NEW ZEALAND INSTITUTE OF LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS INC.

MINUTES OF THE 1979 GENERAL MEETING

The Meeting was held at Rotoiti Lodge, Nelson Lakes National Park, on 12 May 1979, and was opened and chaired by the President, Robin Gay, at 9.30 am.

Executive Committee Present:

Robin Gay - President
Neil Aitken - Vice-President and Acting Secretary
Tony Jackman - Member

Members Present:

Clive Anstey
John Archer
Don Barham
Jim Beard
Nick Beveridge
Gilbert Brakey
Charlie Challenger
Anna Clayton
Jim Clement
Dave Clutterbuck
John Darby
Sarah de Lambert
Graham Densem
Steve Drakeford
Stephen Dunn
Nick Empson
Hedley Evans
Claire Findlay
Ian Howell
Barry Knox
Diane Lucas
Hugh Lusk
George Malcolm
John Marsh
Sean O'Mahony
Terry Palethorpe
Herwi Scheltus
Patricia Shiel
Mike Steven
Christine Thomas
Steve Thompson
Alan Titchener
Janet Ward
Alec Wilson
Jan Woodhouse
Marion Worth
Ray Wright

Observers Present:

Julius Fabos
John Hudson
Grant Milligan
Mary Monzingo

Apologies:

Earl Bennett
Frank Boffa
Bob Boocock
Mary Calver
Helmut Einhorn
Diane Menzies
Lance McCaskill
Alan Morgan
Alan Petrie
Peter Rough
Paul Tritenbach

1. PRESIDENTIAL REPORT

Robin Gay presented his report which was distributed to those present at the Meeting. He also explained why this was a General Meeting and not an AGM.

2. TREASURER'S REPORT

Robin Gay presented this report (as at 30 April 1979) on behalf of Helmut Einhorn. Total assets were $5,187.05 and liabilities (including projected expenditure) were $2,418.65.

George Malcolm questioned whether the outstanding subscriptions item of $1,004.05 was current. Robin Gay replied that it was.

Tony Jackman referred to the healthy state of the Institute's finances compared with past years.

Motion: That the Treasurer's Report be received by the Meeting.

Proposed: George Malcolm
Seconded: Hedley Evans

Carried

3. SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS

(a) Policy, Liaison and Parliamentary Bills

Robin Gay, on behalf of committee chairperson Frank Boffa, tabled Frank's report on the re-writing of the Constitution, currently being undertaken by the Executive Committee. So far, the all-important objects of the Institute have been re-written in draft form and this was distributed to those members present at the Meeting.

Jan Woodhouse considered that the word "objectives" was more correct than "objects" and this is now to be looked into by the Executive Committee.

Clive Anstey felt that the objects as re-written still don't explain what landscape architecture is. He then emphasised the importance of protection of the public being a primary aim.

Charlie Challenger commented that perhaps we shouldn't define landscape architecture because it is an ever-changing thing.

The draft was received unanimously by the Meeting.

Tony Jackman pointed out that the re-written draft Constitution will be distributed in sequence to members as each stage is completed.

Charlie Challenger suggested that it would be more satisfactory and economical (on printing and paper, etc.), to give members the opportunity to comment on the final over-all draft. This suggestion was adopted by the Meeting.

(b) Education, Examinations and Research

Sub-committee chairperson, Tony Jackman distributed his report to the Meeting.

Gilbert Brakey enquired if there were any additional textbooks suitable for the Institute's temporary examinations. Tony replied that sociology is the one subject difficult to get suitable reading for.

John Archer, then raised the question of candidates' travelling costs to attend the examinations - he wondered if it would be better to have these in more than one centre. In reply, Tony Jackman pointed out that examination location is also tied in with the Professional Practice examinations, which have been traditionally held in Wellington, and he could see problems with duplication. However, if numbers warranted it (say, five candidates in Christchurch), he felt that the Institute could arrange something.

Jan Woodhouse stated that candidates do pay fees. Charlie Challenger recalled that the fees are $25 per candidate.

John Archer wondered if the fee should be $25 per person per paper!! But he also stressed the value of the examinations.

