

Sanctuary Cove PBC Code of Conduct: *What every committee member needs to know.*

Effective: [Insert Date] | **Review:**

Purpose of this Code

This Code of Conduct sets out expected standards of behaviour and responsibilities for all individuals involved in PBC related entities, advisory roles or engaging in a consulting capacity. It promotes ethical conduct, accountability, and respectful engagement in alignment with the Sanctuary Cove Resort Act 1985 (SCRA), Building Units and Group Titles Act 1980 (BUGTA), and good PBC Governance.

Applies to: PBC, EC, Sub-Committees, RBC Committees, Advisory Bodies and Advisors. The Executive Committee (EC) have statutory requirements and obligations that are legally enforceable.

Your Core Responsibilities

- Act in the best interests of the whole Sanctuary Cove community.
- Support ethical, lawful, and transparent governance.
- Model respectful, constructive behaviour in all forums—online and offline.

Your Behaviour Matters

✓ Do	✗ Don't
Pre-read papers and contribute professionally	Be dismissive, disruptive, or unprepared
Respect others and maintain meeting decorum	Bully, continuously interrupt, launch personal attacks
Keep sensitive and personal information confidential	Share confidential information without approval
Speak up on concerns respectfully	Undermine agreed decisions or gossip
Use respectful tone in emails and social media	Use emails/forms to attack, criticise, or escalate conflict
Share RBC views and decisions responsibly in PBC forums, where applicable.	Present personal views as representative of your RBC, without prior consultation
Stick to facts and governance matters	Speculate, mislead, or make personal remarks
Disclose actual or perceived conflicts (see COI policy)	Make decisions for personal gain

Meeting and Communication Conduct

- Be concise and respectful.
- Embrace debate but reject disrespect.
- Don't dominate discussions or continually repeat points.
- Be mindful of tone, content, and purpose in written communications (email, forms, apps, online posts).
- Active presence, participation and engagement via meeting attendance or video conference.

Governance Essentials

- Know the basics of SCRA (1985), BUGTA (1980), and your committee's role and Terms of Reference.
- Abide by Sanctuary Cove By-Laws and Policies.
- Governance Manual.
- Complete induction and ongoing training.

Breaches – What Happens?

Step	What It Means
1. Informal Chat	Chair or Secretary raises concern directly with the individual. An observer is also present.
2. Formal Warning	Written notice and request for improvement or change.
3. Mediation	Independent support to resolve conflict or conduct concerns
4. Referral	Breach referred for formal resolution including potential removal
5. Escalation	For serious legal breaches under SCRA, BUGTA or other Acts

Need Help or Unsure? Ask the Chair or Secretary, refer to full Code of Conduct, Review Conflict of Interest Policy.

Sanctuary Cove Principal Body Corporate (PBC) Code of Conduct

Effective Date: [Insert date]

Replaced: 23RD October 2006

Review Date: Annually

1. Purpose

This Code of Conduct sets out expected standards of behaviour and responsibilities for all individuals involved in PBC related entities, advisory roles or engaging in a consulting capacity. It promotes ethical conduct, accountability, and respectful engagement in alignment with the Sanctuary Cove Resort Act 1985 (SCRA), Building Units and Group Titles Act 1980 (BUGTA), and good PBC Governance.

Executive Committee (EC) and its officers have statutory obligations regarding conduct and conflicts under the SCRA, and those obligations are enforceable.

2. Scope

This Code of Conduct applies to all:

- Elected or appointed PBC Member Nominees
- Members of the PBC EC
- Members of PBC Sub-Committees
- Members of RBC Committees
- Persons acting in an advisory, observer, or delegated capacity in governance forums

3. Principles

All individuals must:

- Act in the best interests of the Sanctuary Cove lot owners and uphold their duty to the community of Sanctuary Cove as a whole.
- Demonstrate integrity, transparency, and fairness
- Uphold respectful and inclusive behaviours
- Support sound, lawful and compliant decision-making

4. Conduct Expectations

4.1 Commitment to Role and Governance Obligations

- Basic understanding and comply with SCRA, BUGTA, and by-laws.
- Prepare for and contribute constructively to meetings.
- Attend regularly and participate actively.
- Persistent non-engagement without cause may be raised as a governance concern.
- Exercise due care and diligence in decisions.

4.2 Integrity, Honesty, and Lawfulness

- Act fairly, honestly, and in good faith.
- Comply with all laws and this Code.
- Avoid conduct that brings the forum into disrepute.

4.3 Respect and Civility

- Treat others with courtesy and professionalism.
- Avoid intimidation, bullying, and personal attacks.
- Maintain respectful behaviour in meetings and online.

4.4 Confidentiality

- Keep discussions and documents confidential.
- Share sensitive information only if authorised.
- Maintain confidentiality after leaving the role.

4.5 Fairness and Equity

- Provide equal opportunity for diverse views.
- Avoid actual or perceived bias.

4.6 Meeting Conduct and Collegiality

- Support the Chair in maintaining order and productivity.
- Be concise and avoid repetition.
- Accept disagreement without discourtesy.

4.7 Accountability and Decision-Making

- Ask questions, apply care, and consider impacts.
- Respect final decisions.
- Raise concerns constructively.
- Do not present personal views as RBC positions unless endorsed.

4.8 Role Modelling and Public Confidence

- Model ethical conduct.
- Protect community confidence through responsible behaviour.
- Use public platforms respectfully.

4.9 Continuous Improvement

- Participate in training and induction.
- Seek and act on feedback to improve culture and capability

5. Breaches and Enforcement

5.1 Protocol and Principles

1. Proportional response to severity
2. Fairness: Right to know, respond, and be heard
3. Documentation and transparency in handling

5.2 Response Pathway

1. **Initial Discussion:** Chair, PBC Secretary informally discusses concerns
2. **Formal Warning:** Written notice citing breached clauses
3. **Mediation:** Independent facilitation for persistent issues
4. **Referral:** General Meeting or oversight forum for serious matters
5. **Escalation:** Legal or regulatory referral for legislative breaches
6. **Reinstatement:** Possible after defined period, training, and approval

6. Use of Position

- Must not misuse position for personal gain or favouritism
- Must not influence decisions for benefit of family, friends, or personal business

7. Endorsement

This Code is formally reviewed biennially or following material changes to legislation, structure, or governance practices.

8. References and Supporting Documents

- *Sanctuary Cove Resort Act 1985 (SCRA) & Building Units and Group Titles Act 1980 (BUGTA)*
- *Sanctuary Cove PBC Conflict of Interest Policy (2025)*
- *Sanctuary Cove PBC Code of Conduct – One-Page Summary: What You Need to Know (2025)*
- *Sanctuary Cove PBC Terms of Reference (2025)*

Examples of confidential information: Matters under legal review, individual lot owner's financial information, correspondence marked confidential. Disclosure authority would need to occur with the approval of the Chairperson/PBC Secretary or resolution approved by PBC.

Examples of accessible information – PBC meeting minutes, current by-laws, budgets released to all lot owners.

Appendix: Code of Conduct: Performance Breach and Removal Protocol

Principles Underpinning the Protocol

- Aligned with SCRA (1985), BUGTA (1980) and ‘best fit’ governance practice
- Fair justice: Right to know allegations, respond, and be heard
- Proportionality: Response matches severity and impact of breach
- Transparency: Clear records of process and decisions
- Community confidence: Members held to consistent, respectful standards.

Code of Conduct Breach Management Process

Stage	Trigger/Criteria	Who	Actions	Outcome
1. Initial Assessment (Informal Resolution)	Potential minor breach	Chair or PBC Secretary	- Discuss concerns with the person plus an observer. - Remind member of Code expectations - Seek voluntary improvement	No formal record unless behaviour is repeated
2. Formal Warning and Written Acknowledgement	Repeated minor breach or one-off moderate breach	Chair or PBC Secretary	- Provide written warning, referencing specific clause(s) - Allow member to respond - May include agreed behaviour expectations	Formal record maintained; escalation if unresolved
3. Mediation or Facilitation	Ongoing conflict or persistent breach after warning	Independent mediator (internal or external)	- Structured session between parties - Focus on restoring relationships and setting expectations	Mediation summary recorded; escalate if unsuccessful
4. Referral to Oversight Body or General Meeting	Serious misconduct or multiple unresolved breaches	Chair or PBC Secretary refers to meeting	- Notify member in writing - Offer fair hearing or written response - Motion presented to relevant general meeting	Possible removal from role or imposition of conditions
5. Escalation to External Authority (if applicable)	Breach of legislation or statutory obligation	Chair or Secretary, with legal counsel	- Report to external regulator - Provide documentation and action history	Managed externally; may influence internal governance actions
6. Reinstatement or Re-engagement	After removal, following defined period (e.g. 12 months)	Committee consideration	- Demonstrated respectful conduct - Committee endorsement - Code of Conduct training completed	Member may re-engage; maintains standards while supporting inclusion

Conflict of Interest Policy: What You Need to Know

For PBC, EC, Sub-Committees, Advisory Bodies and RBC Committees

Effective XXX 2025

Why this is important?

Conflicts of interest, whether real, potential, structural or perceived, can undermine trust, integrity, and decision making integrity. This policy helps ensure decisions are fair, transparent, and made in the best interests of the community.

Why Declare Conflicts of Interest?

The law may not compel it in every forum, but good governance does. However, the EC has statutory and legal obligations under SCRA. Declaring a conflict of interest at a PBC EGM (or any formal meeting or forum) ensures that all decisions are seen to be fair, transparent, and free of bias. It also:

- Reduces reputational risk to the committee and community
- Reinforces the ethical standards outlined in our policy
- Helps the Chair manage impartiality and participation appropriately

If in doubt, declare it—or ask for guidance. There is no penalty for caution, but silence on a material conflict can erode trust.

What is a Conflict of Interest?

A **conflict of interest** arises when your personal, financial, or professional interests, or duties to another person or group, could:

- Interfere with your duty to act in the best interests of the Sanctuary Cove community, PBC or committee, or
- Make others question your impartiality.

Types of Conflict of Interest

Type	Definition
Actual	A current conflict interfering with duties or impartiality. A material conflict significantly impairs impartiality and requires stricter management.
Potential	A foreseeable conflict due to evolving circumstances.
Structural	A conflict arising from holding multiple roles across entities with diverging duties.
Perceived	Where a reasonable third party might believe a conflict exists, even if it does not.

Your Responsibilities

1. **Disclose** – Declare the conflict as soon as you become aware of it:
 - Verbally at the meeting or privately to the Chair prior to the meeting
 - In writing (email or the Annual Declaration Form)
2. **Act on Advice** – The Chair (or PBC Secretary, if Chair is conflicted) will guide next steps. You may be asked to consider:
 - Stay and vote
 - Leave the room during discussion, but vote
 - Step away entirely from the issue
3. **Document** – All conflicts and actions are documented in the minutes and Conflict of Interest Register. A copy of the conflict of interest policy should be included in contractor documentation and project charters for advisory bodies.

Examples

Scenario	Is it a Conflict?	Recommended Actions
You vote on a drainage issue that benefits only your lot	Yes – Actual Conflict	Disclose, step away
You support funding an event you're helping organise	Likely – Perceived Conflict	Disclose; Chair decides any actions
Spouse owns company contracted by PBC	Actual/Material	Disclose; Step away
Directors or paid employees of Mulpha or Golf Club voting on PBC motions for land re-zoning or development decisions that could provide a potential financial benefit to the entity.	Actual/Material	Disclose; Step away
You vote on your RBC's general budget	No – Duty of Role	No action unless personal gain exists

Tips for New Members

- **When in doubt—declare it.** The policy encourages a precautionary approach.
- **It is okay to have a conflict** — what matters is how it's managed.
- **Ask the Chair or PBC Secretary** for guidance if unsure.
- **Complete the Annual Declaration Form** and keep it up to date

Resources

- Full Conflict of Interest Policy
- Annual Conflict of Interest Declaration Form
- Conflict of Interest Register (maintained by PBC Secretary)

Sanctuary Cove Principal Body Corporate (PBC) Conflict of Interest Policy

Effective Date: [19th August 2025]

Replaces: ARC COI 2024

Review Date: [Insert Date Annually]

1. Purpose

This policy ensures consistent, transparent, and accountable management of conflicts of interest across all PBC forums and aligned with the Sanctuary Cove Resort Act 1985 (Qld) and the Building Units & Group Titles Act 1980 (Qld).

While the Sanctuary Cove Resort Act 1985 (SCRA) does not impose a legal obligation to declare conflicts of interest at PBC EGMs, **good governance absolutely does**. Under this policy, and consistent with widely accepted governance standards, all participants, whether voting or contributing to discussion, should declare any actual, perceived, structural, or potential conflict of interest that may relate to the business under consideration. In line with the Conflict of Interest Policy, the PBC is committed to fostering a culture of openness, integrity, and accountability

For EC members and officers, compliance with this policy supports and reinforces their statutory obligations under the SCRA and is legally enforceable.

2. Scope

This policy also applies to anyone *appointed, co-opted, or invited* to advisory roles such as Principal Body Corporate (PBC), PBC Executive Committee (EC), all Sub-Committees, Advisory Bodies, invited participants (observers, consultants)_Resident Body Corporate Committees (RBC Committees).

3. Definitions

A conflict of interest arises when a person's personal, professional, or financial interests or their duties to another individual or organisation may:

- **Interfere with their obligation** to act in the best interests of the Sanctuary Cove lot owners, the broader community, or any PBC-related entity; or
- **Reasonably appear to compromise** their impartiality, judgement, or decision.

Type	Definition
Actual	A current conflict interfering with duties or impartiality.
Actual/Material	A material conflict significantly impairs impartiality and requires stricter management.
Potential	A foreseeable conflict due to evolving circumstances.
Structural	A conflict arising from holding multiple roles across entities with diverging duties. If unresolved, structural conflicts can limit the free flow of information, impair decision-making, and reduce community trust.
Perceived	Where a reasonable third party might believe a conflict exists, even if it does not.

4. Governance Expectations

All members should:

- Act in the best interests of the Sanctuary Cove community.
- Proactively disclose all conflicts and avoid using position for personal gain.
- Maintain confidentiality. Confidential information obtained in your role should not be used for personal benefit or shared externally unless formally authorised.
- Uphold decision-making integrity and behaviour aligned with the Code of Conduct.

5. Disclosure and Register Requirements

Members are expected to take a precautionary approach to disclosure, by raising potential or perceived conflicts early, whether privately with the Chair or in the meeting itself. Normalising disclosure supports transparency, protects decision-making integrity, and strengthens trust across the community.

Conflicts of interest should be disclosed at the start of any decision making or discussion forum, including Principal Body Corporate (PBC) General Meetings (GMs), Extraordinary General Meetings (EGMs), Executive Committee (EC) meetings, sub-committee meetings, and working or advisory groups.

To support this, the Chair will formally call for declarations at the commencement of each meeting, and all disclosures will be recorded in the minutes or as soon as they arise.

For electronic voting via Strata Vote, members should tick an acknowledgment confirming they have no conflict of interest to declare before submitting a vote. Votes are invalid if this is not acknowledged. If a conflict is later identified, the vote may be reviewed and excluded under this policy.

An annual conflict of interest declaration form should be completed by all members including members of project advisory bodies.

The declaration should include the nature of the conflict and whether it is actual, potential, structural or perceived.

All members to complete and sign the *Annual Conflict of Interest Declaration Form* at the time of their election or re-election.

A copy of this policy should be attached to the relevant contactor documentations.

Conflicts should be disclosed:

- Verbally at the start of any meeting (GMs, EGMs, EC, Sub-Committees, RBCs) or prior to discussing a motion.
- Privately to the Chair prior to the meeting, if the individual prefers.
- In writing as soon as identified, to the Chair or Secretary.
- Via an Annual Declaration Form (on appointment or by 1 March annually).

