

**Transcript of Eva Wilander's audio recording "Samtal om Slävik 26 nov 12.m4a"**

Discourse 2012-11-26, the part where Nils Larsson participated.

2013-02-09, Stig Rosenlund.

Corrections by Mats Rosenlund 2013-02-12.

Present

Birgitta Wrenfelt

Bo Björkman

Eva Wilander

Jan Byström

Jennie Fischer-Colbrie

Kersti Björkman

Leonard Byström

Louise Björkman

Mats Björkman

Mats Rosenlund

Nils Larsson

Sofia Björkman

Stig Rosenlund

Tobias Rosenlund

Åsa Wrenfelt

Location

U&We's office Stora Nygatan 45, Stockholm

The neighboring properties talked about are

1:7 Karlsson

1:8 Röds

1:9 Norströms

Mats Björkman: Mats Rosenlund has provided us, including Nils, with excellent background material about Slävik. It is carefully and pedagogically set up, so it does not need much more. Åsa Wrenfelt, do you have any plan for today? Would anyone like to add anything? Otherwise, maybe we can let Nils Larsson tell us how he looks at this.

Birgitta Wrenfelt: I have to go after half the program, because I will attend a meeting at 6.

Mats Björkman: Then we'll have to talk quickly, Nils.

Nils Larsson: Then we just decide.

Birgitta Wrenfelt: (Laughter.)

Mats Björkman: Does it seem to be a good idea? Is there anyone who wants to add something to Mats Rosenlund's material right now? Then, of course, we will have the opportunity to discuss this with Nils. If not, I will leave the word to Nils.

Nils Larsson: It is the intention that we discuss when we meet like this, but a little preliminary: I also think it was a good description that you have done Mats Rosenlund. It makes me understand it all, and I have also developed a map of these beautiful properties. Let us clarify them. I can copy as we sit here if needed. Basically we have 1:5 and 1:6 which are here. I show on the map. To me it's new, while you know very well what you have. But the basis of it is that you in the family have two agricultural properties, they are rated as agricultural properties. It is somewhat strange when they are so small. There are no operational buildings for them. You will tell me if there are any linked to them. 1:5 is 6 hectares and 1:6 I think 11 hectares. In 1967 a parceling procedure was made according to an old law called the building law. In 1967, the area within here was designated as what is referred to in professional language as kvartersmark (literally block land). It's such land that you can build on and it became 13 plots, apart from 1:9 which was there already since many years. And 1:9 still exists today too. And on the map, which comes outside the building plan, there are the properties are 1:7 and 1:8 with their own beachfront lots. They are thus catered for with beach and sea on their own, while 1:9 is not. What you can say about the plan is that they made an unusual feature, because the only obligation imposed on the owners of 1:5 and 1:6 was to release the ground for roads free of charge. The starting point used to be a decree from the county administrative board, which states that also the park land is to be released. For between the yellow lies some uninhabited land which lies park land. That park land is therefore common to the properties of the plan area and thus also to 1:9, which is a property in the plan area. But not for 1:7 and 1:8, because they are outside the area.

Mats Rosenlund: A small question. 1:9 is Norströms. Is that the land that is stated in the building plan as building plan land? Is that the kvartersmark?

Nils Larsson: No, the kvartersmark is what is yellow-colored as lot land in the plan. All other land within the plan is public land.

Mats Rosenlund: But also what is marked as parking space further down, is that building plan land?

Nils Larsson: The area for parking is within the plan but public land. It's not kvartersmark.

Mats Rosenlund: Can an area between lot ground be kvartersmark?

Nils Larsson: No, only what is in the building plan (the yellow) for housing is kvartersmark. And all other land is laid out as public land. There are streets, park land, parking lots.

Mats Rosenlund: And the ground just outside the plan area ...?

Nils Larsson: It's ordinary farm land. It has no rules. Park land is the green. The County Administrative Board's ordering lies behind. They get sour in the next generations when they bring their papers. They say, "This dad exploited, and now we want to exploit this green area." Then I have the worst thing they can hear saying to them: "This land is worthless, because the County Administrative Board has prescribed that you shall give it you free of charge to those who own the kvartersmark." And they do not like hearing that. But in your case it was strange that here they say that the County Administrative Board pursuant to section 113 of the Building Act shall reasonably order that you cede without compensation all the undeveloped land within the same property, which is included in the building plan as road land and is indicated by red color. So it's just the road land. And thus you the owners of 1:5 and 1:6 can have a feeling to have a certain property in this park land. It is, to say, worth its price, and it can never be forced from the owners without compensation. But it is normal for the owners in such a plan area to give that land free of charge to form a community facility. But it can not happen. Now it does not matter to you, but you have 1:9, which is not part of your family, nor can it take it for free. Looking at the planning situation, we have a special situation for all land that is within the plan area. We have a completely different situation - even if you own it and will be reimbursed - it's common land. Outside the plan area, which actually only goes along the boundaries of the built-up plots: The rest here is actually farm land, it is rated as agricultural property. You are using them quite sparsely today, because there are pretty hard rules for building. Any kind of plant as close to the water as it is - there's really nothing else to say - getting building permits for something outside here will be very difficult. Getting new plots becomes very difficult. Your problem is then: How are you going to own this plan area in the future, 1:5 and 1:6? And there I can say that I see the question in two parts: How should you own the park land in the future? I think that belongs to the properties.

Mats Rosenlund: But it's quite a small area.

Nils Larsson: Yes, it's a small area, but here 1:9 can actually go to the surveyor at any time, and he will win an application for the creation of a joint facility to jointly manage the park land. Then 1:9 will be charged some money. It is very difficult to know what the price is, but in principle it is the average value of the entire land area.

Mats Björkman: May I ask you something, Nils, for this one you have not received. It's the detailed plan that Nils held up here, we can take copies then if anyone wants. But we can see then that the right of 1:9, it's just this park land. There we have nothing that really is of value, such as boat house, bridge, bathhouse, diving board and so on. So maybe it's not that incredibly interesting for them, because they already have a part in the roads in this procedure, was that so?

Nils Larsson: Building ... .. there is a GA (gemensamhetsanläggning = common facility) behind it, and the planning situation is such and the planning work of 1967 presupposes that these roads will be kept open for these other properties as well. And also kept open

for moving outdoor activities. Because this is a beautiful area, it is a reservation, I do not know how much is reserved here.

Time 12:41

Mats Björkman: Well, sure, Mats knows best. But that's probably something like this. (Showing on map). The arable lands are not reserved. And we have a little land that is reservation.

Mats Rosenlund: If you look at the map that Nils attached, it is clearly visible there.

Sofia Björkman: How is this piece, is not that in the reservation (showing on map)?

Åsa Wrenfelt: Yes, part of it is.

Mats Björkman: Here is the reservation (showing on map).

Nils Larsson: But it means that the reservation does not put any major obstacles in the way. If you then go over to what Mats has written, there are instruments to ... that is in the discussion, isn't it - how are you owners going to in the future .. in a way like property owner - property-related. And then I mean that every lot you have in the area, and you own in the family, get a belonging in a common owner. It's really a common ownership of an area. And then you make a can know. There is little problem, perhaps, that today, the plan area boundary is what is reserved for what you will have for a common facility, together. And to pick up spaces of 1:5 and 1:6 in a common facility for common ground together, in addition to the building plan: it is a little difficult to justify, purely plan wise. Then I do not say that this is not possible, because when we deal with such questions, it's a surveyor who decides, and sometimes it's possible to talk well with them. But the starting point is that you shall be in the building plan, with property-related rights.

Stig Rosenlund: The pump house and the well are located within the building plan, it stands to reason?

Mats Rosenlund: Yes, they are within what is the plan area.

Stig Rosenlund: So it is exclusively these facilities that are included. But the boat house, the bathhouse, the diving board and the bridges, they were not included?

Nils Larsson: There is a bathhouse, and a boathouse up here (showing on map)?

Stig Rosenlund: There is the boat house and there is the bathhouse, diving board and ladder (showing on map).

Nils Larsson: And then you could say that I would like to think, if you agree, that you could form a community facility No. 2 for them.

Stig Rosenlund: Bridge, boat house and bathhouse - even though they are located in different places, can they still be part of it?