(c) Professional Services

In referring to the design and build question, or more properly, the whole area of professional responsibility, Tony Jackman noted that there was widespread confusion during the debate on this subject at the 1978 AGM. Inevitably, the outcome was confused voting. However, since then, there had been some good follow-up by members - particularly Sean O'Mahony. Tony then explained Sean's diagrams showing various professional and contractural methods of operation, which are summarised as follows:

Diagram 1: This showed the traditional professional/client-relationship.

Diagram 2(a): Outlined the situation where landscape architects undertake work organisation, involving the sub-trades, but not actually doing the work themselves.

Diagram 2(b): Outlined the situation where the landscape architect does the work. Here the dilemma arises - does the landscape architect have the ability and impartiality to supervise and execute his/her own work?

In this regard, Sean considered that landscape architects are different from architects and engineers because our smaller-scale landscape projects tend to have a "craft" component.

Jim Beard pointed out, that in this situation the designer was executor and could therefore purchase materials direct, or alternatively, the client could do the purchasing. The scale of work would probably determine this.

Diagram 3: This illustrated the situation of a landscape architect working for a larger multi-discipline firm such as Fletchers.

Robin Gay noted that Brian Halstead had mentioned that the New Zealand Planning Institute will be considering the whole question of professionalism at its 1979 Conference.

Alec Wilson raised the pertinent point of when (or at what scale) is a landscape architect no longer a designer/craftsperson.

Robin Gay then reminded the Meeting of the deletion of the "offending" portion of the corporate membership application clause, to allow the operational freedom desired by members at the 1978 AGM.

Nick Empson pointed out that members apparently support being designer/contractors, but don't like the reverse situation.

Robin Gay emphasised, that to be effective, the present system relies on personal honesty and integrity.

Alec Wilson endorsed this by saying that members must act ethically within the rules of the Institute.

Tony Jackman then asked the Meeting if it saw a need for tighter rules and Neil Aitken requested that members should write to the Executive Committee if they had any further thoughts on this whole question.

Tony then distributed a paper prepared by Helmut Einhorn which re-affirmed and enlarged on the original draft code of ethics (prepared in 1974) and emphasised the importance of Sean O'Mahony's recent comments.

Jim Beard considered that the salient point in all this, was whether the client was getting value for money - this was surely the Institute's primary concern.

Hedley Evans then asked Julius Fabos what the current situation was in the USA.

In reply, Julius considered that our Institute was more open than the American Society of Landscape Architects, but there was a trend within the Society to relax the current restrictions. He also supported the Institute's approach and attitude to the question of professional responsibility.

Alan Titchener reminded the Meeting that he did write to ASLA, and they indicated that they too favoured less restrictive rules.

Clive Anstey asked if the Landscape Contractors Group of the New Zealand Nurserymens Association had a Code of Ethics. In reply, Tony Jackman felt that as the Group had only recently been formed, it was unlikely that there would be an operative Code. Alan Titchener said that the Group did have some guidelines however.

Clive Anstey suggested that perhaps landscape architects working in the design and build situation should be members of the Landscape Contractors Group also.

Charlie Challenger reminded the Meeting that the basic question is - where are the profits coming, because in the "open" situation, there is surely more opportunity to "fiddle the books".

Mary Monzingo made the point that we can't legislate for ethics - they must come from within the individual.

(d) Editorial Sub-committee

Journal Editor, Charlie Challenger, presented his report which dealt in some length with the financial aspects and the re-structuring of the Sub-committee.

'The Landscape' financial statement as at 6 May 1979 was as follows:

Assets	$1,573.16
Liabilities	1,456.12
Credit Balance	$117.04

Charlie pointed out that the $100 ex-central funds had not yet been received; nor had the $500 open space grant been credited to issue No. 8. He also emphasised the financial importance of getting subscriptions renewed. Hopefully, the "expanded" issue No. 8 will be an enticement.

Diane Lucas reported that there had been many favourable comments on The 'Landscape' from delegates at the 1978 IFLA Congress.

Julius Fabos asked what was the primary purpose of the journal; what are the chances of increasing subscriptions to reduce costs?

Charlie Challenger replied that initially the Institute sent "fliers" through other publications to promote 'The Landscape'.

Julius then asked if news-stand sales had been pursued - as with 'Landscape Australia'.

