

2016.01.57.00

NEW ZEALAND INSTITUTE OF LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS INC.Minutes of the 1975 Annual General Meeting

The meeting was held in the Hannah Playhouse, Downstage, Wellington, on 15 August, 1975 and was opened by the President, Tony Jackman, at 9.39 a.m.

Executive Present: Tony Jackman (President), Charlie Challenger (Vice-President), Frank Boffa (Treasurer), Neil Aitken (Publicity Officer), Earl Bennett (Secretary), George Malcolm, and Robin Gay.

Members Present:

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------|
| John Archer | Gordon Griffin |
| Donald C. Barham | Brian E. Halstead |
| Lois I. Binnie | John S. Henry |
| Neil T. Bromley | Sara R. Innes |
| Bernard D. Brown | Eleanor R. Ironside |
| Mary Buckland | Diane J. Lucas |
| Mary C. Calver | David L. Marchant |
| Barry L. Chalmers | Sally M. Mason |
| Chang Poon Chong | Kenneth G. McKenzie |
| Mary Chapman | Diane H. Menzies |
| Anna A.W. Clayton | Janet B. Moss |
| David F. Clutterbuck | Emily B. Mulligan |
| Michael Cole | Graham A. Mulvay |
| Peter A. Coubrough | Paula B. Parsonson |
| David J. Cusick | Alan R. Petrie |
| Stephen T.A. Drakeford | Roger W. Pollard |
| Alison M. Dunn | Gary D. Quinn |
| Helmut Einhorn | Esmae G. Sage |
| Terence C. Emmitt | Peter G.S. Sergel |
| Ron Etherington | Stephen J. Shannahan |
| Boyden H. Evans | Alexander P. Sokolik |
| Douglas Field | Michael L. Steven |
| Derek J. Fry | Anthony Sweetapple |
| Alan D. Titchener | Paul T. Tritenbach |
| Albert L. Vasbenter | Janet H. Woodhouse |
| | Ray Wright |

Visitors: Geoff Green, Boon Quee Tan, Janet Walker

| | |
|---|--------------------|
| <u>Apologies:</u> Michael R. Barthelmeh | Michael Littlewood |
| Hugh E. Baxter | Allan C. Morgan |
| Robert D. Boocock | Gary F. Philpott |
| John A. Boyd | Peter Rough |
| Bart Hopperus-Buma | Patricia E. Shiel |

1. Acceptance of Previous Minutes

The President explained that the motion under item 11 to prepare a reorganised Constitution had been delayed in order to incorporate new changes. The general consensus of the meeting was that this delay is acceptable.

Motion: To accept the Minutes of the 1974 Annual General Meeting as a true and correct record of that meeting.

Proposed: Brian Halstead

Seconded: Emily Mulligan

Carried

2. President's Review 1974 - 1975

The President noted that the present membership stands at 95, an increase of 27 from last year's figure of 68, but that increased membership has not resulted in increased development and the faithful few continue to push on. He extended an invitation to members to present their ideas and to join the various subcommittees in operation.

The President referred to the importance of the efforts by the Institute to advise the State Services Commission regarding job classification and parity for landscape architects in government service. He commended the Professional Practice Subcommittee for its efforts in the production of the Code of Conduct, Scale of Fees, and Conditions of Engagement, and noted that the Education Subcommittee is an area of concern because more direction from the Institute is needed. He remarked that chapter organisation is as yet infant in development and that suggestions and support from members are required.

He extended thanks to the Executive and to the Subcommittees for their efforts during the past year and commended the Conference 1975 Subcommittee for a difficult job well done.

3. Treasurer's Report

Treasurer Frank Boffa submitted an Income and Expenditure account for the period ended 31 July 1975. Income totalled \$2315.09 and expenses were \$2090.86; the excess of income over expenditure of \$224.23 is added to the funds accumulated to 31 July 1974 to result in accumulated funds at 31 July 1975 of \$1412.35. The Balance Sheet of 31 July 1975 consisted of assets of \$1593.35 and liabilities of \$181.00.

