

NEW ZEALAND INSTITUTE OF LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS INC.MINUTES OF THE 1977 ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

The Meeting was held at Helen Lowry Hall, 19 Blakey Avenue, Karori, Wellington, on 21 August 1977, and was opened (and chaired) by the President, Frank Boffa at 10.10 am.

Executive Committee Present:

Frank Boffa - President
 Robin Gay - Vice-President
 Tony Jackman - Immediate Past-President
 Neil Aitken - Secretary
 Emily Mulligan - Treasurer
 Charlie Challenger
 Peter Rough

Members Present:

Jim Beard	Graham Laws
Earl Bennett	Diane Lucas
Bob Boocock	Hugh Lusk
Neil Bromley	George Malcolm
Mary Calver	Dave Marchant
Barry Chalmers	Dennis Scott
Mike Cole	Patricia Shiel
Steve Drakeford	Christine Thomas
Helmut Einhorn	Albert Vasbenter
Boyden Evans	Alec Wilson
Hedley Evans	Jan Woodhouse
Douglas Field	Ray Wright

Apologies:

John Archer	Gordon Griffin
Hugh Baxter	John Marsh
John Boyd	Sally Mason
P.C. Chang	L.W. McCaskill
Anna Clayton	Bill McLeary
Martin Conway	Alan Petrie
Alison Dunn	Esmee Sage
Nick Empson	Paul Tritenbach

1. ACCEPTANCE OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

There were no matters arising.

Motion: To accept the minutes of the 1976 Annual General Meeting as a true and correct record of that meeting.

Proposed: Diane Menzies
 Seconded: Robin Gay

Carried

2.

2. TREASURER'S REPORT

The Treasurer, Emily Mulligan, distributed the Auditor's report, summarised as follows:

- (a) Balance Sheet as at 13 July 1977;
- (b) Income and Expenditure Account for year ended 31 July 1977;
- (c) Conference Account for year ended 31 July 1977.

Income for the period totalled \$2,303.14 and expenses were \$3,397.85; the excess of expenditure over income is \$1,094.71.

These documents were examined, and certified by Clarke, Menzies and Co., Chartered Accountants, on 17 August 1977.

The Treasurer explained that there is some confusion over the apparent loss of \$732.20 incurred by the 1976 AGM and Conference. An Executive Committee investigation is, therefore, to be carried out to clarify this.

Diane Menzies sought clarification of the expenditure item Subscriptions Written Off. The Treasurer explained that this is an auditing procedure for showing debts that have been written off.

Motion: To accept the Treasurer's report for the period ended 31 July 1977.

Proposed: Diane Menzies

Seconded: Lois Binnie

Carried.

3. ELECTION OF AUDITORS

Frank Boffa explained that Clarke, Menzies and Co. are based in Wellington and Christchurch, hence it has been convenient and logical for the Institute to continue using the firm following the holding of Executive Committee meetings in Wellington for the last year.

He also explained that the Institute has now had three Treasurers, each adapting the system somewhat to their own personal preferences and methods. This, understandably, has resulted in unavoidable confusion. Therefore, there is now a clear need for our Auditors to brief the Institute fully and establish a logical and continuing system, irrespective of Treasurer.

Motion: That we re-elect Clarke, Menzies and Co. to continue as the Institute's Auditors.

Proposed: Emily Mulligan

Seconded: Bob Boocock

Carried.

3.

4. SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS

Frank Boffa explained that in the past the Institute has tended to establish sub-committees piecemeal to meet particular, and sometimes fragmented needs. The Executive Committee has recently rationalised this by establishing five standing sub-committees, each with the power to co-opt. Each committee has a defined role and purpose, and, therefore, it is hoped that overall co-ordination will be much more satisfactory.

The five sub-committees, committee chairpersons and objectives are as follows:

(a) Education, Examinations and Research

Chair: Tony Jackman

Objectives

- (i) To administer the Institute's policy on education, examinations and research;
- (ii) To liaise with and assist those involved in landscape education;
- (iii) To assess landscape courses and overseas qualifications;
- (iv) To conduct Institute examinations as and when required;
- (v) To promote continuing education for members.

