

**APPROVED DECISIONS OF THE MEETING OF HERITAGE WESTERN CAPE,
BUILT ENVIRONMENT AND LANDSCAPE PERMIT COMMITTEE (BELCom)
Held on Wednesday, 29 March 2017 in the 1st Floor Boardroom at the Offices of
the Department of Cultural Affairs and Sport,
Protea Assurance Building, Greenmarket Square, Cape Town at 09:00**

MATTERS DISCUSSED

11 PROVINCIAL HERITAGE SITES: SECTION 27 PERMIT APPLICATIONS

**11.1 Proposed Additions to existing Structure & Alteration Farm 237, 31 Sand Street, Elim: MA
HM/CAPE AGULAS/BREDASDORP/FARM 237**

Case No: 16100418HB1006E

Revised proposal drawings (drawing no: 01_01_2015 Rev 01; 03_01_2015 Rev 0; 04_01_2015 Rev 01; 05_01_2015 Rev 01) were tabled.

Ms Heidi Boise made a PowerPoint presentation.

Among other things, the following was discussed:

- The house has heritage significance, both contextually and in and of itself. It is in Elim Zone 2 and is a possible Grade IIIA or IIIB
- There are concerns regarding the proposed new height of the eaves.
- A small window (horizontal, “fanlight” format) could be considered above the front door with a ‘bow’ in the thatch over it, to mitigate the change in eaves – however, the committee would like to assess the impact of raising the eaves on site.

RECORD OF DECISION

The Committee supports the proposals in principle, however the Committee wishes to undertake a site visit to familiarise themselves with contemporary Elim developments (possibly GW, BM, KDS, GJ, JdW – availability of BELCom members subject to the date allotted for site visit).

HB

**11.2 Proposed Site Development Plan for Hazendal, Farm Haasendal 222, Stellenbosch: MA
HM/STELLENBOSCH/FARM HAASENDAL 222**

Case No: 17013110AS0201E

Holistic SDP and motivation was tabled.

Mr Andrew September made a PowerPoint presentation.

Mr Ashley Lillie, Mr Mike Hackner, Mr Chris Wood and Mr Shlomi Azor were present and took part in the discussion.

Among other things, the following was discussed:

- The design team were thanked for their clearly drawn submission.
- The SDP submission, dealing as it does with several highly impactful proposals, needs to be assessed both in its several parts and contextually in terms of the varied proposals' collective impact on the heritage significance of the werf, and of the spaces beyond the werf.
- The entire site, including all the buildings is a PHS – a Gr II resource (see Johan Cornelius Heritage Study, 5 July 2016). The grading of individual components of the site were not discussed.
- The current proposals, whilst showing much merit, are in certain places out of sync with the great heritage significance of the werf and the historic “set piece” buildings which surround it. If all the proposed building work as shown in the current SDP drawings were built, the new would overwhelm the existing in scale and mass, and the effect would be overly compromising to heritage significance.
- A balance between development initiatives and heritage concerns needs to be more thoroughly explored in further SDP design work.
- The proposals for the rear extension to the “Babushka” shed are visually intrusive: the proposed wide-span roof is very high in relation to the existing shed. Both the roofscape and facades indicated on the SDP would have a negative impact on views towards Babushka from the werf.
- The Committee is able to provide interim comment.

RECORD OF DECISION

- The werf and buildings are of high heritage significance (Gr II in heritage report) and will be affected seriously in various ways by the proposals as illustrated in the SDP
- The Committee do not support the SDP in its totality, however aspects of the proposals shown thereon are supported. The issues either supported, or not, are as follows;
 - Proposed restoration of the Manor house (No 1 on SDP): this is supported in principal, but it is noted that the proposed uses of the building, along with the manner in which it will be restored, will need to be approved in due course by the Committee. The manor house may not be left uninhabited or left to decay whilst other buildings on the werf are constructed: attention to restoration of the manor house must be one of the first priorities of the proposed re-development of Hazendal – the sine qua non of the SDP proposals. It was noted that the space behind the manor house (south west) currently includes formal planting: the future use of this space needs to be given proper attention as a component of the manor house precinct, and indicated on the SDP.
 - Proposed removal of the existing (non-historical) kitchen building (currently attached to manor house) is supported.
 - Proposed addition of new Admin Wing (No 3. On SDP): The placement, barn-like form and massing of this are supported. The suggestion of a material which is lightweight is supported. The use of a glass screen wall at the N-facing entrance end of the structure is not supported, nor is the high chimney-like skylight element, which is visually intrusive in its proximity to the historic manor house.
 - Proposed structure covering the kraal (No. 8 on SDP): not supported. The proposal to find a use for the kraal has some support, but an entirely new design concept for this, which does not interrupt the visual or vernacular characteristics of the kraal, must be provided for consideration before support for any proposed new use can be given.
 - Proposed addition of outdoor covered terrace in front of “Babushka” shed (No.20 on SDP): not supported.
 - Proposed additions to the rear of “Babushka” shed (No 11 on SDP): it was noted that additions of smaller footprint, and height, have previously been approved for

