

**MINUTES OF ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING
OF THE LOTS ROAD NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM
ON 12Th FEBRUARY 2025**

1. Richard Jacques opened the meeting with apologies for absence from Giso Van Loon, Josh Lee and Jo Sherrard

2. **Lots Road South**

RJ introduced Lots Road South Development, and handed over to Mount Anvil Representatives: Marcus Bate, Alistair Gaisford and Michael Rolfe responsible for delivering construction.

Marcus Bate is a Board Director and said he'd been with Mount Anvil for 8 years and was responsible for all schemes across London from first bidding on site through to start of construction. He said it was some two years since Mount Anvil was selected by RBKC which seemed a long time. He said this was one of six schemes that MA were planning on starting before March 2026. There is a funding arrangement with the Mayor of London which makes that date very important. LRS was No. 2 on the list of starts, it's now the sixth.

Alastair Gaisford said he had been with Mount Anvil for eight years and had been working on the Lots Road project for some two years. He thanked the Forum for their invitation and said the communication between them and MA had been very organised and easy to understand.

What he proposed to do was to recap on the last project consultation held over July/August and the early part of September 2024. He said MA were weighing the feedback from everyone who'd contributed. He said he would then outline what MA would be doing over the next six to twelve months, with some of the key elements in consultation with RBKC the owner of the Lots Road South site, and London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham, and how the consultation can be fed into. He said MA were partners with LBH & F on another site.

Mount Anvil had two drop in events at Lots Road Auction House July-Sept. 69 people attended. 40 completed feedback surveys either on site or on line. MA promoted consultation very widely to 5500 addresses in both RBKC and LBH & F. In addition meetings held with Lighterman Towers, Heatherley School of Fine Art and the LRNF. MA are trying to have a meeting with Chelsea Academy. Feedback was collected in person, on line – people voting in preference for two different schemes.

Out of the 40 people who completed the forms, 17 have committed their support of the scheme, 35 support some arts and not others. They were particularly concerned about transport, access and deliveries for servicing. This is something MA will return to in a few months. 8% did not vote and 25% don't support, and the reasons varied as well.

MA had shown two different approaches of how they could accommodate housing and commercial space in this scheme. In terms of height two thirds of people preferred the stepped version as opposed to three tower blocks of the same height, and MA will follow this.

MA was very clear in saying that to provide more commercial space on this site would be very challenging. The way to do it would be to make the scheme bigger. Overall the feedback was that commercial space was not an important consideration, and respondents were opposed to making the scheme bigger. A lot of people said the scheme was already too big.

Most people preferred the revised scheme. The original in 2023 was defensive, not permeable - i.e. the single massing block across the entire site. MA had introduced a courtyard and new routes through were welcomed. Probably the most consistent feedback was around play space on the corner. People thought there was enough play space in the area, and did we need more. Why that play space there? What age demographic? Will there be many families there?

There was a lot of questions about transport, and servicing - how are you going to do the deliveries? We should have a lot more response at the end of March.

Questions included the size of the homes – a larger home would have a larger family with more children.

One of the audience asked if MA had asked people about the size of the development. Alastair Gaisford said not directly. Everyone who came to the presentation MA tried to walk around, so if they thought the scheme was too big there's an opportunity for them to say that.

Marcus Bate said that if that direct question was asked, hand on heart people would say it was too big. We ask questions that lead to a decision that we can afford to make.

A shop manager asked what would the commercial space comprise. She said her experience was that people wanted was local facilities - somewhere to have a cup of coffee or buy a pint of milk. She also mentioned the problem of idling vans parking up after delivering and obscuring her premises.

Alastair Gaisford agreed and said most of the commercial space was on the ground floor. It's capable of providing those local facilities that the community want. With that facility provided on the current scheme the question was, do you want to see more commercial space which would essentially be in a basement for storage, or pushed up into the first floor which would become workshops or offices which would then have to push residential up as well. For MA to have delivery of the scheme.

A question was what types of things?

Alastair Gaisford said shops, it could be the types of shops that are there at the moment, like antiques. It could be work spaces. It could be office or modern work spaces you see. It could be little café, that sort of thing...showrooms. That could be on the ground floor. And commercial is so dynamic at the moment that our intention is to build things that will occupy now. In five years work space changes and in fifty years changes again. So it can be flexible and resilient to changes in the market. That's the kind of commercial space MA want to provide. That's what we

described to people who walked around the exhibition. And the question was do you want to see more which would be pushing things up.

