in place and will continue to remain in place regardless of any possible appeals and/or related decision periods. The applicants must timeously and sincerely address resolving the best way forward for the resource through appropriate mitigation of the damage caused by non-compliance of the permit.
2. The applicant must enter into a mitigation agreement with HWC. This agreement must address the applicants' responsibilities in terms of having placed an important and fragile heritage resource at risk. This time frames and other applicant responsibilities are to be strictly adhered to. Non-compliance with the terms and conditions of the heritage agreement will result in criminal charges being laid.
3. The heritage mitigation is primarily to protect the heritage resource for which the stop works may be partially lifted at the discretion of HWC.
4. HWC will suspend processing or hold back formal "no intent to press charges" documentation (often structured around Section 51) until the conditions—such as entering into the requested heritage/mitigation agreement and executing mandated remediation work—are completely satisfied.
5. The appointment by the applicant of a suitably qualified architectural practitioner with long standing experience working with buildings of the period and materiality is a prerequisite for the mitigation agreement and must be put in place by the applicant within 14 working days. The suggested consultant for this role is to provide a detailed recent CV to HWC HOMs for approval.
6. The requirements in the above decision are subject to the appeal process as per the date of issuing of this decision in writing.

8.3 Formal Protection of Buildings refused for Demolition

Nothing to report.

8.4 Compulsory Repair Orders follow up

For noting.

8.5 Internal Memorandum BELCom

It was noted that Advocate Michael Petersen, the DCAS Tribunal Secretariat, was present solely to provide temporary procedural support pending the appointment of a new HWC Legal Advisor. Adv Petersen took no part in deliberations, evaluation of merits nor decision-making on matters.

9. Standing Items

9.1 Report back on Close-Out Reports

None

9.2 Report back on HWC Council Meetings

Nothing to report.

9.3 Discussion of agenda

For noting

9.4 Proposed Site Inspections

- Proposed Additions and Alterations on Erf 14415, 124 Main Road, Hoog-En-Droog, Paarl
- Proposed Alterations on Farm 276-RE, Polkadraai Road - Neethlingshof, Stellenbosch
- Proposed Total Demolition, Additions and Alterations on Farm 10154, Weltevrede Road, Prince Albert

9.5 Site Inspections Undertaken

- Proposed Total Demolition on Erf 921-RE, 122 Main Road, Constantia
- Proposed Additions and Alterations on Erf 158516, Adderley Street Flower Market, Trafalgar Street, Cape Town City Centre
- Proposed Alterations and Additions, Revised Plans on Erf 266-RE, 1 Surf Road - Avalon Apartment Block, Sea Point

9.6 Request for approval to obtain a legal opinion

The Committee requests that HWC Council approve the obtaining of a legal opinion on the following:

1. The circumstances in which Committee members are approached by applicants for advice and are subsequently appointed by those applicants while their applicant remain active with HWC
2. The consultation of Committee members in their capacity as Committee members on ongoing applications outside of Committee meetings, including facilitating the drafting heritage agreements without remuneration.

10. Appointments

None

MATTERS DISCUSSED

11 PROVINCIAL HERITAGE SITES: SECTION 27 PERMIT APPLICATIONS

11.1 Proposed Alterations and Additions on Erf 9547, 160 Dorp Street, Stellenbosch: MA HM / CAPE WINELANDS / STELLENBOSCH / ERF 9547

Case No: 28672SVB0522

GJ recused himself for this item.

Ms Corné Alexander introduced the case.

Ms Nelia Bekker (architect), Mr Tertius Krieger (architect), Ms Katherine Robinson (Stellenbosch Municipality), Ms Corlie Smart (heritage consultant) and Ms Patricia Botha (Stellenbosch Interest Group) were present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

1. The Committee discussed the proposed replacement of the existing thatched roof with a new corrugated roof and sought clarification regarding the supporting structure and its relationship with the retained historic gable ends. It was confirmed that the existing roof structure dates from the 1983 reconstruction and does not constitute historic fabric.
2. The architects advised that lightweight CLT is proposed for the internal wall divisions, while the roof itself is likely to comprise a conventional timber structure. The existing reinforced-concrete first-floor slab will provide significant bracing to the external walls.
3. Particular attention was given to the interface between the new roof structure, the retained historic gable end and the proposed glazed roof-light elements.
3. The Committee noted that the detailed junction had not yet been sufficiently demonstrated and that the structural-engineering requirements could influence the intended slim-line and minimalist appearance.
4. The Committee therefore considered further detailing of this interface necessary, particularly to ensure that the new intervention responds appropriately to the historic fabric.
5. The Committee also noted the change from the previously proposed dormer windows to glazed roof-light elements as the means of introducing natural light into the roof space.
6. The Committee generally considered the previously identified concerns and further requirements to have been addressed, including the treatment of the streetscape and the evolution of the building. However, support was qualified by the need for the detailed resolution of the gable, roof structure and glazed element to be submitted and carefully considered.
7. The Committee was informed that additional historical context regarding the building and noted the extent of alterations to the existing structure and brickwork, particularly along the Andringa Street façade
8. The Committee then indicated general support for the proposal, subject to the outstanding detailed treatment of the roof and retained historic gable interface being satisfactorily resolved.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