Members are encouraged to take a precautionary approach, when in doubt, disclose or consult the Chair or PBC Secretary.

6. Conflict Management

Conflict Type	Suggested Management Action
Actual	Disclose, step away of discussion and vote.
Actual & Material	May require recusal from committee role
Potential	Disclose; Chair to assess; May require abstaining or recusal.
Structural	Disclose on appointment; Review regularly; Consider structural reform.
Perceived	Disclose; Chair assesses materiality; Precautionary approach encouraged.

All actions must be recorded in minutes and the Conflict of Interest Register.

7. Non-Compliance

Breaches may result in:

- Warning or review by Chair or PBC Secretary
- Suspension or removal from role
- Referral to legal counsel or external governance advisor
- Material or repeated breaches may be escalated to an external governance advisor and factored into periodic governance reviews

8. Review & Records

The policy will be reviewed annually or following:

- Legislative changes
- Governance structure updates
- Significant incidents or feedback

All conflicts and actions taken are:

- Documented in meeting minutes
- Recorded in the Conflict of Interest Register (maintained by the PBC Secretary)
- Reviewed annually at the AGMs
- Supported by Annual Declaration Forms

Appendix A: Common Examples of Conflicts

Scenario	Type	Recommended Action
Member votes on relaxing a by-law they breached	Actual	Disclose; Step away
Request for drainage works benefiting only own lot	Actual	Disclose; Step away
Contractor on committee approves work done for lot owner	Actual	Disclose; Step away
Spouse owns company contracted by PBC	Actual/Material	Disclose; Step away
Directors or paid employees of Mulpha or Golf Club voting on PBC motions for land re-zoning or development decisions that could provide a potential financial benefit to the entity.	Actual/Material	Disclose; Step away
Committee member benefits from nearby landscaping works	Potential	Disclose; Chair to assess
Recreational group member votes on relevant upgrades	Perceived	Disclose; Chair to assess
Voting on event funding one is organising	Perceived	Disclose; Chair to assess

Appendix B: Examples *Not* Considered Conflicts

Scenario	Not a Conflict: Rationale
Voting on general RBC budget	Role-based; no unique gain
Participating in inclusive community events	No exclusive benefit
Serving on multiple committees	Acceptable unless decisions directly conflict
Expressing personal values (e.g. sustainability preference)	Not a conflict unless personal gain involved
Supporting common property used by all	Part of elected role
Casual social contact with another resident	Not material unless influence is likely

Appendix C: Supporting Documents

- Conflict of Interest Register Template
- Annual Conflict of Interest Declaration Form
- *Conflict of Interest: What Every Committee Member Needs to Know* (One page Summary Guide)

Sanctuary Cove PBC Community Digital App: September 2025

A single source Sanctuary Cove Community App will give residents easy access to crisis plan, alerts and contacts, policies and procedures, standard forms and Sanctuary Cove community information - improving safety, transparency and efficiency.

Purpose

To seek PBC support and approval to fund the deployment of a foundational level solution for Sanctuary Cove Community Digital App that leverages existing SCBCS databases to enable convenient access to important information such as crisis management, policies, procedures and forms, contact information and essential SC community information.

Why This Matters Now?

- **Enhances Safety Communication** – A trusted, central channel for emergency alerts, crisis management plan and contacts (storms, floods, security incidents across the community).
- **Convenience** – Meets resident expectation to easily access information via phones and tablets.
- **Increasing Transparency** – Delivers on the Governance Improvement Plan by providing transparent, up-to-date codes, policies, procedures, and meeting notices.

Technology Approach

App launches and connects to SCBCS databases for general information, contacts, procedures, forms, meeting notices, minutes, and approved documents.

Sanctuary Cove App – Foundational Stage 1:

Will Provide

Crisis alerts and emergency contact numbers
Crisis Management Plan access
PBC meeting dates, notices, and minutes
Approved Codes of Conduct, by-laws, policies, and procedures
Standard forms and templates (e.g. building requests)
Contact details for SCBCS and key community services
SC newsletters and community notices
Community incident notifications

Will Not Provide (Stage 1)

Daily weather updates or traffic feeds
Restaurant or café booking functions
Golf club site access or tee time bookings
Facility bookings (e.g., tennis courts, function rooms)
Levy statements, account balances, or payment processing
Resident social media feeds, forums, or messaging
Commercial promotions, ticketing, or shopping
Personal data storage or tracking functions

Financials

We seek approval of an initial allocation of \$X for digital support, integration, and deployment. Support costs for the foundational app stage are minor and should be absorbed into the existing SCBCS budget, with potential efficiency gains expected.

Risk of Inaction

- Delays in emergency communication and ease of access to crisis management information.
- Ongoing inefficiencies in accessing updated documents and information
- Residents disengaged due less convenient ways of accessing information

Recommendation and Decision by PBC

- Approve the foundational stage of the SC Community Digital App project.
- Endorses an initial budget of \$15K digital/technology consultant to link app with data bases and pilot deployment.
- SCBCS to manage implementation, with support by Digital Consultant using existing backend databases as the primary information source.
- Timings for the deployment of the SC Community App, before the end of 2025.



AUTHORISATION FOR BODY CORPORATE EXPENDITURE

DOCUMENT CONTROL NO# DF 502040

VERSION NO#1

Entity: ☒ PBC ☐ PTBC

Project/Works Name: Parkway Villas – Provision of Quality Assurance documentation.

Brief Description of Works: Third party civil engineering consultant to peer review and oversee the handover of civil works for the proposed Parkway Villas development.

Location: Parkway Villas

Type of Funding: ☒ Admin Fund ☐ Sinking Fund

Amount to be Approved- \$22,800.00 ex GST

GL Code: Consultants 12550

Priority Level: ☒ High ☐ Medium ☐ Low

Scope of Works: The scope comprises the review of 'for construction' documentation, active participation in pre-start and final handover meetings and inspections alongside consultants, contractors, and Sanctuary Cove representatives, and the preparation of detailed defect lists. It also includes coordination with consultants and contractors to obtain all relevant design documentation, as-constructed drawings, test results, and operation and maintenance manuals for applicable utility services and infrastructure.

Reason for Work: To ensure compliance with processes and procedures for the handover and acceptance of new developments. This review verifies that all new roadworks, drainage, and associated services conform to relevant standards, are thoroughly inspected, and are supported by complete documentation—including as-built drawings and testing—thereby guaranteeing the development meets all required criteria prior to acceptance by the PBC.

Risks or Impacts: Without this review, there is a risk that the development may not meet the necessary standards or procedural requirements, potentially resulting in:

- Incomplete or inadequate inspections
- Missing or inaccurate documentation
- Unresolved defects

These issues could lead to challenges during the handover process, increased liability for the PBC, unanticipated maintenance obligations, and possible safety concerns. Ultimately, this may result in costly remediation, delays in acceptance, and negative impacts on residents and the broader community.

Quotes Received:

Company Name	Quote Amount (ex GST)	Notes (if applicable)
OSKA Consultancy Group	\$22,800.00	Contract variations beyond the agreed scope (e.g., statutory RFI responses or post-construction documentation changes) will be billed at time and expense, subject to an agreed fee.

Recommended Contractor: OSKA Consulting Group



AUTHORISATION FOR BODY CORPORATE EXPENDITURE

DOCUMENT CONTROL NO# DF 502040

VERSION NO#1

Additional Notes: Only one quote was obtained as OSKA Consulting Group is a preferred supplier for this type of work. They are well-versed in the development handover processes and familiar with the onsite stakeholders, ensuring efficient and effective service delivery.

At the direction of the PBC EGM, Management approached Mulpha Developments to discuss the possibility of a contribution toward the expenses associated with the peer engineering review of development/civil works.

On 15 September 2025, Jeff Ray of Mulpha confirmed that Mulpha would contribute 50% of the handover costs as a goodwill gesture. This contribution applies to scopes generally consistent with the detailed scope of works provided by Oska on 17 July 2025, and for all ongoing subdivision of land in residential zones where new secondary thoroughfares and service assets are being created and subsequently handed over to the PBC.

Attachments:

1. OSKA – Fee Proposal – Civil Consultancy Services

Submitted By: Peter Gannon/Shanyn Fox

Date: 17/09/2025

Project: Sanctuary Cove Fibre-to-the-Home (FTTH) Strategic Review and Technical Advisory

Prepared for: Principal Body Corporate (PBC)

Date: September 2025

DISTRIBUTION: PBC	ATTACHMENTS: 1	DATE: September 2025
MOTION: That the PBC EGM, approves the expenditure of \$140,800 (inc GST) for the engagement of Gravel Road Group to provide consulting services for the FTTH network review (Part A). Funds to be expensed to the PBC Sinking Fund code – 22233 FTTH.		

1. Executive Summary

This evaluation assesses quotations received under the FTTH Consultancy Services RFQ. While not a formal tender, the process was conducted in line with the Tender Process Principles and Procedures to ensure fairness, consistency and transparency. Scoring weighted Non-Price 60% (five criteria scored 0–10 and normalised to a 0–60 scale) and Price 40% (lowest price = full points; others proportional to the lowest).

Results (out of 100): Gravel Road Group 87.00, Accelerate 86.86, Grex Consulting 81.14.

- Gravel Road delivered the strongest non-price score (60/60) with a detailed, phase-aligned methodology and well-defined stakeholder plan. After price discussions, it reduced its fee to \$128,000 ex GST, lifting the price score to 27/40 and resulting in the highest overall score.
- Accelerate offers the lowest price (\$86,400 ex GST; 40/40 price) with an acceptable non-price outcome (46.86/60).
- Grex presents a solid non-price result (50.29/60) and mid-range price (30.86/40); fastest indicative timeframe (~6 weeks) but with greater reliance on third-party information.

The CSC and Task Force recognise that, whilst value for money is important, the complexity of these works requires a consultant capable of delivering accurate, future-ready technical outputs, backed by proven experience and a practical methodology. The adopted weighting prioritises technical capability, relevant experience and stakeholder engagement quality, whilst still giving significant consideration to price. This approach supports balanced decision-making, ensuring the selected consultant can meet project objectives to the required quality, within the available timeframe and budget, without allowing cost alone to override capability.

*Recommendation: It is recommended that **Gravel Road Group** be approved as the preferred consultant. They achieved the highest overall evaluation score and have demonstrated the most comprehensive and technically robust approach to delivering the project outcomes.*

The CSC/Taskforce has completed the necessary scope clarifications and reviewed the project phases, providing confidence that Gravel Road is well positioned to meet the PBC's objectives and deliver value for money.

2. Background & Need

Sanctuary Cove's existing Fibre-to-the-Home (FTTH) network is a core utility supporting residential services, security, and commercial operations. The infrastructure is approaching key lifecycle stages where capacity, technology compatibility, and long-term viability need to be assessed. The PBC requires independent consultancy services to:

- Assess the current network status and future requirements.
- Identify and cost strategic options.
- Provide a recommended, future-ready solution aligned with community needs.

The RFQ scope (Part A) covers six phases: stakeholder engagement, field survey, scope definition, technical evaluation, financial modelling, and final presentation. Part B (optional) includes project management support during implementation (if required).

3. Evaluation Criteria

Submissions were evaluated against the following weighted criteria:

Non-Price Criteria – 60% weighting

Criteria	Weight	Description
Technical Capability & Methodology	25%	Evaluates the consultant's understanding of FTTH systems, including network design, regulatory requirements, and futureproofing, as well as the robustness and suitability of their proposed approach.
Relevant Experience & Past Performance	15%	Evaluates demonstrated track record in delivering comparable FTTH or telecommunications infrastructure projects, ideally within complex stakeholder or mixed-use environments.
Team Qualifications & Expertise	10%	Considers the experience, and specialisation of proposed personnel, including lead consultants and subject-matter experts in engineering, financial modelling, and governance.
Stakeholder Engagement & Communication Approach	5%	Assesses the ability to engage and manage diverse stakeholder groups effectively, communicate technical findings clearly, and facilitate consensus.
Delivery Timeframe & Resourcing Plan	5%	Reviews the proposed delivery schedule and resourcing plan to confirm feasibility in meeting the required completion date without compromising quality.

Price Criteria – 40% weighting

Criteria	Weight	Description
Price	40%	Evaluates the competitiveness of the proposed price, structure of fees, and the transparency of inclusions and exclusions.

Score Range	Assessment Level	Description
0	Non-Compliance / Poor Response	Well short of requirements; unsubstantiated claims.
1-2	Unsatisfactory Response	Does not meet minimum requirements or inadequately substantiated.
3-4	Marginal Compliance	Material deficiencies preventing full compliance.
5-6	Satisfactory Compliance	Minor deficiencies preventing full compliance.
7	Full Compliance	Adequate response and appropriately substantiated.
8	Exceeds Compliance	Very satisfactory response; more than adequate and well substantiated.
9	Significantly Exceeds Requirements	Excellent response; surpasses all requirements and fully substantiated.
10	Superior / Outstanding Compliance	Well exceeds requirements and fully substantiated, offers additional value add.

4. Evaluation Results

Consultant / Service Provider	RFQ Submission Received	Total Lump Sum (ex GST)	Total Lump Sum (inc GST)	Estimated timeframe	Total Score
GreX Consulting Pty Ltd	25/07/2025	\$ 112,000.00	\$ 123,200.00	6 weeks	81.14
Accelerate	23/07/2025	\$ 86,400.00	\$ 95,040.00	11 Weeks	86.86
Gravel Road Group	25/07/2025	\$ 128,000.00	\$ 148,095.20	December	87.00
Talemm	Declined to submit	-	-	-	-

Note: Gravel Road's initial RFQ price was \$134,632 (ex GST). Following a pricing review as the highest-scoring non-price respondent, they submitted a revised price of \$128,000 (ex GST). The revision made a minor change to Phase 1 (stakeholder workshops reduced from 4-5 to 2) and a fee reduction in Phase 3. No other changes were made to scope, deliverables, methodology, or program assumptions.

FTTH - Consultancy Services				
Price Weighting (%)	40			
Non-Price Total (%)	60			
Criteria	Weight (%)	Greex Consulting Pty Ltd	Accelerate	Gravel Road Group
Technical Capability & Methodology	25%	7	7	9
		1.75	1.75	2.25
Relevant Experience & Past Performance	15%	7.5	7	9
		1.13	1.05	1.35
Team Qualifications & Expertise	10%	8	6.5	8.5
		0.80	0.65	0.85
Stakeholder Engagement & Communication Approach	5%	7.5	6.5	9
		0.38	0.33	0.45
Delivery Timeframe & Resourcing Plan	5%	7	6.5	7
		0.35	0.33	0.35
Raw Non-Price Score		4.40	4.10	5.25
Normalised Non Price Score		8.38	7.81	10.00
Weighted Non price score		50.29	46.86	60.00
Submission Price (ex GST)		\$112,000	\$86,400	\$128,000
Normalised Price Score		7.71	10.00	6.75
Weighted Price Score		30.86	40.00	27.00
Total Score (Weighted Non-Price + Weighted Price)		81.14	86.86	87.00
Compliance Item		Status	Status	Status
RFQ Form Complete		✓	✓	✓
Insurance - Copies provided		✓	Partial	✓
Experience and Key Personnel		✓	✓	✓
Project Management (Part B) supplied		✓	✓	✓
Compliance Declaration		✓	✓	✓
Supporting documentation supplied		✓	Partial	✓
Declaration and Signature		✓	✓	✓

Notes:

- Value for Money. Accelerate remains the lowest-cost option. Gravel Road upon request reviewed scope and reduced its price to \$128k, improving value while retaining the strongest technical proposition. Grex sits mid-range on price with strong governance credentials.
- Capability & Qualifications. Gravel Road and Grex evidence strong experience with complex, high-value projects; Accelerates credentials are thinner for a strategy-plus-technical engagement.
- Indicative programme durations. Grex 6 weeks; Accelerate 11 weeks; Gravel Road 20+ weeks (longest, reflecting the detailed scope/phases).

