

MINUTES OF THE SAPRA AGM WHICH TOOK PLACE ON 30 NOVEMBER 2022 AT 6PM

AT THE MILITARY HISTORY MUSEUM, SAXONWOLD

1.	<p>As per attached attendance register</p> <p>51 people registered for the meeting with some late comers not registering As per the constitution, 5% of members were present and as there was a quorum, the meeting was duly constituted.</p>
2.	<p>Apologies</p> <p>Patrick and Lilian Boyle and Vanessa Davidson</p>
3.	<p>Welcome by Chairman Bill Haslam</p> <p>Guest Speaker</p> <p>Absence of the guest speaker, Ann Bernstein who apologised as she was ill.</p>
4.	<p>Chairman's Report (as attached)</p> <p>The Chairman said membership had improved somewhat and was sitting at 25% of total residents.</p> <p>He mentioned SAPRA's new policy on Town Planning which has been changed in light of the rate of development. As SAPRA did not have the finances or the manpower to deal with all applications , neighbouring residents would have to take a more proactive stance in the future.</p>
5.	<p>Presentation by Advocate Ross Hutton on the Investigation of the Road Closure Proposal</p> <p>The Terms of reference were to investigate and advise on a number of topics. This project was completed within the time frame set and the report was signed and approved by all three panalists. Mr Hutton presented the report to the Chairman, who thanked the three panalists for all their work on a very difficult project.</p> <p>Once the report has been considered by the committee it will be published on the SAPRA website. This would be done as soon as was possible.</p>
6.	<p>Presentation of the Audited Financial Statements by the Treasurer to June 2022</p> <p>Mr Bagg presented the Financial Statements. The Chairman informed the meeting that the Committee had approved an increase in membership fees from:</p>

	<p>R650 to R800 for members R400 to R 500 for pensioners R 1000 to R1200 for corporates This would take effect from 1 January 2023.</p>
7.	<p>Resolutions</p> <p>It was resolved that:</p> <p>1. That Section 5.2.5 of the Constitution be renamed Section 5.2.6 and that the following be inserted as Section 5.2.5 of the Constitution: “Complex member - an owner, administrator or duly authorized representative of a Community Scheme as defined in the Community Schemes Ombud Service Act, 2011, that is situated within Saxonwold or Parkwood.”</p> <p>3. The name “Family Member” be changed to “Appointed Member” and that Section 5.2.3 of the Constitution be amended to the following: “Appointed Member - A relative or tenant of an ordinary member who is living in the same premises, limited to 4 such people; - A relative of an pensioner member who is living in the same premises, limited to 1 relative; - An employee of a business member, or an owner or tenant of a unit within a complex represented by a complex member, limited to such number of employees, owners or tenants of the complex as the Committee shall determine from time to time“</p>
8.	<p>Appointment of Committee Members</p> <p>The list of committee members for the forthcoming year was unanimously approved.</p>
9.	<p>General</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mr A Dinnie requested an opportunity to provide information on the proposed Saxon Square development and to consider whether SAPRA’s committee decision to appeal against the approval by CoJ was in the best interests of the members and whether the action should be withdrawn. 2. Ms Leila McKenna asked whether SAPRA had originally withdrawn its objection to the development. Tessa Turvey (past chairperson of SAPRA) told the meeting that it had withdrawn its objection. 3. Discussion followed as to whether there should be a vote at the meeting on the Committee decision to appeal the application. Adv Hutton and others did not believe it was in the best interest of residents to vote on the matter then as many would not be included. The Chairman ruled that if a vote were to be considered a separate meeting should be convened. (See attached note on this matter) 4. Ms Renee Kilner said that electricity should be privatised and residents need to start thinking about it collectively. Renee agreed to head a sub-committee on the matter. 5. A member asked whether traffic calming on Cotswold Drive and Saxonwold Drive could be researched and arranged. Ms Marcelle Ravid reported that JRA had started to investigate and have done a traffic count. 6. Mr Edward Legg agreed to head a sub-committee for this item.
	<p>The meeting closed at 7:30pm</p>

Informal Feedback on the SAPRA Annual General Meeting held on 30 November 2022

The AGM was well attended with 52 people signing in. All legal requirements of the AGM were met with the new committee being properly appointed, the accounts approved and two resolutions to amend the Constitution to allow for Complexes to be valid members and the renaming of Family member to Appointed member, were approved.

Advocate Ross Hutton, the convenor of the Panel investigating the Road Closure proposal reported that the Panel had concluded their work and presented the Chairman of SAPRA with a hard copy of the report and annexures. The Chairman acknowledged and thanked Ross and his Panel for the substantial amount of work that had been put into the report. He told the meeting that the SAPRA committee would consider the report and, with their blessing, would put it into the public domain as soon as was possible.

Mr. Alan Dinnie was asked to make comment on his requested item dealing with the development termed the “Saxon Square”. After his presentation there were a number of comments and questions from the floor.

One specific question was raised that demands a considered response. The question was whether SAPRA had, in the past, withdrawn its original objections to the proposed development. The answer to the question was volunteered by the previous Chair of SAPRA who had been in office during the discussions on the development. She claimed that it had been withdrawn. However, after a subsequent review of the documentation the following précis sets out the facts:

- SAPRA’s town planner held discussions with the developer on the development controls which were accepted and reflected in an email dated 29 September 2020. In particular the email stated:
“SAPRA furthermore encourages you/the developer to consider the adjoining neighbours in the design and orientation of the building due to the height and extent thereof. Every measure should be taken to orientate the structure towards both street frontages rather than the neighbours.”
- The developer accepted the contents of the mail and asked whether the contents of the mail constituted SAPRA withdraw of its objections. This was denied as SAPRA

wanted unconditional confirmation that these suggestion would be included in any approval by the City.

- SAPRA subsequently learned that the City had approved the unamended original application despite SAPRA's stated objection. The developer, in the full knowledge of the above, then proceeded with the development with total disregard of SAPRA's objection.
- SAPRA wrote to the City on 26 May 2021 making it clear that there had been no withdrawal of the objections and provided alternatives that would possibly result in a withdrawal of the objections.
- The City immediately withdrew its approval of the application. It argued that it had incorrectly been given to understand by the developer that the objections had been withdrawn by SAPRA.
- SAPRA was subsequently invited to the Tribunal hearing on the matter, held on 29 November 2021. As only recognised complainants are invited to a Tribunal hearing this invitation would not have been extended to SAPRA if the City believed that SAPRA's objections had been withdrawn.
- The above has been drawn to the attention of the previous SAPRA chair who acknowledges that she was wrong in her statement as she "was not aware of this situation".

Mr. Dinnie then requested that a proposal on whether SAPRA should continue with the Court Application should be put to the vote. This resulted in a number of arguments for and against the proposal and the Chairman ruled that a proper ventilation of this subject could only take place during a separate meeting specifically established for that purpose. It has subsequently been learned that a number of those in favour of this vote are not, in fact, members of SAPRA.

Consequently, it is the contention of SAPRA's chairman that SAPRA had been given a mandate to pursue legal action against the City of Johannesburg at a public meeting held on 14 July 2022 and that, without any major change in circumstances, it is unnecessary now to question this mandate.

The meeting was closed at 19h30.