The question was asked that due provision had been given to loading and unloading. Alastair Gaisford said it would be.

Marcus Bate said when they were first commissioned in 2023 they were told that commercial as well as residential was required.

Richard Jacques asked if MA had any knowledge of what was planned in Chelsea Waterfront. He said he thought they were not having an easy time in finding tenants and I think they have concluded that a large Wholefood is probably unlikely, because this corner of Chelsea is something of a cul-de-sac as a destination. They were thinking something like an express retailer – small and local. The biggest ground floor use is probably going to be the Nursery.

A member of the audience mentioned the point raised about nasty lorries idling – as a feedback from this meeting, to go back because RBKC for ticketing idling vans. Who knows what we're going to have in front of Lots Road South, but it would be really great to have more punishment for those vans. It not only damages the site of the existing business.

David Waddell asked if the question was made of the distinction between height and mass?

Marcus Bate said one was specifically about the height of the five buildings. The feeling that there was too much mass across the whole site led to useful feedback about wanting more open ground, more public realm on site.

Alastair Gaisford said one of the things that did come through was the need for more housing at a time of housing crisis. Some people seemed to be more behind affordable housing that he'd seen in ten years.

Richard Jacques said there was one element of the scheme that the whole community had really got behind was the Extra Care Homes – getting that built and getting that available for the community. And alongside that making sure there is affordable housing in the scheme. So that we can feel that it's actually going to be lived in, not going to overseas speculation, and that we can see it serving a useful social purpose. He said there is a real wish to see particularly the extra care homes and adjacent to that making sure that affordable homes, not another dead tower block with lights out at night.

An audience member asked if some of the commercial space rents could be made more affordable for shops that might be more welcome here.

Alastair Gaisford said some of the commercial space would be affordable, which would be secured through both planning authorities. By the time MA have submitted planning application what proportion of commercial space is affordable and what type can be seen. It also fits in with LB H & F industrial strategy.

A question was asked about the sizes of the private accommodation?

AG said it was not fully worked out at the moment, but there would be a mixture. They didn't want to have homes that are empty. The overwhelming number of homes in this market are very large homes – 1500 sq.ft 3 bedroom or much larger. MA don't see it like that but a mix of homes. At the moment they see one and two bedroom and some three bedroom homes. Extra care homes are usually smaller. There's some work for MA to do with LB of H & F, but he would expect there to be some three beds to balance of smaller and larger homes.

Kush Kanodia said he'd been at a meeting in City Hall with Inclusion London who said there were going to be 3% accessible homes. He recommended MA looked at their report and supplied contact information.

AG said all the extra care homes would be full accessible. They are all larger than the normal one bed.

Marcus Bate said they had received the Forum's feedback and it would be considered along with the rest of the community. In summary that 282 homes is a departure from the original brief in the Local Plan. Massing can dominate Lots Road and you're worried about canyonisation. We heard that you think 1380 sq. metres was an unacceptable departure from the original plan, and doesn't provide enough employment opportunities at that level. LRNF is not yet convinced about the contribution of the Western Route wrapped around the back of the site. And there was concern about the placement of the play site. It should be considered as a wider play site strategy. We are talking to them about this.

In the next six months MA will accurately and fairly report how this scheme will affect local infrastructure and MA will present this information at the next consultation.

A question was asked about resident parking. Marcus Bate said he can give some detail on resident parking now, as it would be an entirely car free development.

A question was asked about when the community can get shot of MA?

MB Once we actually put a spade in the ground the construction programme is between 3-4 years...by 2030. He said MA would be very worried if it was going to take longer than four years.

Richard Jacques asked that in the next report back MA would shed some light on the construction traffic management plan. The experience of the Power Station meant that the Forum would hold MA to a really thoughtful traffic plan, which was important over the next five years.

MA said that was why they had brought Michael Rolfe to the meeting. He would be wearing the white hat. Michael said that similar scale size projects had taken three years.

Richard Jacques said one of the attractions of MA originally had been because they built for themselves.

