

LONDON CYCLING CAMPAIGN

Annual General Meeting, 19th October 2013

MINUTES

Ann Kenrick (Chair of the Board of Trustees) took the Chair and opened the AGM at 10:00 by welcoming members and guests.

1 Review of the Year

1.1 Ashok Sinha (Chief Executive), Mike Cavenett (Communications Manager) and Stewart Dring (Cycling Projects Manager) presented a review of the organisation's work and achievements in 2012/13.

1.2 They highlighted the following key points regarding our campaigning:

- The charity is now much more outward facing and is engaging bigger and broader audiences in taking action. Our reputation is growing.
- Following our Love London, Go Dutch campaign of 2012 the Mayor produced his plan and budget for cycling in March 2013, which was (at least in part) a response to that campaign. This "Vision for Cycling in London" contained multiple explicit and implicit references to the agenda of Love London, Go Dutch. LCC described it as "groundbreaking" in its political ambition.
- The true test for the organisation is real world change: we need to see the changes on the ground that we are campaigning for before we can consider ourselves truly successful. This is why we've been pressing the Mayor to implement this "Vision" and will continue to do so.
- Our Safer Lorries campaign has delivered real changes to the procurement policies of councils in favour of safer lorry designs and better driver training.
- Our upcoming Space for Cycling campaign around the local elections (to be presented in the Campaigners' Conference that follows formal AGM business) will not only help take our message from the GLA level to the grass roots, but will also help us hold the Mayor to account.

1.3 Regarding membership and general income they noted the following:

- Raising our membership is important for both our political influence as well as for funding and expanding our campaigning work.
- We have an annual turnover of membership of around 20%, which means that most of our new membership recruitment is orientated towards just maintaining membership levels (although we are improving retention rates).
- Sponsorship is now an important part of our income – it is crucial to the large scale, public-facing campaigns we have started to run; but we are also developing better donation strategies to help meet higher campaign expenditures.
- We continue to develop the clearer & stronger brand that we launched in 2011 which is greatly helping our fundraising efforts.

1.4 In terms of our direct promotion of cycling we have had some significant successes (e.g. the Lewisham bike loan scheme which we created and are operating on behalf of the council). However this has been a year in which we have focussed primarily on developing and testing our key cycling consultancy and services products, which we refine and roll out in a substantial fashion during the coming financial year.

1.5 On behalf of all the staff of the London Cycling Campaign they thanked the trustees and many volunteers and partners with whom they have worked during the year.

1.6 A number of questions were raised by members, answered as follows:

1.6.1 How do we manage the potential conflict of interest between receiving money from TfL and campaigning against them?

Answer: we do not campaign against TfL. Our campaigning focus is on holding London's elected leadership to account rather than the paid officials. The money we receive from TfL is for direct promotion of cycling at the grass roots, including providing grants to community organisations. Accordingly there is a separation between our political advocacy and our community work, but we remain vigilant for real or perceived conflict of interests.

1.6.2 My daughter is 8 and has violin lessons but not cycling proficiency. Is LCC doing anything about this?

Answer: LCC local groups are doing a significant amount for schools (and through our 2014 Local Elections campaign we will press for safer cycle routes to schools). Our TfL-funded outreach is currently focussed on students/universities, but we aim to do more with younger age groups.

1.6.3 Have we analysed difference cycling groups amongst the public so as, for example, to better target our recruitment?

Answer: LCC has looked at the cycling market to identify different existing and potential user groups. We have improved our recruitment approaches to those we can readily reach (such as people who follow cycling issues on social media) but still need to do more to gain access to other audiences with whom we as yet have no consistent channel of communication.

2. Chair's Report

2.1 Chair of the Board of Trustees Ann Kenrick made her report to the AGM. In particular she noted that:

- We are rising to the challenge of "what next?" after the successes of Love London, Go, Dutch.
- We took some risks, including relaunching our London Cycling Awards which were great way for engaging with new audiences and the cycling industry. Regarding the latter we recognise some of the concerns that were raised in relation to this first attempt at a bigger/brighter event and will do better next year.
- Our 'Space for Cycling' protest rides during the summer had a big impact, in terms of both engaging the public and pressing for political action.
- We need to find right balance between campaigning for safer roads, whilst still promoting cycling to the public.

