

Minutes of the 2015 AGM

Held at Coin Street Neighbourhood Centre
10:00 Saturday 17th October 2015



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 Osbornes 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 covered the contents of the attendees' pack, asked them to switch off their mobile phones and encouraged them to use social media. She also explained the fire and first aid procedures, as well as the location of bike parking and toilets, and details for lunch and workshops.
- 1.3 Ann asked if anyone wished to submit Emergency Motions and to contact Thomas Marshall Potter (staff) if they wished to do so.
- 1.4 Finally she reminded those who had not yet voted in the Board Election that they could do so by placing voting forms in the ballot boxes.

2. Apologies for Absence

- 2.1 Isabelle Clement was unable to attend.

3. Approval of Last Year's Minutes (11th October 2014)

- 3.1 No corrections to the minutes were tabled.
- 3.2 The minutes were approved.

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

4. Chair's Report & Q&A (Including Implementation of 2014 AGM Resolutions)

- 4.1 Ann gave her thanks to the CEO, Ashok Sinha, the LCC management team and all the rest of the staff team; as well as to LCC members and supporters, highlighting the importance of maintaining grassroots activity, such as the major protest at Bank.
- 4.2 She also mentioned the number of councillors who now support LCC; and acknowledged Charlie Lloyd's hard work on lorry safety, wishing him well for the future on his retirement from the staff team.

4.3 Ann also spoke about the following:

- Mini-Holland schemes - there have been some exciting developments in this area.
- Cycling in France – she talked about the road collisions she observed there during her trip and also some good facilities for cycling in Paris.
- Period of transition – we will need to cycle a bit slower as volumes of cyclists increase so that we do not alienate pedestrians.
- Backwards steps – specifically regarding bikes having to be dismantled to go on Eurostar trains.
- 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 we still do not reflect the overall diversity of all Londoners. In particular, it would be good if the number of female LCC group leaders doubled within a year.
- Campaigner Awards – highlighted some of the people who were nominated, especially the women.

5. Treasurer's Report

5.1 Tony Levene (Treasurer) thanked staff for producing the annual accounts.

5.2 Regarding the current year: Tony informed the AGM that annual income in the year up to March increased by approximately £100,000 and that Space for Cycling expenditure was £41,000. He added that there would be more spending in the forthcoming financial year because of the Mayoral Election Campaign.

5.3 Tony noted that the other important financial information is the change to the reserve policy. The new reserves policy requires that the charity should aim for Free Reserves of £115k.

5.4 He stated that we are struggling to keep the membership figures looking as healthy as they should be and that there will be a new membership model at some point this year so there may well be a period when the finances decline rather than improve. He therefore emphasises the importance of promoting membership.

5.5 There were no questions raised from the floor.

6. Approval of Accounts (Motion 1)

6.1 Tony proposed that the 2014/15 audited accounts be approved (seconded by Gareth Redmond).

6.2 The motion was **carried overwhelmingly** by the meeting, with three abstentions.

7. Appointment of Auditors (Motion 2)

7.1 Tony moved that More Stevens be appointed as this year's auditors. (He noted that Chantrey Vellacott used to be the auditors but they merged with More Stevens; however we have had the same personnel doing the audit.) The motion was seconded by Alex Dillistone.