The Balance Sheet and Income and Expenditure Account were examined and certified by Clarke, Menzies & Co., Chartered Accountants, Christchurch, on 13 August 1975.

Motion: That the Treasurer's report be accepted

Proposed: Brian Halstead

Seconded: Emily Mulligan

Carried

- 3 -

Albert Vasbenter asked why the Institute's subscription to the Environment Centre in Christchurch has been discontinued. He was advised of the Executive's decision not to commit the national membership to local organisations, but to encourage individual members to join such worthwhile organisations.

4. Election of Auditors

Motion: To retain Clarke, Menzies & Co., Chartered Accountants, as auditors for the Institute.

Proposed: Robin Gay

Seconded: Frank Boffa

Carried

5. Subcommittee Reports

a. Professional Practice: The Subcommittee Chairman, Frank Boffa, circulated copies of the proposed Code of Conduct, Conditions of Engagement, and Scale of Fees to the members present. He reported that Brian Halstead and Bob Boocock had been co-opted to help in formulating these proposals.

Motion: To accept in principle the proposals for Code of Conduct, Conditions of Engagement, and Scale of Fees.

Proposed: Alan Petrie

Seconded: Albert Vasbenter

Discussion: Michael Cole commented on the Scale of Fees that 50% at the sketch stage seemed high. Frank Boffa explained that the subcommittee felt that to arrive at the sketch stage requires a great deal of work since it is in essence the development of a master plan. Brian Halstead commented that in his experience the bulk of the work takes place in the sketch stage. Frank Boffa pointed out that on the Scale of Fees no minimum fee has been established because to do so is probably illegal and because many members do not work on projects which require a minimum fee. Helmut Einhorn pointed out a disparity between the fact that no minimum fee is established and the Code of Conduct which states that landscape architects shall not reduce their fees to obtain work or clients.

Carried

Frank Boffa mentioned that membership in the Architect's Co-operative Society which provides professional indemnity and insurance is being investigated.

John Archer asked if the Code of Conduct applies to all members of the Institute. Frank replied that the Code is intended for corporate members only but that it should serve as a guideline for other members.

The general consensus of the members present was that the Professional Practice Subcommittee should remain as it is presently constituted.

b. Publicity: Subcommittee Chairman, Neil Aitken, extended thanks to the members of his committee for their help over the last year. He reported that the subcommittee had over the last year produced and distributed the proceedings from Conference 1974 and has organised a display at

the Bank of New South Wales, Armagh Street, Christchurch, to coincide with Derek Lovejoy's visit to the city.

Robin Gay reported that a request had been made to the Ministry of Sport and Recreation for a grant to produce the proceedings of Conference 1975, but that no reply had been received. He stated that he hopes to set up a committee to produce a publication which deals with open space throughout New Zealand.

The meeting was recessed at 10.33 for morning tea and reopened at 11.00 a.m.

c. Newsletter Editor Charlie Challenger presented a report on the newsletter in which its costs are compared to the income of the Institute. The cost for producing the newsletter in the last year was \$347.07 which is about 24% of the Institute's annual income. He presented alternatives for cost reduction, cost minimisation, and selling-off costs. Attached to the report is a questionnaire to assess the members' attitudes and desires.

Helmut Einhorn congratulated the staff of the newsletter on the high standard of production and commented that the quality should not be reduced. Brian Halstead commented that the publication should remain as a newsletter and not at this time become a magazine. Michael Cole suggested that the Institute should set up a committee to study the costs and production methods of other journals and that the newsletter image should grow as the Institute does. Brian Halstead said that he felt it would be better if we aimed for sponsors instead of advertisers. Helmut Einhorn suggested that we include our newsletter as a rider in other related journals.

The general feeling of the members present was that the newsletter should continue as it is and that the Institute should try to gather sponsorship or advertising.

