



**General Meeting
of Community Corporation 21109 Inc
Aldinga Arts EcoVillage**

Sunday 25^h Sept 2011. **Aldinga Community Centre, Symonds Reserve Hall,
Stewart Ave, Aldinga Beach**

1. Welcome, Present, Quorum and Apologies

Present

Voting members (lot numbers):

3 15 19 21 22 25 29 30 35 37
42 46 47 48 52 54 56 57 58 60
63 64 75 77 78 81 82 84 85 90
94 95 96 99 101 104 106 108 116 117
118 119 121 122 126 127 131 132 140 141
143 145 149 302 310 315 318

Proxy votes registered (lot numbers):

2 9 13 16 18 26 27 28 31 33
34 39 41 49 50 51 55 59 62 92
93 103 112 134 135 138 142 303 304 309
313 321 324

Note: proxy votes from lot owners who had outstanding amounts owing as at Fri 23rd September were not counted and are not listed above.

Apologies:

Lot 8

Quorum

Jane O'Connell advised that a quorum was present.

Apologies

No apologies were noted

Presiding Officers introduction

Ray welcomed and thanked everyone who attended the meeting. The community members were informed that there had been a change to the order of the agenda and they were asked to ensure that Proxy forms had been submitted to the registration desk for appropriate recording.

Ray presented the attached document that included a series of panoramic pictures 2002-2011 to show the growth we have seen in the AAEV.

Document: *AAEV AGM PresidingOfficerPres RM Sep2011.pdf* attached

2. Q&A with Gordon Russell, Managing Director, UnitCare Services

Gordon has been a Body Corporate Manager since 1986. He is one of the longest standing Body Corporate Manager in South Australia.

Gordon explained that we are one of his most complex clients. He explained how the community's funds are held in trust and how this presents a number of responsibilities and reporting requirements for UnitCare.

Gordon responded to questions forwarded to him by the Statutory Officers on Friday 23rd September in advance of the AGM. The questions and responses have been taken directly from the document returned by Gordon Russell on Sunday 25th September, which was projected at the meeting and spoken directly to.

Income:

Explain that it is possible for the AAEV Community Corp to generate income. We are already doing this - Levies are income & we are selling goods & assets

Explain that in order to do this we need a unanimous resolution & under what section of the Act etc this is covered.

**75(4) A corporation's power to carry on business is limited to—
(c) use of the common property or the property of the corporation to produce income (but only if authorised by a unanimous resolution of the corporation).**

May be prudent to engage a financial planner.

Management Committee Authority:

Identify the authority of the Management Committee as per your conversation with Kevin.

Section 92(2) Subject to this Act and to any limitations imposed by the corporation or by the bylaws of the community scheme, a management committee has full power to transact any business of the corporation.

S75(5) applies to external management, parties outside the corporation eg what we delegate to UnitCare

S75(5) A community corporation can only delegate its functions or powers to the extent permitted by regulation.

Regulation 15—Delegation (section 75(5))

(1) A community corporation may delegate any of its functions and powers (except this power of delegation) to a member or employee of the corporation or to a member of a secondary or tertiary corporation within the same community scheme.

(2) A corporation may delegate the following functions and powers to any person:

(a) the receipt and holding of money and other personal property on behalf of the corporation; and

(b) payment of money on behalf of the corporation; and

(c) the preparation of statements of expenditure and statements of accounts; and

(d) the collection of money due to the corporation; and

(e) entering into contracts of insurance with insurers on behalf of the corporation; and

(f) maintaining and keeping records on behalf of the corporation; and

(g) issuing and signing notices on behalf of the corporation; and

(h) preparing minutes of meetings of the corporation; and

(i) providing information as required by the Act on behalf of the corporation; and

(j) investing money on behalf of the corporation; and

(k) arranging for the maintenance and repair of the common property on behalf of the corporation.

(3) A corporation cannot delegate a function or power under subregulation (1) or (2) if the function or power is of a kind that can only be performed or exercised by the corporation by passing a special or unanimous resolution.

(4) A delegation by a corporation—

(a) may be absolute or conditional;

(b) does not derogate from the power of the corporation to act in any matter.