Nils Larsson: Yes, it does not matter that there are different places, but there are two different ?? But you can place a right in the form of a joint facility in a way for bridge facilities and for boating houses.

Stig Rosenlund: And bathhouse?

Nils Larsson: Yes, you can even lift this boat house so it is not owned at 1:6 but it will be owned directly by the bath community facility. It's a new feature we have since 4-5 years back.

Mats Björkman: And the bridge could also be included?

Nils Larsson: We can also lift the bridge so that it is owned by the community facility.

Time 17:21

In the same way you can arrange a sauna and such. Why I'm saying it's because you say you do not want 1:9, but 1:9, you can not escape when it comes to forming a community facility for the park land. You can not, because you can not form such a community facility that does not follow the plan. And that plan says that he (1:9) will participate in it. On the other hand, if 1:9 is not very tough and bothering you, you can form a community center just for the lots of the extended family, with regard to bridges and baths.

Mats Rosenlund: But if he's a tough guy, what happens?

Nils Larsson: Then he comes and says it's essential to me too, and I'll be included. And who knows how you can resist it. Then it comes into play that it will be essential to them. And as you wrote very well ... This essential requirement, you can agree between you that he gets it so to speak ... But if he is to force himself, you can say that it's not essential to you, but you can hear how bad those words sound, when you think it's important to you at the same time.

Mats Rosenlund: They take baths in Släviksviken, which is closest to them, so they never bathe with us.

Stig Rosenlund: But they may want to have access to a sauna and so on sometimes.

Nils Larsson: This is on the verge of what a GA should be used for. In the archipelago of Stockholm, they are reluctant to give GA for bridges. Then you can say: Is it so important for real estate? If you look at the price increase, you can see it's important. But it's a bit old-fashioned. And permanent construction is also a bit strange. And it speaks to ... But at the same time, I think that surveyors would accept, because they like to want help from them. Thus, that is the solution that is offered by real estate law. The advantage of

solving it by property law is that once and for all it's settled. And that these rights always follow the respective property. They can not be sold, and they can not, so to speak, disappear, but they belong here - they can not be abolished. Then you have order in it.

Mats Rosenlund: The entire legal system is also available, and the entire legislation and ...

Nils Larsson: This whole form of association, or if we translate into Swedish, the entire form of meeting with the order and statutes and all comes with it. And that is good. And then you can say you think about the park land where 1:9 is included, there you have GA1. Or GA2 it will be, for GA1 you already have. And that's one man - one voice (one man/one woman - one voice). And that means that it's not so terribly dangerous maybe, nevertheless, usually, but the one who controls is the majority.

Mats Rosenlund: A question, this well we have and almost everyone uses it, it is located within the building plan then?

Nils Larsson: Yes.

Time 21:38

Mats Rosenlund: And does it mean that if we now are going to have common water arranged with some kind of community facility for well here, then 1:9 should also participate in it, because it lies within the building plan area? Mats, you may point to where the well is located, but it is located within this.

Mats Björkman: Now let's see. Here I think. That must be the park land there. (Shows on map.)

Stig Rosenlund: The well is located in the park land.

Mats Rosenlund: Within the plan area, yes.

Nils Larsson: It is in a public place, what we call park land.

Stig Rosenlund: The yellow is a parking lot and the green is park land.

Nils Larsson: The most recent procedure I saw in Nyköping last week, they are quite flexible at the survey to say that everyone has to join. They do today GA for water, for those who want to be included. And if he wants to be in when it is in the land of the plan area, then it is not possible to stop. On the other hand, one might think that someone says that I do not want to participate.

Mats Björkman: But if you would like to know if they - it might be of the most importance for this community center for bath houses, boathouses, bridges - that we just want this community if they are NOT involved. Can you in any way make a preliminary

contact to make sure that the surveyor thinks it's OK. But if the surveyor has a different opinion, that is, 1:9 should be included, then we say: No, we do not want to do this. Or is it that once you have started this process, you may get them included as part of the bargain.

Nils Larsson: No, but it is true. I say that, although it is a public law, such as here an authority is to decide, there is room for agreement. You can agree on how a community facility will look. And then you do it. You agree. And then you agree also with 1:8, 1:7 and 1:9, and then they have to sign that we do not want to be included. And the only thing you are looking for is a community facility that looks like this. Otherwise, you do not want it.

Mats Björkman: So you do not have to chance? That was my question.

Nils Larsson: No, you do not have to chance if you enter and base the application on an agreement on a community facility. An agreement about the park land itself, an agreement on water and .... Should 1:9 be included in the water, then it is enough to take in it also in the park land. But a separate agreement on bridges and baths as the main theme there. And there we also think that you can take in 1:8 and 1:9 and 1:7, who declared that they should not be included. We do not know if they will oppose it. But then you will refrain from that solution, because they will never be able to compel it.

Mats Rosenlund: Not 1:9 either?

Nils Larsson: No, no one will be able to force him into a communal facility for bridges and bath at 1:6 and 1:5 as the legal situation is today, because you have a road going here. And to take land by force for bridges and baths - then special circumstances are required. In Stockholm's archipelago it's - and there's nothing ... it's the same law on the west side - it's necessary to need a boat as a means of transport to the properties. To take the land by force.

Stig Rosenlund: So the water is then - can 1:9 force itself into water, part of the well facility?

Nils Larsson: If you make the well facility a GA, then it's a danger that he's coming in there.

Stig Rosenlund: He comes in if he wants to. If he does not want, he will of course not have to?

Mats Rosenlund: Can 1:8 say that they will also participate in it, even though they are outside the plan area?

Nils Larsson: No 1:8 and 1:6 (Nils means 1:7, the transcript's listing). But theoretically, they could say, and it's up to the municipalities ... that all water and such there should be in a bigger solution, so to speak. It should be a complete solution for that.

Time 27:04

Mats Rosenlund: But 1:8, you know their water is so scarce. And they consume a lot of water. Because they have several baths and showers and everything. They drive water there by tank trucks.

Stig Rosenlund: It has been going on ... and they drive big tank trucks to all their showers and bathtubs.

Nils Larsson: Is it not just putting a pump into the sea, then?

Stig Rosenlund: and with desalination ...

Nils Larsson: But you can take baths in saltwater?

Mats Rosenlund: But those outside the plan, they can not force themselves into such a water facility?

Nils Larsson: No, but I think so for sure. They can do that. They would theoretically be able to come in and say to the municipality tomorrow ... because then, the municipality's plan will ... Thus, when applying for a GA, the municipality will always start a consultation process, because everything is about using our resources in the best way. And the water supply in the coastal area is always something of a problem, both on the east and west side. And it was, wasn't it, in the construction plan that they would not be able to build before having fixed water and sewage. How do you have the sewage arranged today?

Mats Rosenlund: Well, it is on every site. Infiltration. And some have not arranged infiltration either, because the houses are so old.

Nils Larsson: But then they will (the municipality, the transcript's note) soon hit the fist in the table and judge the facilities to be illicit. That is ..

Mats Rosenlund: But it can be arranged on every site. But the water ...

Nils Larsson: No, that's not certain. It may be that they will require to ... Suddenly they will say, now there can not be a single house more until water and sewage are arranged. With mini purification plants and such.

Mats Rosenlund: Our experience is that they do not make such demands, but they allow infiltration or ground beds on each site.

Nils Larsson: Then you will continue ... So this always becomes one of those constant questions: What will be collective solutions and what should not be collective solutions.

Mats Rosenlund: This old plan, it indicated two possibilities. Either way we have a digged ..., so we continue with the digged old well. You know, a sewage investigation was done before the building plan was adopted in the mid-60s. And then those who did the water and sewage investigation found that there were two possibilities. Either way we continue - we had digged wells at that time, either you continue with a digged well, but then all sewage will be flushed down to the beach, to a large sewage plant down at the beach. Or we can arrange a water source that is outside the sites as a drilled well, for example, and then you can have infiltration on each lot. It was an investigation made by a consulting company in the mid 60's. So there were two options. And then we chose the last one that we would drill a well eventually, and we would have a sewage outlet on each lot. Then it seemed like that.

