

2016.01.60.00

NEW ZEALAND INSTITUTE OF LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS INC.MINUTES OF THE 1978 ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

The Meeting was held at Helen Lowry Hall, 19 Blakey Avenue, Karori, Wellington on 19 August 1978 and was opened (and chaired) by the President, Frank Boffa, at 10.10 a.m.

Executive Committee Present:

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

Members Present:

Jim Beard	Brian Halstead
Neil Bromley	Barry Knox
Graham Densem	Graham Laws
Steve Drakeford	Diane Menzies
Helmut Einhorn	Graham Mulvay
Nick Empson	David Sissons
Hedley Evans	Alan Titchener
Claire Findlay	

Apologies:

Earl Bennett	Don Miskell
Lois Binnie	Lance McCaskill
Bob Boocock	Sean O'Mahony
John Boyd	Alan Petrie
Mary Buckland	Gary Philpott
Mary Calver	Dennis Scott
Anna Clayton	Patricia Shiel
Martin Conway	Alex Wilson
George Malcolm	Jan Woodhouse
John Marsh	Ray Wright
Sally Mason	

1. ACCEPTANCE OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

There were no matters arising.

Motion: To accept the minutes of the 1977 Annual General Meeting subject to the addition of Graham Mulvay and Alan Titchener under Members Present.

Proposed: Robin Gay
Seconded: Tony Jackman

Carried

2.

2. ELECTION OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE : 1978 TO 1980

Frank Boffa announced the results of the special election for the seventh member of the Executive Committee. Once again, it was a tie - this time between Hedley Evans and Brian Halstead, who were both informed of this immediately prior to the AGM. Following discussions, Hedley felt that there would be an overall advantage in having Executive representation in Auckland, and on this basis, he decided to withdraw.

Frank Boffa commented that this was a noble gesture on Hedley's part, and was typical of him.

The Meeting then congratulated Brian Halstead on his election to the Executive Committee.

3. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

In his report, Frank Boffa covered:

- The involvement the Institute has had with conferences and seminars and the preparation of various submissions during the last year;
- Projected activities: the establishment of an undergraduate degree course at Lincoln College; forthcoming visit of the President of the Australian Institute of Landscape Architects; continuing examination programme; 1979 Conference and AGM;
- Thanks to the outgoing Executive Committee;
- Statistical information on the Institute;
- Problems of staff ceilings within the Public Service and the availability of consultants;
- The crucial need for "public" and "private" landscape architects to work as a unified team;
- A general weakness in members' professional ability with office procedure, contract administration, etc;
- The incorporation of landscape technicians within the Institute, and;
- The apparent lack of student interest.

3.

4. TREASURER'S REPORT

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

- (a) Balance Sheet as at 31 July 1978;
- (b) Income and Expenditure Account for the year ended 31 July 1978;
- (c) Conference Account for the year ended 31 July 1978.

Income for the period totalled \$4,030.72 and expenses were \$2,005.39; therefore, the excess of income over expenditure is \$2,025.33.

In general discussion, Jim Beard and Brian Halstead raised the question of depositing a portion of the accumulated funds on fixed deposit. Robin Gay agreed, but made the point that the Institute must always be in a position to meet unforeseen circumstances at short notice.

Instruction: That the incoming Treasurer investigates the question of depositing funds on a higher interest basis.

This was endorsed by the Meeting.

Diane Menzies mentioned the adding of a penalty to the subscriptions in an attempt to avoid membership arrears. Frank Boffa felt that the penalty was in being "struck off" the membership register.

Brian Halstead thought that a rebate for prompt payment may be more realistic.

Diane Menzies considered that terminating membership inevitably depleted the Institute's limited resources still further - she felt that it was in our interests to strive to retain this membership.

Alan Titchener suggested that an official interim reminder would be a good idea; this was accepted and will be adopted as Institute policy in the future.

Brian Halstead then raised the question of the high IFLA fees. Robin Gay felt that this should be discussed with Jean Verschuer, the President of the AILA, when she visits N.Z. later this year - also the question of the two Institutes being levied for the same members - as is currently the case with the N.Z. and Australian Institutes.