Marcus Bate said that MA delayed getting their investment back by taking longer, so he was incentivised to complete homes of great quality quickly, and how their bench mark shows 3 years for a three hundred homes scheme was very realistic from that angle. And that's exactly the same as what we told you initially.

Alastair Gaisford said once they had started the project there was very little reason why the Council would delay them.

A question was asked about how in the period between now and the spade in the ground, the Council could damage the process. He said if you wanted delays and prevarications, it was very easy for the local council to do that. The community wanted the Care Home.

A question was asked about transport and since we are a dead end could the barriered access under the railway line be opened.

A question was asked about whether the Building Safety Act had impacted their plans. Alastair Gaisford said any building over 18 metres needed two stairways not one. Discussion about additional lifts – three rather than two – which applied to all three buildings on the western boundary.

Alastair Gaisford said that MA were currently reviewing a number of issues:

- The first is building heights on the western edge of the site. Some architectural details that would break down massing. Balcony strategy – noting that the parkways of RBKC to be set on Lots Road.
- The suggestion to introduce basements to increase commercial space on the ground floor is being looked at. Transport and servicing impact on doing that. Pros and cons. If we do increase it, what measure. Affordable workspace – that's the most likely avenue – given the local plans focus on

employment space. Play space strategy – as part of an area wide strategy.

- Logistic strategies. Although too much detail would not be presented at application stage, MA are thinking about it because it would be required before start.

A questioner asked why MA keep talking about the work space rather than the retail space where people might be able to buy things they might need. And you put up work space as a category of employment. A retail space is also an employment opportunity. The comment especially in the last year is that this is a “ghost town”, there’s nothing here.

Alastair Gaisford agreed, but said work space employment was a term that is defined in planning policy and describes offices, industrial, so he was not trying to be misleading.

There is an employment policy which will try to steer MA to provide more of the office, industrial storage type workspaces. But if the community would prefer the restaurant, café then that is something MA would use to create a vibrant and artistic community.

We’re looking to do the next consultation end of March, early April. MA would love to do a preview with this group before we do the formal event over the wider community. In late Spring – end of June we’ll submit the planning application, for RBKC and LB H & F before the Autumn so we have a planning submission by the end of the year, or January. Then there’s a three month period to discharge things like the transport logistics, demolition – that sort of thing, so we can start by the March 2027 deadline.

Richard Jacques confirmed the Forum would organise for MA to attend a further Forum meeting. He said that the Forum had to determine its position, and had a very difficult decision to make over the next few months about whether the Forum are going to challenge the whole development because it’s just not meeting our needs; whether the Forum is going to say MA have done their best and make your life easier

with LB H & F planning committee; or to say there are things the Forum like and things the Forum are willing in balance to support, but the Forum is not going to die in a ditch about this. The Forum do want this development to come forward, but there are still things the Forum want you to consider as you go forward about particular design aspects, particular changes. In theory the Forum could seek delay to all this if the Forum chose to do so, but it was a finely balanced decision whether this was.

Bill Toomey mentioned the financial dynamics – the return on investments, capital value of the land. MA don't want unused commercial space, but will make their margin on whatever they build. There's a range of profitability that the Council is expecting. What is that range, and how acceptable is it? If you're going to build something in four years time you have no idea what costs are going to be so how much of a buffer is built in here, to tell us it has to be this size to make it affordable?

Richard Jacques said the worst outcome for the Forum would be to give you a measure of support on this and then for you to come to us and say the price of steel has gone up so much we've got to put up another twenty homes and a couple of storeys on this.

Bill Toomey said what would also be not right was for the site to deteriorate.

Cllr. Cem Kemahli said the Council own the freehold and there have been costs over the years for the Council. There had been costs for the Council to recruit that land over time gone by. There are costs for the Council to relocate our car pound in Park Royal. We also have the salt store which we have proposals to move to Kensington. So we're absorbing around £15m. It's quite a lot of money to get this site ready. We're also asking MA to provide us with the care home at no cost. In lieu of us selling the land onto them. On top of that there is the issue of developer profit. They're not here to do this out of the kindness of their hearts. The general average around London is between 15 and 20% on residential, slightly different on commercial. That's just fair market and

one of those things. We're also getting the affordable housing split between LBH & F and RBKC. But that is subsidised real estate that would otherwise be available for sale. All of that subsidy that the care home and affordable homes does impact their economic returns. I'm sure if it was a purely private scheme with no planning policy attached to it, they could build something four or five storeys and make exactly the same amount they are on something of this nature. There are issues with LBH & F planning policy. They don't just not talk to us, also a problem with the Earls Court Development where they're building 4,500 houses. You think they might pick up the phone for that one. Likewise nothing at all. There is a development agreement, it is commercially sensitive, but fundamentally it is your taxes as well. There are contributions such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, a lease premium to lease the land from us which is a 990 year lease. There is payment from the development to us as well. We remain the freeholder.