5. Summary of Offers

Supplier	Price (ex GST)	Strengths	Limitations
Accelerate	\$86,400	Lowest price; practical in-house capability; emphasis on site survey and clarifying legal ownership/structural separation boundaries.	Strategic objectives will require consultant-led facilitation (five-day turnaround unrealistic); integration of phases; limited detail on testing tools/standards; individual credentials light for a strategy-and-technical scope; references lack contact details; communications plan lacks defined frequency and actions; lowest PI cover (\$2M).
Gravel Road	\$128,000	Most detailed, phase-aligned methodology; vendor-neutral advice; robust testing/mapping (e.g., GIS/OTDR); local QLD presence; strong insurance; deep technical CVs; well-defined stakeholder engagement; clear deliverables and documented risk analysis; strong technical team with extensive industry experience.	Higher cost reflects expanded resourcing and depth of activity; longer overall programme than other submissions.
Grex Consulting	\$112,000	Logical engagement approach; mid-range price; moderate phase detail across key activities; senior team with strong governance/regulatory depth; recent similar projects with verifiable references; highest professional indemnity insurance (e.g., \$10M / \$20M aggregate).	Limited detail on testing methods/tools; stakeholder communications not clearly defined; detailed approach focused primarily on the recommended 10-year option; reliance on external information (e.g., Opticomm).

6. Risk Considerations

- Accelerate: Limited technical substantiation (testing methods, acceptance criteria, critical path, senior oversight) and light credentials mean capability for complex issues is unproven; lowest PI cover (\$2M).
- Gravel Road: Risk of budget pressure from higher costs and extensive surveys; *however, this is likely reflected in the broader, more detailed scope and extended program/timeframe proposed.*
- Grex Consulting: Aggressive six-week schedule requires tight control; reliance on external information (e.g., Opticomm) introduces delay and data-quality risk.

7. Next Steps

1. Issue an interim evaluation pack to the CSC/Task Force
Circulate the scores, summary of offers, and draft recommendation for written feedback within 5-7 business days. – COMPLETE
2. Table recommendations to the PBC EC – 11 September 2025
Present the draft evaluation, negotiation outcomes, and recommendation. Capture any EC directions/conditions. *CSC/FTTH Taskforce members to attend.* – COMPLETE
3. Complete reference checks
Conduct reference checks for the preferred respondent. Record evidence and update analysis accordingly. – COMPLETE
4. The CSC/Taskforce to liaise with Gravel Road to finalise scope clarifications, identify areas in which the project timeline could be reduced, and negotiate potential cost efficiencies, before presenting the updated recommendation to the PBC EGM. – COMPLETE
5. Incorporate EC & Gravel Road Group feedback and prepare EGM papers
Update any supporting documentation. Prepare the draft resolution and supporting pack for the PBC EGM. – COMPLETE
6. PBC EGM approval – 28 September 2025
Table the recommendation for approval, including value-for-money rationale, delivery timeline
7. Award and mobilisation (subject to approval)
Issue Letter of Acceptance, finalise the engagement/contract terms, confirm the start date, and confirm communications schedule and reporting requirements.
8. Draft Survey and Feedback Materials for Phase 1 – Consultation
Develop a concise survey to capture stakeholder input, aligned with project objectives.
9. Identify and Confirm Stakeholder Structure
Compile a comprehensive list of key stakeholders and define the stakeholder hierarchy. Map out commercial elements and engagement pathways to ensure appropriate representation and decision-making authority throughout the project.

APPENDICES – CONSULTANT SUMMARIES

Appendix 1- ACCELERATE- Price (ex GST): \$86,400

Accelerate is an experienced, integrated telecommunications provider offering end-to-end FTTH consultancy, design, and delivery services. Their proposal demonstrates strong technical capability, a collaborative stakeholder approach, and a proven track record in large-scale telecommunications projects, including work for Telstra, NBN Co, and AARNet. The team is qualified, with specialist expertise in network design, carrier involvement (SuperOpti), and infrastructure management.

The methodology proposes merging certain RFQ phases to improve efficiency, supported by subject matter experts for technology selection and cost modelling. While this approach offers potential time savings, it departs from the specified sequencing and provides limited detail on testing processes and precise phase timelines. Pricing is competitive, supported by in-house delivery capability that reduces reliance on subcontractors.

Summary Table

Criteria	Weight	Score (0–10)	Weighted Score	Key Notes
Technical Capability & Methodology	25%	7	1.75	Integration of phases, specialist expertise use; requires more technical detail & timelines
Relevant Experience & Past Performance	15%	7	1.05	Good track record in large-scale, high value projects.
Team Qualifications & Expertise	10%	6.5	0.65	Limited role-specific /detailed history provided, Individual credentials are low for an engagement that spans strategic and technical understanding
Stakeholder Engagement & Communication	5%	6.5	0.33	Workshops referenced; no defined communications schedule/reporting plan.
Delivery Timeframe & Resourcing Plan	5%	6.5	0.33	Solid resourcing; phase detail limited.

Technical Capability & Methodology - Score: 7 / 10

Justification:

- Proposes a site-survey–first approach and consolidates discovery across Phases 1, 2 and the technical-evaluation elements of Phase 4, with outputs to be taken into a stakeholder workshop.
- Describes technical evaluation activities and a legal boundary review, with findings to be integrated into the options assessment and stakeholder session.
- States that subject-matter experts will be engaged for technology selection and to support cost modelling for the options report.
- Would have scored higher if methodology provided more detail on specific tools/testing processes for network performance assessment and clearer phase timelines.

Relevant Experience & Past Performance - Score: 7 / 10

Justification:

- Strong track record with large-scale FTTH and telecom infrastructure projects, including SEQ MDU FTTH (\$13M for NBN Co) and University of Newcastle upgrade. However, reference contact details were not provided.
- Experience spans both private and public networks.
- Slight reduction from full compliance due to limited detail on outcomes/lessons learned from comparable project, note project do tend to appear construction/upgrade based.

Team Qualifications & Expertise - Score: 6.5 / 10

Justification:

- Team includes Project Managers, Infrastructure SMEs, and Carrier SMEs with up to 25 years in telecommunications.
- Certifications in Cisco networking, GIS, and carrier-specific systems align with the principal's needs.
- Presence of both design and delivery specialists supports end-to-end capability.
- Could be strengthened by adding more specific past FTTH project roles/responsibilities. Individual credentials are low for an engagement that spans strategic and technical understanding.

Stakeholder Engagement & Communication Approach - Score: 6.5 / 10

Justification:

- Proposal references stakeholder workshops and collaborative approach to goal alignment.
- Note experience and understanding regarding discretion and managing sensitive stakeholder environments.

- Would benefit from a defined communications schedule.

Delivery Timeframe & Resourcing Plan - Score: 6.5 / 10

Justification:

- Identifies phased delivery, sequencing tasks logically to align with decision-making.
- Resourcing is strong due to in-house capability and minimal subcontracting, reducing dependency risks.
- Lack of detailed schedule with phase durations and milestone dates limit's ability to fully assess feasibility against PBC's timeline requirements.

Strengths:

- Lowest price of all submissions.
- Strong industry experience delivering large-scale telecommunications projects, including high-security and private network environments.
- Integrated delivery model with in-house project management, design, and construction capability, reducing dependency on subcontractors and minimising delays.
- Experienced and qualified team with up to 25 years' experience and relevant certifications (Cisco, GIS, carrier systems).

Weaknesses

- Methodology detail is limited in areas such as specific testing tools, network performance measurement processes, and phases in comparison to other submissions received.
- Stakeholder communication plan is high-level only; lacks defined reporting frequency, formats, and responsibilities.
- Resequencing of RFQ phases (merging Phases 1, 2, and 4) could be seen as a deviation from the requested process if strict adherence is expected.
- Individual credentials light for a strategy + technical scope; Limited plan for developing and comparing alternative solutions.
- Strategic-objectives definition will require consultant-led facilitation; a five-day turnaround from PBC alone is unlikely and risks misalignment.
- References lack contact details;
- Lowest PI cover (\$2M).

Appendix 2- Gravel Road Group- Price (ex GST): ~~\$134,632~~ \$128,800

Gravel Road Group is a highly experienced telecommunications consultancy specialising in FTTH assessment, design, and strategic advisory. Their proposal shows strong knowledge of the Sanctuary Cove network's history, current architecture, and the technical, operational, and strategic considerations for future upgrades. The submission is comprehensive, covering GPON, XGS-PON, hybrid fibre–wireless options, and alternative architectures, with a clear emphasis on vendor-neutral advice and maintaining service continuity.

The methodology closely follows the RFQ's six-phase structure, with detailed processes, timelines, deliverables, and risk controls. It includes thorough technical evaluation, cost modelling, and governance frameworks, supported by a senior team and specialist subcontractor Optilinx for field surveys. While the submission is technically strong and well aligned to scope, the pricing is the highest of the respondents, and the timelines, while realistic given the detailed approach is the longest relative to other submissions.

Scope and Phase Review – Confirmation received 18/09/2025

Phase 1- Consultation: Two targeted stakeholder sessions (reduced from 4–5) at a revised price of \$1,014 ex GST.

Phase 2- Field Survey & Current State Assessment:

- A comprehensive field survey of the Sanctuary Cove FTTH network infrastructure, with an allowance for up to an additional 750 premises, *focus on the on the existing built premises that are not covered under the existing As Constructed documentation.*
- The survey will identify and record NBN and other third-party telecommunications infrastructure where it interfaces with and services the Sanctuary Cove FTTH network, including visible pits, conduits, cabinets and demarcation points on PBC infrastructure, using non-intrusive visual inspection, DGPS capture and available records. This confirms external network service integration and is subject to timely cooperation from relevant providers. It excludes access to, testing of or detailed mapping of provider owned assets beyond the property boundary or off site, and any invasive works, which would require separate scope, permissions and costs.
- Includes compilation of a structured asset register derived from the field survey, listing each identified FTTH asset within scope with unique identifiers, DGPS coordinates, asset type and key attributes, and references to drawings. Where feasible we will format the register for direct upload to the PBC's current asset management system using a template and field map provided by the Principal. The register will be based on non-intrusive survey methods and available records, applies only to assets within the stated Phase 2 scope, and excludes detailed condition grading, lifecycle modelling, or any access to customer premises or third-party systems.

Phase 3 - Scope Definition: Revised price \$3,170 ex GST with no change to scope.

Fee Structure - Gravel Road declined an at-risk holdback for this engagement.

Noting: Our commercial model is fixed price by phase, with the price table set out in our proposal, and invoices raised at completion of agreed milestones. This already provides the assurance that delivery is tied to outcomes without altering the agreed commercial terms. We have clearly defined deliverables for each phase, a staged timeline with milestone checkpoints and reviews, and monthly payment milestones to be agreed with PBC. Our insurances also remain in place for further comfort.

Summary Table

Criteria	Weight	Score (0–10)	Weighted Score	Key Notes
Technical Capability & Methodology	25%	9	2.25	Highly detailed, phase-aligned methodology; strong technical and risk planning.
Relevant Experience & Past Performance	15%	9	1.35	Proven experience on large scale consultancy projects; strong references.
Team Qualifications & Expertise	10%	8.5	0.85	Senior team with 30–40 years' experience; vendor-neutral and multi-technology expertise.
Stakeholder Engagement & Communication	5%	9	0.45	Structured engagement model; including regular reporting, newsletters to the community and milestone-based reviews.
Delivery Timeframe & Resourcing Plan	5%	7	0.35	Detailed timelines; comprehensive proposed scope of works.

Technical Capability & Methodology – Score: 9 / 10

Justification:

- Adheres to all six RFQ phases with detailed execution steps, deliverables, and schedules.
- Includes risk analysis, governance framework, and strategies for GPON/XGS-PON coexistence.
- Comprehensive field survey plan with GIS mapping, OTDR testing, and infrastructure cataloguing.
- No brand bias; meaning recommendations will be objective.
- Demonstrated a top-down strategic approach instead of a focus on current assets.

Relevant Experience & Past Performance – Score: 9 / 10**Justification:**

- Extensive FTTH and telecommunications experience including NSW Regional Connectivity Program (\$1.15M), and QLD Rail Passenger Network Connectivity Project (~\$575k).
- Ability to benchmark against comparable gated communities, large-scale fibre deployments, and government clients.
- Strong client references provided; experience spans technical, financial, and regulatory advisory.

Team Qualifications & Expertise – Score: 8.5 / 10**Justification:**

- Senior leadership with 30–40 years in telecommunications engineering and network strategy.
- Multidisciplinary team covering engineering, project management, financial modelling, and vendor negotiation.
- Inclusion of specialist subcontractor (Optilinx) for technical fieldwork adds operational depth.

Stakeholder Engagement & Communication Approach – Score: 9 / 10**Justification:**

- Provided detailed communication plans. Including newsletters, milestone updates, surveys, and fortnightly virtual meetings.
- Clear decision pathways and progress updates to ensure transparency and timely feedback.

Delivery Timeframe & Resourcing Plan – Score: 7 / 10**Justification:**

- Realistic phase durations with risk buffers and contingency allowances.
- Comprehensive resourcing, but schedules extend up to 4–6 weeks for some phases where competitors offer shorter timeframes.
- Accelerated options available but contingent on stakeholder availability and data access.

Strengths:

- Vendor-neutral technical expertise with proven FTTH assessment and upgrade planning experience.
- Comprehensive, phase-aligned methodology with clear deliverables and risk mitigation strategies.
- Strong stakeholder engagement, showing an understanding of the specific needs of the community within Sanctuary Cove.
- High-quality team with decades of experience and specialist subcontractor support.
- Detailed financial and technical modelling across multiple technology options.
- Relevant/comparable projects (city-scale, multi-stakeholder, tech-heavy) strategy-first method; starts with a needs analysis (as required by the RFQ);
- Queensland-based for easier engagement.

Weaknesses:

- Highest quoted price among respondents.
- Delivery schedule longer than the other submissions, which may delay decision-making and implementation.
- Extensive methodology may be more resource-intensive than necessary for initial strategic review.
- Large survey component (30 days).

Appendix 3- Grex Consulting- Price (ex GST): \$112,000

Grex Consulting is a telecommunications strategy and technical advisory firm with a strong background in FTTH, digital connectivity, and infrastructure projects. Their proposal demonstrates deep expertise in governance, regulatory compliance, and technical due diligence, supported by recent work for government agencies, councils, and private telecommunications operators.

The team includes seasoned project directors, technical workstream leads, and strategy specialists with up to 25 years of industry experience. The methodology appears structured and comprehensive, addressing governance, technical evaluation, and stakeholder engagement. While the submission outlines workstreams, it provides limited detail on specific testing methods/tools and acceptance criteria, and only moderate phase-by-phase detail.

Their track record in similar projects is strong, particularly in complex regulatory and multi-stakeholder environments, though examples of gated community FTTH delivery are limited. Pricing is mid-range, reflecting senior-level consulting rates and broad resource coverage.