7.2 The motion was **carried overwhelmingly**, with two abstentions.

8. Review of the Year & Q&A

- 8.1 Ashok Sinha (Chief Executive) began the Review of the Year.
- 8.2 He started by thanking LCC's Campaigns Manager Rosie Downes as the AGM was her last day at LCC before moving to a new role elsewhere, as well as thanking all the attendees and borough groups who are at the cutting edge of campaigning.
- 8.3 Setting the scene, he mentioned the Waltham Forest mini-Holland event, talking about how local LCC members had given an excellent example of how to reach out and engage with people who are upset by the changes that LCC is advocating. We will need more of this, he said, as our campaigns bear fruit – it is a challenge that comes with success.
- 8.4 Rosie Downes (Campaigns Manager) and Amy Summers (Activism Coordinator) continued the Review of the Year.
- 8.5 They gave a breakdown of the past 12 months as follows:
- October – we recognised achievements of campaigners at Campaigner Award ceremony; the Tower Hamlets Wheelers held their “buy in” on Cycle Superhighway 2 (CS2).
 - November – We handed in our Space for Cycling petition and helped to successfully defend the East-West Super Highway.
 - December – the Hounslow Campaign celebrated a major local success, and we saw LCC's views reflected in TfL's Cycling Level of Service.
 - January – important improvements were made in Camden and the new Deptford Creek Bridge was opened.
 - February – East/West and North/South Cycle Superhighways approved.
 - March – LCC won a London Transport Award for Space for Cycling
 - April – Direct Vision Lorries became more widely available as a result of challenges to the construction industry led by Charlie Lloyd.
 - May – first CS2 extension section opened in Aldgate and first “tiger crossing” on Richmond Road.
 - June – we held major protest at Bank after the lorry collision death there, with a big impact on the City/TfL.
 - July – End Lorry Danger Campaign; 12,000 people signed the petition.
 - August – Royal Parks relented and allowed protected lanes for cyclists.
 - September – Safer Lorries Scheme was launched with the second phase being consulted on in 2016.
 - October – Ealing Cycling Campaign successfully engaged in a legal battle against McDonalds regarding a new cycle track and there was another success in the End Lorry Danger Campaign regarding the freight enforcement unit.
- 8.6 Amy concluded by wishing both Rosie Downes well in her new role at Macmillan Cancer Support and Charlie Lloyd in his retirement.
- 8.7 Stewart Dring (Cycling Projects Manager) continued the Review by talking about LCC's Consultancy and Services.
- 8.8 He informed the meeting that the Cycling Projects Team:

- Generates essential income, and run projects to get people cycling; the income goes towards maintaining LCC's campaigning.
- Has a portfolio that covers consultancy, service provision and putting on LCC events.

8.9 Stewart then gave the following updates –

- RideLondon – we saw 250 volunteers lead numerous some 30 rides to/from the event London.
- Student “London by Cycle” events – these saw a 50/50 male/female split, of which we are very proud.
- Brent Council – we project-managed and organises events for Brent Council in parks, attended by 2,500 people in a borough where cycling is low.
- Urban Cycle Loans – schemes are taking place in 4 boroughs, and have created 2,000 new cyclists of whom 80% are still cycling after three months and recommending to others they also cycle. LCC membership is also bundled with this which is a good way to grow membership.
- Consultancy – this is going from strength to strength with all tube stations’ cycle parking being audited, as well as identifying 18,000 potential parking places for Hackney Homes Council Housing. We also audited Brent and Barking & Dagenham for cycle parking.
- Lorries and freight – as a result of the End Lorry Danger campaign we are working with Hillingdon and TfL, as well as hoping to work with CLOCS champions.
- The Projects team also gives logistical support to campaigning activities, e.g. Bank protest, and to LCC's London Cycling Awards, the AGM and our mini-Holland events.

8.10 Stewart concluded by looking ahead to the next year and challenges we may face, mainly focusing on the issue of having less income and access to funding opportunities (noting the stress this will put on funding Mayoral Election campaign). He also noted the potential to look outside of London as well as highlighted that there is now significant competition for led rides as British Cycling are now the official led ride provider to TfL.

8.11 Ashok finished the review by looking ahead to the 2016 Mayoral Election campaign, underlining the fact that we will have a first-time Mayor – the Ken and Boris era will be over) - and there is no guarantee that s/he will be pro-cycling. He highlighted the following:

- Recent comments from Sadiq Khan regarding infrastructure which could signal a challenge ahead.
- LCC's job to ensure that mayoral candidates understand that there is mass support for cycling.
- Unlike Love London, Go Dutch, we are not seeking a revolution – all the main candidates have stated their support for the principles behind Space for Cycling, at least rhetorically; instead we have to make sure they have the resolution to continue and expand programmes already in place, create new schemes to keep up the momentum, and resist downgrading cycling projects in the context of spending cuts and the “bikelash”.