(b) Professional Services

Chair: Robin Gay

Objectives

- (i) To administer the Institute's policy on matters of professional interest;
- (ii) To interpret and enforce the Institute's Code of Ethics;
- (iii) To establish and maintain liaison with major public and private employment agencies and organisations;
- (iv) To investigate and promote the employment of landscape architects.

4.

(c) Policy, Liaison and Parliamentary BillsChair: Frank BoffaObjectives

- (i) To liaise with other organisations that have similar objectives;
- (ii) To make submissions on behalf of the Institute;
- (iii) To formulate and co-ordinate Institute Policy;
- (iv) To administer, review and co-ordinate the Institute's Constitution and rules.

(d) Promotion, Publicity and PublicationsChair: Peter RoughObjective

To liaise with all other Committees on aspects of promotion, publicity and publications.

(e) EditorialChair: Charlie ChallengerObjective

To produce and publish the Institute's Journal, 'The Landscape'.

The Sub-committee reports are as follows:

(a) Education, Examinations and Research

Tony Jackman asked Charlie Challenger to speak to the meeting because of his (Charlie's) earlier involvement as chairperson of the former Education Sub-Committee.

Charlie explained that an Examination Committee had been established comprising:

Himself (as Chairperson)
George Malcolm
Earl Bennett
Tony Jackman

5.

He continued by saying that the following tentative arrangements have been made for the 1977 Institute Examination:

(i) Special Examination for Corporate Membership:

To be held in Wellington on 2 and 3 December 1977.

(ii) Professional Practice for Corporate Membership:

To be held in Wellington on 5 December 1977.

There is still a great deal of preparatory work to do - as yet, there are no written guidelines for examination candidates. The procedures established at the 1976 AGM have not yet been formalised.

There was no further discussion.

(b) Professional Services

Robin Gay briefly reported on activities in line with the motion passed at the 1976 AGM. There was general discussion on the Code of Ethics, but he pointed out that it is not the Institute's role to police the professional conduct of members.

Robin Gay then asked the members present if they had any particular points on aspects of professional involvement.

Diane Menzies considered that it would be helpful to establish something like a scale of fees as a basic guide - however, it was acknowledged that this would be difficult with the current rate of inflation.

Frank Boffa pointed out that it would be possible to establish draft guidelines, but currently, this appears to be contrary to the policy of the Department of Trade and Industry. He went on to explain that the Institute could establish some procedure or basic formula to arrive at a scale of fees, but in view of the current circumstances, would not establish a minimum fee as such.

In short, it is up to the individual consultant to state their fees, and while this will vary, they should be in line with the fees charged by other Corporate members of the Institute.

(c) Policy, Liaison and Parliamentary Bills

Frank Boffa said that the Institute had been active in the following areas:

6.

(i) Reserves Bill:

A written submission had been prepared and the Institute has been personally represented at the Parliamentary Select Committee hearing. Our comments were well received by the Committee.

(ii) Forum on Land Subdivision:

This forum was conducted under the auspices of the Department of Internal Affairs and the Institute was again personally represented. The Department is currently drafting the new Local Government Bill which will replace the existing Municipal Corporation and Counties Acts.

(iii) Visit of Hubert Owens:

During Dean Owens' visit, the Institute arranged a meeting with the Minister for the Environment, the Hon. Venn Young.

(iv) Open Space and Recreation Seminar:

The Institute will be represented at the Open Space and Recreation Seminar, to be conducted jointly by the Department of Lands and Survey and the Council for Recreation and Sport. The Seminar will be held in Wellington on 24, 25 and 26 August 1977.

(v) Queen Elizabeth II Open Space Trust Bill:

The Institute has been invited by the Secretary of the Land and Agriculture Select Committee to make submissions on this Bill.

Frank Boffa commented that the preparation of these submissions should not primarily be the work of the of the Executive Committee. He continued by asking members to send their own thoughts as well as relevant information on all these aspects to the Executive Committee for inclusion in submissions.

Bob Boocock asked if these submissions are confidential - they are not.