Charlie then enlarged on this previous point by saying that the thrust of promotion had been basically in three areas:

- direct advertising
- advertising in other journals
- fliers.

Julius Fabos emphasised that the whole thing must be treated as a <u>business</u> enterprise rather than an <u>Institute</u> enterprise; what about an independent grant?

Robin Gay replied that the Institute does have a $500 grant from the Ministry of Recreation and Sport, which is to be used for this purpose.

He also referred to the increased annual grant from Institute funds requested by Charlie Challenger in his report.

Alan Titchener felt that members generally supported the increased grant.

Mary Monzingo saw an advantage in de-centralising advertising, and offered her services in Wanganui for this purpose.

Jan Woodhouse reported that there had been little success to date in promoting advertising. Also, she had explored the possibility of working through agents, which was found to be extremely costly.

Gilbert Brakey felt that it would be wasted advertising for most firms. Jan Woodhouse disagreed - she felt that there were good opportunities, particularly with advertising new products. She then made a plea for direct contact by members to promote 'The Landscape'. This had proved most successful in the past.

George Malcolm proposed the thanks of the Meeting to the Editorial Sub-committee.

Hedley Evans pointed out that Government Departments could increase subscriptions by distributing to their district offices and not just head office.

Charlie Challenger appealed to the membership to apply more pressure in gaining new subscriptions. He also stressed the continuing need for articles and accompanying illustrations.

Robin Gay then put the following motion to the Meeting:

Motion: That the Institute increase its grant to 'The Landscape' based on $7.50/member/annum.

Proposed: Alan Titchener
Seconded: John Boyd

Carried

4. LOCAL GROUP REPORTS

(a) Canterbury Landscape Group

Tony Jackman distributed his report on the Group's activities.

(At 11.15 am Robin Gay interrupted the Meeting to allow those members who had made earlier travel connections to depart. The Meeting resumed at 11.35 am.)

Tony then referred to the landscape technicians - he felt that, as an Institute we have tended to let the situation "float".

(b) Otago/Southland Landscape Group

Neil Aitken read a letter from Bob Boocock which set out the basis for the informal establishment of this numerically - increased group.

(c) Wellington Landscape Group

There was no comment from the Group.

5. REMITS

Robin Gay introduced the three remits which were duly signed and carried by the membership during the workshop session held on 11 May 1979.

The remit proposed by Tony Jackman was subsequently re-written and clarified by Tony but not altered as to intent.

The remits are as follows:

(a) That the attainment of professional competence in the graduate's particular field of work be the basis of criteria for the admission to Associate status of the Institute.

Proposed: Tony Jackman
Seconded: Alan Titchener

This remit was endorsed by the Meeting.

(b) That the Institute support the introduction of a three-year post-graduate programme to replace the existing two-year Diploma in Landscape Architecture.

Proposed: Alan Titchener
Seconded: Graham Densem

Alan then enlarged on this remit and it too was endorsed by the Meeting.

(c) That the Institute make representation to the (Lincoln) College Council or any other University that a Chair of Landscape Architecture be established.

Proposed: George Malcolm
Seconded: Neil Aitken

Robin Gay then called for general discussion on the remits.

Mike Steven felt that there were considerable advantages with a post-graduate programme - three years will raise the general level and standards of the graduates.

John Boyd, on the other hand, considered that three years was too long on top of an undergraduate degree. Experience after graduating is crucial - the precise time of post-graduate study is relatively immaterial.

Julius Fabos then referred to various American programmes - the average being three years, but selected students could enter at second year level - especially those with a design base.

Mike Steven endorsed students being admitted (where appropriate), at second year level.

Alec Wilson felt that if the Meeting was talking about just prolonging the existing Dip. LA, this would be unsatisfactory. But there would be value in an additional year for those who wished to specialise beyond the existing Dip. LA syllabus.

Charlie Challenger stated that he also would not support the principle of extending two years to three. But, he would support a Masterate programme because there were better University grants provisions with a degree. However, it would necessitate a staff increase at Lincoln College - and the current staffing situation was definitely unfavourable. In supporting the post-graduate programme, Charlie said that the course must have architects and engineers to provide the essential breadth of undergraduate background.