Nils Larsson: Yes, because that was done ... in the same decision by the county administrative board ... and the county administrative board then takes a determination decision. And did it eventually 1969, and I think it was 1967 that the municipal council took it. 1969, it was in the same decision that they said you should give road rights for free, and so they say that in the 110th section of the Building Act, a ban is being imposed on the execution of a new building in the construction plan area, without a special permit, before roads, water supply and sewage are arranged for the area to the extent necessary and the county administrative board for that reason lifted the ban. That's old today, of course. But all the time, they can come and demand a solution for water and sewers. But I do not think that is so crucial, maybe, for how to handle ownership in the future. Because it's a question like ... You will always encounter questions. But what I said now is that I see that a common facility would fit to in principle own 1:5 and 1:6 within the plan area. And to enter the bay within the community facility for boats and bridges and boat houses and baths. But then there is a lot of land anyway that remains at 1:6 and 1:5. And so the problem persists: How should you own it then?

Time 32:39

Stig Rosenlund: It's all this, it's ... Why not continue like this ...

Mats Björkman: But if I may ask a question then, then, in practice, ownership may be very uninteresting, provided that it does not end up in any external hands that remake these community facilities. Can you do that?

Nils Larsson: Well, common facilities are very difficult to reconsider and they are stable. So I do not see that risk. And it is very much because the rest of the land here becomes quite useless. But it is still a type of ownership. Anyway, it might feel annoying if it were going outside. One way would be to try to let the land survey set the entire land as an extra park land. But then you get 1:9, and then there is a risk of 1:7 and 1:8 being included. It will be, because it goes around it, there's no rhyme and resonance in it. And that may speak for your keeping the ownership of this other land individually as you have it today.

Mats Björkman: One more aspect. If it is possible in the future to make new lots in this area. Maybe you will not be able to do this out on the tongue of the land, but you might think that there are other parts. This could possibly be an advantage, so one thinks that one chooses the solution that minimizes the possibility of hindering the parceling of new sites.

Nils Larsson: Yes, I think so ... We know what we have today. But we do not know how the rules look in 20 years. Not an idea. We have powerful beach protection today. But we do not know at all if you look at that question in the same way in 20 years.

Mats Björkman: What I mean is that maybe you can parcel off new lots here up there, as ...

Sofia Björkman: But, would it be better to parcel off new lots than to split existing ones?

Mats Björkman: No, but say in about 30, 40, 50 years.

Nils Larsson: Yes, today it's not possible.

Mats Björkman: No, but I think maybe it's better to do something - if you do such a community facility so that you make all land to park land, then it may prevent you from parceling new ones in the future, maybe in about 30, 40, 50 years. And then maybe it's crazy to choose that option.

Mats Rosenlund: There up the ground north of the public road, I had a thought to parcel some lots ...

Mats Björkman: Yes, it's this one yes (showing on map our land next to the country road). There is the public road and so this part could be parceled off. North of the public road.

Sofia Björkman: The other is nature reservation.

Stig Rosenlund: This potential future value, it makes it really difficult to redistribute ownership. I have now 1/6 and Birgitta 1/4. I mean to allocate ownership proportionally to the lots, then you have to agree on the price. With the potential enormous value that applies, maybe we have to have 20 million for it all, and then we make a settlement. And it just does not work.

Mats Rosenlund: There is only a theoretical possibility that it can be parceled.

Eva Wilander: Suddenly somebody ...

Stig Rosenlund: But you have to rate it in any way - 10 percent here and there, maybe it will amount to 10-20 million. So I think it's leaning towards that we do not change the ownership, but Birgitta has 1/4, Bosse's 1/4. I have 1/6.

Eva Wilander: And I have 1/6. I'm also leaning towards it.

Mats Björkman: You can, of course, insert this into another form of association. One can own it through a company or financial association, foundation.

Nils Larsson: Exactly, one could imagine that one made a company of it, but the problem ...

Stig Rosenlund: Of this or of the building area?

Nils Larsson: No no, I think I'm rather insisting on ... But you should start to get a feeling that. That's just the advice of me. What is essential with the bridges and baths and this, it feels like you should settle it property-law-wise. Linked to the respective property. It feels like that. And it feels like you as well shall pre-empt this, so that no-one else does. As for the park land within. It would only make you feel foolish if it was 1:9 that came and say, now I'm applying. Instead you should formulate and post this while there is time, and apply for it yourselves. But the other land there, and that's pretty much, because it's 11 and 6, it's 17 hectares. Somehow 17 large soccer fields. One hectare is a soccer field. So that's quite a lot. But yet, as I understand, there is no productive arable land.

Time 38:22

Sofia Björkman: No, it's mostly mountain.

Stig Rosenlund: Here there are bushes on mountain (showing on map).

Nils Larsson: There is no real woodland either. When it is classified as agricultural property or agricultural unit as it is called, a land acquisition permit is required, and it must not be given to a legal person. And also a foundation constitutes a legal person. So you have to get past the obstacle to ... One must get an exception for it. Now, this is not of importance to Swedish forestry and agriculture, when you describe what you do. What Mats said, that's what ... What would be here, that's a foundation. And what would it be? Yes, then, the family branch is here. A relative is sitting ... and then that board shall be appointed by the family. You just have to agree on how the board will be appointed, because that is where the power is located - in the foundation board. So there may be a way to deal with it, thus ensuring that no new owner comes in and messes it up. It is true that because it is an agricultural unit today, it falls under and you point to it (Nils refers to Mats Rosenlund's letter, the transcript's note), joint ownership of agricultural property. And then you can not even sign an agreement that it can not be sold. Instead, sales by the respective owners can be called for at any time. And then it is sold by a salesman appointed by the lower court to anyone, that is. So, it is a rather insecure ownership form today, when there are many who own an agricultural unit.

Mats Rosenlund: Should it go to public auction?

Nils Larsson: On public auction.

Mats Rosenlund: So we can come in and bid then?

Nils Larsson: Then you can go in and bid. You go in and buy it of course, but ... So that's the risk that is.

Mats Rosenlund: Is it a big risk? And can you not handle it?

Nils Larsson: No, there should not be anyone who calls for sales. It is a combat action, someone who has really lost his mind and has become angry with the others who would like such a thing.

Mats Rosenlund: If you go bankrupt as an owner?

Nils Larsson: Then, only the share is sold, then the entire property is not sold. And that percentage, you buy it. But it's more about the entire property being offered for sale. And suddenly this has 1:8 ...

Mats Björkman: A rich Norwegian.

Nils Larsson: ... bought by a rich Norwegian, ...

Mats Björkman: There are already today.

Nils Larsson: ... who takes an oil billion and says: Who wants to fight with me then? And then he thinks it's fun to own this. Too many people think it's fun to own a lot of land around them. But then he can not buy what you already have GA on. So it's a little important to arrange the essentials in a GA.

Jennie Fischer-Colbrie: I will ask one thing about community facilities: Can you join in afterwards? If we were to set up a community facility where 1:9 does not come along, there is an opportunity for them afterwards to claim that they shall be included.

Mats Rosenlund: From the beginning ...

Nils Larsson: Yes, there is an expropriative element in this. This is a Lidbom law, for those who remember. We were given quite a lot, it's quite easy to steal the land of the neighbor. I mean, if you had not owned this land, you could ... Now I said before that bridges and such, it's hard to take it, but it's quite simple private-law-wise to expropriate land in Sweden. You can not be always safe with this. But you're pretty safe with it. And it will be take a lot, it will be a mess you know.

Time 43:36

Mats Björkman: Should it not matter if you have reached an agreement from the start? With 1:9 that they should not be included.

Nils Larsson: Well, it does not bind the next owner, who is not mentioned.

Mats Björkman: So it's not the property, but the property owner you have reached an agreement with.

Nils Larsson: Yes, the agreement only has significance in the current public-law decision. One sets up the frame of the surveyor's decision with it, but nothing more. So they can come in. But I do not see the risk so great about the bridges and the bath beach. I do not see the compulsion there so particularly dangerous. On the other hand, if you should arrange water and drain here and it really works. Then 1:8 and 1:7 say: We have no water, we want to connect to yours. Then there is greater risk, because there is greater significance from the property perspective.