1. All of the requirements listed in the previous minutes have been met.
2. The new design proposal while accepted in principle lacks full structural information. The Committee requires a further submission that includes this information in particular:
 - a. The detailing of glazing, roof sheeting and gable wall junctions where glazing is proposed as a gasket element.
 - b. Detailing of new timber trusses.

CN

**11.2 Proposed Additions and Alterations on Ptn 2 of Farm 496, Forest Hall Estate, The Craggs, Plettenberg Bay: NM
HM / GARDEN ROUTE / BITOU / PLETTENBERG BAY / PTN 2 FARM 496**

Case No: 29391SVB0720

GJ recused himself for this item.

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the case.

Ms Jenna Theron (applicant) was present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

1. The Committee discussed the current condition of the heritage resource and its foundations. It was confirmed that the building is well maintained and in good condition. It was advised that substantial stabilisation and underpinning works had previously been undertaken, particularly along the side and rear of the building, following a period when the property had been vacant and in poor condition. The Committee also noted that the building is currently being used successfully as a tourist/events facility.
2. Clarification was sought regarding the skylight and raised portion shown in the current documentation, following concerns raised in the case officer's report about possible deviations from the 2011 approval. It was confirmed that the approved 2011 plans did include the skylight and that the raised portion appeared to be consistent with the earlier approval. On this basis, the Committee accepted that there was no evidence of unauthorised work, and that the concerns had been raised as a precautionary matter.
3. The Committee then considered the merits of the current proposal, which seeks to extend the existing veranda further around the building to provide additional covered outdoor space for the tourism use. It was clarified that the apparent extensive new glazing shown on the drawings was a graphic representation and did not constitute proposed new glazing.
4. A significant discussion centred on the heritage impact of extending the veranda. The Committee considered that the earlier approval had already compromised aspects of the building's heritage significance but felt that the proposed extension could be acceptable given the building's current use and good condition. The Committee was also concerned that extending the veranda further around the building would cause the primary heritage resource to become visually subordinate to the secondary veranda structure. The view was expressed that the previous approval had deliberately limited the extent of the

veranda so that the building would continue to read as a substantial, freestanding structure.

5. Concerns were also raised regarding drainage, ventilation and the potential for moisture to become trapped around the foundations and exterior walls. The Committee noted that any future proposal should ensure adequate ventilation and appropriate management of water around the historic structure.
6. The Committee discussed the absence of comments from interested and affected parties. It was confirmed that the relevant I&APs had been contacted using the appropriate contact details and that more than 30 days had elapsed without responses. The Committee therefore accepted that the required consultation process had been followed.
7. The Committee considered whether a site inspection was necessary but ultimately proceeded without one. The Committee expressed differing views on the application, with some supporting approval and others opposing the further extension of the veranda. On balance, it was supported the view that the applicant should investigate an alternative approach rather than extending the veranda continuously around the building.
8. The Committee discussed the possibility of accommodating the applicant's functional requirements through an alternative structure, potentially including a separate pavilion or a different configuration of the veranda. It was noted that the Committee should not be overly prescriptive in determining the design, and that the applicant should be given an opportunity to develop appropriate alternatives that preserve the heritage significance of the primary building.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

The Committee resolved that the applicant must:

1. Provide design indicators that take into account the nature of the double storey structure and the manner in which it was permitted to be altered by the addition of a wide clip-on veranda which allowed much of the original architectural massing to remain visible.
 - a. Design indicators must address alternatives for providing the new covered areas using differing spatial configurations and materiality.
2. In line with the above, provide conceptual design alternatives for Committee consideration.

SBr

**11.3 Proposed Alterations and Additions on Erf 237, 8 Sand Straat, Elim: NM
HM / OVERBERG / CAPE AGULHAS / ELIM / REMAINDER OF FARM VOGEL STRUIS KRAAL
237**

Case No: 29289CN0709

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the case.