Frank Boffa emphasised that IFLA is an international body representing most professional institutes, and on this basis alone, our Institute's support was worthwhile.

4.

Neil Aitken mentioned that IFLA periodically sends out notices that are not distributed to Institute members - he also mentioned the successful efforts of Zvi Miller, (the IFLA Vice-President for the Eastern Region), in organising the first Regional Conference in Manila in 1977.

Hedley Evans then referred to the forthcoming landscape conference in Australia, and wondered if any NZILA members were going to attend.

Diane Menzies asked if the Institute would support a member attending this conference.

Robin Gay, however, felt that the conference was not yet fully organised - this will obviously require clarification.

Motion: To accept the Treasurer's report for the year ended 31 July 1978, and continue to use the services of Clarke Menzies and Co., as the Institute's auditors.

Proposed: Frank Boffa
Seconded: Tony Jackman

Carried

5. SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS(a) Policy, Liaison and Parliamentary Bills

Sub-committee chairperson, Frank Boffa, stated that he had already referred to various submissions and activities in the President's Report. However, he stressed the importance of the Institute making urgent comment on the N.Z. Planning Council's report "Planning Perspectives 1978-1983".

(b) Education, Examinations and Research

Sub-committee chairperson, Tony Jackman, in referring to the examinations, said that there were eight potential candidates for the Professional Practice Examination. He suggested that December would again appear to be the most suitable time of the year and asked if Victoria University's School of Architecture could again be used. Tony also asked if Jim Beard and Albert Vasbenter would be prepared to sit on the interviewing panel for the 1978 Examination.

In referring to the Special Temporary Examinations for Associate membership, Tony thought that there could be seven candidates this year.

5.

(c) Professional Services

Sub-committee chairperson, Robin Gay, said that little had happened on the surface as far as the Code of Ethics was concerned, but there are changes apparent in the near future - particularly so as far as design and build involvement by Corporate members is concerned.

In discussing the salary structure and occupational classification for landscape architects within the Public Service, Robin referred to the basically successful negotiations with the State Services Commission. He pointed out that the Institute could not be involved with such negotiations within the provisions of the legislation - only the employee organisation and the employer are permitted to be present. However, Robin also pointed out that SSC will require guidance from the Institute on the question of the Institute's professional qualifications in relation to the various gradings within the new salary scale.

Robin Gay then referred to the question of overseas landscape architects wishing to seek employment within N.Z. He had discussed this with the Immigration Department who informed him that landscape architecture is not on the list of "Required Professions" - there is therefore, no automatic right of entry. However, he had found the Department most co-operative.

Diane Menzies asked what was the Department's attitude to a potential employer. Robin Gay considered that the Department was most helpful - but also very alert as to what was going on generally. He also felt that it was essential to know the right channels from which to get sound and quick advice.

Robin then referred to discussions and correspondence with the Vocational Guidance Section of the Department of Labour on the preparation of a brochure on landscape architecture. Earl Bennett had been dealing with their district office in Christchurch, and the Department's results, in draft form, were most unsatisfactory. This will now be pursued by the Institute.

(d) Editorial

Sub-committee chairperson, Charlie Challenger, explained that production of "The Landscape" has suffered from considerable delays throughout the year, but the situation has now been rectified - Issue No. 6 is due in October and Issue No. 7 before Christmas.

There has also been a serious drop in the number of subscribers (up to 100) and Charlie attributed this to the current economic situation and perhaps also, reader disfavour with only one subject per issue. Broadening the contents is, therefore, being considered.

6.

Charlie then emphasised that the need for more subscribers is desperate.

Robin Gay thanked Charlie Challenger on behalf of the Meeting, for his continuing efforts.

Brian Halstead asked what was the general spread among subscribers. In reply, Charlie said that it was very wide, particularly with numerous libraries, professional people such as lawyers, surveyors, etc.; local authorities seem very interested with their Parks and Recreation, Planning and Engineering Departments subscribing.