this particular area. The footprint, scale and massing of the proposed “No 11” on the SDP are not supported, particularly as there are already two very large, out of scale “industrial” style wide span sheds on the historic rear axis of the farm.

Rather, proposals must be revised to either show additions in keeping with the prior approvals at the site of “No 11” (note that would mean that any mono-pitch roof envisaged would need to sit below the gutter height of the current “Babushka”). Alternatively, ways of using traditional barn form buildings, which respect the integrity of form of the existing Babushka shed, must be explored.

- Proposed pavilion on dam (No 14 on SDP) and related amphitheatre (No 24 on SDP): The pavilion is supported in principle, however concerns were expressed regarding its form and scale: this had to be considered in light of the fact that the homestead needs to remain, and be emphasised as, the focal feature of the werf. Moreover, the proposed dam building/ structure, and its landscaping intervention, need to be considered as part of the “entrance procession” to the werf. The impact of the amphitheatre-like grass dell was questioned in terms of its overall impact on the werf, and requires further consideration in design terms in order for the Committee to assess it further.
- A revised SDP must be submitted, dealing with the above issues prior to the approval of such an SDP. The degree of “contrast” exercised in the design of new buildings, landscaping and structures should be limited such that the existing Cape Vernacular architectural language of the original farm predominates.
- All “support” as indicated here is “support in principal” in terms of a SDP submission that is itself not as yet approved. For every contemplated building or landscape alteration/addition on the farm, a separate building submission application will need to be submitted, along with the revised SDP.
- Internal changes to the existing “industrial” sheds (No’s 5 & 6 on SDP) will have no impact on heritage significance. Proposed alterations to these may be submitted to HWC and assessed, approved and stamped off by HOMS.

AS

11.3 Proposed Additions to existing Structure & Alteration: Farm 237, 23 Nuwe Street, Elim: MA HM/ELIM/FARM 237

Case No: 16020903HB0210E

Heritage Statement prepared by Tyrone Engel dated August 2016 and drawings (drawing no: 01_01_194 Rev 01; 02_01_194 Rev 01; 03_01_194 Rev 01 & 04_01_194 Rev 01) dated February 2017 were tabled.

Ms Heidi Boise made a PowerPoint presentation.

Among other things, the following was discussed:

- The building has heritage significance, it is likely to be either a Gr IIIA or Gr IIIB resource. The Committee did not have sufficient information to hand to make a more detailed grading decision, but noted that in this case, regardless of whether the building is either a Gr IIIA or Gr IIIB, the attitude to the proposals as tabled would be similar, provided that impacts to the historic structure are kept to a minimum, and, as shown in the proposals, additions are restricted to the off-street part of the property behind the existing house.

RECORD OF DECISION

The Committee decided to approve the proposal with these amendments required:

- The replacement of the windows on the street façade with larger windows is not supported.

Revised plans can be submitted to HOMs for approval.

HB

11.4 Proposed Alterations and Additions on Farm 1777, Owloon, Paarl: NM HM/ Cape Winelands/ Drakenstein/Paarl/ Farm 1777

Case No: 16111706HB1123M

Heritage Report prepared by Stuart Hermansen dated 6 June 2016 and drawings prepared by Arnold Shewan (drawing no: 15 901 0/CS/006 Rev 8) dated 24 March 2016 were tabled.

Ms Heidi Boise made a PowerPoint presentation.

Ms Stuart Hermansen was present and took part in the discussion.