8.12 Ashok mentioned that there will be three asks for the 1026 mayoral Election campaign on which members will be consulted via a survey which will be going out soon –

1. A Mini-Holland in every borough
 2. Protected space on main roads and junctions (a continuation of the Space for Cycling theme)
 3. Safer lorries (this has potential for significant wins as it is climbing up the political agenda)
- 8.13 He finished by offering his warm thanks to the Board and staff for their efforts over the past year, and pointed out that although in recent years we have lost 25% of income from some sources on which we have previously relied, we have managed to make up for this from new sources, and run the biggest and best cycling campaigns.
- 8.14 The following questions and issues raised and noted:
- We should use language 'better places for walking and cycling' or 'we cycle' as we are not 'cyclists'.
 - The staff team should get out and about on the streets to increase engagement.
 - Is it possible to make sure all candidates cycle?
 - Clarification of new reserves policy (clarified by Ashok).

C. CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGES

9. Special Resolutions to Amend the Article & Standing Orders

- 9.1 At the invitation of Ann Kenrick, Andy Cawdell took over the Chair for the Special Resolutions. Andy explained that Special Resolutions require at least 75% of those voting to be in favour for them to be carried. She then handed over to Tony Levene to introduce the first resolution.

9.2 SPECIAL RESOLUTION 1

That two new Articles, numbered 33.2 and 33.3, should be inserted after Article 33.1 in the London Cycling Campaign's Articles of Association, such that the whole of Article 33 reads as follows:

33. Management by the Board

- 33.1 *The business of the Company is managed by the Board. They may pay all the expenses of promoting the Company. They may use all powers of the Company which are not, by the Act or by these Articles, required to be used by a general meeting of the Company.*
- 33.2 *The Board is responsible for implementing resolutions made at a General Meeting, including those regarding the policies of the Company. It shall also exercise its power to set or change the policies of the Company as it sees fit.*
- 33.3 *As with resolutions passed at a General Meeting, these policies shall be binding on the Company. The Board may use the powers it has under the Act or these Articles to ensure that those representing the charity abide by the policies of the Company.*

9.3 This went straight to a vote and was seconded by Oliver Schick. It was **carried overwhelmingly**, with one abstention.

9.4 **SPECIAL RESOLUTION 2**

That the following section of the London Cycling Campaign's AGM Standing Orders should be deleted:

All motions shall be received in writing at the LCC office by the copy deadline of the issue of London Cyclist which precedes the AGM, and will be published in it or such date as shall be determined by the Board.

And that the deleted section should be replaced by:

The Board shall set a deadline for the receipt of motions to the AGM. This date shall not be less than four weeks, and not longer than twelve weeks, before the AGM. The Board shall inform all members of this deadline not less than four weeks in advance of it. Motions received after this date shall be ruled out of order.

And that the following section of those Standing Orders be deleted:

Any motion calling for LCC to take a policy position, or change a policy agreed at a previous AGM, shall have been accepted for proposal by the Campaigns Co-ordination Subcommittee, or referred back to the proposers with reasons for non-acceptance before being classed as a motion. If the movers of the motion have not done this the Chair is empowered to rule the motion out of order.

And that the deleted section should be replaced by:

Before sending the motions to members, the Board shall at its discretion invite subcommittees of the Board and/or other committees to each offer amendments to all motions received. Such committees shall also be invited to each provide a written recommendation to the AGM regarding each motion.

If the proposer of a motion accepts an amendment offered by one of these committees, then the original motion will be replaced by the amended one. Otherwise, the motion will go forward unamended.

The following shall then be notified to members alongside notice of the AGM agenda, according to the notice period specified by the Articles: motions, amendments made by the above committees but rejected by the proposers of motions, and any written recommendations made by these committees.