92—Functions and powers of committees

(1) Subject to any limitations imposed by the corporation, it is the function of a management committee to carry out the functions and perform the duties of the corporation within the limits of the committee's powers.

(2) Subject to this Act and to any limitations imposed by the corporation or by the bylaws of the community scheme, a management committee has full power to transact any business of the corporation.

(3) A committee cannot delegate its functions or powers but a community corporation may appoint or engage a person to assist the committee in the performance of the committee's functions.

(4) A committee does not have power to do anything for which a special or unanimous resolution of the corporation is required.

114—Contributions by owners of lots

(1) A community corporation must, in general meeting, fix the amount it requires by way of contributions from the owners of community lots.

(2) The amount must be fixed by an ordinary resolution of the corporation and not by the management committee.

Regulation 22—Resolutions authorising expenditure (section 119)

Expenditure by a community corporation—

(a) of less than an amount that is equivalent to \$2,000 multiplied by the number of community lots in the scheme must be authorised by an ordinary resolution of the corporation;

(b) of the amount referred to in paragraph (a) or more but less than an amount that is equivalent to \$5,000 multiplied by the number of community lots in the scheme must be authorised by a special resolution;

(c) of the larger of the two amounts referred to in paragraph (b) or more must be authorised by a unanimous resolution.

Questions from the floor:

Clarification was sought on the powers of the management committee:

The floor was informed by Rick Davies that in 2001, at the first AGM, the way the MC was set up was that the powers that were delegated to mgmt committee are limited to the budget. The floor was informed that there was a resolution to that effect.

Anything that is outside that presented in the budget, must come back to the community at a GM or AGM to be voted upon.

Work off Levies:

Explain that it is possible to set up a system within the AAEV to work off a portion of AAEV Levies.

A levy could be raised for say grounds work. The works levy could be fixed at an amount that would pay a contractor to undertake the works. All owners would be levied. A date for the works would be set and all owners notified. The notification would explain that owners can apply for a rebate of the works levy if they attend on the day and contribute to the work.

114—Contributions by owners of lots

(1) A community corporation must, in general meeting, fix the amount it requires by way of contributions from the owners of community lots.

(2) The amount must be fixed by an ordinary resolution of the corporation and not by the management committee.

(3) Subject to this Act, the share of an amount fixed under subsection (1) to be contributed by the owner of each lot is proportional to the lot entitlement of the lot unless otherwise provided by a unanimous resolution of the corporation.

(4) A corporation may, by ordinary resolution—

- (a) permit contributions to be paid in instalments specified in the resolution;
- (b) fix (in accordance with the regulations) interest payable in respect of a contribution, or an instalment of a contribution, that is in arrears.

Questions from the floor:

The MC would need to be authorised by the community to preside over the administration of such a process

How can someone be excused? Compassionate grounds rules? Tenants?

A full discussion will need to occur at an alternative time to address the issues that were raised by the floor.

2.1 Open Q&A session with Gordon Russel, UnitCare

Farm Licence Agreement:

Gordon reviewed the draft Farm Licence. It is very comprehensive.

The community were reminded that any liability of the community corporation is born by each of us as individual lot owners. Therefore it is very important that the Farm Licence Agreement protects us.

MOU – Council:

Mary Davies has been working to develop a closer relationship with the Onkaparinga Council. One of the outcomes is the possibility of collecting our bins from inside the recycle bay. The Onkaparinga council forwarded the Management Committee an indemnity agreement. UnitCare's legal advisor has advised us not to sign the indemnity agreement.

Negotiations will continue to develop an agreement that meets the needs of both the Council and the AAEV.

Online Access to AAEV documents:

UnitCare has gone to paperless filing system over the last 14 months. Every activity that occurs with AAEV (correspondence, invoice, phone call) is logged onto the UnitCare website. The Management Committee will be working with UnitCare to ensure that the information available is not of a private and sensitive nature.

3. Confirmation of the minutes from the following meetings:

- 10th July 2011 General Meeting
- 30th January 2011 General Meeting
- 17th April 2011 General Meeting
- 26th September 2010 Annual General Meeting

The minutes of the meetings stated above were accepted as true and correct records of the meetings stated above.

