

**Approved Minutes of the Meeting of Heritage Western Cape
Built Environment and Landscape Permit Committee (BELCom)
Commenced at 08:30 and held on Wednesday, 29 July 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 Sipiwo Mavumengwana (SM)
Mr Shawn Johnston (SJ)
Ms Karin Dugmore-Strom (KDS) (Chair)
Dr Antonia Malan (AM) (co-opted for item 11.2)

Members of Staff:

Mr Olwethu Dlova (OD)
Ms Stephanie Barnardt (SB)
Ms Xola Mlwandle (XM)
Ms Cecilene Muller (CM)
Emily-Jane Vowles (EJV)
Ms Chiara Singh (CSi)
Mr Ruan Brand (RB)
Ms Corne Alexander (CA)
Ms Sofia Briel (SBr)
Ms Waseefa Dhansay (WD)
Ms Penelope Meyer (PM)
Ms Yunus Ogier (YO)
Ms Jwalane Lekama (JL)
Ms Chloe Petrus (CP)

Visitors:

Dr Andrew van Graan
Ms Katherine Robinson
Ms Nelia Bekker
Mr Chris Snelling
Adv Doron Dlodberg
Mr Mark Bell
Ms Emmylou Bailey
Mr David Marais
Mr Richard Summers
Ms Chane Herman
Mr Andre Krige
Mr Piet Louw
Mr Nic Tromp
Ms Celine Oates
Ms Rashay Magan
Mr Shilo Hope
Mr Cillie Malan

Mr Edwinn Ngobeni
Mr Tertius Kruger
Mr Gcobani Sipoyo
Mr Conrad Janse van Rensburg
Ms Isabelle Engelbrecht
Paramount Chief James Katz
Mr Phumzile Sikrwaca
Ms Corlie Smart
Mr Phillip John Green
Ms Marianka Heyns
Mr Garth Hamilton
Mr Araan Louw
Cllr Ian McMahon
Mr Johan Cornelius
Ms Sandra van der Merwe
Ms Anne-Marie Fick
Mr Nick Smith

Apologies

Mr Graham Jacobs (GJ)

Absent

None

4. Approval of Agenda

4.1 Dated 29 July 2026.

The Committee approved the agenda dated 29 July 2026.

5. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meetings

5.1 BELCom Minutes dated 24 June 2026

The Committee reviewed the minutes dated 24 June 2026 and resolved to approve them without amendments.

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

All committee members have accepted the Code of Conduct.

6.1 Recusal

- KDS: items 11.2 and 12.5; and
- KF: item 11.2

7. Confidential Matters

None

8. Administrative Matters

8.1 Outcome of the Appeals and Tribunal Committees

Nothing to report.

8.2 Report back on Stop Works Orders and Charges:

Nothing to report.

8.3 Formal Protection of Buildings refused for Demolition

Nothing to report.

8.4 Compulsory Repair Orders follow up

For noting.

8.5 Erf 3236, 154 Bree Street, Cape Town

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the case.

COMMENT:

1. The Committee resolved to undertake a site visit to view the status quo of the site on Wednesday, 5 August 2026 at 10:00 (KDS, KF, SJ and HB).
2. The applicant to submit the first monitoring report to the case officer by 12 August 2026. This to include a full architectural and engineering methodology which clarifies the shifts

from a timber structural system to the use of concrete and provides a full motivation as to why this is best heritage practice in terms of the BURRA charter.

3. The case officer to inform all BELCom members of the date of receipt of the monitoring report and documentation. Further the case officer to inform BELCom of the date of nearest upcoming HOMs meeting and to invite Ms Foss to attend that HOMs meeting.

CN

9. Standing Items

9.1 Report back on Close-Out Reports

Nothing to report.

9.2 Report back on HWC Council Meetings

Nothing to report.

9.3 Discussion of agenda

9.3.1 Re 32564, Corner Bunga Avenue and N1, Kewtown (Athlone Power Station): MA HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / KEWTOWN / RE 32564

Case No: 28107SB0409

KDS and KF recused themselves and logged off from MS Teams. The Committee nominated SJ to chair this item.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

The Committee notes:

1. The correspondence received from the City of Cape Town regarding the inability to facilitate interior access to Buildings 10 and 11 of the Athlone Power Station due to occupational health and safety concerns, including asbestos-related risks;
2. The asbestos assessment and supporting documentation provided by the City;
3. That the Committee has previously determined that access to the interiors of the relevant structures is necessary in order to properly assess the significance, condition, integrity and spatial qualities of the resource and the impacts of the proposed development;
4. That the photographic material provided to date does not enable the Committee to independently verify the current condition of the interiors, nor does it provide sufficient information regarding the date on which the photographs were taken, the person who took them, or whether they are representative of current conditions;
5. That the absence of interior access continues to impede the Committees' ability to undertake a comprehensive and properly informed assessment of the application.