Hedley Evans asked if the Executive Committee could make copies of submissions available to members by request. He was, however, aware of our limited resources and the additional paper work involved.

(Instruction: That the titles of submissions made are advertised in 'The Landscape'. 

Earl Bennett made the point that the Institute should charge for xeroxing a particular submission if requested - this was adopted.

7.

Jim Beard then spoke on the whole question of communication with members - all non-confidential matters considered by the Executive Committee should be reproduced in 'The Landscape'. He felt it was vital that all matters of general interest should be communicated to members.

Hedley Evans pointed out that this whole question had been raised at the 'open' meeting, the previous Friday (19 August).

The Journal Editor, Charlie Challenger, explained the difficulty of the publication of a particular issue of 'The Landscape' not coinciding with Executive Committee meetings; for example, the information resulting from the December meeting would not appear until the March issue. He pointed out, that to be current and topical, the timing should dovetail more satisfactorily.

Frank Boffa said that there was clearly a consensus of opinion that information should be made available at the earliest opportunity.

Albert Vasbenter referred to the importance of the new Town and Country Planning legislation and the fact that the Institute should comment on the draft legislation.

The Secretary, Neil Aitken, explained that the Institute had written to the Director of Town and Country Planning concerning this and had received what was essentially a non-reply.

Frank Boffa said that it was very important for members to buy copies of the Bill and send their individual comments to the Executive Committee.

Tony Jackman also stressed the immediacy of the Q.E. II Open Space Trust Bill.

Frank Boffa pointed out that time was inevitably limited with preparing submissions - for instance, submissions on the Open Space Trust Bill have to be received by the Secretary of the Select Committee not later than 26 August 1977, and the Institute only received notification last week.

Tony Jackman suggested that the Executive Committee ask for more membership support because of their already heavy commitments.

Earl Bennett pointed out there was some reluctance by members to do this - it is most time-consuming and they feel that they are playing a somewhat pre-determined role anyhow.

8.

Robin Gay replied that the Institute's submission on the Reserves Bill was taken seriously, and the effort had, therefore, been worthwhile.

(d) Promotion, Publicity and Publications

Peter Rough outlined some areas of activity and pointed out that a lot of this work should ideally be done at Chapter or local level - especially the preparation of special studies, items and reports.

He continued by explaining that he had been working on the 1975 Open Space Conference papers, not as formal proceedings but as an open space guideline document for use by local authorities and administrators of open space in general.

The original proceedings, compiled from tape-recordings and papers will be bound and deposited in the Institute Library. Included with this will be the 1976 Open Space Submission and relevant correspondence. A worthwhile addition to information of this nature would be a record of members' involvement with open space.

Peter explained that the open space guidelines publication is now half completed and explanatory information on open space terminology will be included. The final draft will be presented at the next Executive Committee meeting.

Members with special interest in open space were asked to contact Peter Rough.

Robin Gay asked Peter if he considered that the 1977 Conference had been of any particular help to him - Peter felt that it was certainly of relevance - particularly applicable to the section of the publication dealing with members' open space involvement in such fields as management plans.

Albert Vasbenter asked what scale or what detail would the publication get down to - would it cover urban open space at the more intimate, less expansive scale. In reply, Peter agreed, that to be balanced, the publication should include this - in fact, it should cover the whole range, from macro to micro.

Jim Beard asked if the uncompleted publication should be circulated to interested members now.

Robin Gay expressed caution over too wide an involvement at this stage - he stressed that the time was now opportune to complete the publication.

Jim Beard then emphasised the importance of covering the urban situation as a spring-board for local activities. He felt that we mistakenly tended to think of open space as a macro element. We should

start with the urban situation, embracing the work-place, commercial and residential areas - phasing into wilderness areas at the other, extreme end of the spectrum. He stressed that we should be intuitively working out from the urban through this hierarchy of spaces.

Jim remarked on the importance of the District Scheme being the basis for environmental planning.

Frank Boffa stated that the point had been made, and all interested members should communicate directly with Peter Rough.