Among other things, the following was discussed:

- this is a revision to proposals previously approved by BELCom
- the heritage practitioner suggested that the homestead be graded IIIa. The Committee is in agreement with this.
- the configuration and position of a new proposed opening between kitchen and dining room needed to be amended.

RECORD OF DECISION

The Committee resolved to approved the application subject to the new opening being 2.1m height by 1.8m wide and centred to the current existing opening to the East Elevation.

HB

11.5 Proposed Partial Demolition, Addition, Restoration and Alteration to Farm 6/153, Hendrikse Street, Stellenbosch: MA HM/CAPE WINELANDS/STELLENBOSCH/FARM6/153

Case No: 16041911HB0511E / 17030314HB0307E

Revised proposal prepared by HB Architects (drawing no: SK - 000; SK - 200-1; SK - 301-0; SK - 301-1; SK - 301-1;SK - 301-2;SK - 302-1; SK - 302-2; SK - 304-1; SK - A101-1; SK - P 101-1; SK - P 100-1;SK - P 100-2; SK - A 100-1; SK - A 100-2) were tabled.

Ms Heidi Boise made a PowerPoint presentation.

Mr Stuart Hermansen was present and took part in the discussion.

Among other things, the following was discussed:

- This is a follow up application: building work previously approved is currently in progress.
- The buildings are located in a PHS
- Heritage resources will not be negatively impacted by the revised proposals.
- SH noted that a landscaping plan will be submitted in due course.

RECORD OF DECISION

The Committee resolved to approve the proposals, with the exception that the plant room position was not supported. Furthermore, it was noted the glazing reveal at the shower must be thickened.

HB

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

12.1 PROPOSED TOTAL DEMOLITION AND NEW PROPOSALS FOR ERF 95029, WELTEVREDEN STREET, GARDENS: MA HM/GARDENS/ERF 95029

Case No: 16082912AS1021E

New Sketches and Motivation were tabled.

GJ and MS recused themselves and left the room.

Mr Andrew September made a PowerPoint presentation. AS raised on behalf of HOMS two main issues: firstly, that HOMS consider that bulk of the new intervention alongside Leinster Hall as problematic, and secondly, that orthogonal drawings (elevations, sections) need to be submitted to HWC before a full assessment of the impact of the proposals on Leinster Hall can be assessed.

Prof Stephen Townsend, Mr Paul Edmunds, Ms Lize Malan and Mr Philip Brink were present and took part in the discussion.

Among other things, the following was discussed:

- ST asserted that there exists a perception of bias of the functioning of the current BELCom, in that the members who had recused themselves had assisted the applicant. It is noted that on being requested to clarify this assertion, he did not provide explanation, and further stated that he would not rely on it.
- KDS asked each member present to state whether they had had any contact/dealings with any party involved in the application around any aspect of the application. Each member replied “no”, and KDS confirmed likewise.
- ST noted that the neighbourhood/ neighbours affected by the matters to be discussed at this session of BELCom had not specifically been informed of the meeting. PE (neighbour) noted that he was aware of the extent of the development from advertising provided by the applicant to the neighbourhood through CoCT advertising processes.
- ST noted that although advertising may have been carried out/ is being carried out in terms of CoCT requirements for applications for rezoning and HPOZ requirements, specific heritage issues/ processes may not have been covered in those advertising processes.

- PMSuggested that, in the light of the *Piketberg* judgement and the remarks of PE, it would be in the applicant's best interests to conduct wider public participation. The committee could require this prior to taking its decision.
- A site visit to assess impacts on the neighbouring buildings is required.
- The building was graded Not Conservation Worthy.

RECORD OF DECISION

The Committee resolved to undertake the site inspection (GW, PB, KDS, BM and JdW).

The Committee resolved that the applicant is to follow the advice of HWC's Legal Advisor: the applicant should advertise that a Section 34 application for total demolition has been lodged with HWC, and allow neighbours standard reasonable response times. Posting an on-site notice is recommended.

AS

12.2 Proposed Total Demolition, Erf 170902, 86 Chiappini Street, Bo-Kaap: MA HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/BO-KAAP/ERF 170902

Case No: 16081001KR0810E

Heritage Statement prepared by Ron Martin dated February 2017, application document, City Heritage comment, Bo-Kaap Civic comment and Heritage Statement prepared by Johan Cornelius dated 16 March 2015 were tabled.