Richard Jacques asked that MA come back to us knowing the Forum has architects, business people, people who know property – try and be as detailed as you can about how this all stacks up – even if it's bad news, because you're setting out for us all the associated category of costs. It will help the people around this table have a clearer view of the way forward, if some of those questions can be answered even in outline rather than specifics.

3. Update on the House Boats

RJ: said that the RBKC's Planning Applications Committee ordered the enforcement action to remove two apartment boats. RBKC officers rejected CYBC's request for a Certificate of Lawfulness.

As a result CYBC decided to appeal both and were successful in November. In November, the planning inspector said RBKC had been reasonable in their approach, but that the Inspector disagreed with the Council's conclusions and the enforcement action was quashed.

Since then he CYBC approached a number of local societies, Chelsea Society LRNF and RBKC because they would like to reset the relationship

with the local community and find a more constructive way of going forward. As a publicly designated body, Peter Barratt and Richard Jacques took a meeting. The owner said they wanted to agree a new design code for boats. They had no intention of bringing loads of apartment boats to the mooring. They wanted a variety of boats on the mooring. They wanted to find a way to encourage those boats on the mooring having trouble with their fees to set a new plan in motion that would provide social housing on the mooring. The Forum listened and welcomed them to come to this meeting and set out their views. They were sent the agenda for this meeting but the Forum has not heard anymore. The Chelsea Society didn't take a meeting (RJ and David Waddell are on the Council of the Chelsea Society Council). Instead, the Society wrote to CYBC asking them to set out their proposals. There has been no response as yet.

The Forum understands that there have been a range of new eviction notices served, which would not have been the impression given to the Forum at their meeting.

David Waddell said RBKC had contacted the neighbouring MPs suggesting setting up a working party to define what should be done about the whole issue of moorings common to both boroughs. There has been no response, and it's not clear how it will go forward. Meanwhile there is still an enquiry launched in the middle of last year about the use of Cadogan Pier for houseboats. Strictly speaking there should not be any residential boats at Cadogan Pier. The taxation department and the planning department clearly do not speak to each other. There are a number of boats we think six or seven which have in fact been paying Council tax which they should not be doing. The Cheyne Walk Trust has been pressing the Council for answers. During the hiatus of the appeal it might have gone on the back burner, but the Trust feels it is very relevant now. Thirdly there's the complication of the Old Ferry Wharf site. The Council gave a temporary extension to the lease of five years which expires next year. They issued a Section 25 order which meant that they could refuse to renew the existing lease on the Old Ferry Wharf. Unfortunately, they didn't have a concrete plan for

that development. The Trust is therefore urging RBKC to resolve this as quickly as possible.

David Waddell said an important point was that the Cheyne Walk Trust had persuaded the Labour Party who are continuing with the Renters' Bill. Lord Cashman, known to Ben Coleman, has submitted an amendment to the Renters' Bill to secure the rights of the boat owners. At the present moment they do not have those rights in protecting their interests. The normal provision of rights apply to a leaseholder, not a licence-holder. There's some hope that might help, but it's not clear at the moment.

Richard Jacques said he wanted to make sure that Forum members generally knew what was going on. He said LRNF made it clear to the CYBC why the LRNF was involved, as the Forum cared deeply about the houseboat community and about what happened on the moorings. It's an historic part of Chelsea, full of wonderful people, wonderful boats that really enhance all of our lives, and that LRNF will continue to press the case for that community to thrive and be respected.

4. Parking and Traffic

Richard Jacques said that TFL were starting to implement the changes along the Embankment. They are not listening to the community, but they are pressing ahead with: the building of the much needed crossings on the remaining three junctions; no left turn into Beaufort Street.