The Committee therefore resolves that:

1. The applicant, in consultation with the property owner, is requested to provide a revised and updated inventory of the interiors of Buildings 10 and 11, accompanied by recent

- dated photographs identifying the location of the images and depicting the current condition of the relevant spaces and fabric;
2. The applicant is requested to provide confirmation from the Approved Inspection Authority (AIA) or other suitably qualified occupational health and safety asbestos specialist setting out:
 - a. the results of the asbestos air monitoring undertaken within Buildings 10 and 11;
 - b. the airborne fibre concentration readings recorded;
 - c. the applicable occupational exposure limits; and
 - d. an explanation of the implications of those results for controlled inspection access to the interiors;
 3. The applicant is requested to provide recent video footage of the interiors of Buildings 10 and 11, together with confirmation of the date on which the footage was recorded and by whom it was recorded;
 4. Upon receipt of the above information, the Committees' will reconsider whether the information available is sufficient to enable a meaningful assessment of the application and whether a further site inspection remains necessary;
 5. The matter is deferred pending the submission of the requested information.

9.4 Proposed Site Inspections

- Proposed Total Demolition on Erf 23, 18 Kings Road, Sea Point
- Proposed Total Demolition on Erf 1749-RE, 17 Malherbe Street, Paarl
- Proposed Total Demolition of Erf 208-RE, Webersvalley Road and Saleka Street, Jamestown, Stellenbosch
- Erf 3236, 154 Bree Street, Cape Town

9.5 Site Inspections Undertaken

- Proposed Alterations and Additions on Erf 9547, 160 Dorp Street, Stellenbosch
- Erf 921, 4 Welgevallen Road, Stellenbosch

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 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/399185>

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the case.

The Committee reported back on the site inspection that was undertaken on 7 July 2026.

Dr Andrew van Graan (heritage consultant), Ms Katherine Robinson (Stellenbosch Municipality) Mr Tertius Kruger (architect) and Ms Nelia Bekker (architect) were present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

1. The Committee considered the site inspection report relating to the proposed alterations to a Provincial Heritage Site on the corner of Dorp and Andringa Streets, Stellenbosch.
2. The site inspection highlighted the significance of the building within the historic streetscape and identified several key matters requiring consideration. These included the proposed replacement of the existing thatched roof with corrugated metal sheeting, the introduction of roof lights, balconies and altered openings, changes to the principal entrance, internal alterations affecting historic fabric, revised circulation within the central courtyard, and the cumulative heritage impact of all proposed interventions.
3. The Committee agrees that the proposal should not be assessed as a series of isolated interventions but rather on the cumulative effect of the changes on the heritage significance of the building and the wider Dorp Street historic environment. Particular concern was expressed regarding the visibility and impact of the proposed roof lights, balconies, new entrance treatment, and alterations to the roofscape, all of which were considered likely to diminish the character of the historic streetscape.
4. The Committee also considered the heritage value of the extensive 1985 alterations. The Committee acknowledged that the building represents a layered history and debated the extent to which those earlier interventions now form part of the site's heritage significance. While some members indicated that replacement of the thatched roof with metal sheeting could be considered if appropriately detailed and historically justified, there was little support for the proposal as presented due to the combined impact of the roof alterations, fenestration changes, and new entrance.
5. The applicant's heritage architect responded that the proposal was intended to improve the functionality of the building. Regarding proposed alterations to the Andringa Street elevation the applicant motivated that many of the existing features were products of the 1985 intervention and thus did not accurately reflect the building's historic development. The applicant further submitted that the proposed entrance would improve access and permeability for the hotel, that roof lights would enhance accommodation without materially affecting the streetscape. The applicant indicated a willingness to consider removing the roof lights as part of a possible compromise.

6. The Committee reaffirmed that all documentation had been carefully considered and emphasised that the assessment must be guided by the high heritage significance of the precinct, the heritage grading of building, applicable conservation principles, and submissions received from heritage conservation bodies.
7. It was also noted that one of the roof-light precedents cited by the applicant had not been approved by any heritage bodies and therefore should not be relied upon as a precedent.
8. The applicant requested guidance rather than an outright refusal from the Committee and expressed willingness to engage further to refine the proposal. In the light of the Committee's concerns with the current design the Committee decided to hold final discussion in camera before reaching a decision.