Robin Gay then read the remit proposing a Chair in Landscape Architecture. (Immediate discussion on this remit was deferred.)

Jim Beard stressed the need for course flexibility and felt that we should retain the Dip. LA option - this needs further consideration.

The following motion amalgamating remits (b) and (c) was then proposed:

<u>Motion</u>: That the Executive Committee investigates the establishment of a Chair in Landscape Architecture and a Masters degree programme.

Proposed: Jim Beard
Seconded: John Boyd

<u>Carried</u>

The motion was then amended with the insertion of the words "three-year" to read:

That the Executive Committee investigates the establishment of a Chair in Landscape Architecture and a three-year Masters degree programme.

Mike Steven commented that the duration of the course was important rather than the name of the qualification.

Alan Titchener and Graham Densem, after further discussion, decided to withdraw their remit and put forward the following amendment to the previous motion through insertion of the word "maximum".

<u>Motion</u>: That the Executive Committee investigates the establishment of a Chair in Landscape Architecture and a three-year maximum Masters degree programme.

Proposed: Alan Titchener
Seconded: George Malcolm

<u>Carried</u>

Robin Gay then interrupted the Meeting again (to enable those who had made earlier bookings to depart) and to acknowledge the great efforts made by the organising committee and the meal preparation carried out so willingly by the home science students from Otago University.

Robin then asked Jan Woodhouse to propose the vote of thanks to Claire, Gaynor and Jenny (from Otago University); and on John Darby (student member) to propose the vote of thanks to the organising committee, consisting of:

Hedley Evans - Chairperson
Neil Bromley
Steve Drakeford
Claire Findlay
Barry Knox
Julia Williams
- and the regional representatives:
Nigel Hutton
Hugh Lusk
Steve Thompson
Ray Wright - and
so many others

Robin Gay then continued the discussion on remits.

Tony Jackman referred to remit (a), and said that in its original form, the remit was imprecise, hence the need to clarify it.

Alan Titchener emphasised the importance of the professional practice candidates displaying competence in their particular fields; and this competence being accepted and acknowledged by the Interviewing Panel.

Mike Steven also felt, that rather than strict adherence to the criteria for associate membership as set out in the Institute's membership brochure, the Interviewing Panel should concentrate on the areas that the candidate is actually involved with.

Hedley Evans endorsed this as a means of broadening the scope of landscape architectural practice.

Remit (a) was then put forward as the following motion:

<u>Motion</u>: That the attainment of professional competence in graduate's particular field of work be the basis of criteria for the admission to Associate status of the Institute.

Proposed: Tony Jackman
Seconded: Alec Wilson

<u>Carried</u>

6. FUTURE AGMS AND CONFERENCES

In opening the discussion, Robin Gay referred to the table on the last page of his Presidential Report, which set out the Institute's programme for the period 1978-1982. He then put it to the Meeting that it had been suggested that the Institute's next AGM (in early 1980) should be combined with a two-day workshop/refresher course, to be held in Christchurch.

Tony Jackman felt that this would be too introspective.

Hedley Evans, however, endorsed the workshop idea.

Charlie Challenger pointed out that something along these lines could be very worthwhile.

Robin Gay then asked the Meeting if it considered that we should go more "public" in 1980.

Mike Steven also endorsed the workshop and AGM idea. He felt that this combination would be necessary to draw members.

Robin Gay then asked if it was the feeling of the Meeting that we proceed on the basis of a refresher-type AGM in 1980, to be held in Canterbury area. The Meeting agreed in principle with this.

Robin pursued the question of whether a refresher/workshop should have primarily a "public" or a "private" function.

Jim Beard felt that "public" can mean direct media communication as distinct from inviting dignatories to open a conference.

John Archer considered that it was important for related disciplines to be involved.

Alan Titchener reminded the Meeting that there was little knowledge of landscape architecture in his home territory - Hawkes Bay - the message could easily be disseminated throughout New Zealand from there.

The general consensus of the Meeting was, that ideally the 1980 AGM and workshop/conference should be a blend of both "private" and "public", but retaining a theme of informality, which was considered essential.

7. GENERAL

(a) IFLA Technical Conference in Australia : 1982

Robin Gay felt that this would be a unique opportunity for the NZILA to participate and suggested that a group travel booking should be looked into.