Charlie then endorsed the worth of "Cuttings" -its flexibility is its greatest asset.

In referring to "The Landscape", Graham Densem said that a publication of high quality is paramount.

Jim Beard pointed out that it would be wise to have all personal snippets in "Cuttings" thus eliminating them from "The Landscape". Jim felt that personal items could be irritating to (subscribers) non members

6. CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

In emphasising the need for the proposed amendments, the Treasurer, Emily Mulligan, said that adjustments to fees should be a matter for an AGM to decide, not something requiring a Constitutional amendment.

Likewise, the proposed changes to the Institute's financial year would now tie this in with the academic year and therefore, make the whole procedure much more logical.

Frank Boffa endorsed the proposed change as greatly simplifying the process.

The Meeting then voted unanimously in favour of the amendment to Article 14.

In referring to the proposed amendment to Article 44, Emily Mulligan stated that this was necessary to tie in with the amendment to Article 14. Emily also explained that, if the amendment was adopted, members would not pay membership dues for the final quarter of 1978.

Charlie Challenger asked why the new financial year was not to be 1 January to 31 December each year. Emily replied that the auditors seem to regard a given year as starting and finishing on the same day.

Diane Menzies asked when the subscription due notices would be sent out in view of the time lag. In reply, Emily stated that they could be sent out at any time.

7.

The Meeting then voted unanimously in favour of the amendment to Article 44.

7. LOCAL GROUP REPORTS(a) Auckland

Brian Halstead stated that things in Auckland had been very inactive - hence his acceptance of nomination to the Executive Committee.

Frank Boffa wished Brian the best of luck in his capacity as an Executive member, representing the Institute in Auckland.

(b) Wellington

In Albert Vasbenter's absence from the AGM, Graham Mulvay referred the continuing Townscape Study to Helmut Einhorn for comment. Helmut said that the WLG had received a Mobiloil Environmental Grant and the study has still to be completed and finally written up. There have been two or three informal meetings, and Diane Menzies has been of great assistance in providing the necessary base maps through the Wellington City Council.

Diane then referred to Emily Mulligan and Steve Drakeford's efforts on the skyline restoration project, in association with the Architectural Centre. Diane also pointed out that the Group needed more active involvement by Institute members - particularly recent ones. There is an unavoidable conflict between the demands of the Executive Committee and the Group on the very limited time available to Wellington-based corporate members.

(c) Canterbury

Tony Jackman said that the group had "wallowed in a trough of despondency" after the mass migration to Wellington some three years ago by former Christchurch members. Recently, however, the group held a very successful function at Riccarton House. Also they have received a Mobiloil Environmental Grant to study "colour in the landscape", and this is proceeding.

Helmut Einhorn then referred to the Wellington Landscape Group's Skyline project, and pointed out that the study was not done in conjunction with the Architectural Centre, but with the N.Z. Historic Places Trust. The scheme has now been accepted by the Wellington City Council, and thus had in effect, put the group's name on the map.

8.

8. STATUS OF MEMBERS OVERSEAS

In opening the discussion, Neil Aitken said that the Institute had no firm policy on this question. Members can become subscribers after resigning in good standing.

Frank Boffa explained that there were more administrative problems with sending notices to overseas members, and, of course, postage is now very expensive.

Robin Gay pointed out that the Australian Institute has an overseas membership category which costs half the normal dues.

Brian Halstead commented that the N.Z. Institute of Architects does have a permanent overseas membership.

In conclusion, Robin Gay considered that this question should be kept under review.

9. LANDSCAPE TECHNICIANS' REPORT

Steve Drakeford, (on behalf of the Technicians), gave a resume of the discussions held at the 1977 AGM.

He then explained that he and Graham Mulvay wrote to all the technicians inviting comment on various points. Regrettably they received only four replies to 24 letters! Steve was not sure why the response was so poor - perhaps it indicated contentment with the status quo or just disinterest. However, Steve and Graham hope to hold an informal meeting at the Institute's 1979 AGM.