Stig Rosenlund: Then we will have to take that blow when they come and want to enter our water, when they come. May I reconnect, what GA for park land means concretely is that, as it is now, the owners of 1:5 and 1:6 they have this and that (showing on map). What is enclosed in a line that's around this, it would go to a GA. The GA would include it, plus ...

Sofia Björkman: Along the road.

Mats Björkman: Around the lots.

Nils Larsson: You see that the boundary of the plan area goes in the outer ... straight ... There is therefore reason to do that only, I think, and it will be done and it can be done. Within the planning area. And then it's better that you do it yourself. And anticipate it. It will feel a lot much better.

Stig Rosenlund: Anyone of the landowners, and even 1:9 then, can request .... And then we lose ownership-wise. Or then we can sell it. It is forcibly bought by us.

Nils Larsson: Yes, and then all these landowners will pay to the shareholders in ...

Stig Rosenlund: But then it's just as good to do it at once, because they will make a mess later.

Mats Rosenlund: But is it about selling the land? Is will be a community facility there?

Nils Larsson: Yes, it's not legislation ... You can redeem it. It's not normal, but you are setting and marking the area, saying that all land in the building plan area, which is not individual lot land, must enter a community facility for parks managed jointly. For the roads, you find, are already common in another GA. And possibly parking, if not resolved before, comes in here. Yes, that's the thing. And then the question arises if we

will solve the water and sewage issues. The sewage problem you can solve yourselves, but you could make water in that GA.

Sofia Björkman: This is park land now. It's not that you can make it a lot and protect it that way?

Nils Larsson: No. When you make such a plan, you look at: How much can we add lots here to make it nice in the future? And on the basis of the idea that one should have the best, then one lay gaps between them. And that's what you call - even in the countryside - you call it park land. In the city, we know we have a park. But it's called park land. There are such gaps.

Sofia Björkman: They are a bit protected then?

Nils Larsson: A little protected and a little nice. And then, I mean, that you have taken a plan on how much park land is going to be for these blocks. There are out in the archipelago of Stockholm, examples where 100 hectares are laid in GA. And then the county administrative board orders that everything be released free of charge. Then they came to me and said, We own 100 hectares of giant archipelago. Yes, you do, I said, but it is useless. Do you think they were happy then, the clients?

Time 48:50

Mats Björkman: But it's very funny then, because now we know we have parks around. It feels much better than those bushes.

Birgitta Wrenfelt: (Laughter.)

Nils Larsson: It's like this: Because you're doing something, it's going to be a board of directors, a joint council. Usually in the statutes there are three or five persons that are sitting. And they have the task of ensuring that it is managed, the park land. So that's a way to cope. But probably you are addicted to bushes out there (showing map)?

Mats Björkman: And we want that too ... outside ...

Nils Larsson: This is where you have a sea view.

Mats Björkman: There you have mountain, so ...

Sofia Björkman: But may I ask again: If you want more lots sometime in the future, can you do it on the other land then?

Nils Larsson: Not within here in any case (showing on map).

Sofia Björkman: No, but outside (showing on map)?

Nils Larsson: Yes, you can probably do that, but ...

Mats Björkman: ... the beach ...

Eva Wilander: But it has already been done.

Nils Larsson: Only if possible. Just as an idea. Today, you know, if you look at the exploitation: We know that we have a reservation, which takes quite a bit. But as you said - noted - here is no reservation. Then there would be a square here (showing map) that you could exploit. Then you can easily see that it is within - quite close distance from the water, so it will be a beach protection exemption to exploit it.

Mats Rosenlund: That's not impossible?

Nils Larsson: It's not impossible. It depends on the beach protection. They are ... and that was what I meant, today you are almost overly careful about building in coastal locations. You may not have received this (showing on map existing sites [?]) today either. You probably would not have got it, but today for today they are opposed. But this comes and goes. How it looks in 20 years, we do not know. But today ... If you look at exploitation opportunities, you have to simply sit down and explore a bit with the municipal officials: How do you look at this? How does it look? But the starting point is that it is difficult.

Mats Björkman: There may not be such clear-cut areas that here we could put in 15 lots, but maybe there's a little place here and there, possibly.

Mats Rosenlund: That is nothing that is needed right now, I suppose, but it's just what the impact on the value is.

Mats Björkman: In about an additional generation or two, maybe.

Stig Rosenlund: Can I ask if I've understood this? These areas (shows on map) should have been added to the plan area without compensation to owners of 1:5 and 1:6 right from the start?

Nils Larsson: Yes, normally it would have been so.

Stig Rosenlund: And at any time, there may be a transfer of 1:5 and 1:6 to park land here, without the transfer of any money?

Nils Larsson: Yes, today you have the right to claim money.

Stig Rosenlund: Is that so?!

Nils Larsson: But you can not resist transferring it to a GA. And should this ... So, this is just incomplete. And this is how it looked. This is 1967, quite late. Until 1974. They did not really know how to handle this. And young people - my children (they are not so

young anymore) - they call such a thing common. And commons, they disappeared in Sweden at the turn of the century. So they are terribly old-fashioned.

Sofia Björkman: We also say that.

Nils Larsson: Yes, but there are no commons. There is park land, inside the city as well. Thus, they have taken away for it. And from 1974, the law of community facilities came. Then there are no such solutions anymore. That is - it is prescribed that community facilities will be formed. And in the transitional rules of the law, it was said that: It is enough that one calls the surveyor and says "I want to apply". Then the community facility is formed. So here is just a stroke of chance that this old procedure has been maintained. A community facility shall be formed.

Mats Björkman: And one more question. If we now choose to make these community facilities, which it feels like there are great advantages to choose, as you have mentioned: But what about this park land then, community facility No. 1. Then we say: Then we do not want to include 1:9. And then we reach an agreement with them, then they can stay outside. And the argument for that should probably be that they will have to pay to join this community facility. Is not it like that? And we have found that that park land, it really has no value. So it would not be unreasonable to imagine that they will still accept it.

Time 54:05

Nils Larsson: Yes, but it's a bit difficult to keep 1:9 out from the park land.

Mats Rosenlund: And thus from the water.

Mats Björkman: But do not they have to pay to get involved?

Nils Larsson: Yes.

Mats Björkman: But if they say: We do not want to pay, then we want to be outside this.

Nils Larsson: Well, they can not jump out of the building plan area.

Mats Björkman: Yes, they can not? They go there in any case.

Nils Larsson: Yes, so it's a human attitude that they do not want to. The property has its character. It is part of the building plan area. Now this is called detailed plan. From the beginning there was a building plan. But it is the detail plan area. And they cannot likely jump out of that community. It really requires a change of plan. You make a change to the detailed plan and exclude them out.

Mats Björkman: So, it seems complicated.

Nils Larsson: Yes, hard.

Sofia Björkman: But why is it difficult to redo the detail plan area?

Nils Larsson: Because, from the point of view of planning, they have held it to be included once upon a time. And then you have to say: It's not going to be included today. And then you have to find the argument for it. And it's a bit difficult.

Mats Björkman: We do not like them.

Sofia Björkman and Birgitta Wrenfelt: (Laughter)

Nils Larsson: I have no other solution than that you are so many, so you get to collect enough for someone who goes to buy 1:9.

Birgitta Wrenfelt: (Laughter)

Nils Larsson: You knock the door and say: We want to buy.

Eva Wilander: We have tried that before.

Stig Rosenlund: They are so many there, and ingrown. They have lived there for ages. Grandfather .... So they are so rooted there. They stay there. We have very good relationships with them, but they have no interest in mixing with us. They have water and ... It will only be difficult if the question is asked.

Sofia Björkman: You do not know how the next generation will be.

Stig Rosenlund: No. If there will be a shortage of water they have ...

Mats Rosenlund: If they would be included, it is the surveyor who decides what to pay to be included?

Nils Larsson: Yes.

Mats Rosenlund: And he may not set particularly high prices, right?

Nils Larsson: No, the calculated raw land value.

Mats Rosenlund: So they may be included rather cheaply?

Nils Larsson: So, it can be quite high prices, though ...

Sofia Björkman: What does that mean?