(e) Journal Report

The Editor, Charlie Challenger, stated that the basic Journal policy was instituted at the 1976 AGM and that the regular Journal distribution was now much broader than Institute membership, and geographically, the Journal now went well beyond New Zealand. He then distributed a financial report on the Journal and pointed out that three issues had been produced in the last year - the March issue having been dropped to overcome the seven-week time lag. The current circulation (as at the 1977 AGM) was 470.

Emily Mulligan asked what is in the Institute Library (based at the George Forbes Memorial Library, Lincoln College) - she pointed out that members did not really know.

Charlie Challenger replied that the book list was itemised in Journal No. 1 and the list has remained the same.

Mike Cole felt that there should be wider assistance with canvassing for advertising - this was primarily being done in Christchurch.

Frank Boffa considered that this was best done by local landscape groups.

Jim Beard, on behalf of the meeting, congratulated the Editor and his Committee on the quality of the Journal - he pointed out that it was certainly growing in strength. Jim also felt that, with increasing subscriber numbers, advertising could be put in the hands of an agency - chasing advertising is hard work for the inexperienced.

In reply, Charlie Challenger pointed out that last year there were offers of help - Jan Woodhouse, through her personal efforts, had arranged a lot of advertising and, following this experience, he considered that the person-to-person contact was essential if good results were to be achieved.

Frank Boffa commented that the image of the Journal is very professional, and it would be better if all members made a conscious effort to advertise its worth.

Charlie Challenger said that there will be a 'flier' included with the next issue.

Mike Cole commented that 'The Landscape' now goes to Moscow!

5. CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

(a) Article 14 : Fees and Subscriptions

Frank Boffa outlined Article 14 and the proposed amendments to it. He re-emphasised the grave financial reality facing the Institute.

Bob Boocock suggested that the \$40 proposed for Associates should be increased to \$50, and the \$45 proposed for Fellows should be increased to \$55.

Earl Bennett pointed out that this would mean that the desired distinction in status between Fellow and Associate is lessened by the relatively small difference in annual subscription.

Jan Woodhouse asked why Fellows pay more than Associates.

Robin Gay stated that there had to be monetary differences - with perhaps a review in a year's time. He also pointed out that some members had other Institute commitments, such as membership of the Australian Institute of Landscape Architects, and there was, therefore, a need to review the whole question annually.

Ray Wright said that members must recognise actual costs - after all, \$75 was mentioned at the 'open' AGM - he considered that Affiliate fees should be \$25 per annum.

Patricia Shiel pointed out that the scale of annual subscriptions should be structured in accordance with a member's personal circumstances - whether at work receiving an income, or at home. She considered that \$25 was excessive for those in the latter category.

Robin Gay asked Frank Boffa what were the reasons behind arriving at a figure of \$75 as the basic Corporate annual subscription.

In reply, Frank pointed out that many costs are not borne by the Institute. For instance, various agencies pay for xeroxing and travelling costs incurred by members attending Executive Committee meetings in Wellington. Nor does the Institute pay for all its typing, postage, toll charges, etc.

He continued by saying that we are going to have to start paying for these real costs eventually - conservative projected estimates are based on \$1,500 p.a., but the actual expenditure involved would double this figure.

Robin Gay expressed concern about increased costs such as Xeroxing.

Frank Boffa stated that he considered the personal travelling costs which may be incurred in attending Executive Committee meetings actually deterred those prospective members not resident in Wellington, from offering themselves for election to the Executive Committee. This tends to result in a 'closed shop', and this is not desirable, fully democratic or representative.

Hedley Evans considered that the proposed increases were a non-issue really, if the effective functioning of the Institute depended upon it.

Charlie Challenger then proposed this amendment to the written motion:

That the Annual Membership Subscription for Associate be increased to \$50 and the Annual Membership Subscription for Fellow be increased to \$60.

This amendment was seconded by George Malcolm.

Diane Lucas then proposed the following amendment:

That the Annual Membership Subscription for Affiliate be increased to \$25.

This amendment was seconded by Tony Jackman.

Patricia Shiel again raised the question of distinguishing between employed and non-employed members - would such a distinction be workable?