Frank Boffa then invited comment from the Meeting.

Robin Gay asked where were the technicians located. In reply, Steve Drakeford felt that many were not employed in the landscape field at all, which was definitely a cause for concern. Graham Mulvay felt that the pattern of distribution was similar to that of the Institute membership.

Steve commented that he knew of some who were overseas and some were working in the horticultural field.

Charlie Challenger commented that there were nine technology students currently at Lincoln College, and this indicated a continuing interest.

Graham Mulvay agreed with Steve and felt that the technician's employment situation remains unclear.

Diane Menzies felt that there were too few technicians to exist alone - they needed backing - perhaps from within the Institute.

Robin Gay commented that the Department of Lands and Survey has only two and he felt that having more technicians on the staff would provide greater cohesion.

9.

Graham Densem asked what was wrong with technicians being members of the Institute - however, he felt that the whole question required greater investigation.

Frank Boffa was convinced that the technicians need our support - perhaps in the future, the Institute would change its name! Frank was emphatic that the Institute has a duty to bring the technicians together and should therefore take the initiative and establish a membership category for them.

Graham Densem expressed puzzlement as to why the Institute's attitude had changed so much since the 1976 AGM.

Frank Boffa recalled the umbrella group he proposed at the 1976 AGM - the question currently under consideration is not nearly as broad because the contractors had now formed their own group.

Jim Beard asked if Steve Drakeford could elaborate on the lack of interest among technicians - in reply Steve felt that most of them were tired of the whole situation.

Graham Densem wondered if the status of membership would provide some incentive - Steve agreed that it probably would because currently, they had no defined role and purpose.

Diane Menzies wondered what would be an appropriate membership category - perhaps a technician's class of their own.

Frank Boffa then referred to the question of technicians having voting rights.

Charlie Challenger commented that the present landscape technology students, as a group, are very apathetic. After all, the technicians have been on their own since the 1976 AGM, while the NZILA has become an established professional body. Charlie was convinced that we have to do something for them.

Diane Menzies felt that if they became members of the Institute, they should surely have full voting rights. Frank Boffa considered that this question would require detailed discussions.

Robin Gay suggested that the technicians could have a representative on the Executive Committee in the future.

Frank Boffa then asked what were the implications of the Massey University qualifications.

Charlie Challenger commented that there were many links in the qualification chain - where do all these different people fit in?

Robin Gay felt that the Executive Committee obviously has a lot of homework yet to do on this whole question.

10.

Frank Boffa asked if the Meeting wished to direct the Executive Committee on the landscape technicians question, and the following motion was proposed and carried:

Motion: That the incoming Executive Committee pursue the question of incorporating landscape technicians within the NZILA.

Proposed: Tony Jackman
Seconded: Graham Densem

Carried

The Meeting also noted, that in view of this motion, more information is required from Steve Drakeford and Graham Mulvay.

10. INCOMING EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Frank Boffa commented that, in the past, there has been an undesirable time lag in electing office bearers. On this occasion, therefore, he would ask the new Executive Committee to elect office bearers during the lunch hour and announce the results straight after lunch.

11. RESULTS OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ELECTION OF OFFICE BEARERS

Following lunch, Frank Boffa announced that the following office bearers had been elected for the 1978-1980 term of office:

President	- Robin Gay
Vice-President	- Neil Aitken
Secretary	- Diane Menzies
Treasurer	- Helmut Einhorn

12. PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Frank Boffa explained that the question of design and build involvement by corporate members had been raised recently with the Executive Committee by Alan Titchener. Alan had prepared a carefully researched paper and submitted this to the Executive Committee. It was then felt, that due to the wide implications of this basic change in professional attitude, it should be considered by the AGM.

Alan Titchener then emphasised that it would be in the interests of corporate members (in certain circumstances) to implement their own designs.

Frank Boffa pointed out that the Code of Ethics did not, in fact, preclude members from working in the design and build situation.

