

# Minutes of the 2014 AGM

Held at the Directory for Social Change  
10:00, Saturday 11<sup>th</sup> October 2014



## A. APOLOGIES & MINUTES OF THE 2014 AGM

### 1. Welcome, Intro, Agenda & Housekeeping

- 1.1 The meeting was opened by the Chair of the Board, Ann Kenrick, who welcomed everyone to the AGM. Ann thanked Levenes and Butterworths for their sponsorship of the event, and reminded the meeting that the AGM was restricted to members of LCC only (although the Campaigners' Conference later in the day was open to all).
- 1.2 Ann asked if anyone wished to submit Emergency Motions, which she confirmed would be taken at the end of the existing agenda items. No emergency motions were submitted.
- 1.3 Finally she reminded those who had not yet voted in the Board Election, and who wished to do so, that the deadline was 11:30 i.e. before the debate on Special Resolutions and non-finance Motions.

### 2. Apologies for Absence

- 2.1 None.

### 3. Approval of Last Year's Minutes (19th October 2013)

- 3.1 No corrections to the minutes were tabled.
- 3.2 The minutes were approved overwhelmingly with no votes against and one abstention.

## B. REPORTS, FINANCE MOTIONS (1 & 2) & REVIEW OF THE YEAR

### 4. Chair's Report & Q&A (Including Implementation of 2013 AGM Resolutions)

- 4.1 Ann Kenrick (LCC Chair) gave her thanks to the departing trustees for their contributions during their terms of office.
- 4.2 She also warmly thanked LCC's local groups and local activists for their fantastic and important work.
- 4.3 Ann noted that an important role of trustees is to focus on the long term:
  - Politics and campaigning – the role of the Mayor is crucial. Boris and Ken “got” cycling. We won't necessarily have that advantage with the next mayor, and we are developing a strategy to address this.

- Quality of design – implementation of *Space for Cycling* needs to be done well and standards need to stand the passage of time.
- We aim to grow the membership to 20,000 by the end of 2018, and have agreed that we need to review our membership model to make it as attractive to potential new members as possible.
- Activism – we appreciate the amount of work at the local level and want to increase our central capacity to support this.
- We aim to invest in increasing digital media campaigning to reach more people.
- Services and consultancy – we aim to also increase income from business activities (to £200,000 by 2018) as we are unlikely to meet all our ambitions from money raised through memberships alone. This year’s progress that has been impressive.
- Equality and diversity – we have done well in recent years to reduce the gender imbalance on the Board, but there is more still to do as in general we still do not reflect the diversity of all Londoners.

4.4 There were no questions.

## 5. Treasurer’s Report

- 5.1 Tony Levene (Treasurer) thanked staff for producing accounts, and noted that their production had been trouble free with new auditors.
- 5.2 He apologised that last year the 2012/13 accounts were not posted on the website ahead of that year’s AGM, but that he could confirm that this year’s accounts (2013/14) had been posted in advance. He hoped that next year they would be in a more prominent position on the website.
- 5.3 He said had received no questions on the 2013/2014 accounts in advance and was happy to recommend their adoption on behalf of the Board.
- 5.4 Regarding the current year: Tony informed the AGM that HMRC stopped Gift Aid about a month ago due to the fact that the market cost of third-party cycling insurance had now exceeded the value of membership benefits that we are allowed to offer whilst still being eligible to claim Gift Aid on the membership fee. This was a substantial shock and we’ve had to take unwanted and unfortunate actions to cut costs accordingly.
- 5.5 He informed the AGM that this decision is currently being challenged but in the meantime we’re not getting the Gift Aid, which was stopped immediately with no notice. If our challenge fails we will be left with the following choices:
- Option 1 – increase the membership fee to make up for the loss of Gift Aid.
  - Option 2 – drop insurance from the membership offer to regain Gift Aid.
  - Option 3 – cut expenditure back substantially to make up for the loss of Gift Aid.
- 5.6 Tony noted that staff had developed a contingency plan according to the outcome of the challenge.
- 5.7 He stated that we need to find other sources of income longer term (including through a new membership model and increased business activity as referred to in Ann’s report.)

5.8 Tony informed the AGM that some local groups have substantial amounts of money in bank that they don't use; one group has £10,000 which is not being used. This is not unique. He asked: can local groups ask their members whether this is needed? Can it be sent back to the centre?