3. Treasurer's Report

3.1 Treasurer Tony Levene gave his report. He presented the annual Audited Accounts for the financial year 2012/13 to the AGM, recommending their adoption, as well as explaining that the Board is seeking ratification for a change in auditors from RSM Tenon to Chantrey Vellacott DFK on the grounds of both cost and the service we expect to receive.

3.2 A number of questions were raised from the floor and answered as follows:

3.2.1 Andy Cawdell from Southwark Cyclists asked if there had been progress in resolving VAT issue in relation to the Dunwich Dynamo ride that they organise.

It is impossible to give an estimate of when this will be resolved but this issue is being actively pursued.

3.2.2 How often should organisations change auditors?

There is no requirement to change auditors after any given period of time but it is quite widely felt that it is good for charities to re-tender for their auditors after 3-5 years, so as to ensure they are getting good value for money and a fresh set of eyes on their finances.

3.2.3 What are the headline messages from the accounts?

The headline messages are as follows:

- We received £1,038,608 of income.
- The budget was balanced.
- We continue to look for other money saving / income generation opportunities, as we transition to a lower reliance on grants and achieving more income from services and consultancy.

4. Finance Motions

Motion One – To Approve the Accounts

Tony Levene proposed that Chantrey Vellacott DFK be appointed as auditors for the financial year 2013/14, seconded by Suzanne Fogg.

The motion was passed unopposed.

Motion Two – To Appoint the Auditors

Tony Levene proposed that Chantrey Vellacott DFK be appointed as auditors for the financial year 2013/14, seconded by Theresa Griffiths.

The motion was passed unopposed.

5. Tribute to Alastair Hanton

- 5.1 In concluding this session Ann thanked Alistair Hanton, who stepped down from the Board at this AGM, for his commitment and hard work over the years. In particular she praised his quiet hard work and gentle advice. She presented him with a pair bicycle cufflinks as a small token of LCC's appreciation.
- 5.2 Alistair thanked everyone and called for an ongoing commitment to persistent campaigning.

6. Other Motions

- 6.1 Due to Ann's scheduled unavailability for this session, trustee Mel Grech took over the chair.

Motion Three – When Do We Need Protected Space for Cycling?

Proposed by Rachel Aldred (Chair of the Policy Forum) and seconded by Mustafa Arif (Chair of the Campaigns & Active Membership subcommittee):

We welcomed the Mayor's Vision for Cycling, and expect its aspirations to be put into practice. Superhighways, Quietways, Mini-Hollands and other transport or streetscape schemes that promise cycling improvements must enable mass cycling. See for more detail the Policy Forum document 'When Do We Need Protected Space for Cycling?'

LCC resolves:

1. *We believe 'safe and inviting' cycling environments do not compel cyclists to share space with high speed or high volume motor traffic.*
2. *Cyclists should not be expected to share space with motor vehicles moving above 20mph.*
3. *If cyclists will share space with motor traffic, volumes must be low. On the core cycle route network this should not exceed the Dutch maximum for main cycle routes, 2,000 Passenger Car Units per day.*

4. *In assessing schemes where current motor traffic speeds or volumes are too high we will expect to see either (i) specific measures to reduce both motor traffic volumes and speeds to levels acceptable for sharing or (ii) high quality protected cycle infrastructure.*
5. *Where schemes are inadequate, and depending on context (e.g. residential streets vs. main roads) we will push for high quality protected cycle infrastructure and/or measures to reduce both motor traffic volumes and speeds to levels acceptable for sharing.*

Please refer to the full text of the Policy Forum document When Do We Need Protected Space for Cycling, 9th August 2013.

- Oliver Schick raised a point of order, saying that the motion contains a reference to document that is not in the pack. The Chair ruled that, as the document is available to members and the substantive part of the motion is unaffected, the motion remains in order.
- There followed a discussion to help explain the motion; a number of amendments were tabled, debated and voted upon with **all of them falling**.

The motion was put to a vote and carried overwhelmingly.

Motion Four – A ward-by-ward campaign across Greater London for the 2014 local elections

Proposed by Mustafa Arif, seconded by Kieran Drake (amended text below).