Instruction: Michael Cole is to proceed with a study into sponsorship and the need for any changes to the newsletter and is to present the results of his study to the next annual general meeting. He may select his own subcommittee for this study.

d. Chapter Organisation: Subcommittee Chairman Tony Jackman presented a review of the proposals made to date. He reported that a preliminary format which is based on the chapter organisation of the New Zealand Institute of Architects and the American Society of Landscape Architects had been circulated to interested members for comment. The Institute does not have a high enough concentration in any one area to meet the requirement for chapter organisation, but the Chairman encouraged the setting up of informal groups such as the one in the Christchurch area. He stated that chapter organisation should proceed slowly but surely.

Robin Gay suggested that members in the Wellington area establish an informal group such as the one in Christchurch. In his opinion, the organisation of Conference 1975 helped to solidify the Wellington members and so this would be an opportune time to form an informal group.

6. Constitutional Amendments

Amendment to Article 3, Section (a) was proposed and seconded by the Executive Committee. This amendment locates the Institute's registered office with its accountants, Clarke Menzies & Co., Christchurch and was carried without discussion.

Amendment to Article 4, Section (a) was proposed and seconded by the Executive Committee in order to delete the Subscriber membership category and so make provision for paid subscriptions to the newsletter. The amendment was carried without discussion.

An addition to Article 4 of a Section (c) which reads "Only Corporate Members of the New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects shall have the right to use the title Landscape Architect" was proposed by five corporate members. Discussion was called for. Brian Halstead and Helmut Einhorn pointed out that this section was not legally enforceable and that it could not apply to those outside the membership. Frank Boffa replied that we can use this amendment to police our own membership only, but that it is a start. Diane Lucas asked about the status of those who have the educational qualification but not the experience. Emily Mulligan asked about the status of those who apply for jobs titled "Landscape Architect" when they are not corporate members. Paula Parsonson commented that there must be a transition period for adjustment to this amendment. Derek Fry asked what the penalty would be for a non-corporate member who uses the title Landscape Architect; the President replied that under the Constitution such a member could be put out of the Institute. Frank Boffa commented that the purpose of this amendment is not to cause trouble within the Institute since the misuse of the title Landscape Architect is not really an internal problem. Michael Cole stated that he would oppose this amendment until there is clarification of what constitutes a professional. There was general agreement with the President's suggestion that further discussion on this amendment be held under item 7 of the agenda and that any action be deferred until that point on the agenda.

Amendments to Article 7, section (f) and Article 13, section (a), were proposed and seconded by the Executive Committee in order to delete the Subscriber membership category. Amendments to both these articles were carried without discussion.

7. General

a. Discussion regarding the category of Affiliate as a class of membership within the Institute, with reference to qualifications and progression:

Sally Mason: Wants to know the ways and means by which one could progress to Associate membership.

Janet Woodhouse: Anyone can get into the Affiliate category, but cannot get out of it.

- 6 -

Paula Parsonson: How long until examinations and a progression structure are established?

Ray Wright: Progression is important but the concern is with those who have experience but less educational qualification.

Allan Titchener: Is there anything to stop anyone from joining as an Affiliate? The President replied that the constitution and education policy contain provisions regarding Affiliate membership.

John Archer: Isn't everyone a student except corporate members since they have to learn more? Frank Boffa replied in the affirmative and stated that this Institute should be comparable with other professional bodies who have only corporate and student membership.

Alexander Sokolik: Feels he should not be in the Affiliate category of membership. The President pointed out the requirement for two years experience, one of which is in New Zealand.

Ray Wright: Would the newsletter cover what some members have done toward progressing to Associate membership?

Kenneth McKenzie: The Executive should afford some protection for those in the Affiliate category.

Derek Fry: The machinery for progression is there now - it is up to the individual to work toward his own goal.

John Archer: Need direction from the Executive Committee.

Frank Boffa replied that the Institute can not set up a separate education system.

Derek Fry: There is a danger in the Institute having its own examination system.