RBKC are also consulting on the idea of issuing another 2,000 parking permits to those who have second homes in the Borough, (i.e. people who have told the Council that they live elsewhere and are paying the second home council rates). The Council's view is it would only be fair to give them a parking permit – whereas if you have a business in the area you don't necessarily get a permit – if you move into a new build home in the area, you're not entitled to a parking permit. And if you want to see less cars, why would you be giving out more permits. RJ said at the end of the discussion he suggest a position which the Forum might adopt.

DAVID WADDELL said the number of parking permits taken out in the Borough has fallen steadily by about 5% - down to 8,000. RBKC therefore felt it might be appropriate to issue an appropriate number for the use of people who had second homes in the Borough. However, the Chelsea Society, and most people, have said that they do not agree with it. People who have second homes are not part of the community; there's an increasing pressure to take out parking places with electric charging systems, and bicycle pens and so on, so there is a concern that residents parking places are being removed anyway. So the demand by residents will be more critical in the future. The Chelsea Society has objected formally already.

RICHARD JACQUES said he was going to propose to the meeting that the LRNF did likewise.

DAVID WADDELL said there was some doubt about whether the letter had gone out to all residents.

RICHARD JACQUES: The resurfacing of Lots Road created merry hell. It was exacerbated by the school street scheme, i.e. barriers unattended made matters much worse.

KERRY DAVIS HEAD said the total mismanagement to have the resurfacing of Lots Road at the same time as school closing of part of other roads was total mismanagement. It was total chaos. The school guy basically gave up and walked away.

RICHARD JACQUES: The resurfacing of Lots Road came out of the Council's budget. It should have been done five years ago as part of the planning of road renewal.

CHARLES PELHAM said the Council let the community down because there were two days when they were finished, despite his letter saying there was a major public relations job. He said everyone he knows believes the community is at war with the Council and have been for some time. He also referred back to someone in the Council saying that because of the environment, the price of permits should be put up. Rank hypocrisy from the Council on this point.

KUSH KENODIA said he had joined TFL on the independent disability advisory group. Internal, private confidential advice on disability.

DAVID WADDELL said a group had formed CAST (Chelsea Alliance Safer Traffic) which arose from the problems, foreseen in the safety scheme for Battersea Bridge which should have been done in 2005. There have since been five deaths there and CAST have been urgently pressing TFL to do something about it. The plan they produced was sent to Chelsea residents, but was totally ignored by TFL. There should have been co-ordination between Battersea and Chelsea Bridges and equitable to the side roads of Chelsea. They made two decisions, one of which is they've closed the southern turns and the northern turns in Chelsea Bridge which cause far more heavy traffic on the Embankment which goes as far as Battersea Bridge which actually reduces safety at Battersea Bridge, and secondly they want to close the left turn N. at Beaufort Street – which will put an awful lot of pressure on other turns North into Chelsea. They are all very exercised about that. TFL have been unsympathetic. They seem to have a doctrinaire attitude that what they do is right and safer and they won't listen to any common sense. RBKC is part of CAST and will try and make some progress, but it's very unlikely.

In addition to the N at Beaufort Street, there's colossal problems on the north of the eastern side of Battersea Bridge because of traffic unable to get into the left hand lane to go south over the River, so vehicles are coming down Danvers Street which is a one way road, driving into the middle of the Embankment or Cheyne Walk, sitting there trying to force their way into the left hand lane across the Bridge, so all of that has got to be resolved and this is part of the argument.

The whole area is very dangerous. We've got the local police involved. They want to be helpful.

RICHARD JACQUES said the Forum would continue to work with David Waddell and CAST. He invited the audience to inform the Forum about traffic – like the school street scheme because it isn't working.

5. **Safety and Crime**

RICHARD JACQUES mentioned the Safer Neighbourhood meeting.

CHARLES DONLAN said the Police Sergeant who hopefully will be with us until the end of the year and representatives of the four wards have been working together to produce a Plan Chelsea which will be announced at that meeting.

He said that people should consider joining the Whats App group. Also he stressed the importance of reporting any crime no matter what kind and how small.

CHARLES PELHAM said drugs were endemic in the area. He also advocated more cameras.

CHARLES DONLAN said they were of limited use. Car crime at the weekends should be reported by phoning 999.

Laura Burns said she would try to attend that meeting.