5.9 The following questions were raised from the floor, which Tony answered as below:

*Q. What about a fourth 4<sup>th</sup> option – separating insurance from membership?*

A. It is currently being investigated as to whether this is possible.

*Q. Please clarify the types of insurance received by members.*

A. As a member of LCC you have third party insurance. LCC rides and events are covered by our public liability insurance. You have access to theft insurance at a discounted price.

*Q. Is there a danger of HMRC trying to recover revenue from the past?*

A. That has been mentioned by HMRC and is something we are factoring in, but it looks like a low probability at the moment.

*Q. Southwark has a lot of money in their accounts because they're waiting for a VAT resolution for Dulwich Dynamo. Has this been resolved yet?*

A. No, but a resolution is imminent.

*Q. Is the Gift Aid problem common to CTC too? Could Cyclenation help?*

A. This problem is not unique to LCC and we are talking to other organisations about it.

## **6. Approval of Accounts (Motion 1)**

6.1 Tony moved that the 2013/14 audited accounts be approved (seconded by John Everard).

6.2 The accounts were approved by a majority of those present, with none voting against and two abstentions.

## **7. Appointment of Auditors (Motion 2)**

7.1 Tony moved that Chantrey Vellacott be reappointed as this year's auditors (seconded by David Arditti).

7.2 The following question was raised: *does LCC need auditors?* To which Tony answered yes, we're a very long way above the level of income that requires auditors.

7.3 The motion was carried by majority, with one vote against and three abstentions

## **8. Review of the Year & Q&A**

8.1 Ashok Sinha (Chief Executive) began the Review of the Year.

8.2 He said that this had been a remarkable 12 months for LCC: we have continued our task of re-energising the organisation, becoming more visible, achieving more impact, and being even more valued, influential and respected.

- 8.3 He noted that we've substantially reduced our dependence on ever-more-scarce grants, in particular by once again raising sponsorship for campaigns and increasing our income from consultancy and services.
- 8.4 He said that we've not got everything right, and we are yet to see on the ground the changes we have advocated and for which we've won political support: we need to become even better as an advocacy group to make sure these changes happen.
- 8.5 He added that:
- *Space for Cycling* had been an incredibly complex and hard campaign to run, but it was successful – so successful that other NGOs have been seeking to learn from how we did it. The unprecedented technology and scale operation – lobbying over 7,000 candidates regarding 629 ward-specific 'asks' across six different themes - was very tricky to create but thanks to some incredible work by staff and volunteers we met our goals.
  - Our London Cycling Awards had more buy-in than in previous years, increasing the number of contacts with local authorities, business contacts. The Awards are helping LCC to be recognised as part of London's multifaceted cycling scene/culture, as well being as a campaigning organisation.
  - Our consultancy has grown. It currently represents about 15% of core income and we seek to double this over the next 3 years. Ashok noted that it's not just about generating money - we do projects with councils and businesses that put bums on saddles – so this work is directly relevant to the charitable aims of the organisation.
  - Our Social Media presence is getting better: during the year our Twitter followers grew from 15,000 to 21,300, Facebook from 8,000 to 11,000, and millions were exposed to the S4C hashtag across social media during the *Space for Cycling* campaign.
  - We are currently reviewing all our digital platforms, including social media, our website, and our online campaigning tools. We shall act upon the conclusions of the review, with the overarching aims of achieving better integration across platforms and becoming more efficient and more effective externally and internally.
  - Our campaigns had again won awards, with more recognition being given to *Love London, Go Dutch* London and *Space for Cycling* being honoured too.
  - And finally, we are in active collaboration with other cycling campaign organisations, sharing our thinking on strategy and policy, making our guides on activism freely available, sharing our *Space for Cycling* logos/brand. He added that we continued to work at the national level with supportive MPs on the Get Britain Cycling campaign, in a partnership with CTC, Cyclenation, Sustrans, British Cycling and the Bicycle Association.
- 8.6 Rosie Downes (Campaigns Manager) continued the Review of the Year, saying that she had re-joined LCC this year after a number of years working at other organisations as a result of being inspired by the *Space for Cycling* campaign.
- 8.7 She continued by highlighting the work of LCC's local groups and referring to the progress on achieving the *Space for Cycling* ward 'asks' (all details and statistics available on the website)
- 8.8 In particular, she said that:
- The current phase of the *Space for Cycling* campaign is gathering responses from councillors to get an accurate picture of progress to date and their intentions.
  - In parallel with this we are pressing the Mayor and GLA to implement the former's *Love London, Go Dutch* promises – we need to ensure the Vision for Cycling money is spent, and spent well on things we want.