Helmut Einhorn: The architects have a system in conjunction with the University. The Institute should look into the procedures used by other professional bodies.

Mary Calver: Wants ways and means for progression.

Don Barham: Wants ways and means for progression.

Janet Moss: Would one lose his membership if he did not want to progress to Associate membership? The President replied that he would not.

David Cusick: Agreed with previous statements.

Paul Tritenbach: Thinks that the Institute will probably find that it will have to abandon the Affiliate category in the future and that it should be phased out over a period of time.

Brian Halstead: Related institutes have all returned to using the established education institutions.

Roger Pollard: Suggests that the Institute have Student and Associate categories of membership with the Affiliate category taking in such people as contractors.

Helmut Einhorn: The Institute can encourage the Associate members to use the letters A.N.Z.I.L.A. while Affiliates can use no such letters.

The President pointed out that there are employment difficulties in the public service because we may require landscape architects to be corporate members, but would also like to see recent graduates employed as landscape architects although they may be Affiliate members.

Instruction: The Education Subcommittee is to proceed to cover the points raised in this discussion and is to develop a policy for the near future.

The President pointed out that time is of the essence in the carrying out of this instruction and extended an invitation to the members to advise Charlie Challenger regarding this matter as they are affected.

b. Discussion regarding the initiation of an inquiry into the vocational value of the Diploma in Landscape Technology course currently being taught at Lincoln College:

A background paper comparing the Dip.L.Tech., Dip.L.A., and Cert.L.D. was prepared by Charlie Challenger and circulated to members prior to the meeting.

Mary Chapman: Are the Certificate in Landscape Design and Diploma in Landscape Technology equal? She was referred to the background paper which compares the courses.

Gary Quinn: The Dip.L.T. course could be changed to better reflect the needs of the students.

Michael Cole: Asked if the Executive Committee had comment at this time.

The matter was referred to the Education Subcommittee. Charlie Challenger, Education Subcommittee Chairman, asked for written comments from members.

Ray Wright: Was the Dip.L.T. course instituted to create corporate members? Charlie Challenger replied that it was not.

Sally Mason: What about employment?

Instruction: That the Professional Practice Subcommittee investigate avenues of employment for the holders of the Dip.L.T.

Charlie Challenger stated that Lincoln College has informed the State Services Commission of this course but has not yet received a reply from them although a considerable amount of time has elapsed.

The President asked Roger Pollard to provide Charlie Challenger with some help in this matter since he is a potential employer.

- 8 -

Gary Quinn:: Feels that the Dip.L.T. course is not fulfilling a need for landscape contractors and that many of the current students do not intend to be technicians.

Janet Woodhouse: Would the status of the Dip.L.T. and Cert. L.D. be equal in the Institute? The matter was referred to the Education Subcommittee.

c. Discussion regarding the Institute's Education Policy:

The President asked that members direct to Charlie Challenger any matters related to this policy.

d. Addition to Article 4, section (c) regarding the use of the title "Landscape Architect":

Janet Walker suggested that since professionalism appeared to be the concern, would not corporate members be better called "Professional Landscape Architects".

Motion: To accept the amended addition of section (c), Article 4 which reads, "Only the Corporate Members of the New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects shall have the right to use the title Landscape Architect".

Proposed: Brian Halstead
Seconded: Helmut Einhorn

Carried by a vote of 11 for and 2 against. Emily Mulligan expressed a desire to have her opposition to the addition of this section registered since she feels that it needs more consideration.

The President asked members to direct additional remarks and comments regarding this matter to the Executive Committee.

The President closed the meeting at 12.35 p.m.


E.H. Bennett
Secretary.

The following resolution was proposed by Mr Ewen Henderson of Wellington and accepted by those attending the New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects Open Space Conference at Wellington on 16 August 1975:

That this conference urge central government to complete a national open space plan. This plan to include all national and departmental interests and provide the framework within which regional and local planning can proceed.