**MINUTES OF THE GENERAL MEETING HELD MAY 1, 2017 AT THE CLUBHOUSE, POINT PIPER AT 7 PM**

**PRESENT:** Mr Greg Mason (Commodore) Mr Adrian Broadbent (Vice Commodore) Mrs Caroline Crane (Rear Commodore) Mr Max Sheaffe (Honorary Treasurer) Messrs Chris Gosselin, Tony Booth, Andrew Strange, Terry Matthews, Brendan Lyons, Ms Susan Barker (Secretary) and 61 Members

**APOLOGIES:** Messrs Frederick A Pratten, Mrs Kay Pratten, Ms Justine Pratten, Ms Monique Pratten, Mrs Robyn Berkeley, Mrs Ann Kirkjian, Mrs Margaret Forsyth, Mr Ron de Wit, Mrs Elizabeth de Wit, Mrs Donella Freeman, Ms Barbara Maunsell, Messrs Andrew Thane, David Horsfield, Simon Schudmak, Richard Dennison, Nigel Stewart.

Following a briefing by the Commodore on the background to the proposed amendment, Members were asked to consider and, if thought fit, pass the following Ordinary Resolution:

**ORDINARY RESOLUTION**

***Moved by Glenn Crane and seconded by John Ryrie:***

***That the members hereby approve the recommendation set out in the Proposal for the Remediation and Redevelopment (the Proposal) of the clubhouse as follows:***

***“That the Board (General Committee) be authorised to proceed with the Redevelopment of the clubhouse as consistent with the general proposal and concept previously distributed to members and as discussed at the Member’s Forums, with the cost of the Redevelopment to be met from voluntary fundraising programs and other financial resources available to the Club, excluding debt. The final design, budget and timing of the Redevelopment construction to be subject to the availability of funds.”***

A discussion ensued and the following questions raised:

Cheryl Yarrow said that the Resolution stated that the redevelopment of the clubhouse was consistent with the general proposal and concept previously distributed to members; however, since that time two more plans were presented to Members, incorporating many of the suggestions that were put forward at the forums. Why were the amended plans not included in the proposal?

Chris Gosselin responded that the Resolution was worded to be consistent with the overall plan so as not to tie the Committee down in the early stages of the design plans or at the DA stage; there was no intent to change the broad proposal and final layout.

Terry Matthews said that the Resolution stated that the redevelopment of the clubhouse was consistent with the general proposal and concept and did not say a “specific” proposal.

***Moved by Gordon Woolf and seconded by Andrew Goldfinch an Amendment to the Proposal as follows:***

***“That the board (General Committee) be authorized to proceed with the redevelopment of the clubhouse to DA lodgment stage as consistent with the general purpose and concept previously distributed to members and as discussed at the Members Forums, with the cost of the Redevelopment to be met from voluntary fundraising programs and other financial resources available to the Club excluding debt. The final design, budget and timing of the Redevelopment construction to be subject to both the members’ approval and availability of funds.”***

Andrew Goldfinch stated that, before the Members gave the Committee the go ahead, there was need for more detail and for the Committee to come back to Members before DA stage.

Simon Furber asked what outcome was to be expected if Members passed the Motion?

The Commodore responded that the original Motion was subject to the availability of funds; before the final design went to DA, it would require refinement and stakeholder involvement, thereby not allowing the Committee to provide a final design at this meeting. Suggested input from the forums to where the corridor should be was incorporated into the two distinct designs, but the overall intent and usage of the area had not changed. If final plans went to DA (and it was found that funding was difficult or the overall concept had to change) the Committee would go back to Members. To obtain final costs, construction drawings were required, which was the next stage to submit a DA to Council; the Committee was requesting that it be allowed to move forward to develop and submit plans with consultation from Members.

Richard Hill asked what were the Members being asked to approve?

The Commodore replied that the Committee was asking for approval to move forward to develop and submit final DA drawings to Council subject to finance. He stated that affordability was dependent upon fundraising for the project.

Chris Gosselin said that the funding issue was really important; there were broad estimates of costs, which could change if the plans were changed; there was also an offer from the Australian Sports Foundation to accept voluntary donations that would be tax deductible. The Committee would not go into debt but, order to attract donations, Members had to know that the proposal was going to proceed, subject to available finance.

Richard Hill asked what the cost was to submit the DA? Did the Club have the funds to proceed? Who was going to come up with the tax deductible donations?

Grant Jagelman said that if there was an amendment to the Motion, why not vote on it? He also said that if the Motion was not passed, then the original proposal be put forward for the Members to vote yes or no.

Max Sheaffe said that if there was a supplementary Motion on the floor, Members had to vote on it.

Gail Broadbent asked the Committee to confirm that the Resolution was about the redevelopment in the undercroft and that the Committee will proceed with remediation regardless of the outcome.

The Commodore confirmed that the Redevelopment was simply re-purposing areas of the clubhouse.

Andrew Goldfinch asked that if remediation were to be carried out first, were the Members voting for the Redevelopment to take place many years in the future?

The Commodore replied that, if the Members voted to proceed and move forward, there were savings to be made in combining both projects together; there was the funding in place to carry out the remediation works; it was unnecessary to carry out the remediation work tomorrow but necessary for that work to be undertaken in a reasonable length of time because of the nature of the building and the work; if the membership approved to move forward and have funds in place to do it, the Committee would seek to carry out the redevelopment at the same time rather than subject the membership to endless years of sections of the Club being closed while the works were in progress.

Andrew Goldfinch asked what was the timeline?

Chris Gosselin replied that it depended on the fundraising; if funds were in place, both the remediation and redevelopment work could commence next April and finish by September; if the money could not be raised by April, then redevelopment would be delayed by one year but balanced with the need to implement the remediation.

Stephen Wawn asked the Committee to confirm if the funds for the remediation were quarantined for that purpose and would not be used for the redevelopment?

The Commodore replied in the affirmative.

John Ryrie said that the membership should vote in the affirmative to allow the Committee to proceed.

Ian Creber asked what the actual cost would be to get to the DA stage including consultants, engineers, etc.

Chris Gosselin replied that the cost to date had been around $30,000 including the quantity surveyor’s reports and two consulting engineers’ reports; it was expected that the total cost of consultants (including the $30,000) would be $100,000 but will depend on end design detail. The initial drawings had been well accepted by Council.

Jeremy West asked how the Committee felt about the proposal to change the Resolution.

The Commodore replied that he had not had the opportunity to canvass the Committee on that point.

Max Sheaffe said that if the Resolution was amended and went only to DA stage, it would slow down the process, and it would also fail to get tax deductions before 30 June; the Centenary was approaching so the Resolution should not be amended.

Simon Furber asked if the original Motion would be redundant if the amendment was passed, and if the vote was against the amendment, would be Members vote on the original Motion?

The Commodore replied in the affirmative.

1. ***The Amendment to the Proposal was put.***

***Following a show of hands, the Motion failed.***

1. ***The Ordinary Resolution was put.***

***Following a show of hands, the Resolution proposed was passed.***

The Commodore advised that communication with Members would increase; he welcomed Members to speak with him following the meeting.

The meeting duly terminated at 7.45pm

Signature.....................................................................Dated............................