Moved by: Ray Mines, Presiding Officer

The motion was carried, the majority being for the resolution, there being no votes against and one abstention.

- 4. 9.4 Resolution 3: That the community agrees to the use of Glyphosate on the Common Land as part of an Integrated Weed Management Strategy; to effectively control the couch grass infestations. The Management Committee will review the use of Glyphosate on a yearly basis to ensure that it is phased out in line with the Integrated Weed Management Strategy for the farm.**

Resolution required: Ordinary Resolution (50% + 1)

Moved by: Jill Wilson, on behalf of Management Committee & NEC

The motion was carried, the majority being for the resolution, there being 3 votes against.

Comments from the floor: (addressed by Marteen Ryder)

Q: Has couch grass developed a resistance to Glyphosate?

A: Not aware of this, please forward research to Marteen

Q: How has the couch responded to the Weed Management Strategy over the last 3 years?

A: It was not clear, as Marteen has not been here for 3 years and was unable to provide a definitive response.

Q: If it is passed, one individual resident wanted to request a 10m zone around his/her property?

A: 'Exclusion zones' have been in discussion. This is a fair call for any particular individual who wishes to have an exclusion zone.

A: If they want an exclusion zone they need to deal with the couch in that zone to get it under control as it will defeat the whole process.

Q: Can we use livestock to keep couch under control?

A: Another alternative to be considered

A: The infestations are around fruit trees and it may not be appropriate to have livestock grazing in orchards.

General Comments:

- The couch on vacant lots is very strong and keeps creeping into other areas.
- It was raised that we are probably at more risk from overspray from neighbouring land, not use on our own AAEV land.
- Best time to spray when there is lots of green leaf coverage
- A neighbouring farmer who was using spray on a day when the wind was a bit high was contacted and requested that the spraying be stopped. The farmer kindly obliged.

5. Treasurer's Report and 2010/2011 Financial Report

Rick Davies addressed the floor with the following points:

- Risk is now understood by the community and is being addressed more as time goes on.
- Responsibilities and accountability have been addressed a lot more in the last 3 years.
- People understand that expenditure is on behalf of the community on trust, as trustees and not as individuals in their own capacity.
- It was reiterated to the floor that we, as individuals, are joint and severable liable if we were to fall into a debt situation and financial recovery was necessary.

The Treasurer's Report and 2010/2011 Financial Report documents were tabled.

Presented by: *Rick Davies, Treasurer*

5.1 Finance Resolution 1: That the 2010/11 Financial Report and the Treasurer's Report be accepted.

Resolution required: Ordinary Resolution

Moved by: *Rick Davies, Treasurer*

The motion was carried, the majority being for the resolution, there being no votes against.

7. Project Resolutions

Special Project Resolutions were included in the 2011/2012 Budget presentations and discussions

8. 2011/2012 Budget

The 2011/2012 Budget documents were tabled.

Explanations were provided as follows:

- The Budget set today is for funding allocation only
- There is a Base Budget & Sinking fund Budget
- Future expenditure approval is required for the actual activity on which the funds will be spent
- Sinking fund is currently over allocated
 - This means that more money has been 'ear marked' for future expenditure than we currently hold in the bank and plan to receive from levies 2011/2012
 - Over allocation increases the risk of the opportunity to run out of funds at a particular point in time. However, we plan to manage the process to reduce the risk to an acceptable level

- An over allocation only becomes a problem if we were to spend everything we have approved and previously allocated in one budget year
- Our allocations can always be adjusted at GM/AGMs to ensure that we do not find ourselves in this situation

Presented by: *Kevin Chan, on behalf of the Management Committee*

8.1. Finance Resolution 2: That the AAEV Financial Reporting and Budgeting cycle be changed from 1 Oct - 30 Sept to 1 Sept - 31 Aug.

A move to the new AAEV Financial Reporting and Budgeting cycle will provide for the following:

- improved alignment with the issue of quarterly levy notices
- ability to hold AGM at the end of August
- greater number of 'active' months to utilise budget allocations to achieve results prior to Christmas/New Year

The motion was carried, the majority being for the resolution, there being no votes against, and one abstention

8.2. Finance Resolution 3: That the 2011/12 base budget be adopted

The Base Budget is the operating budget for the committees to operate within. The Base Budget has a mixture of items from both the Administration and Sinking fund.