I&APs and applicant were invited to attend the meeting, but they were not in attendance.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

1. I&APs raised strong objections to the proposed breaking the consistency of the prevailing linear alignment of houses and street frontage.
2. The Committee considered the proposed alterations to the historic dwelling in Elim, including the extension of the existing veranda and proposed additional accommodation to the front.
3. The Committee noted that the property is located within the Provincial Heritage Site (PHS), specifically in Zone 2, rather than along the more intact primary street frontage.
4. The Committee generally found the proposed rear alterations acceptable and welcomed the retention of the existing oven on the side of the building.
5. The principal discussion concerned the proposed front return-gable extension. The Committee generally agreed that a gabled projection would be inconsistent with the prevailing linear frontage and architectural character of the streetscape.
6. The Committee nevertheless recognised the limited accommodation available within the historic dwellings and considered whether a smaller, subordinate lean-to or afdak-type extension could provide an appropriate alternative. It was emphasised that any projection should remain clearly subservient to the principal building and should not occupy such a substantial proportion of the façade.
7. The Committee also questioned whether the need for the front extension could be reduced by making greater use of the existing roof or loft space, particularly as the proposal includes a new internal staircase and substantial roof replacement. Further investigation of the available headroom and potential for accommodation within the roof space was therefore considered warranted.
8. The Committee agreed that there was insufficient information to make a final determination on the proposed front accommodation. Further information, including an appropriate section drawing and clarification of the proposed roof/loft accommodation, should be provided. The applicant should also investigate whether the required accommodation could be achieved within the roof space or through a smaller, subordinate lean-to or afdak-type intervention in place of the proposed return gable.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

The Committee resolved that Elim guidelines need to be followed. In light of this:

1. The applicant is to revise the submission and provide new design drawings.
2. Additional accommodation must be prioritised for the roof space rather than extending beyond the existing street frontage. Head height in the roof can be achieved by using a steeper pitch for the proposed new roof.

CN

11.4 Proposed Alterations on Farm 276-RE, Polkadraai Road - Neethlingshof, Stellenbosch: NM HM / CAPE WINELANDS / STELLENBOSCH / FARM 276

Case No: 29554CN0729

Ms Corné Alexander introduced the case.

Ms Patricia Botha (Stellenbosch Interest Group) was present and took part in the discussions.

INTERIM FURTHER REQUIREMENT:

1. The Committee noted the absence of a method statement and specifications for traditional lime mortars and renders that a project of this nature and significance requires. Additional comment from the Committee will be provided after the proposed site inspection.

HELD OVER:

The Committee resolved to undertake a site inspection on Monday, 05 October 2026 (KF, HB and GJ), and is to be heard the Special BELCom meeting, scheduled for 15 October 2026.

CN

12. STRUCTURES OLDER THAN 60 YEARS: SECTION 34 PERMIT FOR TOTAL DEMOLITION

12.1 Proposed Demolition of Structure on Erf 302, 1 Langalibalele Drive, Langa: NM HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / LANGA / ERF 302

Case No: 29397SB0728

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Mr Kuhle Mbemba (applicant) and Ms Neliswa Roto (owner) were present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

1. The Committee sought clarification regarding the location of the property and noted an error in the street name contained in the report. The correct address was confirmed as 1 King Langalibalele Drive, with the reference to another street identified as a typographical error. Members also considered the surrounding street context and contextual photographs.
2. A broader discussion followed regarding the heritage significance of the property and the social history of Langa. The Committee noted that the existing building represented a common residential typology associated with the development of Langa and other township areas following forced removals and the establishment of migrant hostels. It was suggested that the heritage significance may lie more strongly in the wider social history and development of the area than in the individual property.
3. Concerns were also raised that the application did not sufficiently address this social history or provide a locality plan clearly identifying the property.

4. The Committee noted, however, that the structure had already been demolished and that the demolition had occurred without the required heritage process being completed. The legal and procedural implications of the demolition were discussed, including the application of Section 34 and Section 51 of the National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA).
5. The Committee was advised that the structure which had triggered the Section 34 process no longer existed and that the Committee therefore needed to determine whether the remaining heritage jurisdiction applied. It was further noted that a broader social-history assessment would more appropriately be addressed through municipal and community-level processes rather than being imposed as a requirement of this application.
6. The Committee also considered the broader policy context of heritage controls in township areas, including the challenges faced by communities where historically mass-produced residential typologies are widespread and where residents may not have been adequately informed about heritage requirements. The Committee acknowledged the importance of considering social history and community circumstances while also recognising the Committee's statutory mandate and the need not to unnecessarily prevent appropriate development.
7. Following discussion, it was recommended that the Committee resolve not to press charges in respect of the unauthorised demolition and that the heritage process should not be applied to the demolished structure. The recommendation was supported by the Committee. It was noted that the street frontage is a Grade IIIA heritage resource but nevertheless supported the resolution not to pursue the Section 51 process in relation to the demolished structure.
8. The Committee noted that the unauthorised demolition could not be condoned but concluded that the heritage significance had not been materially compromised in a manner warranting further action by the Committee.