- Anthony Gilmore proposed an amendment on the grounds of needing to reflect the importance of speeds and traffic volumes as well as the reallocation of roadspace in the first numbered paragraph (even though a recognition of the issue of speed appears elsewhere): i.e. that “or the reduction of motor traffic speeds and/or volumes” be inserted at end of the first sentence. **This was put to a vote and carried overwhelmingly.**
- MA proposed that the words “Space for Cycling” be included at various locations in the motion on the grounds that the deadline for submission of motions was before this name for the ward-level campaign had been identified and agreed. **This was put to a vote and carried overwhelmingly.**
- Rachel Aldred proposed that the wording “low traffic zones” be amended to “to areas without through traffic” and that an additional policy theme of “liveable high streets” be added; both of these would reflect policy work that had continued after the deadline for submission of motions. **This was put to a vote and carried overwhelmingly.**
- Oliver Schick spoke against the motion on the grounds that it didn’t adequately deal with the issue of managing the interaction between buses and cyclists.

After amendment the motion read as follows:

Noting the Mayor’s commitments to meet the 3 key tests for “Love London, Go Dutch” we committed ourselves at the last AGM to make a ward-by-ward campaigning LCC’s strategy priority until May 2014.

The Mayor has since published his Vision for Cycling in London, which sets out how he will deliver his promises. Our primary campaigning objective now is to secure that delivery.

LCC Resolves:

1. *To recognise that the principal challenge to delivering the Mayor's promises is to secure sufficient political will for the reallocation of road space or the reduction of motor traffic speeds and/or volumes. We therefore re-affirm our commitment to using the 2014 local elections to build local political support for delivery of the Mayor's promises.*
2. *To endorse the Space for Cycling campaign themes for the ward-level 'asks' proposed by the Policy Forum:*
 - a. *Safe routes for schoolchildren*
 - b. *Areas without through traffic*
 - c. *Dedicated space on main roads*
 - d. *Greenways*
 - e. *20mph speed limits*
 - f. *Liveable high streets*
3. *To campaign for the Space for Cycling demand (based on one theme) in each and every one of the 624 council wards in Greater London for the May 2014 elections.*
4. *To hold one high profile Space for Cycling event in each Borough for the May 2014 elections.*
5. *To endorse the overall Space for Cycling messaging strategy.*
6. *To mandate the Board to continue to prioritise capacity building for ward-by-ward campaigning and grassroots activism.*

This was put to the vote and carried overwhelmingly.

Motion Five – Uniformity of cycling provision and suitability for all ability groups

Proposed by David Arditti (amended text below)

- Kevin Hickman proposed that the intended inclusivity of the motion be made even more explicit by adding the phrase “families and by the disabled” at the end of the third sentence. **This was put to the vote and carried overwhelmingly.**

The amended motion was as follows:

LCC welcomes the Mayor's plans for the Cycle Superhighways, Quietways and the Central London Grid. However, it considers that the standard of all links in the overall planned cycle network for London must be uniform, in the sense that there must be equal suitability, usability, and level of safety, of all the facilities, for all cyclists who might use them. We consider it would be a mistake for the standards for any elements of the network, for example, the Superhighways or Quietways, to be specified in a way that makes them less suitable, for example, for use by children, or by inexperienced cyclists, families, and the disabled. The corollary of this is that network elements must not be such as to involve a trade-off between safety and convenience; in other words, cyclists wanting the safest journey should not be forced to use a less convenient or slower route, or a route having lower priority, because the most convenient, fastest, or most prioritised route is engineered to a lower safety standard.

The motion was debated, **put to the vote and carried overwhelmingly.**

Motion Six – Membership

Proposed by Francis Sedgemore seconded by Alex Crawford (amended text below)

- Mustafa Arif and Rachel Aldred proposed that the motion be amended to explicitly recognise the link between membership recruitment and campaigning. The proposed changes were to add the sentence. “Recognising that campaigning is the best way to make cyclists aware of LCC” to the start of the second paragraph and to add “use the 2014 Space for Cycling local elections campaign as the basis for [membership recruitment]” in the same sentence. They also proposed that the words “The link with the election campaign should be made where appropriate, according to circumstances and local group” be added at the end of the motion. **These amendments were put to the vote and carried overwhelmingly.**
- Andrew Lockley proposed that the motion be amended by adding the words “with a particular focus on under-represented groups”. **This was put to the vote and carried overwhelmingly.**

After amendment the motion read as follows:

LCC exists to represent and further the interests of cyclists in London, and our organisation is an integral part of the wider cycling community in the capital. Over the years we have achieved much, and have an impressive media profile given our small membership base. But therein lies a problem. With only 12,000-odd members we are severely limited in what we can do, and as a campaigning and advocacy body LCC is nowhere near as representative as it could be of London cyclists as a whole.