Individual explanations:

Government Asset Management Pack \$550

Workspace Sharing Costs \$2,600

- Kevin Chan disclosed that he has a financial interest in this item. He has rented a private residence to develop a co-share office facility for those villagers who work from home.
- The management committee felt that it was important to have a more habitable environment for all our volunteer committees to meet
- Provide a comfortable creative space for villagers
- Once we have a community hub building we would cease this arrangement
- Not a sub-lease. This is co-working model where you can gain either a membership to the space

Q: have you explored using Lorenzen Hall?

A: No facilities (toilet) and not much different to sharing shed

Q: What portion of rent is Kevin paying?

A: Not a for profit exercise. The cost is divided between all that use it. Budgeted at one share, which is \$50 a week.

Q: Why do we have an expenditure on rent when we could be accumulating

those funds for expenditure on the Community Hub. The Financial Interest was not disclosed in the AGM documents?

A: Idea was to trial for 3 months, if it does not appear to be working for the community it will be ceased

A: We do not have a community house this is a small cost to enable a functional space to be utilized. Productivity should improve in a comfortable environment

A: Works out to about \$15 a lot to contribute to the office space. Personal view is that Kevin is not making money and therefore there is not a conflict of interest

Q: Is Kevin 'renting' the house to the village?

A: No, payment is for a license to use a desk

Q: Will the cost of increase in utilities etc increase the cost to the village?

A: No, the payment is a fixed license fee

The floor decided that because this item had not been sufficiently disclosed to the community in writing it should be removed. This resulted in an amendment to the resolution. See amendment and final resolution below.

Arts \$2,000

\$500 adjustment for Playscapes will occur when the committee is formally formed

Other/ PR/ External Relations \$2,000

External relations to build stronger relationships with the council etc

Water \$16,000

Investigating the high expenditure

Orchard Management (Works) \$1,103

Keep separate from the Farm budget to track expenditure separately

7.1 Project Resolution 1: Subject to the availability of funds, prioritisation and the setting of the Sinking Fund levy for 2011/12, that the sum of \$3,000 be allocated out of the Sinking Fund for the Arts committee, over a period of 3 years, for a program to beautify lamp posts throughout the village using mosaics.

Resolution required: *Special resolution (no more than 25% of all eligible votes against)*

Document: Mosaic Lamp Posts.pdf

Moved by: *Mary Davies, Arts & Culture Co-ordinator on behalf of the Arts & Culture Committee*

The motion was carried, the majority being for the resolution, there being 10 votes against, 6 abstentions

Questions from the floor: (addressed by Maria)

Q: Has anyone been consulted from the works maintenance group to ensure that this project is not going to interfere with our already problematic street light infrastructure?

A: Yes

Q: Are Mosaics & Metal compatible?

A: There is a special glue designed for this application

Q: Are there examples of where this has been done and proof of their 'life'?

A: We are always pushing the boundaries. We plan on only doing a small number of lights first to test the process

Q: How many poles will be decorated?

A: To get high quality, we need a professional to direct the concept, design and implementation. Want something that will hold its integrity, its design and reflect our community. The \$3,000 budget goes towards a professional person to develop 6m of working drawings.

Q: With the \$3,000 funding from the AAEV, will further funding be applied for via grants?

A: If people like what they see, we could receive grant funding if we can prove that we have made a commitment to the project.

Q: Who has been working on the project to date?

A: There will be a workshop for a representative from NHG to attend. Workshop will have a design and installation

Q: Is the artist running the courses etc going to be from the village?

A: Yes, we are looking at artists within the village

Q: Have you accounted for the cost of working at heights of 8-10ft?

Q: Is there flexibility to pay more than \$500 in year one?

A: Don't feel that \$500 is sufficient budget to get the project started.

Q: Are we voting on the concept or the money?

A: 2 parts – 1st part (Project Resolution 1) actually placing it on the light, 2nd part (Finance Resolution 4) voting to accept the budget line

Q: Split between materials and labour?