6. **Parks**

RICHARD JACQUES said that following the public consultation the small amount of money available had been used in Westfield Park with new drinking water fountain, improved lighting, additional park benches and picnic tables.

The most important thing was to reconfigure the public toilet and have a changing place facility for disabled park users. There will be a review of CCTV for monitoring nefarious activities, because the park has its own budget .

One of the reasons that there is not major redesign of Westfield Park is because of the new park planned for Chelsea Wharf, where it will be part of the mix. There will be a public consultation, principally for the new site where the Tideway Tunnel has been built.

CHARLES PELHAM said that following the experience of Cremorne Gardens, the new park is safeguarded for the community.

RICHARD JACQUES said it was important that local institutions like the Forum and LVC have their considered views listened to by the Council. CIL money will be spent on local parks.

7. **Review of 2024**

In response to questions RJ explained that NCIL money is the construction level across the Borough, but then the Borough can decide itself where it wants to spend the money. Much of it will go into the big development on Portobello Road, but a certain amount will come to this area. You won't believe it but this Ward has a very small NCIL budget, because although we've had a lot of development that hasn't finished yet, so there will be more NCIL money coming. There will be more NCIL money when Lots Road South is built. CIL budgets are borough wide budgets, but there is a community spend because the Council recognises we have been on the receiving end of a lot which has tried people's patience a lot. Some of the things they are investigating are completing the Thames Path, including a cantilever bridge around Chelsea Wharf so it can connect with Cremorne Gardens. It would stop our area being something of a dead end, and would mean that you could walk the whole embankment. As always this is somewhere in the future. There will be some money coming from Chelsea Waterfront next year, because of the occupation dates which is a moveable feast. We will be coming back to parks and CIL.

From the NCIL pot of money, there are two small things – more cycle racks between Worlds End Studios and the School on Tetcott Street, which was a suggestion put forward by David Lloyd Davis.

Also the flower boxes that are outside Martin & Co are in a constant state of bad repair, so the Forum put in a project to create a permanent planter that isn't going to degrade, that the Forum can put "Lots Road Chelsea" on and begin to make more people aware that there is a unique identity in this area that the Forum should be enhancing.

Planning and Licensing applications. The Forum have been working very closely with LVC. Two heads are better than one in opposing things that

are not within the conservation area we live in. Licensing is perhaps our most disappointing area because most of the businesses that want late night licenses are lawyered up and are fully prepared. We've had some very disappointing outcomes on that. But we will keep plugging away at Jacks.

For noise and nuisance, even in the middle of the night, it was recommended to be in touch with the Council, to ensure there is a paper trail.

RICHARD JACQUES said in the last year there had been a couple of good outcomes in opposing Planning. One was putting an entirely new building on the garage at the end of a terrace. With enough local motivation the Council officers got the point and the applicants withdrew it, and another case there was a sort of okay to the alteration of a mansard roof. The owner said okay, he was going to change his design to make it more harmonious across the terrace. If you don't make the point, nothing happens.

CHARLES PELHAM asked for a list of council offices on the what's app. It was pointed out that the Council online drop down menu was the solution. *(Members of the audience demonstrated how to do this).*

RICHARD JACQUES mentioned the Glassmill building – we don't need another 34 storey building overlooking everyone.

Chelsea Waterfront are putting in an application for some additional lighting on the side of the building on Lots Road, uplighters to show the beautiful brickwork that they have restored. He asked for people to come back to him with their opinions. Despite their attitude in the past Chelsea Waterfront have been engaging with the community recently.

8. Election of Forum Committee for 2025

- Richard Jacques, Chair
- Peter Barrett, Vice Chair
- Kerry Davis-Head, Vice Chair and LVC Chair
- Josh Lee, Treasurer and Pooles Lane Residents Association
- Gill Best, Secretary and LVC
- Charles Donlan, Website and communications
- David Waddell, Cheyne Walk Trust
- Jenny Graham, Chelsea Reach Boatowners Association
- Kush Kanodia, Disability Rights and Race Equality Champion
- Veronica Ricks, Principal, Heatherley School of Fine Art
- Giso Van Loon, LVC
- Jo Sherrard, LVC
- David Lloyd-Davis, Worlds End Studios

The meeting re-elected the Forum Committee unanimously.

Peter Barratt thanked those who had supported the application for the café at the World's End Studios.

The Meeting closed at 19.10.