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee does not support the proposal in its current form.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

1. The proposal must respond more appropriately to the immediate streetscape and the broader historic context of Stellenbosch, as well as to the significance and layered development of this Provincial Heritage Site.
2. The rooflight alterations at Oude Leeskamer, referenced by the applicant as a precedent, are unauthorised and have not been approved by the Stellenbosch Municipality. Accordingly, the Committee did not accept these alterations as an appropriate precedent in assessing the current application.
3. An alternative to the roof reconstruction proposal for the Andringa Street wing to be provided that does not require rooflights on Andringa Street or the use of congregated iron instead of thatch.
4. The Committee acknowledge the need to bring more natural light into the ground floor of the Andringa Street wing. However, an alternative means of doing this rather than using very large windows must be provided. The fact that the Andringa and Dorp Streets facades read together as a whole from a wide view corridor must be taken into account. The Committee are of the opinion that further attention must be given to retaining the Dorp Street facade as the primary facade while the Andringa Street facade must be more convincingly treated as the secondary facade. This is a matter of dealing with the resource as a contributor to its immediate and broader context which is the historic core of Stellenbosch rather than only a matter of the material heritage authenticity of the resource itself.
5. The location of the new Andringa Street front door on axis to the courtyard is acknowledged as a useful functional change in planning. However, its design must take into account the points raised at 4 above.

CN

**11.2 Re 32564, Corner Bunga Avenue and N1, Kewtown (Athlone Power Station): MA
HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / KEWTOWN / RE 32564**

Case No: 28107SB0409

This matter was discussed under item 9.3.1.

SB

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

**12.1 Proposed Total Demolition on Erf 23, 18 Kings Road, Sea Point: NM
HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / SEA POINT / ERF 23**

Case No: 28807SVB0603 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/401970>

HELD OVER:

The Committee resolved to undertake a site inspection on Wednesday, 5 August 2026 at 11:00 (KF, SJ and HB).

SVB

**12.2 Proposed Total Demolition on Erf 1749-RE, 17 Malherbe Street, Paarl: NM
HM / CAPE WINELANDS / DRAKENSTEIN / PAARL / ERF 1749**

Case No: 28772CN0529 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/400362>

HELD OVER:

The Committee resolved to undertake a site inspection Thursday, 13 August 2026 at 12:00 (SM, KF, SJ and HB).

CN

**12.3 Proposed Total Demolition of Erf 208-RE, Webersvalley Road and Saleka Street,
Jamestown, Stellenbosch: NM
HM / CAPE WINELANDS / STELLENBOSCH / JAMESTOWN / ERF 208-RE**

Case No: 28924EJV0611

HELD OVER:

The Committee resolved to undertake a site inspection Thursday, 13 August 2026 at 11:00 (SM, KF, SJ and HB).

EJV

**12.4 Replacement Structure Evaluation on Erf 168487, 124 Waterkant Street, De Waterkant:
NM
HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / CAPE TOWN / ERF 168487**

Case No: HWC24102411CH1122

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the case.

Mr Chris Snelling (heritage consultant), Mr Richard Summers (attorney representing applicant), Mr Piet Louw (urban designer), Mr Conrad Janse van Rensburg (architect) and Mr Andre Krige (architect) were present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

1. The Committee considered the application following the submission of additional motivations, supporting reports, and recommendations addressing matters previously raised during the assessment process.
2. The Committee acknowledged the extensive information provided and noted that the submitted material had given the Committee further matters for consideration.
3. The Committee noted that the application had previously been considered by the Committee and that it had a significant application history. Based on the findings of the RCA report, Mr Pet Louw's letter, and the comprehensive supporting documentation submitted, the Committee accepted the report recommendations and supported the application.

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee resolved to endorse the replacement structure as indicated on drawings numbered 03 – DD – A.1, 03 – DD – A.2, 03 – DD – A.3, 03 – DD – A.4, 03 – DD – A.5, 03 – DD – A.6, 03 – DD – A.7, 03 – DD – A.8, 03 – DD – A.9, 03 – DD – A.10, 03 – DD – A.11 Revision L, and 03 – DD – A.12, 03 – DD – A.13, 03 – DD – A.14, 03 – DD – A.15, 03 – DD – A.16 Revision P, dated 11 June 2026, as prepared by Theo Kruger and Andre Krige from TwoFiveFive Architects.