Ms Katherine Robinson made a PowerPoint presentation.

Ms Jacqueline Poking were present and took part in the discussion.

Among other things, the following was discussed:

- The CoCT have graded the site as not conservation worthy.
- CoCT and BOCRA support the proposed development.
- SAHRA's comments have not been obtained.
- It is possible that the left side of the building incorporates an historic gatepost - one of two originally marking an entrance, probably to the Prayer Quarry.

RECORD OF DECISION

The Committee supports the proposal in principle with the proviso that window proportions are vertical and that historic wall fabric be incorporated into the new building. A heritage practitioner with suitable historical architectural experience should be appointed to oversee the incorporation of existing historic fabric. This practitioner should provide to HWC a short report detailing the incorporation of such fabric with 30 days of Practical Completion. The Committee resolved not to waive the requirement for an archaeological sensitivity statement (as per previous minutes).

KR

12.3 Proposed New Development and Total Demolition on Erf 27883, 289 Lower Main Road, Observatory: MA HM/OBSERVATORY/ERF 27883

Case No: 16101702AS1024E

Contextual rendered images and additional information relevant to the site inspection were tabled.

Mr Andrew September made a PowerPoint presentation.

GJ, GW and KDS reported on their site inspection. The site inspection report is annexed as Annexure "A"

Mr Marc Turok, Ms Ursula Rigby and Mr Theo Kruger were present and took part in the discussion.

Among other things, the following was discussed:

- The building was graded Not Conservation Worthy.
- The Committee requires further information regarding the broader streetscape in the form of drawings analysing massing, scale, building profiles and built module widths in relation to the subject site. It is recommended that these be done in the form of elevations and sections in order to inform the design of the replacement building in relation to its context. It is premature for the Committee to comment on the nature of materials and proportions of the proposed infill building until such information has been provided.
- The proposed new elevations to Scott Street and Arnold Street are very sheer and require mitigation.
- The backdrop to the adjacent three "baroque" gabled buildings appears too busy.
- Upon inquiry, PM noted that replacement buildings proposals submitted along with an "Application for a Section 34 permit of Total Demolition" are being assessed by HWC as a result of the recent "Gees Judgement". Approval conditions may be imposed in terms of that judgment, where heritage resources are affected.
- The committee suggested that the input of a heritage practitioner with appropriate heritage architectural experience, who would provide suitable heritage design indicators for the site would be a useful addition to the professional team for this project.

INTERIM COMMENT

The Committee decided to await further information before making an informed decision.

AS

12.4 Total demolition of structure on Erf 50296, 4 Oakdale Avenue, Newlands: NM HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/NEULANDS/ERF 50296

Case No: 17020809KR0216E

Application documents, CoCT and Newlands Residents Association comments, counter comments from applicant and proposal replacement building were tabled.

Ms Katherine Robinson made a PowerPoint presentation.

Among other things, the following was discussed:

- The CoCT has graded the site as not conservation worthy and supports the proposed demolition.

- While the Committee agrees that the house on the site in question is not highly conservation worthy, the site as it exists does contribute to both a streetscape, and a public open space. The resources in this case are therefore the streetscape, and the public open space which the site contributes to. 4 Oakdale Road, in its current form, with hedges, a large tree, green pavement and a single storey home which recedes into the greenery, contributes greatly to significant planted public spaces.
- The NRA has concerns regarding the height, scale and massing of the replacement building. The committee suggest that dealing properly with landscape can mitigate these concerns.
- “The Oval”, an office development in the area, has been successful in terms of its neighbourhood fit largely due to the excellently planned and implemented landscaping interventions: this care of the public space needs to be continued in the neighbourhood.

RECORD OF DECISION

- The Committee resolved to accept the proposed replacement building on condition that a landscape plan, including boundary treatments and paying attention to existing planting on site be submitted to the Committee for approval. This landscape plan must pay attention to the following:
 - The large tree on site must be retained and incorporated into the design.
 - Hedging (currently on site, or as per “The Oval”) must be incorporated into boundary treatments.
 - Oakdale Road must be treated in the landscape design as a significant major green public space linking the important tourist venue, the Vineyard Hotel, with the Claremont shops. Moreover, the significant triangular public space (Oakdale Road and Elgin Terrace) must not be compromised by unsympathetic boundary treatments.
 - Design attention needs to be given to site exit/entry, recognising that these will impact on the public realm.