RECORD OF DECISION:

The National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999) does not make provision for the condonation of illegal work (i.e. Work done without obtaining a permit in terms of the same Act PRIOR to start the proposed work).

Undertaking work without a permit constitutes a criminal offence in terms of section 51(1)c of the same Act.

In this instance, there is no heritage resource that has been affected by the unauthorized work. Please note that this matter has been recorded for future reference and should any further illegal work be undertaken, HWC will consider laying charges.

HWC requires no further actions in terms of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999).

SB

**12.2 Proposed Total Demolition, Additions and Alterations on Farm 10154, Weltevrede Road, Prince Albert: NM
HM/ CENTRAL KAROO/ PRINCE ALBERT/ FARM 10154**

Case No: HWC25070304CH0801

GJ recused himself for this item.

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the case.

Mr Gerrit van Zyl (owner) was present and took part in the discussions.

HELD OVER:

The Committee resolved to undertake a site inspection on Monday, 19 October 2026 (HB, KF, SJ and KDS).

RB

**12.3 Proposed Total Demolition on Erf 921-RE, 122 Main Road, Constantia: MA
HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / CONSTANTIA / ERF 921-RE**

Case No: 28858EJV0604

HELD OVER:

The matter was held over to the Special BELCom meeting, scheduled for 15 October 2026.

XM

**13 STRUCTURES OLDER THAN 60 YEARS: SECTION 34 PERMIT FOR PARTIAL
DEMOLITION/ALTERATIONS**

**13.1 Proposed Additions and Alterations on Erf 158516, Adderley Street Flower Market, Trafalgar Street, Cape Town City Centre: MA
HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / CAPE TOWN CITY CENTRE / ERF 158516**

Case No: 29185SVB0703

HELD OVER:

The matter was held over to the Special BELCom meeting, scheduled for 15 October 2026.

SBr

**13.2 Erf 921, 4 Welgevallen Road, Stellenbosch: MA
HM / CAPE WINELANDS / STELLENBOSCH / ERF 921**

Case No: 28508EJV0512

HELD OVER:

The matter was held over to the Special BELCom meeting, scheduled for 15 October 2026.

XM

13.3 Proposed Additions and Alterations on Erf 14415, 124 Main Road, Hoog-En-Droog, Paarl: NM
H HM / CAPE WINELANDS / DRAKENSTEIN / PAARL / ERF 14415

Case No: 27805RB0313

HELD OVER:

The Committee resolved to undertake a site inspection on Monday, 05 October 2026 (KF, HB and GJ), and is to be heard the Special BELCom meeting, scheduled for 15 October 2026.

RB

13.4 Proposed Alterations and Additions, Revised Plans on Erf 266-RE, 1 Surf Road - Avalon Apartment Block, Sea Point: NM
HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / SEA POINT / ERF 266-RE

Case No: 28508EJV0512

HELD OVER:

The matter was held over to the Special BELCom meeting, scheduled for 15 October 2026.

CN

13.5 Proposed Alterations and Additions on Erf 46023, 23 Lovers Walk, Rondebosch: NM
HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / RONDEOSCH / ERF 46023

Case No: 28190CH0415

HELD OVER:

The matter was held over to the Special BELCom meeting, scheduled for 15 October 2026.

CN

14 HERITAGE AREAS: SECTION 31 CONSENT APPLICATIONS

14.1 None

15 PROVINCIAL PROTECTION: SECTION 29 PERMIT

15.1 None

16 PROVINCIAL PROTECTION: SECTION 28 REFUSAL

16.1 None

17 HERITAGE REGISTER: SECTION 30 PROCESS

17.1 None

18 PUBLIC MONUMENTS & MEMORIALS: SECTION 37 PROCESS

18.1 None

19 REQUESTS FOR OPINION/ADVICE

19.1 None

20 CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT PLAN

20.1 None

21. NON-COMPLIANCE

21.1 None

22. OTHER

22.1 None

22. ADOPTION OF RESOLUTIONS AND DECISIONS

The Committee resolved to adopt the resolutions and decisions as minuted. KF adopted SjW supported.

23. CLOSURE

The meeting closed at 16:15

24 DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

28 October 2026

MINUTES APPROVED AND SIGNED BY:

CHAIRPERSON _____

DATE _____

SECRETARY _____

DATE _____