RB

12.5 Proposed Total Demolition on Erf 258, 4 Avenue De Longueville Avenue, Fresnaye: MA HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / FRESNAYE / ERF 258

Case No: 27944SVB0324 <https://sahris.org.za/node/394304>

KDS recused herself and logged off from MS Teams. The Committee nominated SJ to chair this item.

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the case.

Mr Johan Cornelius (heritage consultant), Mr Richard Summers (applicant), Mr Nick Smith (Objector's) and Adv Doron Goldberg (Objector's) were present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

1. A request was made to clarify whether the legal view previously expressed by the heritage authority's legal representative had been provided in writing or verbally. It was confirmed that no written legal opinion had been issued and that the view expressed during the meeting was an oral opinion. It was further explained that a written opinion was not considered necessary, as the matter was not regarded as presenting particularly difficult legal questions.
2. Following this clarification, it was confirmed that there were no further questions arising from the issue.
3. A representative of the objectors confirmed that the objectors had already presented their substantive submissions at the previous BELCom meeting
4. It was acknowledged that the Committee would thus proceed to consider the matter on its merits and make its decision, after which the objectors would determine any further course of action based on the outcome.
5. The discussion concluded with no additional substantive submissions, and the meeting proceeded to the Committee's consideration of the application.

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee resolved that there is insufficient heritage significance to warrant the retention of the structure. The application for demolition is approved.

SVB

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

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

Case No: 28508EJV0512

Emily-Jane Vowles introduced the case.

The Committee reported back on the site inspection that was undertaken on 7 July 2026.

Ms Anne-Marie Fick (heritage consultant), Mr Cillie Malan (architect) Ms Patricia Botha (Stellenbosch Interest Group) and Ms Sandra van der Merwe (DOCOMOMO) were present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

1. The Committee considered the heritage significance of the dwelling following a site inspection and review of the assessment report. It was noted that the property remains substantially intact and is of architectural significance as an example of Modernist design. Although some alterations have previously been undertaken and certain areas have deteriorated or are of limited significance, the dwelling retains a high degree of original fabric. The site and structure are considered capable of accommodating carefully considered alterations, particularly in previously altered or less significant areas.
2. The Committee supported grading the property as a Grade 3B heritage resource. While there was acknowledgement that the building may not represent the highest significance within the architect's body of work, the majority agreed that its architectural qualities, level of intactness and contribution to the local heritage inventory justified this grading.
3. The proposed additions and alterations generated concern regarding their impact on the heritage significance of the building. The Committee considered that the proposal introduced a contemporary architectural language that differed substantially from the original modest Modernist character. Particular concern was expressed that the new additions, especially above the garage and around the entrance sequence, would become visually dominant and diminish the prominence of the original building. The enclosure of the front pergola, changes to the entrance hall and the treatment of the sunroom were also identified as interventions that could adversely affect significant architectural elements.
4. The Committee discussed the relationship between the existing building and the proposed additions, concluding that the overall scale, massing and roof form of the new work should be reconsidered. The Committee agreed that the proposed additions should be reduced in visual prominence, particularly on the street-facing elevation, to ensure that the original building remains the dominant architectural element. While there was no objection in principle to a second storey, the design should achieve a more balanced relationship between the original structure and the new interventions.
5. Strong support was expressed for retaining and restoring all original fenestration (including the windows with steel frames and timber opening sections) as well as the lower level joinery. It was noted that these elements form an important part of the

- building's heritage significance and authenticity. The Committee considered restoration of all windows and doors preferable to replacement with aluminium, both from a conservation perspective and because the original hardwood species is regarded as suitable for repair and long-term preservation. The retention of original materials and detailing was viewed as essential to maintaining the building's architectural integrity.
6. The Committee also identified the need for greater clarity in the architectural transition between the original building and the new additions. The Committee considered that the junctions between old and new should be more subtle and clearly articulated, avoiding design solutions that create visual tension or obscure the distinction between original and contemporary fabric.
 7. I&APs noted that they broadly agreed with the Committee's concerns, noting that the proposal concentrated substantial alterations within certain significant portions of the building while leaving less significant areas relatively unchanged.
 8. I&APs queried the use of the space over the garage as the best position for proposed additions, suggesting that additional accommodation could instead be directed towards other parts of the property. However, the Committee had no objection in principle to using the space above the garage for additions.
 9. The Committee therefore indicated that a revised proposal should reconsider the location, scale and architectural treatment of the additions to better conserve the heritage significance of the dwelling while still accommodating the owner's development objectives. It was emphasised that any revised proposal must be informed by clear heritage design indicators and demonstrate a stronger conservation-led design approach rather than relying solely on contemporary architectural expression.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