Nils Larsson: Yes, what do you mean? It will be really technical here. If I had ... The equalized raw land price is actually the price you have on the plan area before it is designed as kvartersmark, but it is an expectation that it will be a kvartersmark. So it's really the value it is when you sell directly to the one who exploits. It is such thought out values. But because this is so dense. The exploitation rate is extremely dense. There is little park land in relation to kvartersmark. Even though it is located where it is, it may be a very high square meter price.

Mats Björkman: Although you will never be able to build on those parts?

Nils Larsson: That's another matter. The compensation is there, but the starting point for a building plan is that you get that value in the lots. Therefore, the county administrative board decides to 99 percent that you should to cede it for free. But it has not been done yet. And then you have the basic value left.

Mats Björkman: But then it is very unlikely they will be included if they have to pay a very high price to get something that they do not benefit from. To get involved and decide if some bushes are to be kept or not.

Jennie Fischer-Colbrie: It also feels unlikely that they would call for a community facility based on the same argument.

Mats Björkman: Even less.

Jennie Fischer-Colbrie: That is what I mean.

Nils Larsson: No, exactly - if - it will be a battle - and this is a valuation. This is hard. But my assessment is that, I would require a raw land value on this. And that can be money.

Jennie Fischer-Colbrie: Maybe that's even good.

Nils Larsson: It's fine that it is, I think.

Mats Björkman: Why would they want to join this? If they have to pay for something that they do not benefit from?

Nils Larsson: So, reluctantly - I feel the pressure here - but it's always so that some want more than I can really accomplish. But it is clear that one can try with an agreement also with regard to the park land by 1:9, including ... agree and say: That did not even belong to it from the beginning. That's an old plan. They do not have to be included here. Now we form a community facility for the park land. We agree that 1:9 should not be included. So you can do that.

Nils Larsson: It would be very interesting to see how the surveyor would act here. He is supposed to say no. But it is not certain he does.

Stig Rosenlund: That 1:9 should be included. And that they will pay 100,000s of kronor to us. Which they do not want to do, which we do not want.

Nils Larsson: Yes, that's what would be the advantage to say to the surveyor, that here is the land value left. Yes, you have almost never been in such a valuation situation. It is very rare.

Mats Björkman: But, on the other hand, it's the case that ... If they are included with this park land, it's not ... it does not feel very risky, because it's no value again.

Nils Larsson: No.

Jennie Fischer-Colbrie: And could it happen, if they would be included, what would it mean concretely? So, let's say they are included ... yes, then, can they walk here then, or? So ...

Time 1:00:28

Nils Larsson: They can anyway.

Jennie Fischer-Colbrie: Yes, if they want to. Then they will. So what, in what way would ...?

Nils Larsson: It is purely public-law-wise available.

Mats Björkman: That's really the cutting of bush?

Jennie Fischer-Colbrie: So what would it really mean that they would be included?

Nils Larsson: This is one way of arranging an organization for the management of the park land.

Jennie Fischer-Colbrie: Yes. But then they are taking part in the care of it. And that is good.

Nils Larsson: They can help taking care.

Mats Björkman: Exactly.

Mats Rosenlund: But so, one question. This is linked to this well located in this park land.

Nils Larsson: Yes.

Mats Rosenlund: And that gives water to almost all of us. And that they might want to join. If they are included in this park land, and the entire park land becomes a community facility, do you manage the well and the water distribution through that too, so to speak?

Nils Larsson: Normally, if you are included there, then you have a GA for both public places and water. Normally. But if we are to have special solutions, you can make a GA just for water.

Mats Rosenlund: So just for the pump house, the well ...

Nils Larsson: So, that's a very special situation here. And the plan is old. So ... 1:9 is just in the edge of the plan area. And, really, only have park lands that are of interest to them directly south. And I guess they are not there that much. And it is always available purely public-law-wise.

Jennie Fischer-Colbrie: Yes. It does affect anything.

Nils Larsson: No. Let's ... Try an agreement where you explain to 1:9, that we do not want to force you to pay here. We arrange the ownership between us here, this GA. And exclude him and we'll see what the surveyor says.

Eva Wilander: Would that be true for all future then also? Or can they come at any time and ...

Nils Larsson: This applies to all future. With the opportunities to

Jennie Fischer-Colbrie: Expropriate

Nils Larsson: make a compulsory request, apply for change.

Mats Rosenlund: Next Generation ...

Nils Larsson: That is ... Have they not requested now, to request against when it's ... It's even more incredible. Thus, participation in park land is of no great value.

Jennie Fischer-Colbrie: And just for that reason I think ...

Nils Larsson: And it costs.

Jennie Fischer-Colbrie: Yes. So I just feel a little bit tired after sitting here listening. So it feels like if it's as it seems, they have more difficulties being included in swimming and bridge, maybe that's what we care more about. Bathhouse and sauna and beach, which are like ... But they have ..., they are very likely to be included in the park land.

Nils Larsson: Yes.

Jennie Fischer-Colbrie: It does not feel like that, so ... yes, if they do, they'll do it. So, I'm just thinking by sitting here and listening. I do not really see what the big danger is that in

that case they would be included in that park, although it would be better if we could avoid it, maybe.

Nils Larsson: Yes.

Mats Björkman: But, then further this, so it will be clear now. It does, however, assume that they contribute to paying. Are they saying that: No, we do not want to be included, because it costs us money for something we do not really want. Because we can still walk there.

Nils Larsson: Yes.

Mats Björkman: Then they will not be included? Or can the surveyor say that they have to be included and pay, even if nobody wants it?

Nils Larsson: So, then you can withdraw the application in that situation. Or redo it.

Mats Björkman: Or you do it the way you suggest, that you still do it, and then you tell the surveyor that nobody wants 1:9 to join. Neither they nor we. But if it were anyway ... If they were forced, they would have to join. We can live with them being included in that, which we do not care so much about.

Nils Larsson: You can probably expect them to be included in the park land. So the surveyor has to make the wrong decisions, and sometimes they do. But it assumes that he is wrong for them to be not included.

Eva Wilander: So they must then join this GA then, and pay. Though they do not want to be included and, above all, do not want to pay.

Nils Larsson: Yes, yes. It's not only easy here in the world.

Sofia Björkman: How hard for them if we start with this.

Eva Wilander: Yes, how hard for them, as I said. The poor guys. Who do not want to be included at all.

Stig Rosenlund: So the different GAs as we said before. GA1 is the road. GA2 could just be the park land. GA3 is the water, the well. GA4 is bridges and adjoining things.

Nils Larsson: Yes.

Stig Rosenlund: But GA2 and GA3 could be merged into one.

Nils Larsson: Yes.

Stig Rosenlund: So much depends on how to do it - these four GA to three.

Nils Larsson: Yes.

Time 1:05:17

Stig Rosenlund: They may want to be included in the water in the future. They are not interested in the park land. The most beneficial for everyone is to make as many GA as possible, is it not. Or four.

Mats Björkman: Yes, there will be many board meetings.

Stig Rosenlund: Well, it's the same guys that are sitting, is it not.

Nils Larsson: Yes, that's not good.

Stig Rosenlund: No, but because then you can treat the park land separately if they are included there because the surveyor says so. And so we can do in another way for the water. And in a third way with bridges and boat house, diving board, sauna.

Eva Wilander: For the water it's a little sensitive question for us. Because we are not sure for how many it is enough. Is it not like that? That maybe we are already many who will get water from there, and maybe we do not want also 1:9 and 1:8 and 1:7 to exploit the water too. Because it may not be enough.

Nils Larsson: How does the water work today? How do you administer it today?

Stig Rosenlund: Informally. No formal GA.

Nils Larsson: Who's that ...? Is it you in the family who have it? No 1:9 that ...

Eva Wilander: No.

Nils Larsson: And 1:7 and 1:8?

Eva Wilander: No.

Nils Larsson: When you take care of this water. Yes, but keep on doing that! Wait to arrange water in a collective solution until needed.

Eva Wilander: The risk is that 1:8 will consider this and think that: Here we have the opportunity to get our water, because they fetch water in big tank trucks.

Nils Larsson: It is clear that they will do so, if you start a solution for water. But as long as it works for you, let that question be.

Eva Wilander: Let the bear sleep.

Mats Björkman: But will not this well be included, if it is on the park land?

Nils Larsson: No. It does not need it.

Mats Rosenlund: So, should we not make a community facility for the well? Even though it is on the park land?