KR

12.5 Proposed Total Demolition on Erf 550, 2 Lincoln Road Sea Point: NM HM/Cape Metropolitan/Sea Point /Erf 550

Case No: 17020620HB0208E

Heritage Statement prepared by Johan Cornelius dated 24 November 2016 was tabled.

Ms Heidi Boise made a PowerPoint presentation.

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

Among other things, the following was discussed:

- the heritage consultant has indicated that the resource is severely compromised by extensive alterations to historic fabric: COCT has not graded the property
- there are several houses forming a heritage pocket in the vicinity of this resource, some of which are Gr IIIA and Gr IIIB resources. Impact on the greater environment surrounding No. 2 Lincoln Road needs to be assessed on site.

RECORD OF DECISION

The Committee resolved to undertake a site inspection (MS, GW, PB, JdW, and KDS).

HB

12.6 Proposed Total Demolition on Erf 555, 146 Main Road, Sea Point: NM HM/Cape Metropolitan/Sea Point/ Erf 555

Case No: 17011101HB0130E

Motivational letter prepared by Johan Cornelius was tabled.

Ms Heidi Boise made a PowerPoint presentation.

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

Among other things, the following was discussed:

- Mr Cornelius indicated that he had not been employed by the owner and was not the applicant.

RECORD OF DECISION

The Committee resolved to undertake a site inspection (MS, GW, PB, JdW, and KDS).

HB

12.7 New Proposal for Total Demolition on Erf 3326, 17 St. Quintons Road, Gardens: NM HM/GARDENS/ERF 3326

Case No: 16101307AS1031M

Total demolition response and new proposals were tabled.

Mr Andrew September made a PowerPoint presentation.

Ms Claire Abrahamse and Mr David Peerutin were present and took part in the discussions.

Among other things, the following was discussed:

- The building scheduled for demolition was graded Not Conservation Worthy.
- More information was required regarding the relationship of the proposed development both at street level and within the broader context.
- Concern about the scale of the proposed roof in relation to the street context.

RECORD OF DECISION

The Committee supports the proposed demolition but requires the finalisation of the design for the proposed replacement building informed by the additional information as noted. Final proposals (revised where necessary in accordance with the additional information) are to be submitted to the Committee for approval.

AS

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

13.1 Proposed Additions and Alterations - Erf 1181 - 45 Buxton Avenue, Gardens: NM HM/ CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ GARDENS/ ERF 1181

Case No: 17020613WD0213E

Application documents were tabled.

GJ took the chair for this item.

Ms Waseefa Dhansay made a PowerPoint presentation.

Ms Kristin Mc Laughlin was present and took part in the discussion.

Among other things, the following was discussed:

- The CoCT has graded the site IIC.
- BELCom require an on-site check to consider impacts on heritage significance.

RECORD OF DECISION

The Committee resolved to undertake a site inspection (MS, GW, PB, JdW, and KDS).

WD

13.2 Proposed Additions and Alterations to Erven 9778 & 9779, 211 & 212 Bree Street, Cape Town: MA HM/CAPE METROPOLITAN/CAPE TOWN/ ERVEN 9778 & 9779

Case No: 16120704HB0118E

MS and PB reported back on their site visit undertaken on Friday, 3 March 2017.

Ms Suzanne Schekman and Mr Leon Saven were present and took part in the discussion.

Among other things, the following was discussed:

- Concerns were expressed regarding the size of the proposed new wall openings.
- Questions were raised regarding the nature of the potential signage.

INTERIM COMMENT:

- The proposals are to be revised to include narrower openings to show larger amounts of wall area. There should be differentiation between openings within the spine wall versus the other internal walls of the respective units.
- The cutting back of the wall at the semi-circular unit is supported.
- The proposals are to include particulars regarding the design and location of the potential signage.
- The revised proposals are to be submitted to HOMs for approval, and referred back to this Committee should HOMs require this.

HB

**13.3 Proposed addition and alteration to Rem-Erf 48753, 27 Kent Road, Newlands: MA
HM/ CAPE METROPOLITAN/NEWLANDS/ REM - ERF 48753**

Case No: 16120807HB1212E

PB recused himself and left the room.