Brian Halstead commented that design and build can be quite professional, or alternatively, it can be unprofessional, depending upon the structure and form of the agreement. He continued, that in Auckland, there is a serious lack of competent landscape

contractors - perhaps only two or three. It has, therefore, been necessary for him to co-ordinate his own sub-contracts.

Helmut Einhorn pointed out that the operation Brian was referring to was quite different from design and build. In large operations, the design component can become subservient to other major aspects in the execution of the works - such as could be the case with larger landscape projects. In continuing, Helmut pointed out that many architects are now acting as contract organisers. He said, that in Brian Halstead's case, he was merely extending his service to clients - but there was no conflict of interests in this form of service. With design and build operations proper such as are undertaken by large construction firms (like Civil and Civic), they also employ designers. The danger, however, in this type of operation is when things go wrong financially; when this happens, are you still truly and faithfully serving your client, or do you avoid bankruptcy (if it is as serious as that), by loading costs to suit your own interests. This sort of situation means, in effect, that you have forfeited your right to act as your client's agent in a dispute case - whereas, within the N.Z. Institute of Architects, the architect is automatically arbitrator.

Helmut then defined the three basic options in a client/adviser relationship:

- purely professional (in the traditional sense);
- as contract organiser (where the consultant fulfils the role of the main contractor in organising sub-contracts direct);
- design and build.

Alan Titchener then pointed out, that on a smaller scale he could, for instance, offer his services on a labour basis (comprising both design and implementation) and arrange the purchase of materials at no profit to himself. However, he affirmed he would have to state his modus operandi right at the beginning of a particular job.

Brian Halstead disagreed by stating that it is acceptable if profit is made in both fields; either as a contractor or not. He readily admitted that he had been tempted to go into limited contracting himself, in order to achieve better results.

Jim Beard pointed out, that if there is a design content in any given situation, someone inevitably, will have to pay - it is, after all, quality that is of prime importance - and how can this be controlled anyhow?

Jim continued by commenting that "professionalism" is not worth a lengthy debate - this image is strictly Victorian in origin and application. He pointed out, that in the hard business of contracting, no one is deferring to professionalism anyhow - his

12.

experience is that it is a fight all the way. What is wrong with being a contractor and a so-called professional. Admittedly, Jim conceded, that difficulty might arise with a quasi-judicial situation; but, there is no reason why the designer can't also contract.

Brian Halstead pointed out that many clients prefer design and build.

Jim Beard emphasised that the Meeting was, of course, discussing landscape architects and not just the architects situation.

Graham Densem recalled that, over the years, the Institute had faced this problem repeatedly, with members encountering great difficulty in getting their designs satisfactorily implemented.

Frank Boffa emphasised that the Code of Ethics does not forbid this - the one clause in the application form for Corporate membership was essentially the reason for the current discussion and dissatisfaction. This, of course, can simply be deleted from the form.

The clause in question reads as follows:

"I declare that the above statement is a true account of my professional training and experience, that I derive no profit from any trade connected with landscape gardening or horticulture, or any contracting services connected with landscape architecture, and that if elected, I agree to be bound by the Constitution rules and bylaws for the time-being in force."

Alan Titchener then asked why the clause was inserted in the first place.

Robin Gay considered that the Institute had not had test cases yet and he felt that the Executive Committee should now do some homework on this, or alternatively, the situation can be left as is, until a particular case arises.

Frank Boffa then asked what was the feeling of the Meeting on deletion of the clause.

Brian Halstead recalled, that when the Institute was formed, there was a great deal of discussion on this very question.

Jim Beard considered that, in the future it would be good to have firms doing the total job with their own designers, and landscape architects should be encouraged to do just this.

Jim Beard then put the following motion (through the chairperson) to the Meeting:

Motion: That the clause in question be deleted from the Corporate Membership application form.

Proposed: Jim Beard
Seconded: Brian Halstead

Frank Boffa then asked for any further discussion.

Robin Gay felt that the implications of such a motion required further consideration.

Diane Menzies suggested, that perhaps an amendment to the form was needed and asked if the Executive Committee could report to the next AGM.