Summary Table

Criteria	Weight	Score (0–10)	Weighted Score	Key Notes
Technical Capability & Methodology	25%	7	1.75	Solid governance & technical framework; limited detail on sequencing & testing tools.
Relevant Experience & Past Performance	15%	7.5	1.13	Significant FTTH-related advisory experience; high-profile clients; limited information/details provided on scope of projects.
Team Qualifications & Expertise	10%	8	0.80	Highly qualified, senior team across governance, tech, and strategy
Stakeholder Engagement & Communication	5%	7.5	0.38	Weekly meetings and a management playback session; does not set out a full communications schedule.
Delivery Timeframe & Resourcing Plan	5%	7	0.35	Experienced resourcing; timeline detail moderate. Logical approach to engagement, Aggressive timeline

Technical Capability & Methodology – Score: 7 / 10

Justification:

- Demonstrates understanding of FTTH networks, regulatory frameworks, and operational considerations with mixed use systems.
- Methodology covers governance, stakeholder engagement, technical evaluation, and strategic development.
- Proposes multi-workstream approach with defined personnel for governance, technical, and strategy areas.
- Moderate detail provided for sequencing of RFQ phases and detailed testing/assessments.

Relevant Experience & Past Performance – Score: 7.5 / 10

Justification:

- Delivered significant FTTH-related advisory projects, including Logan City Council's DC&I plan and ACCC expenditure assessments.
- Strong portfolio of high-value due diligence and infrastructure strategy projects for government and private telcos.
- Displays experience in complex, multi-stakeholder environments; but few detailed examples of the scope of works.

Team Qualifications & Expertise – Score: 8 / 10

Justification:

- Senior-level team with cross-disciplinary qualifications in engineering, project management, economics, law, and communications.
- Extensive experience (15–25+ years) across telecommunications, digital infrastructure, governance, and financial modelling.
- Expertise covers technical, commercial and strategic aspects.

Stakeholder Engagement & Communication Approach – Score: 7.5 / 10

Justification:

- Demonstrated success engaging diverse stakeholders in regulated and politically sensitive projects.
- Capability to engage councils, government departments, and private carriers.
- Would benefit from a more detailed communications plan with defined frequency, and reporting formats.

Delivery Timeframe & Resourcing Plan – Score: 7 / 10

Justification:

- Strong, experienced resourcing with minimal subcontractor reliance.
- Senior-level consultants allocated to ensure high-quality outcomes.
- Specific milestones listed, along with inputs/outputs and assumptions.

Strengths

- Highly experienced, senior-level team with proven expertise across governance, technical, and strategic domains.
- Significant advisory experience, including government and large-scale infrastructure projects.
- Strong stakeholder engagement skills in regulated and multi-stakeholder environments.
- Strong documentation/reporting; high PI limits; structured add-on pricing; fast mobilisation.

Weaknesses

- Moderate detailed sequencing of RFQ phases and specific technical assessment methods.
- Fewer direct examples of gated community FTTH implementations compared to broader government and telco experience.
- Communication plan could be more formally structured.
- Heavy reliance on third-party data in Phase 2; without a comprehensive field inspection, the gap analysis and financial modelling are likely to be assumption-heavy and less accurate (noting Gravel Road's higher cost reflects this survey work).
- Team is strategic consulting focussed and less technology focussed, strategy lead new to the business.

This page has been left intentionally blank



CLASS A WATER PROJECT

DISTRIBUTION: PBC EGM	ATTACHMENTS: 8	DATE: September 2025
1. MOTION That the PBC EGM approves the expenditure of \$345,881.80 Inc. GST plus a 10% contingency of \$34,588.18 Inc. GST, for TEW to undertake the remaining works as detailed within the Scope of Works for the Class A Project. Funds are to be allocated from Sinking Fund – GL 222601 (Irrigation Control). Costs are to be apportioned as follows: ▪ PBC: 70% – \$242,117.26 (incl. GST) ▪ PTBC: 30% – \$103,764.54 (incl. GST) Furthermore, that the PBC EGM approves a reduction in the required number of quotes from three (3) to one (1), recognising TEW's extensive knowledge of the project, their detailed analysis of the remaining scope, and their unique capability to deliver the works efficiently, mitigate risk, and ensure timely completion ahead of the holiday shutdown. 2. MOTION That the PBC EGM approves the expenditure of \$17,614.85 Inc. GST for Smartstone to construct a retaining wall and reprofile the land within Cassia Park. Funds are to be allocated from Sinking Fund – GL 222601 (Irrigation Control). Costs are to be apportioned as follows: ▪ PBC: 70% – \$12,330.40 (incl. GST) ▪ PTBC: 30% – \$ 5,284.45 (incl. GST) Furthermore, that the PBC EGM approves a reduction in the required number of quotes from two (2) to one (1), acknowledging the nature of the works, the need for timely completion, and the nominated contractor's ability to deliver the works efficiently with minimal disruption. 3. MOTION That the PBC EGM approves the expenditure of \$4,780.88 Inc. GST for Plant Management Company to undertake turf reinstatement within Cassia Park. Funds are to be allocated from Sinking Fund – GL 222601 (Irrigation Control). Costs are to be apportioned as follows: ▪ PBC: 70% – \$ 3,346.62 (incl. GST) ▪ PTBC: 30% – \$ 1,434.26 (incl. GST) 4. MOTION That the PBC EGM approves the expenditure of \$3,960.00 Inc. GST for KBHI to install roof capping on the Entry Bunker. Funds are to be allocated from Sinking Fund – GL 222601 (Irrigation Control). Costs are to be apportioned as follows: ▪ PBC: 70% – \$ 2,772.00 (incl. GST) ▪ PTBC: 30% – \$ 1,188.00 (incl. GST) 5. MOTION That the PBC EGM approves the expenditure of \$6,050.00 Inc. GST for Wavetime Constructions to supply and install a flattop fence to bunker located on Caseys Rd. Funds are to be allocated from Sinking Fund – GL 222601 (Irrigation Control). Costs are to be apportioned as follows: ▪ PBC: 70% – \$ 4,235.00 (incl. GST) ▪ PTBC: 30% – \$ 1,815.00 (incl. GST)		

Objective

To approve the completion, commissioning, and formal close-out of the Class A Recycled Water System project, including all remaining civil, mechanical, electrical, control, and site restoration works.



CLASS A WATER PROJECT

Background

The Stage 1 contract was executed on 8 November 2022 and achieved practical completion on 22 November 2023, with agreed defects noted at the time. A Stage 2 contract was signed concurrently to manage remaining items pending Energex connection, final commissioning, and ancillary deliverables.

At practical completion, several items on the defect's inspection report relating to the certification of the bunker remained unresolved. Due to a dispute between HydroVision and their sub-contractor, some required documentation was not provided at handover. This was attributed to outstanding payments and, in some cases, the inability to finalise certification as the bunker was not yet complete or connected to power.

The principal contractor's engineer provided a letter confirming the structural drawings met the requirements for structural adequacy under NCC 2022, with engineering clearance to be finalised following the building certifier's inspection.

In March 2024, HydroVision submitted an out-of-scope claim for \$264,000 relating to alleged tank sub-base works. This claim was formally rejected by PBC and PTBC on the basis of contract terms and lack of prior authorisation. The dispute was settled on 28 April 2025, with the following key outcomes:

- Settlement Sum: \$153,437.34 (inc. GST), payable after execution of the deed and return of all project equipment and design documents (Stages 1 & 2).
- Returned Items: All pumps, control panels, crane, Cassia fence screens, and all design documentation.
- Defects: PBC/PTBC agreed to forego claims for two listed defects/omissions.
- Stage 2 Contract: Mutually terminated.
- Mutual Release: Both parties released each other from all claims, except for unknown defects.

Settlement Breakdown:

\$75,000 Allocated for the disputed sub-base tank works (INV-102880).

\$100,591.08 Release of retentions withheld

Less

- \$20,000 withheld for defects.
- \$22,153.75 applied to Stage 2 deposit.

Total \$78,437.34

Engagement of TEW

Following the settlement and termination of the Stage 2 contract, TEW (sub-contractor to the principal contractor) were approached to quote on the remaining works. TEW had been responsible for the pump and electrical components during the original project and have direct experience with the installed infrastructure. They also have an established relationship with Grundfos, the manufacturer of the pump and control gear, which provides an additional level of assurance that the system will be commissioned and integrated correctly with appropriate manufacturer warranties applied and maintained.



CLASS A WATER PROJECT

TEW have confirmed that manufacturer warranty coverage can be secured provided they undertake the pump maintenance for the 12-month period following installation and commissioning. This arrangement ensures that the system will be supported under warranty, minimising the risk of unbudgeted costs due to early component failure or operational issues.

Given that the remaining works predominantly involve the installation, testing, and commissioning of the pumps and controls, tasks originally within TEW's scope, engaging an alternate contractor would have introduced unnecessary risk, potential rework, and additional cost associated with mobilisation and familiarisation. TEW's historical knowledge of the project and their previous involvement meant they could quickly identify scope gaps, confirm the status of previously completed works, and propose a cost-effective and technically sound solution.

TEW have since undertaken a comprehensive review of the project, assessing its current status and preparing a detailed cost breakdown to complete the outstanding components of the Class A Water Project. Their review identified scope gaps and outstanding defect rectification requirements, ensuring alignment with the approved scope of works.

Note: As TEW were not the installing or principal contractor for the original works, there remains a degree of uncertainty regarding the status of previously completed works. TEW have factored this risk into their proposal and have provided a fixed price offer as requested. A Minor/Major Project Agreement will be executed to ensure the contract terms and work specifications are clearly defined and adhered to.

Estimate timeframe for Works

Assuming approval is granted on 25 September 2025, TEW will be ready to commence works from 29 September 2025.

Based on the information currently available, and provided no major issues arise during the works, completion is anticipated within three (3) months, enabling completion prior to the Christmas holiday shutdown period.

Building Certification

The builder has supplied all relevant Form 12 certificates that were previously outstanding under the Principal Contract (Hydrovision). The only remaining item is the final certification. This process is independent of the proposed works and will not delay their commencement or completion, as the structure is already complete. Once all documentation has been reviewed, the certifier will confirm the appropriate pathway to achieve final certification and compliance with building standards and regulations. Should certification costs exceed Management's approval threshold, it will be tabled for consideration at a future EGM.



CLASS A WATER PROJECT

Scope of works

Please refer to attachment 1- BOQ

Additional items

Cassia Pump Station

1. Retaining wall - Excavate and pour a concrete footing, install charcoal Versa Wall blocks and caps with appropriate drainage (ag pipe and no-fines concrete), and complete site clean-up.
2. Reprofilng land - Strip and subgrade the area to the required depth, supply and place underturf, remove spoil and unwanted material from site, and complete site clean-up.
3. Turf reinstatement - Prepare and soil the area, supply and install 250 m² of wintergreen couch turf, top-dress turf edges, and water in on completion.

Entry Boulevard

- Bunker Roof Capping- Supply and install matching Colourbond capping with a 50 mm return to the top parapet wall above the roller door, fixing directly to the blocked parapet with approved silicone and sealing all corners with appropriate weatherproof sealant.
- Entry Bunker Fencing- Supply and install approximately 25 m of aluminium flat-top safety fencing (including 14 m raked section) on top of the bunker structure, with 38 x 25 mm top and bottom rails, 16 mm vertical tubes, and 50 x 50 mm posts, finished in satin black powdercoat, to prevent falls from height and ensure compliance with relevant safety and building code requirements.

Pricing

Description	Contractor	Total ex GST
Remaining Contracted Works	TEW	314,438.00
Cassia - Retaining wall	Smartstone	13,181.50
Cassia - Reprofilng of land	Smartstone	2,832.00
Cassia - Turf reinstatement	PMC	4,346.25
Entry Tanks - Bunker capping	KBHI	3,600.00
Bunker Certification	TBC	—
Entry bunker fencing	Wavetime	5,500.00
	Firm Finish Option A (Q2127)	7,750.00
	Firm Finish Option B (Q2128)	7,750.00
Total Fixed Price ex GST		351,647.75
Remaining project funds		186,899.15
Further Funds Required for Completion		164,748.60



CLASS A WATER PROJECT

Important Note:

The following costs, while directly attributable to the project, were not included in the original approved scope of works. These expenses arose as a result of unforeseen requirements and contractual obligations that became apparent as the project progressed. As such, they have been funded from the allocated contingency allowance to ensure the project could proceed to completion without delay.

Items	Total cost Ex GST
Legal	\$41,973.14
Energex	\$115,771.61
Settlement costs	\$88,348.00
Total	\$246,092.75

As a result, the project contingency has been significantly depleted, and additional funds are now required to complete the remaining works and close out the project in full.

Attachments

1. BOQ Remaining works – TEW Costed
2. Smarstone - Quotation Cassia Park Pump House Retaining Wall
3. Smartstone - Cassia park - Reprofilling land
4. KBHI – Roof Capping Quote
5. QU2000 – PMC
6. Quote_1511_from_Wavetime_Constructions
7. Firm Finish Q 2127 Caseys Rd
8. Firm finish Q 2128 Caseys Rd

**CORRESPONDENCE
FOR INFORMATION**



Mulpha Sanctuary Cove (Developments) Pty Limited
ACN 098 660 318 ABN 20 098 660 318

Jabiru House, Masthead Way
PO Box 199 Sanctuary Cove QLD 4212 Australia
T 61 7 5577 6500 F 61 7 5530 8455
www.sanctuarycove.com www.mulpha.com.au

RE: COMMISSIONING THE NEW VILLAGE GATES, RE-CONSTRUCTION OF 'THE PARKWAY' ROAD (CONVERTING TO STANDARD 7.5M WIDE ROAD) AND DEMOLITION OF THE OLD VILLAGE GATES.

6 August 2025

Dear Sir/Madam,

Mulpha wishes to advise that works have been scheduled to demolish the Old Village Gates and construct a new 7.5-metre-wide road pavement linking the New Village Gates to the pedestrian crossing near the first harbour-front villa.

To allow these works to be carried out safely, The Parkway will need to be closed to all vehicular and pedestrian traffic from 18 August 2025 to 17 November 2025. The construction site will be fenced at both ends to prevent all vehicle and pedestrian access, thereby eliminating any public entry into the residential area. The upgraded road and Village Gates are anticipated to be operational from 18 November 2025.

These works form part of the broader upgrade program for Sanctuary Cove and will be delivered by **Smart Stone Group (SSG)**, who have extensive experience completing similar projects in the community. Additional re-paving works, undertaken by the Principal Body Corporate, will also occur during this period to complete adjoining sections of The Parkway.

We understand this closure may cause some inconvenience and sincerely appreciate your patience and cooperation while these upgrades are carried out. Please note the program may be subject to change should unforeseen conditions or adverse weather occur, and updates will be provided as required.

If you have any questions regarding these works, please contact:

Jeff Ray
Civil Project Manager 
Mulpha Sanctuary Cove (Developments) Pty Limited
E: jray@mulpha.com.au



28 August 2025

Company Secretary, Mr Conor Pujol
Sanctuary Cove Community Services Limited
'Shop', 1A Lot33 Masthead Way
HOPE ISLAND QLD 4212

Chairperson, Mr Stephen Anderson
Sanctuary Cove Primary Throughfare Body Corporate
c/- Sanctuary Cove Community Services Limited
Shop 1A, Building 1, Masthead Way
SANCTUARY COVE QLD 4212

By Email: [REDACTED]
ptbc@scove.com.au

Dear Mr Pujol and Mr Anderson

NOTICE OF APPOINTMENT – PBC NOMINEE DIRECTOR

At the recent PBC Extraordinary General Meeting held on 31 July 2025, a resolution was passed appointing Mr Stuart Shakespeare as the PBC Nominee Director to the Board of Sanctuary Cove Community Services Ltd (**SCCSL**) for a further two-year term.

In accordance with clause 5.6(b) of the Shareholders Agreement dated 4 November 2019 and varied by way of Deed of Variation dated 19 August 2025 (the **Shareholders Agreement**), we hereby provide formal notification that Mr Shakespeare's new term as a director of the Board of SCCSL and its subsidiaries, will take effect from 27 September 2025, upon the conclusion of his current appointment (being 26 September 2025).

Please find **enclosed** a copy of Mr Shakespeare's resume for your records.