- The N-S and E-W cycle superhighways, which replace a lane of traffic with a segregated cycle path, are a great move forward but opposition is strong; we're tackling this opposition with a digital campaign.
- We pay tribute to the Cycle Works business campaign set up by LCC members to support the new highways.
- Improvements are being planned for CS2, and that we are working with the Tower Hamlets LCC group to press for the best possible result.
- Although next year's general election does not have a direct bearing on cycling in London we will still seek to engage London's parliamentary candidates.

8.9 Ashok then continued the Review on behalf of Lucy Cooper (Income Generation Manager) who was unable to attend the AGM.

8.10 He said that:

- Getting more members has become extraordinarily difficult, but we managed to achieve what we set out to achieve – just.
- We were addressing the concerns of activists about the Awards, stressing that their aim is to promote LCC to help ensure campaigns can be funded and delivered.
- Thanks are due to the Bicycle Association, Evans Cycles and the Embassy of the Netherlands for sponsoring our *Space for Cycling* campaign.
- We've become more attractive to businesses without watering down our political advocacy.
- We may have saturated the market of people that are ready to pay for a membership and there is a clear trend towards people preferring to support multi-issue online campaigns – we need a new supporter-member-donor approach to achieve our goals.
- We're going to do a piece of research to find out what the market is and potentially re-cast our membership model for the future. Nothing will happen until research shows that this is needed and members will be brought up to date in due course.

8.11 Stewart Dring (Cycling Projects Manager) continued the Review by talking about LCC's Consultancy and Services.

8.12 He informed the meeting that the Cycling Projects Team:

- Uses the cycling expertise and local knowledge of LCC to generate profits that are ploughed into running campaigns.
- Is exploiting opportunities arising from the growth of cycling in London.
- Is trying out new approaches, brands and services.
- Is focusing on the most profitable ones, which are generally with corporates, universities and local councils. He gave the examples of services we had provided for Levi's and the Brixton Cycling Fair.

8.13 Stewart then gave the following updates:

- Led rides: our Ride London partnership successfully saw us take thousands on our feeder rides. However, we should be aware that others are also seeking to compete in this market, for example British Cycling.
- London by Cycle (funded by TfL): around 5,000 people came to our events, and we are looking at how to build on this.
- Our Urban Cycle Loan service (to councils): 87% of people that participate stay cycling after leaving the scheme. We need to make sure that we capitalise on this success, despite the severe cutbacks in funding being experienced by councils.

- Consultancy: this is the biggest income generator. We work with the Campaigns Team (who provide specialist expertise) and the LCC groups (who provide expert local knowledge). We recognise that there have been problems however, and will improve communication with local groups. Highlights include work done for InMidtown (Business Improvement District, Holborn), Ealing Mini-Holland bid, Hackney Council, and Heathrow Airport.
- Community Cycling Fund for London (TfL funded): this is one of our key areas with 26 projects, to which we issued £104,000 in grants, reaching out to 3,000 beneficiaries.

- 8.14 Stewart concluded by reminding the AGM that funding remains tight in the current economic climate, but a market still remains that can be accessed. However we will need to be even more capable in future to compete with others who are entering this market. If we don't then there will be substantially less money generated to channel into our campaigns.
- 8.15 Ashok finished the review by noting that soon we would have a new London Mayor – but that the funding profile for cycling is budgeted to decrease post-2016. We therefore have a major fight on our hands to ensure this does not happen.
- 8.16 He offered his warm thanks to everyone, especially the staff, for their efforts over the past year.
- 8.17 Questions were raised and answered as follows:

*Comment: Amy Summers (Activism Co-ordinator) has a list of everyone in each area that has signed up to S4C. That resource is gold dust.*

*Q. We are competing against other cycling organisations. Can't we co-operate?*

A. We work together on campaigning but we can't rely on other organisations to help us financially.

*Q. Should we not think outside the box to improve cycling safety without so much public spending? For example, why don't we campaign for changing liability legislation which would be a low cost intervention by government?*

A. We have won a major investment programme from the Mayor on the basis of what we believe will work most effectively to promote cycling, and we need to make sure it is delivered properly. Stricter Liability is on the agenda, but it's not a priority right now.

*Q. What about conflicts of interest regarding consultancy work. How do we handle the situation where we are providing a service to a council at the same time as wanting to campaign against its policies.*

A. We have to retain our integrity. We hope that if we're polite and co-operative they'll accept our constructive criticism. There will be times when this will be tested but at the moment it is working.