A: Mosaics on bus shelters in Moana (project cost \$8,000). Hiring an artist will require them to be accountable

A: Only the 'leader' will be employed. The rest of the people doing the work and attending the workshops will not be paid.

A: The working drawings will cost about \$1,500. The artist will work with the community to get the design

Q: Has any consideration been taken for corrosion?

A: Going by the manufacturer's recommendation for the project. The metal can be sealed prior to the tiles being glued on.

7.2 Project Resolution 2: That the Community authorises the expenditure of \$32,500 from the sinking fund on a 10kw Solar PV system to generate income in order to offset the Village utility costs.

Note: there is an additional resolution to vote on the location of the installation in 'Other Resolutions' below.

Resolution required: *Unanimous resolution*

Document: **Resolution Solar Expenditure.pdf**

Moved by: *Ray Mines, on behalf of the Management Committee*

The motion was carried, the majority being for the resolution, there being no votes against, no abstentions.

Questions from the floor:

Q: What is the certainty of the feed in tariff staying as is & has the future rising cost of electricity been taken into consideration?

A: Feed in tariff is available until 2028. Once inside the scheme the rate you receive is Grandfathered. However any government can still pass legislation to change the scheme, and this is still a risk.

A: Future years 4% p.a was included in the calculation. Payback improves as the price of electricity increases.

Q: Will the locations identified for installation determine whether it would be deemed to be 'profiteering'?

A: At the WWTP site we are directly offsetting the costs of our power

A: ETSA will come on site and determine whether any of our sites would be deemed to be profiteering

A: No clear legislation on which site would be deemed to be profiteering

A: All of our meters combined (7) represent the whole community and offsetting should be a viable argument

A: ETSA has approved locations, but feed in tariff is not guaranteed yet.

Original Finance Resolution 3: That the 2011/12 base budget be adopted

Moved by: Jodie Summer, on behalf of the Management Committee

Seconded by: Ray Mines

Amendment to the above resolution: That the Workspace Sharing Costs budget of \$2,600 be deleted from the 2011/12 base budget

Moved by: Rick Davies

Seconded by: Jenni Reece

Resolution required: Ordinary Resolution

The motion was carried, the majority being for the amendment to the resolution, there being 31 votes against, one abstention

Final Resolution: That the 2011/12 base budget be adopted with the deletion of the 'Workspace Sharing Costs' budget line of \$2,600

Resolution required: Ordinary Resolution

The motion was carried, the majority being for the resolution, there being no votes against, 6 (six) abstentions

Straw pole: the majority of the floor were 'for' the concept of utilising the

Shared Workspace and allocating a budget line for the 'Workspace Sharing Costs' at the January 2012 GM.

8.3. Finance Resolution 4: That the 2011/12 Special Projects budget be adopted

Original Resolution: That the 2011/12 Special Projects budget be adopted

Amendment to the above resolution: Increase the budget line item '6.e Arts – Mosaic Street Lights' from \$500 to \$3,000

Moved by: Rick Davies

Seconded by: Annette Inwood

The motion was carried, the majority being for the amendment to the resolution, there being no votes against, and 18 abstentions.

Final Resolution: That this 2011/12 Special Projects budget be adopted with an increase to the budget line item '6.e Arts – Mosaic Street Lights' from \$500 to \$3,000

Resolution required: *Ordinary resolution*

The motion was carried, the majority being for the resolution, there being no votes against, and 1 abstention.

Questions from the floor:

Q: What is the \$3,000 Workshop Fit Out budget for?

A: There are a number of improvements that are required to bring the workshop up to scratch to be able to be used

- A:
1. An underground three phase electrical supply.
 2. Transparent sheeting (glass fibre or similar) to weather-proof the southern and northern walls of the workshop.
 3. Purchase a new 300mm circular saw blade, safety switch and blade guard for the existing tablesaw.
 4. Portable dust extractor.
 5. Second-hand wood thicknesser for processing rough sawn timber similar to that stored in "longwood hall".

Q: Who will be responsible for monitoring and spending the funds?

A: The Community Hub

8.4. Finance Resolution 5: That the total levies (per lot entitlement) remain unchanged for 2011/12 (CTA s114(2))

Resolution required: *Ordinary resolution*

The motion was carried, the majority being for the resolution, there being 2 votes against, and 1 abstention.