Kind Regards

Jodie Syrett

Manager of Body Corporate
Sanctuary Cove Community Services Limited

Dear Members Nominees and Committee Members,

TENURE OF MR STEPHEN ANDERSON AS DIRECTOR OF SCCSL AND ITS SUBSIDIARIES

On 15 August 2025, Mr Stephen Anderson (the PTBC Chairman) wrote to the PBC outlining a proposal with respect to his tenure as a director of Sanctuary Cove Community Services Limited (and its subsidiaries) (SCCSL). That correspondence was previously circulated to all Members Nominees and Committee Members on 18 August 2025 and was also included in the August EGM agenda in Correspondence for Information. I have enclosed this correspondence again as **Annexure A**.

In summary, Mr Anderson has proposed the following:

- That he withdraws his letter of resignation and continues as a director of SCCSL and its subsidiaries;
- That the PBC holds a voting majority on the Board, being represented by two directors and the PTBC represented by one; and
- That the Chair of SCCSL and its subsidiaries be a PBC Nominee Director.

Following that correspondence, the PTBC held an EGM on 28 August 2025 that considered the following motion supporting Mr Anderson's proposal:

Motion: Agreement to amend Shareholders Agreement

THAT, subject to a satisfactory Deed of Variation to the Shareholders Agreement being prepared and agreed to, the PTBC supports the amendments to the Shareholders Agreement foreshadowed in Mr Stephen Anderson's letter to the PBC of 15 August 2025 (a copy of which has been circulated with this agenda) which include:

- *The PTBC will only appoint one director to the Board of Sanctuary Cove Community Services Limited, Sanctuary Cove Security Services Pty Ltd, Sanctuary Cove Body Corporate Services Pty Ltd and Resort Body Corporate Services Pty Ltd.*
- *The PTBC will support the PBC appointing two directors to the Board of Sanctuary Cove Community Services Limited, Sanctuary Cove Security Services Pty Ltd, Sanctuary Cove Body Corporate Services Pty Ltd and Resort Body Corporate Services Pty Ltd.*
- *The PTBC will ensure its nominee director supports a resolution at Board level appointing a PBC director in the role of Chairman of the Board.*

And further, THAT the above proposed amendments are conditional upon the Board remaining functional, cooperative and acting in the best interests of the Company, and the implementation of certain policies and programs by Sanctuary Cove Community Services Limited with respect to Board member skills and experience.

That motion passed unanimously.

The next step is for the PBC to formally vote on whether Mr Anderson's proposal (ratified by the PTBC) is an acceptable one. I intend to submit a motion to the PBC EGM at the end of this month along the following lines:

Motion: Acceptance of Mr Stephen Anderson's Proposal of 15 August 2025 (by ordinary resolution)

That the PBC accepts Mr Stephen Anderson's proposal of 15 August 2025 (a copy of which has been circulated with the agenda) which was subsequently endorsed by the PTBC on 28th August 2025, and agrees that it will not pursue the removal of Mr Anderson as director of Sanctuary Cove Community Services Limited and its subsidiaries with respect to any past conduct that was the reason for serving the Notice of Intention in accordance with the resolution of the PBC passed on 30 May 2024.

And further, that such acceptance is conditional upon a satisfactory Deed of Variation to the Shareholders Agreement being prepared and agreed to by the PBC.

I appreciate the significance of this matter, particularly for those who have been heavily involved in its history. For this reason, I have provided this information in advance of the EGM agenda for September, to provide you with sufficient time to review all material, discuss the potential outcomes and raise any queries or concerns in advance of the EGM to understand the position your RBC wishes to adopt. I encourage you to reach out to me should you require any further information or wish to clarify anything.

History

I am aware that some Members Nominees may not be across the reason for Mr Anderson's original notice of his intention to resign on 31 October 2025.

In summary, the PBC was dissatisfied with Mr Anderson's conduct as a director, and at the EGM held on 30 May 2024, the PBC resolved to take certain steps to seek removal of him as a director. That included serving a Notice of Intention with SCCSL requisitioning a shareholders meeting for the purpose of considering and voting on a resolution for Mr Anderson's removal as a director.

The explanatory note to that motion provided as follows:

Stephen Anderson, PTBC Nominee Director, of Sanctuary Cove Community Services Ltd (SCCSL), presided as Chairperson over the Annual General Meeting of Sanctuary Cove Community Services Ltd on 9th May 2024. Following receipt of questions submitted prior to the meeting, and in answer to those questions, Mr Anderson revealed significant governance failures and breaches of the Corporations Act 2001 (Cth) that transpired during 2023. They confirmed many of the statements made in the PBC Chairperson's 6th March 2024 communication to Sanctuary Cove residents. The failures included but were not restricted to:

- 1. Prevention of the PBC Nominee Director to participate in SCCSL board activities despite election in July 2023 and formal appointment by ASIC in September 2023. (The PBC shareholders were without representation from the time of the previous chairperson's resignation in May 2023 until early 2024.)*
- 2. Conduct of non-quorate board meetings from May – December 2023 due to the absence of a PBC Nominee Director resulting in the invalidity of many SCCSL decisions.*
- 3. Failure of the independent Director and PTBC Nominee Director to resign and reapply for their positions well past their expiry dates.*

From May 2023, 2 directors presided over SCCSL. The Independent Director resigned in December 2023 and Stephen Anderson remains.

The Company Secretary will be replaced following procurement of an external service.

A Notice of Intention was delivered by the PBC to Mr Anderson on 12 June 2024 (**Annexure B**).

Mr Anderson responded to the Notice of Intention. His response was included in the July 2024 PBC agenda (**Annexure C**).

A shareholders meeting was subsequently held on 15 August 2024 to consider and vote on the motion to remove Mr Anderson. The PBC proxy shareholder voted for the motion and the PTBC proxy shareholder voted against, meaning the vote was tied and the shareholders were in deadlock. Following this, the PBC issued a further communication to the PTBC invoking the dispute resolution process per clause 19 of the Shareholders Agreement. Notwithstanding the above, between July – December 2024, much of the Board's time was taken up dealing with the resignation of the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), providing management direction and support to its employees and recruiting for the role of General Manager. The PBC and PTBC agreed to extend the timeframe allowed for dispute resolution to focus on the proper operation of SCCSL. Subsequently on 29 January 2025, the deadlock was broken when Mr Anderson issued correspondence to SCCSL notifying it of his intention to resign, effective as at 31 October 2025.

Considerations for the PBC

I have spoken at length with the PBC's nominee directors (Mr Kernaghan and Mr Shakespeare), and together, we have worked through possible alternatives including refusing the proposal and proceeding with Mr Anderson's removal as a director.

However, as the Secretary of the PBC, it is my personal view that accepting the proposal of Mr Anderson is the best outcome for the PBC for the following reasons:

1. The proposal offers support for rebalancing the Board in favour of the PBC, which is a fairer reflection of the cost contribution to SCCSL by the shareholders.
2. SCCSL has appointed an external party to fulfil the role of Company Secretary (previously this position was held by the CEO) and has employed an In-House Legal Counsel which has improved the professionalism and formality of Board meetings, communications from the SCCSL and overall company governance. This has ensured that simple matters such as the appointment of directors, achieving a quorum at Board meetings and director tenures are not overlooked.
3. The current Board has worked collaboratively and constructively to improve the internal operations of SCCSL and the quality of service to its body corporate customers. Additionally, the current Board worked together through the resignation process of the former CEO, jointly assisted in the management of the company during the CEO's absence for a period of eight months, and actively participated in the recruitment of the new General Manager. This was all aided by Mr Anderson's history of involvement in Sanctuary Cove Resort since 2010. Although there is still more work to be done in this space, Mr Anderson's input has been important in achieving some of the results to date.
4. The current Board (including Mr Anderson) unanimously agreed to a governance review process for SCCSL that will see integral changes made to key areas of the company to improve and enhance its operation. Mr Anderson has previously acknowledged that the governance of the company should be improved, and he has committed to playing a part in that improvement. A comprehensive governance improvement plan has been developed and committed to by all current Directors of SCCSL, including Mr Anderson.
5. All Board decisions have been passed unanimously, which has supported the PBC's view that paying for an Independent Director to sit on the Board as a 'swing' vote, is not necessary or desirable for the proper operation of the Board. This not only saves costs to the shareholders

but demonstrates the willingness of Mr Anderson to work cooperatively to achieve positive results for SCCSL and its shareholders.

6. If the PBC chooses to pursue Mr Anderson's removal, it will drive this matter back into dispute which will require the parties to undertake further dispute resolution processes, which could ultimately result in formal arbitration through an independent party pursuant to the Shareholders Agreement. Any judgement through arbitration would be binding on both parties. The PBC needs to weigh up the risk of a potential unfavourable outcome through arbitration and the significant expense and lost time in progressing with arbitration, against the proposal of Mr Anderson.

I am not suggesting that the PBC, as a shareholder, should be turning a blind eye to previous conduct of company directors. I am suggesting that Mr Anderson has acknowledged historical governance matters that he could have handled better, SCCSL has worked to put in place sufficient protections to guard against those matters occurring again in the future, and the PBC is now better represented at Board level and informed of Board decision making. With all of that in mind, I think that accepting the proposal will be of significant benefit to the PBC and the residents of Sanctuary Cove Resort.

I would welcome any respectful dialogue on this and again, would encourage you to reach out to me should you have any queries or require anything further.

Yours sincerely,

Cheryl McBride OAM

Secretary of Sanctuary Cove Principal Body Corporate

15 August 2025

The Chairperson
Principal Body Corporate
Sanctuary Cove

By Email: stuart@shakespeares.info

Dear Stuart Shakespeare

Re: Sanctuary Cove Community Services Ltd and my tenure as director

I have appreciated the opportunities to meet with you to discuss my tenure as director of Sanctuary Cove Community Services Limited (the **Company**). Our discussions have been frank and direct but I understand your role is to have regard to, and represent the interests of, the PBC.

I believe that the current Board is working very well. The Board has been faced with a number of challenges over the past 18 months that it has navigated diligently and respectfully, with the unanimous support of all the directors. Despite some matters being particularly complex, directors have been able to confidently share their views and advance the interests of their Shareholder whilst continuing to act in the best interests of the Company. To that end, I extend my thanks to yourself and Paul Kernaghan.

As we recently discussed, the PTBC faces the following challenges:

1. My intended retirement as a director on 31 October 2025;
2. Barry Teeling's intention to resign as director at the end of August 2025 due to an increased workload.

This means that the PTBC faces the prospect of only having one director sitting on the Board by the end of August and then no director from 1 November 2025. Mulpha does not have the capacity for other senior personnel to step into the role of director at this stage.

Although the PTBC is at liberty to appoint any person as its director, there is a need for director/s to have a thorough understanding of Sanctuary Cove Resort, the PTBC and the PBC and issues that face the commercial, recreational and residential users of the Resort. This limits the pool of potential candidates. With most of the lots in the PTBC owned by Mulpha entities, that leaves Sanctuary Cove Golf and Country Club Holdings Limited (**SCGCC**) as the only entity (aside from the PBC) intimately involved in the Resort. I understand that SCGCC would like for Paul Sanders to focus his workload on their affairs and has not given approval for Mr Sanders to sit on the Board of the Company.

I have given considered thought to what would be in the best interests of the Company and how we may continue with the progress we have made as a Board as we approach the start of a new financial year.

Below is my proposal that I would like for you to raise with the PBC for feedback:

- Upon Barry's resignation, the PTBC will not nominate a replacement director and will only have one director on the Board;

- The PTBC is prepared to have one director on the Board for as long as the Board remains functional and cooperative, and continues to act in the best interests of the Company;
- The PBC continues to have two representatives on the Board;
- I will support a resolution of the Board to appoint a PBC director in the role of Chairman of the Board;
- The Company implements a policy on required/desired Board member skills, experience and behavioural traits and puts in place a professional development program for directors, consistent with the action items developed from the recent governance review. Ideally, this should be achieved by February 2026.
- I withdraw my letter of resignation and continue as a director of the Company;

I am personally prepared to advocate for the above changes with the PTBC members but obviously these are my personal views and have not been ratified by the PTBC in general meeting. I have had some discussions with Mulpha about the proposed changes and, to date, they have indicated support.

I am also supportive of making the changes permanent by amending the Shareholders Agreement, but this would be subject to the final wording of the variations, implementing some safeguards around the qualifications and experience of nominated directors and the approval of both shareholders.

In the interests of the Company and the community I believe the above proposal will be a workable solution to the challenges that will present itself in the very near future.

Please let me have the PBC's feedback on this.

Should you wish to discuss this further, please contact me directly.

Yours faithfully
Stephen Anderson





Notice of Intention

12 June 2024

The Secretary
Sanctuary Cove Community Services Limited
Shop 1A, Building 1, Masthead Way Sanctuary Cove Q 4212

Delivered by email to conor.pujol@boardroomlimited.com.au

To the Board Members and Shareholders,

As the Shareholder's Nominee for the Sanctuary Cove Principal Body Corporate (PBC), I am instructed to formally present a Notice of Intention to remove Stephen Anderson from the Board of Directors of Sanctuary Cove Community Service Ltd (SCCSL) and subsidiaries, via ordinary resolution, at a general meeting of shareholders.

The PBC, as a shareholder, has lost confidence in Mr Anderson, as a Director of SCCSL and its subsidiaries.

Mr Anderson is entitled under the *Corporations Act 2001* 203D(4) to put his case to members and shareholders by providing the company with a written statement for circulation and delivering a verbal communication, prior to the vote, at the proposed meeting (date below).

Mr Anderson currently holds the role of Shareholders Nominee for the Sanctuary Cove Primary Thoroughfare Body Corporate. Due consideration may be given to securing a suitable replacement in anticipation of his removal.

As required by the *Corporations Act 2001* s203D(2), a period of two months is required post presentation of the Notice of Intention to remove Stephen Anderson as a Director of SCCSL and its subsidiaries. For that specific purpose, I hereby call a general meeting of the SCCSL shareholders to be convened at the company Masthead Way meeting room, Sanctuary Cove, on 15 August 2024 at 11am

Yours sincerely

Stuart Shakespeare
Shareholders Nominee
Sanctuary Cove Principal Body Corporate

STATEMENT OF STEPHEN ANDERSONPTBC REPRESENTATIVE AND DIRECTOR OFSANCTUARY COVE COMMUNITY SERVICES LIMITED AND SUBSIDIARIES (SCCSL)1. **Introduction**

- 1.1 I am a director of SCCSL having been nominated by the Sanctuary Cove Primary Thoroughfare Body Corporate (**PTBC**) (in its capacity as a 50% shareholder) and validly appointed. I have held this position since 14 June 2021.
- 1.2 I make this statement in opposition to the Notice of Intention delivered by Mr Stuart Shakespeare (as the nominee director of the Sanctuary Cove Principal Body Corporate (**PBC**)) on 12 June 2024 seeking to call a meeting of members of SCCSL and propose a resolution to remove me as a director.
- 1.3 This statement is endorsed by the PTBC.