GJ, KS and MS reported back on their site visit undertaken on Thursday, 9 March 2017.

Among other things, the following was discussed:

- The NRA have concerns regarding the height of the new intervention and that the plans do not indicate the external street boundary elevation.
- Although members who had been on a site visit concluded that a double story would not be out of place, much of it would be highly visible from the street with the upper and lower levels reading in relation to each other.
- The windows on upper and lower levels do not correlate.

RECORD OF DECISION

The Committee requested that the street boundary wall be shown on elevation and that it comply with the special area guidelines and further attention be given to the fenestration on the street façade.

Revised proposals to be submitted to HOMs for approval.

HB

**13.4 Proposed Alterations to the "Agricultural Shed" on Farm D'Olyfboom, Farm 29112, Napier Street, Paarl: MA
HM/PAARL/FARM 29112**

Case No: 16090602AS0907E

This item was carried over to the next BELCom meeting.

AS

13.5 Proposed addition to Erf 25673, 25 Polo Road, Observatory: MA

HM/CAPE METROPOLITAN/ERF 25673

Case No: 17013010HB0130E

GJ, KS and MS report back on their site visit undertaken on Thursday 9 March 2017.

Mr Rowen Ruiters was present and took part in the discussion.

Among other things, the following was discussed:

- The site is graded IIC and inside Observatory HPOZ
- The addition of a carport on the street frontage will interrupt the visual legibility of the architectural experience of both the house, and the streetscape. Heritage significance will be severely compromised by the proposed carport, and a negative precedent for the streetscape would be established.

RECORD OF DECISION

The Committee resolved to approve the addition at the back of the property; however the addition of the carport on Polo road is not supported.

Revised drawings can be submitted to HOMs for approval.

HB

**13.6 Proposed Alterations and Additions to Erf 59855 (177835 & 177836) 6 Balmoral Road, Lansdowne: MA
HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ERF 598559 (177835, 177836)**

Case No: 16111513KR1118E

Application documents and drawing (drawing no: 052/2016 page 1 of 1 Rev. 1) dated March 2016 prepared by M. Amien Kagee were tabled.

Among other things, the following was discussed:

- Some heritage resources have been compromised by unauthorised work. One house remains substantially intact.

RECORD OF DECISION

The motivation by the applicant is accepted by the Committee on condition that there be no further alteration made to heritage fabric: it is particularly noted that the street boundary wall for all three cottages and the surviving bay window must not be altered. (Note, however, that all building fabric older than 60 years cannot be altered without a permit). Should the applicant wish to raise the height of boundary treatment for security, this would require submission to HWC: it is noted that existing boundary walls would need to be retained, and that only visually permeable, suitable fencing to the approval of HWC would be considered for approval.

KR

**13.7 Proposed Additions to Existing Structure and Alteration on Erf 10905, Tokai:
NM
HM/ CAPE METROPOLITAN/TOKAI/ERF 10905**

Case No: 16111705HB1122E

This item was carried over to the next BELCom meeting.

HB

**13.8 Proposed Additions and Alterations to Existing Structure on Erf 94992, 101 Kloof Street, Gardens: NM
HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/GARDENS/ERF 94992**

Case No: 17022207KR0301E

This item was carried over to the next BELCom meeting.

KR

**13.9 Unauthorised Work - Proposed Alteration on Erven 3166 & 3167, 176 & 178 Bree Street, Cape Town: NM
HM/CAPE METROPOLITAN/CAPE TOWN/ERVEN 3166 & 3167**

Case No: 17020804HB0209E

This item was carried over to the next BELCom meeting.

HB

**13.10 Proposed Additions and Alterations on Erf 4446, 9 Cheve Street, Paarl: NM
HM/PAARL/ERF 4446**

Case No: 17013101AS0220E

This item was carried over to the next BELCom meeting.

AS

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 OTHER MATTERS

20.1 None

21. NON COMPLIANCE

21.1 None

22. ADOPTION OF RESOLUTIONS AND DECISIONS

The Committee adopted the resolution and decisions.

23. CLOSURE

The meeting adjourned at: **17:00**

24 DATE OF NEXT MEETING: 11 April 2017

CHAIRPERSON _____ **DATE** _____

SECRETARY _____ **DATE** _____

Approved