Hedley Evans wondered if there was the opportunity for a joint (NZILA/AILA) Conference coinciding with the IFLA Conference.

Robin felt that this could well be on and supported the idea of some joint undertaking.

Diane Lucas suggested that it would be a good idea to encourage a post-conference tour of New Zealand.

(b) Technical Information Service

There was then general discussion on the worth of the Institute establishing a technical information service. Diane Lucas and Herwi Scheltus then endorsed the following motion:

Motion: That the Institute investigates the establishment of a technical information service.

Proposed: Graham Densem
Seconded: John Boyd

The motion, however, was not carried.

Alec Wilson wondered if it would be better for the Institute to subscribe to the SATIS Group rather than establish its own service at this stage.

Robin Gay suggested that a sub-committee be formed to work on these various options.

Jim Beard considered that it would not be unreasonable to request Central Government to look into the preparation of a technical information bibliography, along the same lines as the 'Planning Research Index' compiled by the Town and Country Planning Division of MWD.

Charlie Challenger, sounding a note of caution, felt that there would be a fantastic amount of work involved in the Institute establishing its own service.

Diane Lucas wondered if the Institute should pursue (through IFLA) the establishing of an international databank on design and technical information.

The Meeting then decided that the formation of a small committee would be worthwhile - to look at various options. The following members accepted nomination:

Herwi Scheltus
Mike Steven
Ray Wright

Robin Gay felt that it would be a good idea for this committee to refer its findings to the Professional Services Sub-committee for presentation at the 1980 AGM.

(c) Role of Landscape Architects in District Planning Scheme Preparation

In opening the discussion, Alec Wilson referred to the Waimairi County Council's recent seminar/workshop on the general topic of Planning Scheme preparation. The seminar/workshop illustrated that there was a great deal of confusion in councillors' minds over this whole question.

Alec is convinced that the Institute must formulate some basic philosophy on environmental planning in District Schemes.

Ray Wright endorsed this view.

Alec continued by saying that the only specific clauses appeared to relate to "the landscaping of industrial zones". Various Councils seem to want to extend this input to other zones, but there is no philosophical statement or definition to support such an extension.

Charlie Challenger supported this by saying that the Institute should formulate specific policy objectives similar to ASLA's policy series.

Alec Wilson pointed out that there was concern with the word "amenity" - which probably means "environmental quality" in broadest sense. Amenity must therefore be regarded as something much more meaningful than "prettying-up". Alec is convinced that now is the time for the Institute to make a clear policy statement.

Jim Beard considered that this was certainly a "momentous opportunity" for the Institute. The Town and Country Planning Act 1977 is very loose and there is constant difficulty in matters of interpretation.

Robin Gay asked if there was a consensus in favour of Alec Wilson submitting proposals to the Executive Committee for urgent consideration. This was agreed to by Alec and endorsed by the Meeting.

Jim Beard then reminded the Meeting that the Act also encompasses Regional Schemes.

(d) Standard Specifications

Alan Titchener stated that he and the Landscape Contractors Group were working on a draft specification - but this had turned out to be a major task. Because of this, it was evolving more in the form of guidelines and checklist with detailed provisions being left to the individual and the particular project concerned. However, Alan stressed the urgent need for copies of any specifications which members may have prepared for their own projects.

(e) Articles for "Garten and Landschaft"

Neil Aitken referred to a letter from Boyden Evans who is currently working in West Germany, requesting articles on landscape architecture in New Zealand for "Garten and Landschaft".

(f) Public Relations

Jan Woodhouse wondered if the Institute should investigate mounting a public relations compaign on the profession of Landscape Architecture.

Robin Gay pointed out that a start had been made on the preparation of material in association with the Vocational Guidance Service of the Department of Labour.

In his concluding comments, Julius Fabos stressed the need for teamwork - we must push collectively - this is education in the fullest and widest sense.

Following this, the General Meeting Chairperson, Robin Gay, declared the Meeting closed at 1.15 pm.

Tony Jackman then offered Julius Fabos the warmest thanks of all present, for the inspiration he had given, through his wisdom, humility and spontaneity.

Neil Aitken

Neil Aitken
Acting Secretary, NZILA Inc.