2. **Summary**

- 2.1 For the reasons set out in this statement I do not consider there are any grounds to validly remove me as a director.
- 2.2 The PTBC has a right to nominate and appoint a director of its choice and has validly done so in accordance with the procedures under the Shareholders Agreement. Despite having a right to do so, the PBC did not object to my appointment in February 2024.
- 2.3 Despite this valid appointment, the PBC (by its nominee director) now seeks to remove me as a Director.
- 2.4 I set out my credentials in Annexure A to this statement. I believe that I have the requisite qualifications and experience to provide a positive contribution to the Board and conduct of business of SCCSL.
- 2.5 I accept that there are past matters of governance (the subject of complaint) that could have been handled better and governance can always be improved but those matters the subject of complaint by the PBC are:
- (a) objectively minor in nature and, whilst regrettable, relate to the governance matters for SCCSL. There is no suggestion (and nor could there be) that I have somehow breached my duties as a director or that I have personally been responsible for any of the matters the subject of complaint;
 - (b) not matters which have resulted in any prejudice or loss to SCCSL or its shareholders (and nor could there be); and
 - (c) matters which have now been rectified and ratified by the current SCCSL Board.
- 2.6 In the circumstances, the motivation of the PBC and/or its nominee director to attempt to remove me is unclear and, in my view, any objective third party observer would not consider there are any valid or reasonable grounds for my removal pursuant to the Corporations Act or otherwise.
- 2.7 For my part, I have always enjoyed a professional and respectful relationship with the members of the Board. I have no ill-will towards Mr Shakespeare or any other member of the Board or management and I am comfortable that we can work together and function positively for the benefit of all stakeholders of SCCSL.

3. **Rights of shareholders to appoint a director**

3.1 The SCCSL Shareholders Agreement provides that each of the PBC and PTBC have the right to appoint 2 directors to the SCCSL board.

3.2 Fundamentally this is not an unusual or remarkable situation. Each of the PBC and the PTBC have a right to equal representation on the SCCSL board. However, there is a process where each shareholder can object to the nominee of the other shareholder.

3.3 By way of summary, that process includes:

- (a) providing written notice to SCCSL and the other shareholder of the shareholder's nominee director (together with their resume), not less than 4 weeks prior to the intended commencement of such nominee director; and
- (b) within 3 weeks of the receipt of the notice, the non-appointing shareholder has a right to object to such nomination and appointment, with such objection notice to set out specific bona fide reasons for the objection.

3.4 Consistent with this process:

- (a) I provided a written resignation of my director position to SCCSL on 1 February 2024.
- (b) the PTBC gave written notice to SCCSL on 9 February 2024 of my nomination.
- (c) notice of my nomination was provided to the Chair of the PBC and SCCSL on 19 February 2024.
- (d) the PBC did not object to my appointment.

3.5 As set out below, the matters the subject of complaint are for a period of well before February 2024 (in some cases as long ago as June 2023) and must have been known well before my nomination was presented.

3.6 Even if the matters were not known, it does not matter as it is unlikely that any of the matters complained of would have been a valid reason to object to my nomination.

4. **Complaints**

4.1 The precise complaints of the PBC that are said to be relevant to the proposal to remove me are not clear. However, for the purposes of seeking to provide an explanation for the benefit of shareholders I understand that the PBC has complaints about the following matters:

- (a) Alleged frustration of the PBC Nominee Director to participate in SCCSL board activities from July 2023 to December 2023 and a suggestion that the PBC was without representation from the time of the previous chairperson's resignation in May 2023.)
 - (i) A SCCSL director pack was sent to Mr Shakespeare on 17 August 2023 in order to on-board Mr Shakespeare to the SCCSL Board. Mr Shakespeare's consent to act as a director of SCCSL was received on 8 September 2023.
 - (ii) As part of SCCSL Policy, Mr Shakespeare was asked to obtain a police clearance and provide fingerprints as part of that clearance as SCCSL was a security company. Mr Shakespeare provided his fingerprints in December 2023, and the police clearance application was provided to the Office of Fair Trading (QLD) (OFT).
 - (iii) Mr Shakespeare's clearance as an officer of a security company was not recognised by the OFT until February 2024.

- (iv) There is no particular example given of how the PBC was in fact prejudiced or its interests were adversely impacted - nor could there be.
- (b) Conduct of non-quorate board meetings from May – December 2023 due to the absence of a PBC Nominee Director.
 - (i) it is correct that there were a number of board meetings without an appropriate quorum however the content of those meetings and the resolutions considered:
 - A. were not of a character as to have impacted the proper functioning of SCCSL, nor caused SCCSL any loss; and
 - B. were all resolutions which were later ratified by the SCCSL board unanimously which indicates that those resolutions were uncontroversial,
 - (ii) the relevant resolutions fell into the following categories:
 - A. matters which were within the power of the CEO and did not require board approval,
 - B. resolutions which required ratification as follows resolutions remain for rectification as unauthorised resolutions:
 - 1) ratification of the contract with Employsure;
 - 2) approval of the Operating Plan for 2023/24;
 - 3) approval of SCCSL Proposed Plans - Operating for 2024;
 - 4) approval of financials for FY23 ended 31 October 2023 (which was also approved by the external auditors);
 - 5) approval of the CEOs leave.
- (c) Failure of the independent Director and PTBC Nominee Director to resign and reapply for their positions past their expiry dates:
 - (i) as set out above, this was rectified without opposition.

5. **Conclusion**

- 5.1 To the extent there are any other complaints about my conduct I reserve my right to respond to them
- 5.2 I confirm that I am personally prepared to work with all Board members and management of SCCSL for the benefit of all shareholders and members of each of the PTBC and PBC going forward. In my view, it is important to focus on the execution of the business of SCCSL and to move on from internal matters which take away the focus of the Board and management from the core business of SCCSL. To the extent the shareholders consider it necessary of desirable undertake a governance review and a potential reform of any SCCSL procedures, I am happy to support and participate in the process in a professional way.

ANNEXURE A

I am a Chartered Accountant with over 30 years in business, predominantly in the construction and development industries.

I have been involved with Sanctuary Cove and the Body Corporates since 2010, serving on the PBC, PTBC, PTBC Executive Committee, Chair of the PTBC since 2014, and a member of the Finance Subcommittee for over 10 years. Over that time I have gained significant knowledge and background of the issues facing the community.

Perhaps my most significant contribution to the community was as a member of the Site Wide Review Committee of 2014 that was tasked with reviewing the finance, structure and governance of Sanctuary Cove. I was tasked with the Finance review and undertook significant modelling to determine a strategy for the finances of Sanctuary Cove. As part of that strategy, the largest ever asset review was undertaken in order to properly determine the future sinking funds required for the community assets. I advocated strongly within the community for the adoption of the proposed strategy and was successful in convincing the community it was the correct way for the future. For the first time the Administration and Sinking funds were considered separately, all assets were properly identified and assessed, 3 year budgeting was introduced and the community purchased a proper asset management system.,

The result of that strategy is now evident with Administration fund levies lower than 2016, and the sinking funds have been replenished even after huge asset replacement and investment in community assets over the last 9 years.



12 September 2025

Vanessa Kelly
[REDACTED]

SANCTUARY COVE QLD 4212

CLAIM FOR MONIES OWED: Stormwater drain

Dear Vanessa & Mark,

We are writing to advise you of the outcome regarding your claim for reimbursement of \$350.00 in plumbing costs associated with stormwater drainage at [REDACTED] Marine Drive East.

The PBC has resolved to approve your request. This approval is granted strictly in relation to the present matter and is not to be construed as an admission of liability. For clarity, this decision does not create any precedent or obligation in respect of any future claims, works, or damages that may subsequently be identified

Our Accounts team will be in touch shortly to confirm your bank details and arrange for the reimbursement.

Should you have any questions or require further clarification, please don't hesitate to contact the office on (07) 5500 3333 or via email at psc@scove.com.au

For and on behalf of
Sanctuary Cove Principal Body Corporate GTP 202

Jodie Syrett
Manager of Body Corporate
Sanctuary Cove Community Services Limited



Electricity Contracts	DP40049	VERSION 1
Electricity Procurement and Engagement of Third Party Procurement Specialist	Page 1 of 1	September 2025

1. Purpose

To outline a clear and efficient process for getting electricity supply contracts. This procedure ensures strong governance by building in key mechanisms to maintain oversight and transparency. It also leverages a third-party specialist's access to a broad range of retailers, which is essential for securing the most competitive rates. This approach acknowledges the volatility of the electricity supply market. The combination of wholesale electricity supply and short offer validity periods makes a standard review and approval process unfeasible for capturing the best rates available.

2. Scope

This SOP applies to all electricity supply agreements entered by the Body Corporate, including new contracts, renewals, and any agreements initiated by a third-party specialist to take advantage of favourable market conditions.

3. Responsibilities

Facilities Services Team: Initiates the contract review process, coordinates with the Third-Party Electricity Procurement Specialist, and prepares the final recommendation.

Third-Party Electricity Procurement Specialist ("EPS"): Accesses a wide range of market retailers, manages the request for tender, obtains and analyses offers, and provides a report with recommendations.

Finance Team: Reviews the financial implications of all proposals and confirms that the recommended pricing aligns with the current budget and financial forecasts.

Body Corporate Manager: Prepares the contract proposal for the general meeting agenda, drafts the necessary motion for committee review and approval, and facilitates the formal approval process.

4. Procedure

i. Initiation

- Contract expiry dates are monitored via the contract register process.
- At least 2 months before expiry, review options for renewal or re-tendering. Note that electricity retailers have short offer validity periods (Typically 3-7 days)
- Pro-active renewal: EPS may recommend a renewal process prior to expiry if market rates drop significantly, allowing an opportunity to enter a new agreement without penalty.

ii. Specialist Engagement

- Engage EPS (either existing or new) to approach the retail market on behalf of the BODY CORPORATE.
- EPS will obtain and present a minimum of two quotes from various retailers.
- EPS will prepare a detailed analysis, report and recommendations on the best option.



Electricity Contracts	DP40049	VERSION 1
Electricity Procurement and Engagement of Third Party Procurement Specialist	Page 1 of 1	September 2025

iii. Evaluation & Approval

- a. Report Review: The Facilities Team will review the EPS report and recommendations.
- b. Financial Confirmation: The Finance Manager will confirm the impact of the recommended pricing to project with comparison to the approved budget and forecasts.
- c. Governance & Approval Rational: The process for reviewing electricity contracts differs from standard procurement due to the highly volatile market and short validity periods for offers (often as short as 3-7 days). The standard review pathway requiring two committee meetings is unfeasible. The time required to issue agendas and materials (7 days prior to each Contracts Sub Committee & Extraordinary General Meeting of the Body Corporate), would cause the competitive offer to expire. As such, the proposal is to proceed directly to the Body Corporate Manager for preparation to include in the Agenda for the EGM.

iv. Committee Preparation

- a. Body Corporate Manager includes contract recommendation in EGM, supported by an explanatory note and EPS report for reference.
- b. Body Corporate Manager to prepare a motion for committee member review and consideration.
- c. Approval
- d. Contract proposal submitted to general meeting for approval by resolution.
- e. Resolution to specify authorised signatory for contract execution.

v. Contract Execution

- a. Contract signed by authorised signatory as specified in the resolution.
- b. Copy of the signed contract is filed in the official records by the Body Corporate Manager.

From: [Cassie McAuliffe](#)
To: [HUGH MARTIN](#)
Cc: [Stuart Shakespeare](#); [Paul Kernaghan](#); [Jodie Syrett](#)
Subject: RE: Sanctuary Greens Irrigation Project (Update)
Date: Friday, 12 September 2025 2:30:37 PM
Attachments: [17626-IR-DD-OA-101 \[A\] 08-09-25.pdf](#)
[17626-IR-DD-OA-102 \[A\] 08-09-25.pdf](#)
[17626-IR-DD-OA-103 \[A\] 08-09-25.pdf](#)
[image001.png](#)

Hello Hugh

Thank you for your email and for your careful oversight of the Sanctuary Greens irrigation project. I have worked with the Facilities Services team to provide the following update.

You are correct that the project was endorsed for inclusion in the 2024/25 budget. A consultant was approved at the July 2025 EGM and commenced in August. Once mobilised, they provided the following indicative design and procurement programme, which we used to update the operations report:

1. **PW – Preliminary Works / Discoveries** – within 2 weeks
2. **PD – Preliminary Detail Design (50%) for Approval** – 1st week of October
3. **DD – Detail Design (90%) for Approval** – pending review, 20th October
4. **IFT – Detail Design Issued for Tender** – pending review, end of October

Indicative timeframe for the remaining project stages

5. **Tender/RFQ** – approximately 1 month – (November)
6. **Award** – (subject to committee meeting schedule) – If not meeting scheduled for December – will be January 2026
7. **Construction / Works Completion** – estimated 2/3 months from award.

Why the estimated completion date moved

- Physical works cannot begin until the tender and award process is finalised.
- Contractor availability and lead times can only be confirmed until a contractor is engaged.
- Award timing is dependent on EGM meeting cycles.

I acknowledge that the September EC pack showed the revised completion (to February 2026) without a covering note. This was an oversight, and we will aim to attach an explanatory comment to any future schedule changes.

Funding and delivery

Although the project sits in the 2024/25 financial year, if final delivery extends beyond 31 October the allocated funds remain available, and the project will proceed (subject to approvals).

Next steps

- Shanyn has provided the first set of consultant drawings (sprinkler and valve locations), attached for your easy reference. She is happy to meet to walk through the details if you would find this useful.
- We will aim to include a brief progress narrative in each monthly Sinking Fund Projects report, so any movement is explained.

Thank you again for raising this so we could clarify matters for residents.

Kind regards

CASSIE MCAULIFFE

General Manager

Email cassie.mcauliffe@scove.com.au

Main 07 5500 3333 | enquiries@scove.com.au

Address PO Box 15 | Shop 1A, Building 1, Masthead Way Sanctuary Cove Q 4212

Web oursanctuarycove.com.au



SANCTUARY COVE COMMUNITY SERVICES LIMITED | SANCTUARY COVE BODY CORPORATE PTY LTD

This email and any files transmitted with it are subject to copyright, confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify us via telephone or email and delete this email and any attachments from your computer.

From: Hugh Martin

Sent: Sunday, 7 September 2025 11:23 AM

To: Stuart Shakespeare

Cc: Paul Kernaghan; Cassie McAuliffe; Jodie Syrett <

Subject: Sanctuary Greens Irrigation Project

Caution! This message was sent from outside your organization.

[Allow sender](#) | [Block sender](#)

Dear Stuart,

Re: Sanctuary Greens Irrigation Project.

At the PBC EGM on the 27th June, 2024, it is minuted that the above irrigation project would be included in the 2024/2025 budget. I make this point to highlight the fact that this project is not new or a late insert into the BCS planning programme.

This project however only began appearing in the Sinking Fund Project reports from March 2025 with a starting date of August 2025 and a completion date of October 2025.

I have followed up on a regular basis at PBC meetings and have been told this project was on track. I specifically asked Cassie at the July meeting and again was told the October completion date still stood. The EC Meeting minutes of the 15th of August also state the project is on track!

However, the Sinking Fund Projects report in the September EC pack now shows this project with a start date, as before, of August but the completion date which was previously October has now moved out to February 2026! No explanation has been provided as to how a 3 month project as per the EC minutes of 15th August has now become a 7 month project with an estimated completion in February 2026.

There are 4 RBCs involved in this project and residents require information as to why the original completion date is no longer achievable and the reasons for this last minute change.

I trust that your response will provide the clarity that is required.

With Kind Regards,
Hugh Martin.

From: [Sanctuary Cove Community Services](#)
Subject: Village Gates - Temporary Fence Closure Times
Date: Monday, 15 September 2025 12:44:02 PM

Dear Residents,

Security has identified a potential issue with the temporary buggy path entrance at the Village Gates and, together with Mulpha, has acted promptly to implement a solution.

An additional fence panel has been installed, allowing the two panels to be joined and locked to secure the perimeter. Security officers will manage the locking and unlocking of this gate, the gates will be locked from 8:00pm to 4:00am daily.

Main 07 5500 3333 | enquiries@scove.com.au

Address PO Box 15 | Shop 1A, Building 1, Masthead Way Sanctuary Cove Q 4212

Web www.oursanctuarycove.com.au

SANCTUARY COVE COMMUNITY SERVICES LIMITED | SANCTUARY COVE BODY CORPORATE PTY LTD

This email and any files transmitted with it are subject to copyright, confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify us via telephone or email and delete this email and any attachments from your computer.