Comments from the floor:

- Someone was uneasy about not having CPI increase on levies. Council areas at least increase by CPI. A large increase later may be more difficult for people to budget
- MC had a meeting and it was after this meeting that there was additional discussion surrounding the levy situation. The MC were going to put the option to the community
- We always need to be looking creatively looking for income streams
- Not everyone can afford an increase in levies
- We would like to consider all other potential income sources altogether in a community workshop

8.5. Finance Resolution 6: If Finance Resolution 2 is approved: That UnitCare Services be engaged as the management services provider for the 12 month period ending 31 August 2012.

Resolution required: *Ordinary resolution*

The motion was carried, the majority being for the resolution, there being no votes against, and no abstentions.

Finance Resolution 2 was carried, and therefore the following resolution was removed:

If Finance Resolution 2 is NOT approved: That UnitCare Services be engaged as the management services provider for the 12 month period ending 30 September 2012.

8.6. Finance Resolution 7: That the Management Committee be authorised to manage and re-allocate as necessary any line item expenditures within the approved budget (Authorised standard resolution for AGMs)

Original Resolution: That the Management Committee be authorised to manage and re-allocate as necessary any line item expenditures within the approved budget (Authorised standard resolution for AGMs)

Amendment to the above resolution:

Exclude special projects from the 'approved budget'

Moved by: Adrian Oakey

Second by: Toby Good

The motion was carried, the majority being for the amendment to the resolution, there being no votes against, and 7 abstentions.

Final Resolution: That the Management Committee be authorised to manage and re-allocate as necessary any line item expenditures within the approved budget excluding special projects

The motion was carried, the majority being for the resolution, there being no votes against, and no abstentions.

9.1 Resolution 1: Hub Resolutions

The purpose of these resolutions is to clarify the community's design choice and priority for development of a community building.

Comments from the floor

Q: Important for us to stabilise the 'name' of the project?

A: The 'Hub' is for the whole area, 'house' or 'centre' is for an actual building within the 'Hub'.

Q: On the 'A' Area there is an existing building, does that mean that the existing building will be removed?

A: We are purely looking at the location.

Q: Does this decision mean that any of the four plans will have to change?

Q: If 'A' is chosen, where will we continue to meet, do projects such as mosaics?

A: The intention is not that we will lose any 'space' and nothing will be demolished in the very short term.

The Community Hub Project team is just looking for some direction from the community as to where people want the first building to be built in the 'Hub'. This will be the first of many decisions the Community Hub Project team bring to the community. The team has got to the point where we need to know whether A or B is the desired 1st stage to build a building. All of the designs have many common elements but the teams have got stuck on this point.

Resolution 1.1 That the community chooses 'Location A' as marked on Diagram 1 in the supporting documentation ('Community Hub Design Team Resolutions for Sep 2011 AGM') as the first priority for design and funding of a community house."

Resolution required: Ordinary resolution

Proposed by: Kevin Chan on behalf of the Community Hub Design Teams (Heart of the Village)

The motion was NOT carried, the majority being against the resolution, there being 27 votes for, and 3 abstentions.

Resolution 1.2 That the community chooses 'Location B' as marked on Diagram 1 in the supporting documentation ('Community Hub Design Team Resolutions for Sep 2011 AGM') as the first priority for design and funding of a community house.

Resolution required: Ordinary resolution

Proposed by: Kevin Chan on behalf of the Community Hub Design Teams (Heart of the Village)

The motion was carried, the majority being for the resolution, there being 9 votes against, and 3 abstentions.

9.1 Resolution 2: Solar PV installation location

Resolution required: Special resolution

Moved by: Ray Mines on behalf of the Management Committee

Resolution 2.1: That the Community approve the installation of a Solar PV system adjacent to the Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP) on the farm (Location A).

The motion was carried, the majority being for the resolution, there being 2 votes against, and 3 abstentions.

Resolution 2.2: That the Community approve the installation of a Solar PV system in the recycle bay (Location B).

The motion was carried, the majority being for the resolution, there being 6 votes against, and 3 abstentions.

