

## **BBRA Constitution Change Proposals 2021**

4. Some of the proposed amendments are practical and it is submitted **non-contentious**. Examples include:

- The clear distinction required between the committee and the Exco. which distinction originated from our bankers.
- To have a quorum of 4 was also clearly inappropriate and the proposed amendment to a **majority** of the elected members makes sense as the size of the committee could vary between 4 and 15 (refer to clause 9(a)).
- To restrict this to members **elected** at the AGM is in accordance with clause 11(a)(ii) which clearly states that co-opted members serve in a "temporary capacity".
- Also that the EXCO should consist of permanent residents has a practical value as these members not only have to be in touch with on-going activities in Betty's Bay on an almost daily basis but can also meet and conduct site inspections at short notice.

5. To restrict **future** membership to property owners only is not discriminatory as existing renter members (if any) are not denied that membership. For the past 2-3 years only property owners obtained membership and there were no requests from renters of properties. The character of Betty's Bay has significantly changed with many properties being developed for own use and not as investment properties for rent. In any event it is the owner who has a vested interest and who is the ratepayer.

6. The only real possible contentious proposed amendment is the restriction of committee members having to reside for at least 6 months of the year in Betty's Bay. As indicated under point 4 it is deemed expedient that committee members should have their proverbial ears on the ground and be readily accessible. Should there be a property owner who is not eligible to serve on the committee on an on-going basis throughout the year but has specialist skills that are on offer, such person can be co-opted on an ad hoc basis.

A case in point was John Cope, who is a non-permanent resident, who did excellent work on the proposed revitalisation of the CBD. but there was no need for him to serve on the committee.

**Conclusion:** It is sad that aspersion is being cast by one person on a collective decision taken by a validly constituted committee. The recommended amendments are in any event subject to a two thirds majority vote of the AGM and each member of the BBRA has the right to vote in favour or against the amendments.

**Werner Zybrands**