The Parkway re-construction - Scope of works and Quantity Schedule

Scope of works to be as described in schedule below and attached Construction Details Plans A3 and associated supporting plans package attached

Item	Decription	Unit	Qty
1	Preliminaries		
a	mobilisation, de-mobilisation	item	1
b	ATF fence at each end of the site	item	1
c	erosion/sediment/dust control	item	1
2	Clearing and grubbing (as per attached Clearing reuirement PDF incuding stumps and roots. Dispose of off site)		
a	remove 3 large trees including removal of all roots in the Energex land allocation of 0mm to 900mm from the road/lot boundary to a depth of 1200mm from existing ground surface level	each	3
b	remove shrubs and hedges between fence wall and footpath including removal of all roots in the Energex land allocation of 0mm to 900mm from the road/lot boundary to a depth of 1200mm from existing ground surface level	item	1
c	replace void created by 2a and 2b above with non-rocky friable soil up to existing ground level	item	1
d	remove shrubs and weeds on lots side of fence	item	1
e	lop branches from Large PBC tree in car park	item	1
f	remove all plants, turf and soil in garden bed areas to depth necessary for new pavement construction (yellow on Construction Details Plan)	item	1
3	Demolition (includes removal and disposal off site of all demolition materials)		
a	demolish all existing kerb and associated haunching from both sides of the road and garden islands within the east and west limit of work	item	1
b	demolision as per Constuction Details Sheet 1	item	1
c	demolision as per Constuction Details Sheet 2	item	1
d	demolision as per Constuction Details Sheet 3	item	1
e	demolision as per Constuction Details Sheet 4	item	1
f	remove and dispose of off site all existing clay pavers from the exiting roadway	item	1
g	demolish existing redundant road pavement as shown Construction Details Plan	item	1
h	demolish existing easbound cariageway road pavement as cross hatched green on Construction Details Plan	m2	266.5

i	demolish existing gates, gate walls and gate wall footings	item	1
j	demolish exiting gully pits in new gully pit locations 3 and 4 as per Construction Details Plan	item	1
k	remove and dispose of redundant switchboards and access hardware remaining on the gate walls	item	1

4 Stormwater drainage ans sewer overflow

(all stormwater pipe and pits to be constructed as per Morton Urban Solution Stormwater Design attached)

a	locate new pit 1 postion by services locator 'rodding' up pipe from existing manhole with FOK at pit 1 0.5m from boundary (boundary to be marked by Mulpha's surveyor)	item	1
b	Install new pipe between Pit 1 ands Pit 2 including backfilling trench with dry lean concrete	item	1
c	construct Pit 1 over existing outlet pipe and new pipe to Pit 2		
d	construct Pit 2 at end of new pipe	item	1
e	construct new Pit 3	item	1
f	extend existing pipe between Pit 3 and Pit 4 to new location for Pit 4	item	1
g	construct new Pit 4	item	1
h	break into existing field inlet pit and install pipe into the pit, concrete surround the outside of the pit/pipe joint, render up the inside of the pit/pipe joint to seal the pit	item	1
i	install new pipe between existing field inlet pit and pit locations 5 and 6	m	20
j	construct new Pit 5	item	1
k	construct new Pit 6	item	1
l	constuct sewer overflow as per sewer overflow plan ans sewer overdlow plan 2	item	1

5 Roadworks

a	construct works per Construction Details - Sheet 1	item	1
b	construct works per Construction Details - Sheet 2	item	1
c	construct works per Construction Details - Sheet 3	item	1
d	construct works per Construction Details - Sheet 4	item	1
e	construct new pavement in old demolished garden areas (highlighted green on Construction Details Plan)	item	1
f	construct pavement widening for road width of 7.5m FOK to FOK to Meinhardt Urban Pavement Design plan and kerb detail and extent of pavement widening plan (orange area on Construction Details Plan)	item	1
g	construct new easbound cariageway road pavement as cross hatched green on Construction Details Plan to Meinhardt Urban Pavement Design plan and kerb detail and extent of pavement widening plan	m2	266.5

h	provisional allowance for CBR 15 subgrade replacement to 250mm depth		
i	construct new kerb to both sides of the road bwtween east and west limits of work	m	160
j	supply and install new 80mm concrete pavers over new and existing road pavement	m2	1200
k	road crossing conduits - allow for supply and installation of 100mm dia PVC road crossing conduits installed below the road pavement including cackfilling the trench with compacted dry lean concrete	each	2

6 Miscellaneous Works (provisional allowances)

a	supply and place imported quality under turf topsoil	m3	50
b	supply and install A Grade Wintergreen Couch Turf	m2	1000
c	water truck to water turf - including the supply of water	hr	20
d	supply and install sewer overflow pipe	item	1

Works Description	Month	July		August				September					October				November			
	week ending	25-Jul	31-Jul	8-Aug	15-Aug	22-Aug	29-Aug	5-Sep	12-Sep	19-Sep	26-Sep	3-Oct	10-Oct	17-Oct	24-Oct	31-Oct	7-Nov	14-Nov	21-Nov	28-Nov
PBC approval to close The Parkway																				
install new water main valves (Golding)																				
old gates power supply abolishment application and disconnection																				
close old village gates and fence off works area (18th August)																				
decommission old village gates power and access control and remove hardware (JR Electrical, Secure Access Systems, Brisbane Gates)																				
clearing and grubbing trees and shrubs (SSG - from 20 August)																				
The Parkway reconstruction demolition (SSG)																				
construct new stormwater pipe and structures in The Parkway (SSG)																				
The Parkway new pavement construction (SSG)																				
new kerb and new pavers installation (SSG)																				
tilt panel fence procure / install / paint																				
commission / activate new village gates (Brisbane Gates, Secure Access System)																				
remedial asphalt works in car park																				
complete H1 stormwater structures in the park area (SSG)																				
landscape south of Harbour One and turfing (SSG)																				
Parkway Greens road crossing culvert and structures procurement (Golding)																				
install The Parkway road stormwater diversion (Golding)																				
install Parkway Greens stormwater road crossings in road reserve - culverts and structures (Golding)																				
The Parkway new pavement construction where Golding road crossing occurred (SSG)																				
The Parkway new kerb and new pavers installation where Golding road crossing occurred (SSG)																				
install balance of stormwater pipes and culverts (Golding)																				
new footpath constuction (SSG)																				
final landscape clean up and turfing (SSG)																				
open The Parkway to traffic and pedestrians - 18 November																				

From: stuart@shakespeares.info
To: [Jodie Syrett](#)
Subject: Mid Term Appointment of PBC Chairperson
Date: Thursday, 18 September 2025 11:17:00 AM

This sender is trusted.

Cheryl McBride
PBC Secretary

Dear Cheryl

My ownership in Felicia will end at the end of October, so I'm able to remain as the Chairperson through to and including the EGM on 30 October 2025. The process of appointing a replacement chairperson needs to coincide with this meeting date. Following our consultation and in your absence overseas, I've asked Jodie to include an item in the September EGM agenda advising the members of the appointment process.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the PBC for the privilege of serving as their chairman and also for the support and assistance of my colleagues, the MNs and the management staff.

Kind Regards
Stuart Shakespeare
PBC Chairman

CORRESPONDENCE FOR ACTION

From: stuart@shakespeares.info
To: [HUGH MARTIN](#)
Cc: [Paul Kernaghan](#); [Cassie McAuliffe](#); [Jodie Syrett](#); [Shanyn Fox](#); [Derek Glinka](#)
Subject: RE: Sanctuary Greens Irrigation Project
Date: Sunday, 7 September 2025 9:31:42 PM

This sender is trusted.

Dear Hugh

Your email to me will be included in Correspondence for Action at the forthcoming EC meeting and EGM.

Cassie, could you please provide a response to Hugh and include a copy in the EGM meeting papers.

Regards
Stuart

From: Hugh Martin <hmartin@y7mail.com>
Sent: Sunday, 7 September 2025 11:23 AM
To: Stuart Shakespeare <stuart@shakespeares.info>
Cc: Paul Kernaghan <paul.kernaghan@icloud.com>; Cassie McAuliffe <cassie.mcauliffe@scove.com.au>; Jodie Syrett <jodie.syrett@scove.com.au>
Subject: Sanctuary Greens Irrigation Project

Dear Stuart,
Re: Sanctuary Greens Irrigation Project.

At the PBC EGM on the 27th June, 2024, it is minuted that the above irrigation project would be included in the 2024/2025 budget. I make this point to highlight the fact that this project is not new or a late insert into the BCS planning programme.

This project however only began appearing in the Sinking Fund Project reports from March 2025 with a starting date of August 2025 and a completion date of October 2025.

I have followed up on a regular basis at PBC meetings and have been told this project was on track. I specifically asked Cassie at the July meeting and again was told the October completion date still stood. The EC Meeting minutes of the 15th of August also state the project is on track!

However, the Sinking Fund Projects report in the September EC pack now shows this project with a start date, as before, of August but the completion date which was previously October has now moved out to February 2026! No explanation has been provided as to how a 3 month project as per the EC minutes of 15th August has now become a 7 month project with an estimated completion in February 2026.

There are 4 RBCs involved in this project and residents require information as to why the original completion date is no longer achievable and the reasons for this last minute change.

I trust that your response will provide the clarity that is required.

From: [Brogan Watling](#)
To: [Stuart Shakespeare](#); [Paul Kernaghan](#); [Derek Glinka](#); [Brian Earp](#); [dianneontheqc](#); [tmcginty52](#)
Cc: [PBC](#); [Cassie McAuliffe](#)
Subject: Guidance from PBC EC | Contingencies and Motions with Alternatives
Date: Thursday, 4 September 2025 8:05:00 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Dear Executive Committee

We are reviewing our internal Company policy and procedure on the use of PBC funds, to bring it line with the new agreements that are due to commence on 1 November 2025.

As part of aligning our internal policies with the new agreements, I seek the EC's guidance on the following two matters:

1. The raising of contingencies; and
2. Presenting a motion with alternatives when there are 2 or more quotes to be considered.

I have expanded upon each of these below.

Contingencies

We currently have a practice whereby a contingency (of around 10%) is added to the estimate provided by a contractor to be engaged, and approved by the PBC at an EGM. I am told this is to account for variations in scope of works.

In my experience, the amount stated in the motion should reflect the amount estimated by the contractor and there should be no mark-up or contingency that we unilaterally impose (unless the quote itself contains a contingency in which case the cost being approved in the motion should include it). To the extent the contractor's estimated cost increases beyond what was approved, the contractor should put that in writing to the PBC who can then vote on the additional costs. This ensures that costs associated with the project but not specific to the works approved (for example legal fees) are approved in a separate motion and from the relevant fund. Alternatively, if the proposed additional costs are minimal or require approval urgently because of some emergency work that was not anticipated, we could obtain instructions from the PBC nominee to continue with the work and then seek retrospective approval for the costs at the next EGM.

There are obviously efficiencies that flow from building in contingencies to the approved quote and this is a practise strongly supported by the FM department.

Could you please let me know what the EC's preference is here or whether you would like for this matter to be put to the PBC EGM?

Motion with alternatives

We currently have a practice whereby if 2 or more quotes are obtained, our office forms a view on the most suitable, and proposes that for approval at an EGM. If a second or third was preferred over the one we recommended, MNs wouldn't have the ability to select that quote as the motion only refers to one. MNs would have to vote against the motion and wait for the motion to be re-submitted next month. You may have noticed in the last EGM agenda, we have started preparing motions with alternatives. This allows for 2 or more quotes to be submitted to the EGM to be voted on, without our office selecting the most suitable. A recommendation can still be made in the explanatory material accompanying the motion, but this approach creates greater transparency and allows for greater decision-making by MNs.

Could you let me know your thoughts on a motion with alternatives? Again, if you would prefer this is discussed at a PBC EGM, please let me know as we still have time to put that up.

Thank you.

Kind Regards,

BROGAN WATLING

In-house Counsel

Email brogan.watling@scove.com.au

Main 07 5500 3333 | enquiries@scove.com.au

Address PO Box 15 | Shop 1A, Building 1, Masthead Way Sanctuary Cove Q 4212

Web oursanctuarycove.com.au

My working days are Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday



SANCTUARY COVE COMMUNITY SERVICES LIMITED | SANCTUARY COVE BODY CORPORATE PTY LTD

This email and any files transmitted with it are subject to copyright, confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify us via telephone or email and delete this email and any attachments from your computer.

From: [Brogan Watling](#)
To: [leeu](#)
Cc: [RBC - Schotia Island](#); [Stuart Shakespeare](#); [Jodie Syrett](#); [Cassie McAuliffe](#)
Subject: RE: Proxy for PBC Meetings
Date: Wednesday, 10 September 2025 9:18:36 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Hi Lee

Thanks for your time on the phone on Monday.

I understand that you have received mixed views from other MNs on whether proxies can be used at PBC EGMs which prompted you asking me. You also mentioned that in each agenda issued, the use of proxies is welcomed and a proxy form is included.

Following our discussion, I took some more time to look into this and I need to correct my position taken below with respect to question 2.

Firstly, I had overlooked sections 47C - 47E of SCRA that permits the use of proxies at general meetings. I had missed these sections in my initial email to you, so I was being guided only by Schedule 2, Part 2 of BUGTA. Section 47C states that a person entitled to vote at a general meeting may appoint a proxy unless the PBC has resolved (by special resolution) to prohibit the use of proxies altogether. I don't believe that has occurred. There are a couple of additional formalities set out in this section that I won't go into but you can read them [here](#). Section 47D sets out the form that a proxy must take. Section 47E then provides that: *"A member of the principal body corporate ("member A") who is the proxy for another member of the principal body corporate ("member B") may vote both in member A's own right and also as proxy of member B."*

These sections aren't helpful in explaining precisely how a MN goes about appointing a proxy. For example, what level of approval (Committee approval or EGM approval) you would need to obtain from your RBC to appoint a proxy. But given that the proxy holder would not be required to act in the best interests of the RBC who appointed them as their proxy, it may be viewed by some that EGM approval for something so significant, is required. The reason I say that is because when you appoint someone as your proxy, they are not required to vote how you would. When you vote in your capacity as MN at a PBC EGM, you are voting in the best interests of your RBC. A proxy would not have that same obligation. In appointing a proxy, you are essentially making a decision for your RBC to have no input at the relevant meeting.

I apologise that this hasn't been a straightforward answer to your question.

I plan to raise this matter at the EC meeting tomorrow if there is time for their input and discussion. If necessary, it may be a useful discussion to have at PBC EGM level to ensure everyone is on the same page. Ultimately, the Company provides guidance to the PBC on these matters, but it is a matter for the PBC to determine how and when it will accept

proxies.

Thanks Lee.

Kind Regards,

BROGAN WATLING

In-house Counsel

Email brogan.watling@scove.com.au

Main 07 5500 3333 | enquiries@scove.com.au

Address PO Box 15 | Shop 1A, Building 1, Masthead Way Sanctuary Cove Q 4212

Web oursanctuarycove.com.au

My working days are Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday



SANCTUARY COVE COMMUNITY SERVICES LIMITED | SANCTUARY COVE BODY CORPORATE PTY LTD

This email and any files transmitted with it are subject to copyright, confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify us via telephone or email and delete this email and any attachments from your computer.

From: Brogan Watling

Sent: Friday, 5 September 2025 3:53 PM

To: Leeu <leeu@bigpond.com>

Cc: RBC - Schotia Island <schotiaisland@scove.com.au>; Stuart Shakespeare <stuart@shakespeares.info>

Subject: RE: Proxy for PBC Meetings

Good afternoon Lee

Thank you for approaching me after the EGM last Thursday and thank you for your patience in awaiting my response.

I have copied in Stuart as the Chairperson so he is aware of the Company's position on this.