Eva Wilander: The well is excluded from the community facility.

Nils Larsson: Yes, it is located there. It is located in the park land. The board does not want to cancel that right to well.

Jennie Fischer-Colbrie: No.

Nils Larsson: Whatever the case, you will be seated with a 90 percent majority.

Mats Rosenlund: Should we primarily focus on getting a community facility for the swimming beach? Another for bridge and boats, boat house?

Eva Wilander: But, why do we really want that?

Mats Rosenlund: And no community facility for the well? Or should you start by trying to get a community facility for the well too?

Nils Larsson: No, it should not be. It works today, unless you want to invite others. Because then I think you should wait, because both water and sewage will eventually come. You'll see how you solve it. The technology goes forward very fast.

Stig Rosenlund: Desalination of sea water.

Nils Larsson: Yes, I thought about the drainage side, which has been an incredible success lately. Where you can clean and drop in the recipient, it can be the ocean. There is a huge advance in that area. But, it's just like we're sitting brain-storming, and you get some information, and you'll get to ponder where to go. But what I'm saying about the park land, that is that 1:9 can anytime be inclined to apply. He may not understand better, and then you have it started. And that matter could be arranged. And bridges and bathing areas you could arrange property-linked, so that it was adjoined to lots directly. But I do not have a good solution for the ownership of 1:6 and 1:5. And it's not a good solution with .. It's all connected like this.

Nils Larsson: One could also think of making ownership of 1:6 and 1:5 the same as of lots.

Stig Rosenlund: Proportional. But then we have that problem ...

Eva Wilander: No, that's not good.

Nils Larsson: No, maybe not so good.

Eva Wilander: No.

Stig Rosenlund: ... then there will be that dispute about 100 million or one million. There will be a lot of money that some of us have to come up with. Others who get something they do not need.

Stig Rosenlund: But everything should be voluntary. You can not make a compulsion here.

Mats Björkman: But is that not, if you sum up, as I understood, it is not really that valuable. The only value in it is that you could possibly parcel off some lots in the future. Then it may be worth something else.

Stig Rosenlund: It is hypothetical. In the future.

Mats Björkman: Yes, so maybe not .... If you get to these community facilities, then you have secured these great values, those we really care about.

Time 1:10:37

Stig Rosenlund: What's now all about ownership, it is the bridges and the boat house. If we start with it. GA4 then. Just GA4 if it's together. Or GA4 and GA5 if there are two different ones.

Eva Wilander: But this idea of having the ownership tied to the lots, as you are talking about. It's actually not quite fair for some ...

Nils Larsson: No.

Eva Wilander: ... who may have too few lots in relation to the number of heirs.

Stig Rosenlund: Yes, that's what I said when I talked about a million, 10, 20, 100 million. As it could theoretically ...

Eva Wilander: Yes, I agree with you there.

Mats Björkman: Now we are not talking about the community facilities but about 1:5 and 1:6. That real estate-linked community facility for boat house, bath house, seems quite good, I can feel spontaneously. That is, all property owners then become owners of it. And it must be so that ...

Eva Wilander: But we who have few properties ...

Jennie Fischer-Colbrie: But wait, wait ... Does it matter? Because of the boathouse and bathhouse, we do not really talk about an area where you make a community ... but the community facility, it's just about the bathing area, i.e. the building itself, the boat place, the bridge. It does not mean the surrounding land, right?

Nils Larsson: No.

Jennie Fischer-Colbrie: So that the plant becomes a theoretical plant, i.e. a right of use you can say.

Nils Larsson: Yes, right, right.

Sofia Björkman: So it's not that you can jump more times from the diving board just because you have bigger shares?

Jennie Fischer-Colbrie: No.

Eva Wilander: (Laughter.)

Mats Björkman: Priority to the sauna ...

Eva Wilander: (Laughter.)

Jennie Fischer-Colbrie: It's not the land, it's sort of the right to use the bathhouse, sauna. And then I actually think it's reasonable to have this empty ... just right there. On the other hand, I agree that I do not think it is reasonable to divide any other land by lot shares.

Eva Wilander: No.

Mats Björkman: And it does not accomplish anything, any value. For then you will ... , there is a risk of disagreement. It does not matter so to speak. If you own it directly, you do not take that risk away.

Nils Larsson: So, another way is that you make a foundation, and seek an exemption from the county administrative board for that. Land acquisition permit is required. But it should actually be possible in this case. But then ownership shares will be completely uninteresting. It will simply become a board. The most important thing is what is in the foundation document. Who is going to appoint like the board?

Eva Wilander: Not good. Oh, how cumbersome.

Mats Björkman: But could it be that it should be the same persons as in the community facility for bathhouse and boathouse? That should be smooth. But maybe you can not connect it like that?

Nils Larsson: No, it should be much more honorable. It must be the eldest son and so on.

Sofia Björkman: (Laughter.)

Eva Wilander: (Laughter.)

Nils Larsson: Discriminate the women, you know ... that's the entailed estates, I suppose. No, I do not know how to do this.

Nils Larsson: The family's oldest member decides.

Stig Rosenlund: Yes, it's Birgitta.

Eva Wilander: She has gone. (Laugh.)

Mats Rosenlund: Other forms of association - if you think of a financial association, how would that be?

Nils Larsson: I do not think an economic association is allowed here, actually. I do not think the Swedish Companies Registration Office would register it. I do not see that. I do not see what the financial content of managing this land is, really. Because it does not generate anything. If it had leases, then it would be to let up and so.

Stig Rosenlund: We had it before. We owned the arable fields before, but in practice we gave them to Benjour's. They belonged to us before.

Eva Wilander: It was stupidly done.

Stig Rosenlund: So here lies the old farm. (Shows on map.)

Stig Rosenlund: Done is done.

Eva Wilander: As long as Bernhard and Ingeborg lived, so ...

Nils Larsson: But it's nature reservation, or?

Sofia Björkman: There will not happen so much there.

Mats Björkman: And a limited company then, is it ...?

Nils Larsson: Limited company is the same problem, you will own the shares then.

Eva Wilander: Not good.

Time 1:15:01

Mats Björkman: Yes, I think then you can have shareholder agreements and so, to reduce the risk ... (Now you get into my area here). This reduces the risk of these forced sales. That's a bit of a worry about this partnership. That someone might ... That there will be disagreement and then someone will ... Yes, then I'll force it out at a public auction. And then the Norwegian will there to bid.

Eva Wilander: Yes, no good yes.

Stig Rosenlund: Well, that's what we said, there is no good solution.

Mats Björkman: A foundation perhaps. Or ...

Nils Larsson: Or a limited company.

Mats Björkman: Foundation - after all, you then have eliminated that risk.

Nils Larsson: Yes.

Sofia Björkman: But you can not prevent anyone from selling his lot, if it would come to that.

Jennie Fischer-Colbrie: But the lot is another thing.

Nils Larsson: Everything now builds upon: Every owner of the property and the land will be involved. Will be strengthened. It is the individual ownership. And there is nothing but that everybody own. There you have to control each other with ...

Sofia Björkman: ... buns ...

Stig Rosenlund: ... subtle persuasions ...

Nils Larsson: ... family feel ...

Stig Rosenlund: ... pressures and subtle emotions ...

Nils Larsson: But no other obstacles. And I actually think that is also very sensible, because it works better with volunteering than with compulsion. It's my experience. It is not so good. But otherwise you would throw up all the sites in a bag and say that: Everything is part of the foundation and the foundation will decide. But then ... I do not believe in it. I do not think it will be managed very well. But each one manages his lots. These more ... I agree with Mats, this is quite useless land. It may ... there is potential. The ownership will match GA, maybe this GA for bridges - who knows we have another bridge in 20 years. Such things. Or maybe you want a helicopter ramp here. Or has something else has come along. So it does have some meaning as neighbor and ...

Eva Wilander: But one day it may be important. The conditions may change.

Stig Rosenlund: In the future, you may prefer to put a desalination plant here in the mountain at the bunkers.

Nils Larsson: In such a case, perhaps a stock company would be the nicest. And with a shareholder agreement, how to control.