Frank Boffa considered that it would complicate things, if we had, for example, a 'Retired Affiliate' category.

Robin Gay then referred to the question of members going into a 'holding' situation, if they were not actively employed for a particular period.

12.

In reply Frank Boffa considered that there was no 'holding' situation as such - it would be preferable if the situation was clear-cut - merely a question of resigning or continuing full membership.

Diane Menzies pointed out that the members in the non-employed category do have to continue paying full subscriptions - this situation is highlighted by a member who is pregnant.

Charlie Challenger reminded the meeting that such a situation only really applies to 'bad debtors' - because they are constitutionally given six months to pay an overdue subscription before membership privileges are withdrawn, i.e., receiving the Journal and a continuance of voting rights.

Frank Boffa referred to the fact that members currently overseas do not forfeit their membership merely because of their absence.

He then put the following Constitutional Amendment forward for a vote by Corporate members:

The annual subscriptions for the various classes of membership of the Institute shall be as follows:

Fellow	\$60.00
Associate	\$50.00
Graduate	\$25.00
Affiliate	\$25.00
Student (in employ)	\$25.00
Student (enrolled on landscape course)	\$10.00
Retired member	\$20.00

The amendment was carried unanimously.

(b) Article 44 : Financial Year

Frank Boffa informed the meeting that the written amendment proposing that 'The financial year of the Institute shall close on the thirty-first day of December each year until otherwise determined by the Committee' had been withdrawn by the Executive Committee pending discussions with the Institute's auditors.

6. THE CONSTITUTION

Frank Boffa outlined the shortcomings and anomalies of the existing Constitution. He raised the point of our financial year not coinciding with the calendar year - it appears that it would tie in more satisfactorily for auditing purposes if it did.

Frank also detected a change in membership attitude to the form our conferences should take - such as considering a summer conference, out in the field. However, August would not be suitable because of the normally unfavourable weather. In this regard, February seems to be ideal.

He pointed out that it is vital to consider all these Constitutional questions comprehensively rather than in isolation. In fact, it may be better to re-write the Constitution in its entirety and thus simplify it.

This was followed by general discussion and Frank Boffa made the point that the auditors should be consulted on all these aspects.

Earl Bennett agreed with separating rules from Constitutional provisions.

Frank Boffa felt that it was necessary for the Executive Committee to seek an instruction from the meeting.

Instruction: That the Executive Committee is to compile a report on the Constitution for consideration by the Membership.

me d'it

7. GROUP ACTIVITIES

(a) Wellington Landscape Group

The Group Chairperson Diane Menzies, presented the first annual report of the Group as instructed at the 1976 AGM. An addendum to the report was also presented and this high-lighted the basic membership/structure problems affecting the Group, together with the Group's recommendations.

In the discussion that followed, Robin Gay mentioned that the rules governing the formation of the Group stated that all members would have to be financial members of the N.Z.I.L.A. and the Group Committee must comprise three Corporate members of the Institute.

Mike Cole agreed with the Group's recommendations on broadening the membership outside the Institute - he considered it essential that activities come from the grass roots level - especially inter-disciplinary projects.

Robin Gay asked if this would complicate restructuring.

Frank Boffa made the point that all these things really come back to restrictions imposed by the Institute's Constitution.

Robin Gay cited the example of the Group applying for a Mobil Oil Environmental Grant, and the Executive Committee not being informed of this before the event. He pointed out that applications of this nature should be controlled and co-ordinated.

Albert Vasbenter replied that as the Group was not an Institute Chapter this situation should not embarrass the Executive Committee. He pointed out that to be effective, local group decisions had to be made quickly - particularly in the protest situation - comment has to be made when an issue is topical.

Frank Boffa re-affirmed that the Group Committee members had to be financial members of the N.Z.I.L.A. and this provided the necessary inter-relationship.

Albert Vasbenter emphasised the need for autonomy to make statements at the time local environmental or landscape issues arose.

Robin Gay asked if the Group's activities could again be reviewed in a year's time.