Frank Boffa felt that the clause was unreasonable and recommended its deletion.

Jim Beard pointed out that, if the clause was deleted, a new one could be incorporated to meet the new requirements, if the Executive Committee chooses.

Helmut Einhorn felt that the Meeting was being extremely rash if it passed the motion. Such a decision will irrevocably alter the whole legal client/professional adviser situation and the principles involved. Helmut then cautioned the meeting by stating that such an important decision should not be rushed.

Jim Beard countered this point - he felt that the whole client/adviser relationship was an ever-changing and widening situation - he emphasised that design and build is being done right now by people who are not in the Institute.

Helmut Einhorn disagreed - he felt that under the present situation, it was accepted that a large firm such as Fletchers could engage a landscape architectural consultant as their agent on a particular project.

Charlie Challenger pointed out that it should be acknowledged that there is real expertise necessary in landscape contracting alone - he emphasised that a good landscape architect was not necessarily a good contractor.

Nick Empson felt that it was largely a problem of scale - the current situation was particularly limiting in small-scale operations: if the clients interests are not being prejudiced, it is better for the landscape architect to implement his or her own design.

Frank Boffa re-affirmed that the Institute is not sure of its precise policy in this whole area; Constitutionally, we can work on a design and build basis now.

Emily Mulligan then stated her support for Jim Beard's motion.

Hedley Evans considered that its deletion would greatly assist people such as Alan Titchener.

14.

Brian Halstead asked if the Meeting was worried about any particular aspect.

Jim Beard reassured the Meeting that an amended clause could be re-inserted by the Executive Committee without further reference to an AGM.

Frank Boffa then put Jim Beard's motion to the Meeting again:

Motion: That the clause in question be deleted from the Corporate membership application form.

The Meeting then voted as follows:

Against: 3
For: 7

Carried

13. PRESENTATION OF MEMBERSHIP CERTIFICATES

Frank Boffa presented Corporate membership certificates to those who were at the Meeting.

14. DESTRUCTION OF BALLOT PAPERS

Neil Aitken pointed out that an AGM motion for the destruction of the ballot papers is a constitutional requirement.

Motion: That the ballot papers for the 1978 Executive Committee elections be destroyed.

Proposed: Emily Mulligan
Seconded: Graham Densem

Carried

Secretary to now notify scrutineers in writing.

15. 1979 AGM AND CONFERENCE

Hedley Evans, as convenor of the Conference Sub-committee, spoke to the paper which had previously been distributed to members. He emphasised the importance of the natural environment and relaxed surroundings at Nelson Lakes National Park, and continued by reading relevant excerpts from Julius Fabos' letter.

Frank Boffa explained that the other members of the Committee are: Jim Beard, Ray Wright and Claire Findlay. Frank then asked for comment on the proposed arrangements.

Diane Menzies endorsed the theme of the conference on design and its practical application - she said that the "doing thing" was so important and perhaps the conference could be entitled "Landscape on the Ground".

Hedley Evans said that Jim Beard had thought of something like "Design Retreat" which sounded really good.

15.

Brian Halstead hoped that Julius Fabos would go over all the ground he referred to in his letter.


Frank Boffa then thanked Hedley Evans on behalf of the Meeting, and said that the Institute had now adopted a policy of having a biennial Conference and we should, therefore, be planning our 1981 Conference now.

16. GENERAL

The Secretary, Neil Aitken, welcomed Claire Findlay to Graduate membership of the Institute.

On behalf of the Meeting, Neil then thanked outgoing Executive Committee members Emily Mulligan and Charlie Challenger for their very hard work and dedication during their terms of office. Charlie, as a foundation member of the Institute, and for providing initial guidance and impetus in the education and publication fields in particular. And Emily, for managing the financial aspects of the Institute so systematically and for definitely not being the token woman on the Executive Committee.

The AGM chairperson, Frank Boffa, declared the meeting closed at 2.25 p.m. and thanked all those present for their attendance and contribution.



N. A. Aitken
Secretary, NZILA Inc.