Mats Björkman: One would be able to make every family ... you own in the same proportion as you do today. And then you have a shareholder agreement that controls that ownership. But you can ... you do not get this forced sales scenario. And then as the family branches, then you can split the shares and then you can proportionate them there, if you want, on ...

Jennie Fischer-Colbrie: If you sell, it will be taxation ...

Mats Rosenlund: But it's still the same shares.

Stig Rosenlund: 1/6 ...

Jennie Fischer-Colbrie: ... so if you were to parcel off and sell something.

Mats Björkman: But then you have said that you can not sell.

Jennie Fischer-Colbrie: No, that is what I mean. The stock company decides to sell it.

Mats Björkman: Yes, exactly.

Jennie Fischer-Colbrie: So, if it's going to be in the future. Then the stock company will make a decision to sell. Then, it may be distributed to shareholders, or if it goes into the stock company then, so to speak.

Mats Björkman: If you were to sell the land?

Jennie Fischer-Colbrie: Yes. Not everything, but I'm thinking of someone ...

Mats Björkman: Yes, lots. Yes, you can do that. And then you have that flexibility as well.

Jennie Fischer-Colbrie: And then you have retained that opportunity, for example as a limited company, you can get some money there and you can sell some lots, somewhere where it does not bother. And then that money goes to ...

Eva Wilander: As here along the road here.

Mats Björkman: If there is someone who wants to buy.

Mats Rosenlund: I have a lot of objections to limited companies, but I can return to them in written form.

Mats Björkman: But why is not it good to have it?

Mats Rosenlund: It's so complicated. I have not penetrated it all. It will be a 5-page essay.

Nils Larsson: So, I would like to recommend that you make an effort to make such a Stockholm model. This is only 16 hectares. It is even more in the Stockholm archipelago, where it is 100 hectares and they have done a GA of it all. But then it is so, that you do not have full discretion, because then as an unavoidable consequence 1:9, 1:8, and 1:7 will be joining in it. That is the way it will be.

Mats Björkman: Yes, that sounds the least attractive.

Nils Larsson: ... it is only foundations and such ...

Jennie Fischer-Colbrie: Yes.

Eva Wilander: I can not help thinking it's a little weird, because we are those that de facto own the land ... No, I have understood that ..

Nils Larsson: It's not ... You'll get the ownership form just the way you want. But the community facility is a great way to associate with these lots you own. But if you do, then it should be ... Then the law requires it to be general, for all. So that's the element that comes. But you can do well to own ... and then you own personally, but then we have the risks. And not a little awkward. You can transfer to a foundation, but then it is the county administrative board that keeps track of your respecting the founding documents.

Eva Wilander: Limited company may sound quite appealing.

Nils Larsson: A foundation may not be so fun - a family foundation.

Eva Wilander: If we proceed with the stock company idea, how would the shares be distributed? According to shares as 1:5 and 1:6, the main property, is owned today.

Nils Larsson: It will be that the shares will go to the one that is owner today, in proportion to what one owns.

Mats Björkman: And the benefit is, as I see it, that then those shares can rain down in the generations. And then you have emption and pre-purchase. "I've grown tired of that. Now I want to sell to that Norwegian." No, then it is a shareholder agreement, then it must go to other relatives. There must be pre-emptive rights, otherwise a breach of contract will be made and will be liable for damages - damage compensation. This way you can hold

the ownership together. And if I should go bankrupt, then you can also have such models as ...

Jennie Fischer-Colbrie: But can we not investigate that question some more then, just the form of shareholding?

Time 1:21:51

Nils Larsson: It has to be presented more, so to own ... and it is true that ownership of shares in a limited company is more or less worthless if you do not have a good shareholder agreement. And that's where Mats says. And that's what Mats is good at. So you can control it all, so you get what you want.

Jennie Fischer-Colbrie: Exactly. And then it has been done without the influence of the authorities in the same way. You have the opportunity to do more, maybe.

Nils Larsson: Then it's still that you own the farm land, and you do with the farm land what the law will give you right to do from time to time. If we do a GA, then we have a public-law device where everyone will be involved. There is the difference. And as it is leaning towards now, you should have GA for the park land, because it has already been publicly told of how it should look. And then you do a GA for you, bridges and bathing places. And you agree with these (neighbors), if you even need to do it with them, one might wonder. You may not even need to talk to them, because this is so individual for you to organize it on your own. And you say that that is a prerequisite.

Jennie Fischer-Colbrie: They do not currently use that land anyway.

Nils Larsson: No, it's just not this public pressure that there is a need for every property. But it almost assumes that you are united. And it's only you who agree. And you have agreed with the landowners that you do not get this. The landlords do not agree with it for anyone else. It will be as simple as that.

Mats Rosenlund: And they can not force themselves in then? I think of 1:8 and 1:7.

Nils Larsson: No, they can not force themselves.

Mats Rosenlund: Not even 1:9, which is in the plan?

Nils Larsson: No, it has not to do with the plan. This is a completely different matter. But if you were to ... I often find it helpful to consult and clarify, to have straight pipes. So this does not come up. And then I believe that in the best of worlds, you have informed 1:7, 1:8 and 1:9 about this. And maybe even have them write that they do not mind it. In order to inform the surveyor and the municipality of that message. Because such an application, the municipality will look at it. For it, it will also be a bit of admissibility in building issues and urban issues that come into play. Now you have existing facilities, thank goodness, but you may be able to augment them somewhat, too.

Mats Björkman: Is that a suggestion then?

Mats Rosenlund: We are proposing to build a new bridge too, so it is already underway to expand.

Nils Larsson: It's pretty convenient almost then.

Mats Rosenlund: But just to be absolutely sure then - if you start talking to the surveyor, or first talk with the owners of 1:7, 1:8 and 1:9. But if they say, "No, we want to take part in this", it's not that they can then contact the surveyor and start a procedure?

Nils Larsson: For swimming beach and bridges?

Mats Rosenlund: Yes.

Nils Larsson: I give them very little chance, because the jurisprudence we have states that is not of such importance that it is essential to them.

Mats Rosenlund: Instead it might be possible, that then they will get an idea to get into the park land instead.

Nils Larsson: Yes, they can not, but 1:9 ...

Jennie Fischer-Colbrie: But then 1:9 will get along, at worst.

Nils Larsson: That's what I mean, for psychological reasons, maybe you should be the ones who are applying. And I simply call that, that the plan is being implemented and executed. It is from 1967 and not executed. Because it should not be owned by anyone else. It should be owned jointly like this. It is not executed.

Time 1:26:15

Mats Rosenlund: If 1:9 the is included in the park land, then we can not exclude them from the well water?

Nils Larsson: No. You have not thought about GA for that.

Mats Rosenlund: But it is located in the park land.

Nils Larsson: Yes, but it does not matter that it is located in the park land. Instead it's the function of getting water. Whether it is located there or outside does not matter. But the question is: How do you solve the availability of fresh water for real estate in the area? So you will not escape. And it's equal to 1:7 and 1:8 (Nils refers to 1:9 and 1:8, the transcript's note) that are so close. If there is a construction of a community facility for freshwater and sewage, then they are included. And then we talk about something in the

law called area of advantage, simply. And advantage means profit. Profit Area. Who wins to join? And you see it yourself on the map, if you are going to make a total solution here, then you're included. The whole cape.

Sofia Björkman: I am thinking of whether to drill a new well, or one more well, in the park area. Will 1:9 be included in it?

Nils Larsson: No, they are not included in it, but then ... If you are going to drill a new one in the future, you must have the promise of being there, and it may be wise by the Board of Directors of the GA also to say it, that: that: That well, you can have it.

Sofia Björkman: And in the board it is the majority, because there are more lots owned by us together. So we have a clear majority.

Nils Larsson: It feels quite safe.

Stig Rosenlund: The GA we are talking about, it is GA2 then for the park land.

Nils Larsson: Yes, it will be.

Stig Rosenlund: GA3 for water we wait with. It may never be formed.

Nils Larsson: No.

Stig Rosenlund: GA4 for it. Or GA4 and GA5. (Stig refers to GA4 bridges and boat house and possibly bathhouse, diving board too. GA5 is possibly a bathhouse, diving board. Transcript's note.)

Nils Larsson: Yes, I would probably add a GA for both of these.

Sofia Björkman: GA3, was that the well then?