Earl Bennett sought clarification of a provision within the report addendum and made the point that anybody can speak for the Institute if they have the authority of the Executive Committee.

Frank Boffa recommended acceptance of the report and addendum.

Dave Marchant questioned Diane Menzies about the basic functions of the Group which she described as follows:

Social Communication;

consideration of (through workshops and investigations) and comment on the Wellington landscape - in the broadest sense.

Albert Vasbenter pointed out that this local knowledge was essential when commenting on, for example, District Scheme Reviews.

Frank Boffa then invited Dave Marchant to represent the Auckland group - the basis would be informal - mainly social contact because of the current absence of rules. With an increased Auckland membership, local activities will become more formalised.

(b) Canterbury Landscape Group

Earl Bennett, the Canterbury Area Representative, presented his report on the year's activities, together with thoughts on the future structure and functions of the Group. He pointed out that one of the basic dif-

faculties was obtaining Executive Committee clearance for pursuing local activities - the geographic isolation being a major factor in this.

Diane Menzies still considered that the Groups should not yet be Chapters of the Institute.

Frank Boffa commented that the Wellington Landscape Group has considerable autonomy and can really do any project they wish, but they cannot speak for the Institute.

Earl Bennett felt that the Canterbury Group was too loose - this question needs resolving.

(c) Area Representatives

In general discussion, Diane Lucas said that there was a very small, loosely knit group in Hamilton, and so far, activities were limited to social evenings. However, she pointed out that they are interested in writing or contributing to press articles and getting areas of landscape concern and interest shown on television.

Frank Boffa said that the Institute would assist in the preparation of television programmes.

Alan Titchener, the Palmerston North representative considered that the whole question of group structure was getting too bogged down in rules and procedures.

Frank Boffa pointed out that we must all be clear on procedural aspects - these questions must be resolved.

(d) Summary

The Wellington and Canterbury Landscape Group reports were received by the meeting and there was a general consensus that, as far as the pilot exercise was concerned, the Wellington Group's recommendations were sound, and on this basis, the Group should continue for a further year and submit a report at the 1978 AGM.

8. SPECIAL REPORTS

(a) Alternative Methods for Electing the President

As requested by the 1976 AGM Tony Jackman presented a report on alternative election procedures. He has looked into methods used by other Institutes and favours a modified version of that used by the New Zealand Institute of Surveyors. Their method involves an election process by full Corporate member-

where to now

ship as well as offering continuity by appointed Retiring Presidents.

The meeting received his report with thanks.

(b) International Federation of Landscape Architects

A report was submitted by Earl Bennett, the Institute's I.F.L.A. Delegate. Information contained within the report included a summary of the year's activities; a preview of 'Conferences' to come; a submission on a changed voting procedure, and thoughts on the future. Earl maintained that it was important for the Institute to remain in I.F.L.A. because this is our one real link with the world community in professional terms.

He also considered that it was desirable to establish closer links with the Australian Institute of Landscape Architects.

The meeting expressed its thanks to Earl Bennett for his report.

9. INSTITUTE FELLOWS

In a general introduction, Frank Boffa referred to the invaluable groundwork achieved by the four Fellows prior to the formation of the Institute. Theirs had been very much a pioneering and, at times, thankless role in tirelessly promoting 'landscape concern' in its widest sense in their day-to-day activities.

Charlie Challenger, F.N.Z.I.L.A. - the verbal citation was presented by Hedley Evans.

George Malcolm, F.N.Z.I.L.A. - the verbal citation was presented by Neil Aitken.

Helmut Einhorn, F.N.Z.I.L.A. - the verbal citation was presented by Albert Vasbenter.

Hugh Baxter, F.N.Z.I.L.A. - the verbal citation was presented by Patricia Shiel.

10. CERTIFICATES FOR CORPORATE MEMBERSHIP

Frank Boffa opened the discussion by asking the question: should we embark on preparing certificates for Corporate members?

Robin Gay commented that the Australian Institute now issues them.

Frank Boffa concluded that there was a consensus that the Institute should proceed with this.

Bob Boocock reminded the meeting that membership certificates of this nature are not owned by individual members but are merely in their possession while they remain financial members of the Institute.