Recognising that campaigning is the best way to make cyclists aware of LCC we call on the LCC secretariat, board of trustees and borough groups to use the 2014 Space for Cycling local elections campaign as the basis for launch a massive membership drive throughout all sectors of the London cycling community - capitalising on recent British triumphs in the Tour de France and on the Olympic Velodrome track – with a particular focus on under-represented groups. In addition to enhancing our political clout, an increased income from membership dues will allow LCC to fund more projects, and devote more human resources at both London-wide and local levels. The link with the election campaign should be made where appropriate, according to circumstances and local group.

This was put to the vote and carried overwhelmingly.

Motion 7 – Sponsorship Ethics & Product Reviews

Proposed by Francis Sedgemore (amended text below)

- Matt Ashby proposed that the motion be amended by deleting paragraph three as shown on the agenda, on the grounds that it is as “redundant” and “restricts the judgement of professionals”. **This was put to the vote and carried overwhelmingly.**
- Bill Chidley proposed to amend the motion by removal of second paragraph. When asked for a ruling the Chair ruled that the amendment was in order; **it was put to a vote and defeated.**

After amendment the motion read as follows:

LCC is a campaigning organisation which derives part of its income from cycling-related business interests. Corporate sponsorship provides LCC with valuable funding, enabling us to work for the benefit of the London cycling community in ways that would not be possible were we to rely on membership subscriptions alone. Sponsorship is a good thing, but brings with it a responsibility to act fairly and openly when it comes to product placement, reviews, and public recognition in the form of awards presented in the name of LCC.

We note with concern that corporate sponsors of LCC were among the nominees for the 2013 London Cycling Awards, and question whether this is appropriate. Sponsors of LCC receive considerable brand recognition by virtue of their association with our campaigning work. Having sponsors then included among award nominees

and recipients creates the potential for an ethical conflict of interest that LCC must avoid at all costs. We call on the LCC secretariat and board of trustees to ensure this does not happen again.

If we are to promote and review cycling products, it is essential that ethical conflicts be avoided and our target audience respected. Product advertising must clearly be marked as such, whilst critical reviews should be delegated to LCC members, with proper bylines included. We call on the LCC secretariat, board of trustees and editor of London Cyclist magazine to develop in consultation with members a code of conduct that applies to product promotion and review in LCC media.

This was put to the vote and defeated.

Motion 8 – London Cycling Awards

Proposed by Ian Blore and seconded by David Arditti (amended text below)

- Mustafa Arif proposed that the motion be amended by adding the following text at the beginning of the last sentence: “We note that the Board has, since this motion was first drafted, agreed to: (1) make the cycling champion category more campaigns-focused, (2) add new awards open to individual local campaigners, and (3) recognise work by LCC local groups. We are pleased at this response to members' concerns, and”.
- This was accepted as a friendly amendment by the proposer.**

After amendment the motion read as follows:

We move that the London Cycling awards be expanded, in consultation with members, to add more recognition to local London cycling champion categories, and that these categories be judged by a panel according to agreed criteria and be announced at the AGM of the LCC. The winners may, if this is considered appropriate, be recognised at any subsequent event organised by the LCC to award corporate or national champions. We note that the Board has, since this motion was first drafted, agreed to: (1) make the cycling champion category more campaigns-focused, (2) add new awards open to individual local campaigners, and (3) recognise work by LCC local groups. We are pleased at this response to members' concerns, and we suggest possible extra categories could be: (1) best local ride leader, (2) most active young rider, (3) most active branch, (4) best trainer of young cyclists.

This was put to the vote and carried overwhelmingly.

The meeting closed 13:40