Mats Björkman: No, you do not want it, because then we only risk their being included. So it can be as it is. This feels like that, here we have come a long way. Somehow - here you only see the benefits of doing this way and really no disadvantages. Or really no options.

Jennie Fischer-Colbrie: No, I really do not see any options.

Mats Björkman: And if we get here now, we have achieved an incredible amount. And then we have left this ownership question, 1:5 and 1:6. Either you continue and own as you do, which might risk sales on a public auction, or you can transfer it to a limited company or foundation.

Stig Rosenlund: There might be a GA for water in the future. But GA for park land and for bridges, we should, as it seems, get started already.

Nils Larsson: You can take it in a three-stage-rocket, but I think you should consider this with a limited company. In principle, it is forbidden to enter agricultural units in limited companies. But because this is as special as it is, I think it might be possible to get an exception. Then it's good that the arable fields are not affected this time. Then it would not have been possible.

Eva Wilander: It's good luck, if so.

Nils Larsson: There are very many well-off people who want to put their capital into agricultural units - land and forest - because today you are quite happy to get one percent interest on your money. It is not everyone who dares to believe in the stock exchange, at least not with their basic capital. That's why many people try to buy land in a limited company, but it's really hard. But here's a special case.

Stig Rosenlund: There will not be shares with agricultural operations. Sheep walked here before, it was remote land for Näverkärr. Then it was farmland in that sense.

Mats Rosenlund: It is rated as an agricultural unit, because sheep walked there before. And there were arable fields that were transferred to the farm.

Nils Larsson: When you transfer it to a limited company you can try to get another valuation, that this is another property, it is a special property. A residual property of some kind. It's amazing that it looks like it does. They have already formed it.

Mats Rosenlund: It did not change when the arable fields were taken away, so to speak. Then it remained as an agricultural unit, agricultural property as it was then.

Stig Rosenlund: A large part of the land that is now forest, it was meadow before and sheep grazed there. (Shows on map.)

Nils Larsson: Yes, yes, it's razor saws who will have to do the job now instead. With mower hack.

Mats Rosenlund: A small question. Now a detailed plan has already been made on three of the lots. So that the building plan no longer includes the part we have as a detailed plan area on three lots. If you would theoretically do, request more detailed plans, maybe eventually for all our lots. Then this old building plan would fall out? It would be completely out of date?

Nils Larsson: Yes, take out 1:9 there.

Mats Rosenlund: If you are going to remove it, then it will not be park land anymore then?

Nils Larsson: What's done, as it looks here. It is, after all, that you have done a detailed plan, simplified detailed plan, to simply cleave existing kvartersmark. But I can not imagine changing the nature of the plan.

Mats Björkman: It's 1:17, old 1:19 and 1:20 - these are the three who have ...

Time 1:33:09

Nils Larsson: You have laid out the total road. But it does not mean anything else than that the building plan is left outside. One has entered and regulated the kvartersmark in detail. You have gone out in a stub to ...

Mats Björkman: Yes, there was a change. But that's the only thing.

Mats Rosenlund: But if you continue the next thirty years with detailed plans that include 1:18, 1:21, 1:23 for example. A new detail plan covering all the lots in the birch forest, i.e. beyond ... Håkanson's lot and those towards the sea. One can theoretically ...

Mats Björkman: And why should you do that?

Mats Rosenlund: No, you do not know, but if you split a lot, you must have a new detailed plan.

Mats Björkman: No, I do not think so. Do you need it?

Nils Larsson: Well, that's what you're doing, because otherwise it's property formation violating the plan. Because the plan ... you will change that. But you are not affected here. Then there are boundaries for other buildings that remain. So the old detail plan - to the extent it is not affected - remains.

Mats Björkman: But that does not really have any bearing on this discussion?

Mats Rosenlund: No, but in the future, all our 13 lots will be covered by new detailed plans: will not the old building plan just be removed?

Nils Larsson: Get obsolete? No it does not. Because you keep ... The only thing you go into and change is on the detailed plan, where in the kvartersmark as the detailed plan ... If we look here, it's located ...

Mats Rosenlund: I am thinking of this park land.

Nils Larsson: It is not affected.

Mats Rosenlund: If you were to make a community facility for the park land, it would not be affected by the fact that you eventually will have - within 30 years - completely new detailed plans for all the lots?

Nils Larsson: No.

Mats Rosenlund: It remains there as a park land?

Nils Larsson: It remains there, as long as you do not touch it. If so, it's ... But there's one thing you can think of: Do you want to change this?

Mats Rosenlund: Yes, remove the old one. Remove park land and make it more modern.

Nils Larsson: Remove the park land. But it is a new detailed plan that should come in. I would nest a plan like this, when we do a split. Then we will redo the detailed plan. And take away the park land. But is it not good to have? I have never seen a plan without any park land.

Stig Rosenlund: Do the authorities not force us to have park land?

Nils Larsson: Yes. It is still so little. I would say you should have had more.

Mats Björkman: In addition, it was a heck of a job to change that. Oh, how many years it took and how much ... We had to hire these town hall architects, they made plans and ...

Nils Larsson: Yes.

Mats Rosenlund: Was it not required then that there should be more park land?

Mats Björkman: No, they have not taken a stand on that. All they have done is they changed these existing sites, which they have sort of cut out and done ...

Mats Rosenlund: I'm just thinking aloud how the request for new detailed plans of some lots, how it affects the issue of that kvartersmark and park land.

Nils Larsson: No, not this, that's all I can judge. It would not have done that. But you might well think, that if you would split one up here or someone else. That we then say: But then we actually - then we need more park land.

Mats Rosenlund: More park land?

Nils Larsson: More park land - no less. It is likely. I think the degree of exploitation - that's what they say - how much can you build within a given area. Now I can defend it very well, I think if I were architect. Out here - here it will - here it is publicly available. But in these 1960s, one often has to be more expansive and take large areas, one is smaller today. So this is a bit more modern than its time, by all means. Normally, you would have a much larger area.

Mats Rosenlund: This park land, it goes extra down far south, towards the property boundary, towards the farmer's land. There was a parking lot drawn there, it never got realized. The intention was that the municipality would go in and join in the road in order to allow the public to drive in and park their cars there, when visiting the nature reservation. And that has never come to anything. So that the municipality has never entered the road community facility and never asked for a parking space.

Nils Larsson: No, but now there is a GA here for road.

Mats Rosenlund: The municipality is not into it in any way, since it's only for individuals.

Nils Larsson: But you sit on the board of the road community facility.

Mats Rosenlund: Yes.

Stig Rosenlund: I am an alternate. And Bo Wrenfelt board member. (Transcript's note. 2013: Bo is no longer a board member. 2017: Bo passed away in 2016.)

Mats Rosenlund: We can join the board more if we want, but we have not had the stamina for it. They are doing so well, the others here. Those who own 1:9 and 1:7 take care of it.

Nils Larsson: But if I'm going to scare you, it's true that when you have such a situation, there's an organization for the road, and there's no plan done for the park. Then it's really the organization for the road that is responsible for the park land being taken care of.

Mats Rosenlund: They do not know about that.

Nils Larsson: No, there is no point in telling them. It's fun with real estate law - there's so much.

Stig Rosenlund: Now what really is, is that we gather one day and clear the vegetation around the road. They could say: You're going to clear a good way outside the road too, because it's our responsibility.

Time 1:39:31

Nils Larsson: Yes, it depends on how it is written, this GA for the road. Often you forget the road side. There are disputes where the landowner has absolutely determined that he shall have the birches, and then the cars have to go and scrape the sides. Everything is in the countryside.

Åsa Wrenfelt: But, can you sum it up like this: The road is existing. What we are looking for is a GA for boat house, bridge, diving board and more. GA for park land. Water we can ignore for now, so to speak. (Writing on the blackboard.) And then step 2 - make a company of 1:5 and 1:6.

Mats Björkman: Alternatively a foundation, but it felt spontaneous as a worse ...

Åsa Wrenfelt: But we need to know more about it. So that this we can start to think about. (Shows on the blackboard.) So I do not know when to return to the issue. When should we tie the bag together? Or - shall we have a new meeting in January?

....

Thereafter, the family's internal discussion continued after Nils Larsson completed his participation.