*Q. Should we not ask for a bigger cycling budget from the Mayor?*

A. We may do so - but we haven't yet. Priority one is to ensure the existing streams are spent without unnecessary delay, in full, and well.

*Q. How do we make sure investment by local and city wide authorities is spent wisely?*

A. We scrutinise the plans and feedback informally and formally to press for the highest quality of delivery. Sometimes we have to go to the streets and protest if the authorities don't live up to what we believe are their responsibilities. The general approach is to get in early and be a constructive critic.

Q. *There is a risk of not being able to spend the Enfield Mini Holland budget in time and the budget being lost when next mayor comes in. The local LCC group is small and needs more local support.*

A. Support for local activism is something we need to do better, but the central effort required to deliver *Space for Cycling* this year detracted from that. One of our future priorities is to invest in this area.

Q. *The Government's spending review is crucial. Cycling is bound to be one of the areas that will be dropped first. Money that is in the pipeline already needs to be spent now, even if the result is not 100% perfect.*

A. There is general agreement to this, subject to the actual level of quality – we cannot accept poor quality implementation any longer.

8.18 Ann closed the session by encouraging those present to participate in local consultations, and by thanking the staff team.

## C. CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGES

### 9. Special Resolutions to Amend the Article & Standing Orders

9.1 Andy Cawdell took the Chair, summarised the Special Resolutions, and explained that they required at least 75% of those voting to be in favour for them to be carried.

#### 9.2 SPECIAL RESOLUTION 1

*That Article 14.3.1., which reads:*

*"14.3 Membership is open to:-*

*14.3.1 Any individuals aged 18 or over whom the Board decides to admit to membership;  
and*

*14.3.2 Any organisations whether incorporated or unincorporated which the Board decides to admit to membership.*

*The Trustees may determine criteria for membership but are not obliged to admit any person satisfying such criteria as members and may decline in their absolute discretion any person's application and need not give reasons for such decision."*

*Be amended by the deletion of the words "aged 18 or over" to read:*

*"14.3 Membership is open to:-*

*14.3.1 Any individuals whom the Board decides to admit to membership; and*

*14.3.2 Any organisations whether incorporated or unincorporated which the Board decides to admit to membership.*

*The Trustees may determine criteria for membership but are not obliged to admit any person satisfying such criteria as members and may decline in their absolute discretion any person's application and need not give reasons for such decision."*

- 9.3 This went straight to a vote and was **carried overwhelmingly**, with one vote against and no abstentions.

#### 9.4 SPECIAL RESOLUTION 2

*That the following item in Standing Orders:*

*“Elections*

*Election of Board members shall take place by postal vote, and/or electronic vote and at the AGM. Interested candidates must fill in a nomination form, available from the LCC office, and return it to the office by the copy deadline of the issue of London Cyclist which precedes the AGM or such date as the Board shall determine. Their nomination must be proposed and seconded by two other LCC members. Candidates must write a short summary not exceeding 50 words explaining why they wish to stand.”*

*Be amended by deleting the “not exceeding 50 words” to read:*

*“Elections*

*Election of Board members shall take place by postal vote, and/or electronic vote and at the AGM. Interested candidates must fill in a nomination form, available from the LCC office, and return it to the office by the copy deadline of the issue of London Cyclist which precedes the AGM or such date as the Board shall determine. Their nomination must be proposed and seconded by two other LCC members. Candidates must write a short summary explaining why they wish to stand.”*

- 9.5 This went straight to a vote and was **carried overwhelmingly**, with one vote against and no abstentions.

#### 9.6 SPECIAL RESOLUTION 3

1. *The 2014 AGM **affirms** that the charity is committed to diversity and equality. This includes an opposition to discrimination, including on the grounds of race, colour, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, religion, disability, age, or national or ethnic origin.*
2. *It **resolves** that the trustees of the charity must uphold the charity’s commitment to diversity and equality, as defined from time to time by the AGM.*
3. *It also **resolves** that the charity’s Articles of Association be amended as per the Special Resolution below:*

Special Resolution:

*That new Articles be added to Article 35 (Make-up of the Board) as follows:*

*“35.3 Trustees must uphold the charity’s commitment to diversity and equality. If a trustee does not uphold this commitment, their membership of the Board may be removed under the procedure set out in Article 40.1.9 or Article 41.*

*35.4 The trustees may at any time rule that a member may not stand for election to the Board because that member’s activities are inconsistent with the charity’s commitment to diversity and equality, by resolution of more than 50 per cent of the trustees present and voting at a Board meeting at which at least half of the serving trustees are present.”*