11. 1978 AGM AND CONFERENCE

Frank Boffa told the meeting that the Institute had agreed in principle to a joint Conference to be held in Dunedin next May with the New Zealand Planning Institute.

Mick Field and Bob Boocock have been representing our Institute and their report and draft Conference Programme was presented. The theme was basically 'Working Together' and a range of possible topics had been discussed.

Frank Boffa then asked the meeting if it wanted our 1978 Conference to proceed on this basis.

Bob Boocock expressed his concern that there might be only a small Institute representation at the Conference in only eight months' time. He pointed out that there could be 100 planners present and this could cause an imbalance in the composition of joint working groups.

Albert Vasbenter and Hedley Evans considered that even with a lesser number of Landscape Architects, joint contributions should still be possible.

Frank Boffa pointed out that the number of Corporate members present could, in fact, be less than 20.

Diane Menzies reminded the meeting that the Institute has been aiming towards having a more informal type of Conference.

Frank Boffa then asked the meeting: Do we defer our next Conference as such until 1979?

On this theme, Charlie Challenger felt that the Institute should start seriously thinking about biennial Conferences.

Hedley Evans maintained, that even with informal attendance at the 1978 N.Z.P.I. Conference, there would certainly be professional benefits.

Frank Boffa pointed out that attendance on a less formalised basis is still going to be expensive for the individuals concerned.

Robin Gay expressed his concern that joint N.Z.I.L.A./N.Z.P.I. running of the 1978 Conference may jeopardise our 1979 Conference on financial grounds.

(b) Landscape Staff Employed within the Public Service

Robin Gay explained that he, Neil Aitken and Hedley Evans had prepared draft notes on the establishment of a Landscape Architectural Occupational Class, within the Public Service. This had been informally submitted to the National Office of the Public Service Association.

The principle of improving the status of all landscape personnel had been accepted by the PSA as a basis for future negotiations with the State Services Commission.

Robin pointed out that the notes prepared had no official identity and were intended merely to initiate dialogue with the PSA on improving the current situation which was most unsatisfactory for all concerned.

He concluded by saying that it was essential for all affected members to be informed as soon as possible by the PSA on what action is proposed by that organisation.

(c) 1977 Conference Committee

Robin Gay proposed the thanks of the meeting to Frank Boffa, Conference Committee Chairperson, and his Committee, comprising: Neil Bromley, Boyden Evans, Ross Jackson, Diane Menzies and Emily Mulligan, for a most well organised, constructive and enjoyable Conference and AGM.

Frank Boffa, as AGM Chairperson, thanked all present for their attendance and contribution and closed the meeting at 1.25 pm.



N. A. Aitken
Secretary, N.Z.I.L.A. Inc.

Charlie Challenger re-emphasised that he considered it would be worthwhile departing from our established conference format and having an open air type conference, with families in, say, February 1979.

Mike Cole considered that we should pursue our involvement with the 1978 Conference if there is an alternative way of achieving this.

Mick Field pointed out that we could co-operate on a joint basis without full or formal Institute involvement. This could well fulfil both needs.

Frank Boffa then asked the meeting if there was a general consensus that this Institute should not have a formal Conference in 1978 but merely an AGM as is constitutionally required.

The meeting then agreed that the Institute should defer its next Conference until 1979.

Frank Boffa asked the meeting if Wellington would be a suitable location for the 1978 AGM - this was accepted unanimously.

12. GENERAL

(a) Landscape Technicians

Graham Mulvay told the meeting that the technicians present had held an informal meeting and the following points had emerged:

- (i) That the technicians wish to retain their identity as a group;
- (ii) That they wish to maintain a close association with the Institute;
- (iii) That they have decided to establish a small working group and present a report to the 1978 AGM.

He stressed that the landscape technicians do not wish to compete with landscape architects or reduce, in any way, the professionalism of landscape architecture.

Graham concluded by stating that the working group initially wishes to work alone to establish a basic framework. Following this, they will look to the Institute for guidelines.

His report was noted by the meeting.