1. The proposal must be substantially revised to respond more appropriately to the heritage significance, architectural character, spatial qualities and material integrity of the Pius Pahl-designed dwelling.
2. While the Committee has no objection in principle to a double-storey addition above the existing garage, its massing, scale, proportions and architectural expression must be reconsidered to ensure that it remains appropriately subordinate to the existing dwelling and does not overwhelm the low-profile Welgevallen Road elevation.
3. The relationship between the existing building and the new work must be more successfully resolved. The revised proposal must establish a clear yet sensitive distinction between old and new, while responding appropriately to the proportions, compositional logic and architectural language of the original dwelling.
4. All surviving Modernist fabric and Pius Pahl-designed detailing must be retained and appropriately conserved, including the fireplace and chimney, existing timber and steel fenestration, built-in timber joinery (not including bedroom cupboards) and seating, timber ceilings, staircases and balustrades, entrance foyer elements, face-brickwork, off-shutter concrete, characteristic window and skirting details, floor finishes, etc. Where this is not possible an appropriate motivation for alternative to be provided.
5. The revised proposal must be circulated to I&APs for 14 days prior to resubmission to BELCom.

EJV

**13.2 Erf 29077-RE, Corner Campground and Durban - Klipfontein Road - Mowbray Horse Fountain, Mowbray: NM
CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / MOWBRAY / ERF 29077-RE**

Case No: HWC23082112SJ0826

Emily-Jane Vowles introduced the case on behalf of Ms Corne Alexander.

Mr Mark Bell (CoCT) was present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

1. The Committee considered the proposed restoration of the historic fountain and supported the applicant's preferred restoration option, noting that the proposed methodology prioritises repair and conservation of the original fabric, with only limited replacement where necessary. The Committee welcomed the comprehensive restoration approach and was satisfied that the proposal aligned with accepted conservation principles.
2. Clarification was sought regarding the anticipated programme for the restoration works and the subsequent reinstallation of the fountain. It was explained that the restoration would be undertaken as a donated project by a specialist engineering firm under the City's donation process. As the work would be carried out alongside the firm's normal business operations, the duration of the project could not be confirmed. The City (as the Applicant) advised that it would oversee and liaise closely with the appointed engineering team throughout the restoration process.
3. The Committee also discussed the proposed relocation of the fountain following restoration. It was explained that the current location would be affected by planned road intersection upgrades intended to improve traffic safety. Subject to the timing of the restoration and the roadworks, the fountain may either remain in secure storage until the intersection is completed or be temporarily reinstated in its existing position before being relocated to the new landscaped public space. The Committee acknowledged that the proposed relocation would improve the long-term protection of the fountain by reducing the risk of vehicle damage.
4. It was noted that the restoration process would include careful documentation during dismantling and repair, providing valuable information on the fountain's original construction methods, engineering and craftsmanship. The Committee welcomed this aspect of the project as an important contribution to the conservation record and future understanding of the structure.
5. The Committee discussed the future operation of the fountain, including whether the trough should function as originally intended or instead be planted with flowers. It was acknowledged that practical considerations relating to maintenance, vandalism and ongoing management would influence this decision. The Committee agreed that this was an operational matter rather than a heritage issue and supported leaving the final decision to the City's own heritage branch following further consideration.
6. The Committee encouraged the inclusion of interpretive signage or an information board to explain the historical significance of the fountain, its restoration and its role within the broader network of historic public water troughs in Cape Town. The Committee

considered that appropriate interpretation would enhance public appreciation of the restored heritage resource.

7. The Committee expressed support for the application and endorsed the preferred restoration option.

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee endorsed the submitted Method Statement prepared by Dennes Engineering dated May 2026 for the full restoration of the Mowbray Horse Fountain, and approved the application on the following conditions:

1. All restoration work must be undertaken strictly in accordance with the endorsed Method Statement, with maximum retention and conservation of the fountain's original historic fabric. Any deviation from the endorsed methodology, including the replacement of original components found during the works, must be referred to HWC for approval before implementation.
2. The fountain whether in dismantled or restored form to be kept in safe storage by the applicant throughout the restoration and relocation process.
3. Two closeout reports to be submitted by the applicant to BELCom:
 - a. Closeout of restoration of the fountain itself.
 - b. Closeout on relocation on site.

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.

23. CLOSURE

The meeting closed at 15:55

24. DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

26 August 2026

MINUTES APPROVED AND SIGNED BY:

CHAIRPERSON _____

DATE _____

SECRETARY _____

DATE _____