I understand your two queries were:

1. How should a Member's Nominee take direction to ensure it complies with its statutory duty?
2. Can someone else attend and vote on your behalf at an EGM when you will be

away? If not, can you give your right to vote to another MN?

I should preface this by saying that this is not legal advice but rather guidance being provided by the Company as the PBC's body corporate manager.

Question 1:

Section 24(6) of the *Sanctuary Cove Resort Act 1985* (Qld) (**SCRA**) is the starting point. This section provides that a MN appointed by a subsidiary body corporate (being its RBC) must represent its RBC:

- a) in the way the RBC directs; and
- b) subject to paragraph a), in a way that is in the best interests of its RBC.

Referees have approached this in slightly different ways over the years. It may help you to review the Referee Order here which is one of the more recent decisions that provides some good guidance. Paragraph [16] is not helpful.

My understanding is that most MNs write to their committees in the lead up to the PBC EGM proposing how they will vote and requesting feedback. I am also aware of a MN that obtains a committee resolution for each motion the PBC is to vote on.

Importantly, you should ensure that if your RBC has indicated a particular stance on a matter, you should be voting in accordance with their direction.

-

Question 2:

I do not think there is an ability for you to appoint someone to vote on your behalf at an EGM of the PBC. The reason this is slightly unclear is because SCRA provides that Schedule 2, Part 2 of BUGTA applies to its general meetings. However, BUGTA was not drafted with SCRA in mind so the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 2 do not necessarily make sense when applying them directly to PBC meetings.

Although Schedule 2, Part 2 of BUGTA permits voting by proxies, section 24 of SCRA does not anticipate Members Nominees using proxies or transferring their voting entitlements to other Members Nominees/owners within their RBC when the MN is absent. And I think there may be good reason for that. The first reason is that I do not think a Members Nominee could vote in the best interests of a RBC for which it does not represent or own a lot in. The second reason is that your RBC appointed you to be their MN not another owner within your RBC. So, you could not transfer your voting entitlement to another owner (who would not be bound by the restrictions of section 24 as MN) without the approval of your RBC. This would necessitate, your removal as a MN and their appointment. Which I don't think is what you intend.

Cheryl was recently presented with a similar situation when she travelled overseas. I

understand that Cheryl voted electronically in her role as MN whilst she was away, but sought approval from the PBC EC for a member of her RBC to attend as an observer to be able to report back to Cheryl on any important business discussed at the EGM. I appreciate that sometimes it may be difficult to decide how to vote on a motion in advance of the meeting and that pertinent discussions often take place at the meeting that may change your initial views on what way to vote. For those motions, you could always abstain from voting if you are uncertain or try to have those meaningful conversations prior to the EGM to assist you in your decision-making.

Does that help?

Thanks Lee.

Kind Regards,

BROGAN WATLING

In-house Counsel

Email brogan.watling@scove.com.au

Main 07 5500 3333 | enquiries@scove.com.au

Address PO Box 15 | Shop 1A, Building 1, Masthead Way Sanctuary Cove Q 4212

Web oursanctuarycove.com.au

My working days are Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday



SANCTUARY COVE COMMUNITY SERVICES LIMITED | SANCTUARY COVE BODY CORPORATE PTY LTD

This email and any files transmitted with it are subject to copyright, confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify us via telephone or email and delete this email and any attachments from your computer.

From: Leeu <leeu@bigpond.com>

Sent: Wednesday, 3 September 2025 10:37 PM

To: Brogan Watling <brogan.watling@scove.com.au>

Cc: RBC - Schotia Island <schotiaisland@scove.com.au>

Subject: Re: Proxy for PBC Meetings

Caution! This message was sent from outside your organization.

[Allow sender](#) | [Block sender](#)

Thanks Brogan.

Regards Lee
Mob: 0411890213
Sent from my iPhone

On 3 Sep 2025, at 19:57, Brogan Watling <brogan.watling@scove.com.au> wrote:

Hi Lee

I apologise for the delay.

I have not forgotten about coming back to you. This is on my to-do list and you will have an email from me by the end of the week!

Thanks
Brogan

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Leeu <leeu@bigpond.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 3, 2025 6:06:22 PM
To: Brogan Watling <brogan.watling@scove.com.au>
Cc: RBC - Schotia Island <schotiaisland@scove.com.au>
Subject: Proxy for PBC Meetings

Caution! This message was sent from outside your organization.

Hi Brogan,

Just a quick follow up on our discussion after the Aug PBC EGM.

Are you been able to confirm to whom I can give a proxy for PBC meetings?

Regards Lee
Mob: 0411890213
Sent from my iPhone

GENERAL BUSINESS

HISTORY OF SOLAR PANEL ISSUE

- 10 July – Email from MN for Zieria to PBC Chairman
- 15 July – Email from PBC Chairman to MN for Zieria
- 15 July - Initial site meeting with adjacent owner.
- July 2025 EGM –
 - Objection by MN for Zieria about meeting with owner
 - Assertion by MN for Zieria that solar panels are not necessary
 - Assertion by MN for Zieria that mains power was sufficient
 - Intention to reconvene meeting with owner and MN for Zieria
- 3 August - Email from PBC Chairman to Facilities Manager (FM) seeking advice on the assertion that mains power is appropriate for the Security's 2-way system.
- 14 August - Email from PBC Chairman to FM seeking advice on whether an Uninterrupted Power Supply (UPS) system is a feasible power source in lieu of solar panels.
- 15 August – Email from electrician to FM that main powers not reliable enough as an emergency power source plus initial comments on UPS system
- 9 September - Email from FM to PBC Chairman containing quotes for screens and card-reader lock for toilet door
- 9 September – Email from PBC Chairman to FM seeking response on UPS feasibility.
- 9 September – Email from FM to PBC Chairman providing further internal feedback received from Security on 15 August on a UPS.
- 11 September – Email from MN for Zieria requesting the Jabiru Park solar panels matter be put on the agenda for the September EGM

Stuart Shakespeare
PBC Chairman

17 September 2025



#	MEETING DATE	RESOLUTION	RESPON SIBILITY	COMMENTS	EXPECTED COMPLETION DATE
316	11/24	Stage 2 DCBL's RESOLVED that the PBC authorise the ARC and Developer to meet and finalise the DCBL documentation: FURTHER RESOLVED that the PBC is required to review the revised final documentation and the PBC will then approve if it is satisfactory.	ARC/ BCM	- Stage 2 commence working group 2025. - RBC resolution to be confirmed	Ongoing
419	08/22	Village Gate	PBC	- Completion expected end of 18 Nov 2025. - Schedule of work included in Sept EGM	Ongoing
426	04/23	Cypress Point licence agreement and buggy path repairs	PBC	Boom gate installed and operational.	With CMcB to consider
427	05/23	PBC FTTH Network Solution	PBC	- Legal Advice obtained services outside gates - May 25 – written report and list - Evaluation of RFQ tabled at PBC EC for endorsement - Meeting held with Gravel Road Group to finalise scope/phase clarifications.	Ongoing
429	03/24	Purchasing Policy updated	PBC	- The Company's internal policy on procedures around the use of PBC funds is being updated. - Correspondence for action includes an email seeking guidance from the PBC on some matters that this policy will cover. - This policy will be reviewed by the Board at its October meeting.	2025 Governance Review



#	MEETING DATE	RESOLUTION	RESPONSIBILITY	COMMENTS	EXPECTED COMPLETION DATE
430	07/24	Secondary Thoroughfare By-Law	PBC	- Removal of 6.3 passed at EGM, minutes completed and sent to Dep for approval. - Passed at PBC EGM July 24 - Awaiting gazettal confirmation.	Awaiting gazettal
431	2025	Administration & Facilities Agreements	PBC	- Passed at PBC EGM in June - PTBC at August EGM requested legal advice - Agreements due to commence on 1 November 2025	Passed at PBC EGM June 25
432	2024	Governance Review	PBC	2025 Lead by Simone Hoyle (SH) as Governance Project Lead - Monthly updates from SH at PBC meetings.	Ongoing
433	2025	Shareholders Agreement Amendment	PBC/PTBC	- Resolved - Amendment has been made	Completed
434	2025	Land Tax review	PBC	- Legal advice received on 16/09/2025 - Recommendation is to prepare and lodge an objection to land tax assessments from 2021 – 2025 - Motion has been submitted to agenda for September	Ongoing
435	2025	RZABL Amendment	PBC	Chambers Russell Lawyers have been engaged to provide advice on and draft 3 x by-laws within RZABL	Ongoing
436	2025	Sanctuary Green Irrigation	PBC	Consultant undertaking approved Preliminary/Detailed Design of system.	Ongoing



437	2025	Solar Panels Jabiru	PBC	Quotes obtained for 3 options. Possible battery-operated option is being sourced.	Ongoing
#	MEETING DATE	RESOLUTION	RESPON SIBILITY	COMMENTS	EXPECTED COMPLETION DATE
438	2025	Darwinia Planter box	PBC	- Owner instructed to remove planter and make good of area - Resident is requesting Darwinia park drainage to be rectified before removing.	Ongoing
439	2025	Buttner/Leslie dispute	PBC	- The PBC is awaiting the receipt of consent orders from QCAT that will see the QCAT matter brought to an end. Once these orders are received, a comprehensive update will be provided. - Separately, Mr Leslie has made requests for certain PBC documents (that were communications between the PBC's solicitor and Mr and Mrs Buttner's solicitor) that the EC considers would be protected by legal professional privilege. The EC and the Manager are working through this.	Ongoing
440	2025	Development Handover	PBC	- Request for Mulpha to contribute to expenses associated with engineer review - On 15 September 2025, Jeff Ray confirmed agreement to contribute 50% of the costs, based on the original detailed scope of works provided by OSKA. This contribution applies to all ongoing residential land subdivisions where new secondary thoroughfares and service assets are	



				being created and will ultimately be handed over to the PBC.	
441	2025	Biodiversity presentation	PBC	o TBC	
442	2025	Harbour One FTTH Agreement	PBC	o Mulpha has approved the agreement o Currently being signed by Mulpha	
443	2025	Security Agreement to PBC	PBC	o In the process of being drafted by the Manager	

Note: Green = Complete, Yellow = In Progress, Red = Not yet in Progress.

Ongoing

Working Progress

Mulpha

On hold

From: stuart@shakespeares.info
To: [Jodie Syrett](#)
Cc: [Cassie McAuliffe](#)
Subject: September EGM_Mid Term Appointment of Chairperson
Date: Thursday, 18 September 2025 11:04:21 AM

This sender is trusted.

Hi Jodie

As discussed. Pls insert 'Mid Term appointment of Chairperson' as an item under BA and the following under Explanatory Notes

Mid Term appointment of Chairperson

Stuart's last general meeting as Chairman is on the 30 October 2025.

The following is the PBC Policy on the appointment of a PBC Chairperson or Ordinary Member of the PBC Executive Committee, dated 27 July 2023.

In accordance with the this policy the EC will appoint a replacement Chairperson at its meeting on 16 October 2025. The PBC will vote on a motion at the October EGM to ratify that appointment. The appointed person will preside as chair for the EGM and EC meetings in November and December. At the December EGM the PBC will decide on the Chairperson, Treasurer, Secretary and Ordinary Members of the EC for the 2026.

On behalf of the Secretary
Cheryl McBride

(insert copy of the policy)



PRINCIPAL BODY CORPORATE (PBC) – RESIGNATION OF CHAIRPERSON AND ORDINARY PBC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (EC) MEMBER - POLICY

BACKGROUND

This policy is to simplify the process to be followed upon the resignation of the PBC Chairperson and that of an Ordinary Member of the PBC Executive Committee

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCES – SCRA (section 42)

PURPOSE

Clearly define the replacement of the PBC Chairperson and Ordinary Member of the PBC Executive Committee.

POLICY DETAILS

- a) Chairperson
 - a. A resigning Chairperson should be encouraged to do so with effect from the next PBC general meeting.
 - b. Upon the resignation of the Chairperson (at any time throughout the year) the PBC EC will appoint a current member of the EC to be Chairperson for the remainder of the PBC election year.
 - c. The PBC at general meeting will ratify the temporary Chairperson's appointment.
- b) Ordinary Member of the EC.
 - a. A resigning EC ordinary member should be encouraged to do so with effect from the next PBC general meeting.
 - b. Upon the resignation of the EC ordinary member, the following process will apply.
 - i. All residential body corporates (RBC's) are notified of the resignation and at the next PBC general meeting, nominations for the vacant position/s will be called for from the floor at that PBC general meeting.
 - ii. The eligibility of those nominees will be verified at the meeting.
 - iii. For those nominees who are eligible, if there are equal nominations to the number of vacant positions, they will be automatically appointed.
 - iv. If there are more nominees than vacant positions (e.g., 3 nominations for 2 positions), the Chairperson at the meeting will call for a show of hands, with the two nominations who receive the most votes elected to the PBC EC.
 - v. The Chairperson welcomes the Ordinary Members to the EC for the remainder of the election year.



PRINCIPAL BODY CORPORATE (PBC) – RESIGNATION OF CHAIRPERSON AND ORDINARY PBC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (EC) MEMBER - POLICY

RESPONSIBILITIES

Secretary to ensure the above policy is strictly adhered to upon PBC approval at general meeting.

DEFINITIONS

DOCUMENT REFERENCES

REVISION HISTORY

Version No#	Date	Author	Summary of Changes
1	24/07/2023	BCS	Initial

DISTRIBUTION

Name	Title
PBC / Website	Resignation and replacement of casual Chairperson and Ordinary Member PBC EC.

Information about Proxies

This page is for information only and not part of the prescribed form.

Lot Owners can appoint a trusted person as their representative at meetings, to vote in ballots or represent them on the committee. This person is your proxy.

To authorise a proxy, you must use the prescribed form and deliver it to the owner's corporation secretary. If appointing a Power of Attorney as a proxy, you should attach a copy of the Power of Attorney.

Proxies automatically lapse 12 months after the form is delivered to the secretary, unless an earlier date is specified.

Proxies must act honestly and in good faith and exercise due care and diligence. Proxies cannot transfer the proxy to another person.

A Lot Owner can revoke the authorisation at any time and choose to vote on a certain issue or attend a meeting.

It is illegal for someone to coerce a Lot Owner into making another person their proxy.

Owners' corporations must keep the copy of the Proxy authorisation for 12 months.

Proxy form for Body Corporate meetings

Building Units and Group Titles Act 1980

Section 1 – Body corporate secretary details

Name: The Secretary

Address of scheme: C/- Sanctuary Cove Principal, PO Box 15 SANCTUARY COVE, QLD, 4212

Section 2 – Authorisation

Notes: The Regulations set out a number of restrictions on the use of proxies, including an ability for the body corporate to further restrict their use including prohibition. If there is insufficient space, please attach separate sheets.

I/we

Name of owner 1:

Signature: **Dated:** ____ / ____ / ____

Name of owner 2:

Signature: **Dated:** ____ / ____ / ____

being the Proprietor/s of the following Lot/s

Lot number/s: **Plan number:**

Name of Body Corporate:

SANCTUARY COVE PRINCIPAL

hereby appoint,

Proxy (full name):

as my/our proxy to vote on my/our behalf (*including adjournments*) at (please tick **one**)

☐ The body corporate meeting to be held on ____ / ____ / ____

☐ All body corporate meetings held before ____ / ____ / ____ (*expiry date*)

☐ All body corporate meetings held during the rest of the body corporate's financial year unless I/we serve you with a prior written withdrawal of the appointment

unless I/we serve you with a prior written withdrawal of the appointment of Proxy.

Signature of proxy holder: **Dated:** ____ / ____ / ____

Residential address:

Suburb: **State:** **Postcode:**

Postal address:

Suburb: **State:** **Postcode:**