Resolution 2.3: That the Community approve the installation of a Solar PV system between Seaberry Walk and the rainwater tanks (Location C).

The motion was NOT carried, the majority being against resolution, and 7 abstentions.

Comments from the floor:

- The technical details have not been considered as yet
- We do not want to be limited by selecting one solution over the other as technical constraints may make a final decision for us
- Vote against only if you are against a non-technical issue

- We would prefer all resolutions were passed if possible to keep the options open

Q: Any safety issues with a ground mount system (e.g. electrical access)?

A: Electrics are designed to be secure for these systems

Q: Only piece of common property Seaberry Walk has access to?

Q: Will people have an opportunity to vote again once the ETSA applications are approved?

A: No

Q: How has it been decided that car parks can fit north/south at Seaberry Walk entrance, rather than parallel?

A: This was in the original plans

Q: Why couldn't panels go on Seaberry Walk existing carports?

A: Because they are on private property

9.2 Resolution 11 (2009) Special Resolution

Wood Fired Stoves: Proposed alteration of Bylaws submitted by Adrian Oakey (not the BDC).

Background: Back in 2002, there were discussions over the use of wood fired stoves within houses and the lack of clarity within the bylaws and the issue was tabled at the 2002 AGM where it clear that a majority of owners against using wood-fired combustion heaters and ovens. This was never formally followed up though the BDC has identified in its design guidelines that any application involving a wood fired stove would be of concern and may involve community consultation.

A recent application has been received for a wood fired stove (separate agenda item) however my view is that we need to resolve this matter for once and all by altering the bylaws, thus providing the BDC with a clear reference under which to make decisions. In terms of information about the pros and cons, there is any number of web sites that discuss the downsides of wood fired stoves (covering health and sustainability) and as with all scientific debate plenty of counter arguments. While some may feel they need to be further informed, I believe that most people know which way they want to go and am thus submitting this amendment to the bylaws without extensive consultation.

The bylaw proposed for change is 22.1 with the following addition of a new clause 22.1.4.

22.1 In particular, approval will not be given for the following:

22.1.1

22.1.2

22.1.3

22.1.4 any building utilising wood fired stoves or ovens or any other wood fired device for the purposes of room heating, water heating or cooking.

and the alteration of Clause 36.15 by deleting the reference to wood fired stoves.

From

"36.15. systems which heat water and spaces efficiently (ie – solar water heating with "wet-back" backup from wood heater in winter; wood burning heaters with a high efficiency rating. Refrigerant airconditioning systems are not preferred but may be required: they must be used on a strict needs only basis. The preferred method of cooling is "evaporative".);"

To

"36.15. systems which heat water and spaces efficiently. Refrigerant air-conditioning systems are not preferred but may be required: they must be used on a strict needs only basis. The preferred method of cooling is "evaporative";"

The motion was carried, the majority being for the resolution, there being 3 votes against, and 3 abstentions.

10.2. Election of office-bearers and Committee Co-ordinators

The following office-bearers and Committee Co-ordinators were successful in their nomination and accepted the position.

- Presiding Officer: **Ray Mines**
- Secretary: **Jodie Summer**
- Treasurer: **Kevin Chan**
- Building Development Co-ordinator: **Vacant/Michael Vawser**
- Natural Environment Co-ordinator: **Paul Rosser**
- Community Development Co-ordinator: **Anita Priadko**
- Communications Co-ordinator: **Jane O'Connell**
- Works Maintenance Co-ordinator: **Tony Gerlach**
- Arts and Culture Co-ordinator: **Mary Davies**
- Farm Co-ordinator: **Kathryn Maxwell**
- Governance & Strategic Development Co-ordinator: **Wayne Allen**
- Community Hub Project Co-ordinator: **Mary Davies**
- Playscapes Project Co-ordinator: **Lucy Chan**

11. Other Business

Q: Who has the authority to decide on what assets of the village are sold?

A: It was identified that a Rainwater Tank was unsafe and it was required to be removed. The issue came to the Management Committee. It was presented that the removal was going to be costly and the options were presented to us. The result was that the Rainwater Tank was removed and we have received money for the material that we have enabled the person who is removing the tank to keep.

12: Meeting Closed 4:00pm