- 9.7 The Chair reminded the meeting that amendments were not allowable, and took a number of speeches and comments for and against the motion.
- 9.8 Donnachadh McCarthy asked if the clauses in the Special Resolution can be voted on separately e.g. to take into account religious positions on sexual orientation. The Chair said this was not allowable.
- 9.9 The Resolution was put to a vote and **carried by 81% of the vote** with 87 votes in favour, 6 against, and 15 abstentions.
- 9.10 In response to a question about when it comes into effect the Chair explained that in principle it is in effect immediately, but it has to go through Companies House and the Charity Commission for their acceptance before the changes to the Articles can be confirmed.

## D. OTHER MOTIONS (3-6)

### 10. Motion 3 (Buses & Bicycles)

- 10.1 Ann re-took the Chair, thanked Andy for steering the AGM through the Special Resolutions, introduced the remaining motions and explained the process for debating and voting on them.
- 10.2 Rachel Aldred proposed the motion as Chair of the Policy Forum, giving her view that it does not conflict with Motion 4. She noted that the motion clarifies and expands upon previous resolutions on “protected space”. She added that planners should not presume that creating *Space for Cycling* will impact on buses.
- 10.3 The Chair took a number of speeches for and against the motion before putting it to a vote. The motion was **carried by a clear majority**, reading as follows:

**LCC notes:**

*Policies passed at the 2013 AGM say we need inclusive cycling environments on a dense and direct core cycle network. Policy includes a test for when we think protected space is needed: where speeds are over 20mph, or daily motor traffic volumes over 2,000 Passenger Car Units.*

*LCC's Policy Forum has been discussing bus-bicycle interaction, triggered by concerns that creating Space for Cycling will cause problems for buses. This motion is informed by a Policy Forum paper, available at <http://lcc.org.uk/pages/current-projects> .*

**LCC resolves:**

1. *Where the core cycle network coincides with a bus route, usually the 'protected space' test will mean we need to separate bicycles from buses, at route level or at street level.*
2. *Separation at route level can mean re-routing buses (for example, to create a cycle-only street, as in The Narroway, Hackney), or re-routing the core cycle network. If the second option is chosen, this must maintain network density and directness, and access to key destinations.*
3. *Where buses and bicycles are separated at street level, we want high quality cycle tracks or protected lanes, which cater for the increases in cycling they will generate. Protected space must continue safely through junctions and past bus stops.*

4. *We do not believe this stance creates conflict between bus and bike provision. The current situation has put cyclists at risk: buses seriously injure as many cyclists in London as lorries do. Mixing high bus and bicycle flows delays both, although this is not taken into account in modelling.*
5. *Separating bicycles from buses has important wider benefits. It will create safer, more pleasant cycling environments, encouraging more bus users to cycle some short trips, with big health gains. This can reduce overcrowding on buses and create capacity to shift other trips from car to bus.*
6. *Planners should not assume creating Space for Cycling threatens buses. It should be considered an opportunity to prioritise both buses and bicycles over less efficient modes.*

## 11. Motion 4 (Buses & Modal Share in Central London)

- 11.1 David Arditti proposed the motion, stating that it clears up, rather than changes, existing policy. He said that LCC is not a campaign for fewer (or more) cars or buses per se; rather we are a campaign for getting people onto cycles.
- 11.2 A number of amendments were proposed, debated and voted upon. All fell. The Chair then took a number of speeches for and against the motion.
- 11.3 A procedural motion was then moved to go straight to vote, which was ruled as in order by the Company Secretary; as required the Chair immediately took a vote on this (but took no speeches) and it was carried.
- 11.4 The motion was then put immediately to a vote and carried by a clear majority, reading as follows:

### **Noting:**

1. *The history of cycling campaigners supporting provision for buses as beneficial for walking and cycling (by reducing demand for private car use).*
2. *Figures published by the Greater London Authority showing that buses now cause more cycling KSIs per km travelled than HGVs. Reference: "News from Darren Johnson AM: Buses as dangerous as lorries for cyclists, but not as fatal", 11 April 2014, <https://www.london.gov.uk/media/assembly-member-press-releases/green-party/2014/04/news-from-darren-johnson-am-buses-as-dangerous-as-lorries-for>.*
3. *Figures published by the Greater London Authority in the Mayor's Air Quality Strategy (December 2010) showing that buses are a significant, and growing (as a percentage of total particulates) source of air pollution in Central London.*
4. *Recent road schemes in Central London, such as Camden's proposed West End Project have sought to justify inadequate provision for cycling on the need to improve or maintain provision for buses and existing bus and cycling modal share.*

*Defining 'Central London' as the area within the "Inner Ring Road", LCC **resolves** to:*

1. *No longer automatically assume that increasing, or even maintaining, provision for buses in Central London is beneficial for walking or cycling. Nor to automatically accept that such provision for buses is a legitimate reason to accept poor provision for cycling.*
2. *Campaign for TfL and London boroughs, in every Central London road scheme, to actively consider opportunities for modal shift from buses to cycling, through the provision of high quality 'Space for Cycling'. Highway authorities should design cycling provision for the modal*

*share likely when there is high quality provision, not based on current modal share, which is suppressed by poor provision.*

3. *Seek integration of tube and bus fares (including daily Oyster / Contactless price-capping and Travelcards) with TfL Cycle Hire so as to eliminate the financial incentive that commuters have in choosing to get a bus over hiring a cycle for the final part of their journeys into Central London.*

## **12. Motion 5 (Devolution of Powers Relevant to Deliver 'Space for Cycling')**

- 12.1 Mustafa Arif proposed the motion and spoke to it.
- 12.2 A number of amendments were proposed and carried by clear majorities of those voting. The Chair then took a number of speeches for and against the amended motion.
- 12.3 The amended motion was then voted upon and carried by a clear majority, reading as follows:

### **Noting:**

1. *That improvements for cycling in London have principally been the result of initiatives by the former GLC, current Greater London Authority, the City Corporation and the London Boroughs, not by national government.*
2. *That a general election is due in May 2015.*

### **LCC resolves:**

1. *To seek, from the next Parliament, transfer of any relevant powers (e.g. control of the Royal Parks), that are required to fully deliver 'Space for Cycling', to London's own tiers of elected government.*
2. *Whilst seeking a supportive national government policy towards cycling, to maintain the primary onus for delivering 'Space for Cycling' on London's elected leaders.*

## **13. Motion 6 (Activating Local Campaigners by Improving the Forums, Rides and Local section of the LCC Website)**

- 13.1 Dominic Fee proposed the motion, saying that many LCC groups have few members and struggle to recruit; LCC needs to tap into the many people who are active on cycling (and similar) forums attract a good proportion of them into our local groups.
- 13.2 The motion was debated and a number of amendments were tabled and accepted by acclamation; Ann asked the meeting if it was happy to move to a vote, about which there was no dissent.
- 13.3 A number of speeches were taken for and against the amended motion.
- 13.4 The amended motion was put to a vote and **carried comfortably**, reading as follows:

*To sustain, enlarge and increase the diversity of LCC local groups, we must continually activate more members to get involved in local campaigning. We call on the LCC to recognise the importance of the LCC website because of the wider audience it reaches, and to:*

- a. *Identify key requirements and commission the revision or replacement of the website in order to:*
- *Reflect the full range of LCC's activities in a form that is easy to access and navigate*
  - *Provide a public record for centrally-generated material and news postings*
  - *Enable the members responsible for activities to update and add to the content about them presented on the site.*
  - *Provide easily navigable material on the website and feedback to members regarding the work of committees and local groups, but not necessarily provide the full internal communication facility needed for the conduct of such work.*
- b. *Identify a path for the membership to move to a system to support electronic communication and forum discussions for committee work and for discussions in local groups that goes beyond the current Yahoo Groups infrastructure on which much of LCC's work currently depends to at least support the following:*
- *Enable members to receive notification of issues and discussions that may be of interest and to subscribe on an individual issue or topic basis*
  - *Include a range of media in discussion contributions*
  - *Provide mechanisms to control access to some discussions while leaving others open to wide participation.*
- c. *Ensure that user's comments and experience are fed into the planning of these and other LCC internet systems.*
- d. *Ensure that the concerns raised by the Westminster local group in the original (unamended) motion are addressed*

*And that a report on progress should be brought to the 2015 AGM.*

## **E. BOARD ELECTION & AOB**

### **14. Board Election**

- 14.1 Acting as Returning Officer Ashok displayed the voting statistics and full result on the screen, declaring that the following had been elected to the Board of trustees to serve for two years:

Rachel Aldred  
 Alex Dillistone  
 George Coulouris  
 Gareth Redmond  
 Hannah Roberts

- 14.2 Ashok congratulated the winners, and thanked all those who stood for election.

**There being no other business the meeting was closed at 13:30.**