The Board shall set an adequate timetable for the above procedure to be followed.

9.5 This went straight to a vote and was seconded by Andrew Allaz. It was **carried overwhelmingly**, with one abstention.

9.6 **SPECIAL RESOLUTION 3**

That a new defined word should be added under Article 1.3, 'Words [and] Meanings:'

Groups Groups of the London Cycling Campaign, as registered by the Charity according to these Articles

And that a new Article should be inserted between the current Articles 17 and 18 as follows:

18. Registered Groups of the Charity

- 18.1 *The Board may register networks, committees or other bodies as Groups of the Charity.*
- 18.2 *Such Groups must abide by these Articles.*
- 18.3 *The Board may make such regulations covering the rights and obligations of Groups as it sees fit.*
- 18.4 *In the event that a Group does not abide by these Articles, or does not meet the Charity's obligations under the Charities Act, or for any other reason that the Board deems it necessary, the Board may remove this registration and the Group shall no longer part of the Charity from the point at which the decision is taken.*
- 18.5 *All financial and other assets of Groups shall ultimately be under the control of the Charity.*

And that all subsequent Articles should be renumbered accordingly.

- 9.7 Tony Levene clarified that this resolution originated from concerns regarding keeping track of local group's finances (e.g. some have multiple bank accounts with different providers) and that in general the group model needs to be reviewed as in future LCC may have groups not associated with boroughs (for example workplace groups or student groups). Similarly all groups need to have the same standing as they are part of LCC and not independent.
- 9.8 Oliver Schick seconded this resolution and Ann invited speeches against which provoked the following questions and issues –
- Ruth Bishop from the Hackney Group asked about the primacy of borough groups, to which Ashok responded that there is no distinction between the types of groups inasmuch as all must go through the same process to register and must meet the obligations as part of the charity; that said, borough groups will remain the main conduit for presenting official LCC views to councils.
 - Charles Harvey from the Barnet Group said that it would be a positive step to reflect the different circumstances in each borough; for example they have no chair as no-one is willing to take up the role and they would prefer not to have a constitution.
 - Another member pointed out that this resolution needs to happen because LCC needs to hold local groups to account. It was suggested that an annual report may be required
 - Clarification was requested on whether all liability was now the responsibility of the charity as the charity would own all the assets.

- 9.9 Ashok responded to some of these points by saying that the parent charity has ultimate liability for the activities of LCC groups – hence the need to formalise their status with the charity - agreeing that new reporting procedures and guidance for groups will be required.
- 9.10 A vote was taken and majority approved this resolution with 1 vote against and 5 abstentions.

D. OTHER MOTIONS (3-6)

- 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. Motion 3 (Policy on One Way Streets)

- 10.2 David Arditti proposed the motion as Coordinator of Brent LCC group. He noted that the motion clarifies LCC's policy on one way streets and highlighted problems with such streets e.g. fast traffic, which is dangerous to cyclists, and the negative environmental impact. He suggested a more nuanced approach and explained the differences between one way streets in other countries.
- 10.3 A number of amendments were proposed, debated and voted upon. The Chair then took a number of speeches for and against the motion. The motion was **carried by a comfortable majority**, reading as follows:

Noting that the LCC Policy Forum agreed a document (<http://lcc.org.uk/uploads/9508>) on one-way streets on 29 July 2015 that stated:

- 1. Two-way cycling should be the default on London's streets; and*
- 2. The question of whether streets should be two-way or one-way for motor vehicles should be decided on a case-by-case basis,*

LCC now resolves that:

- 1. We will support schemes that restrict motor vehicle flow to one direction to allow the creation of high quality Space for Cycling, and will support one-way schemes that are designed to remove through-traffic, provided speed limits are 20mph (or lower) and adequate attention is given to quality of the pedestrian environment.*
- 2. If there are conversions from one-way to two-way working of roads carrying more than 2000 PCU per day, we will demand that each pair of parallel roads should, between them, provide protected Space for Cycling in both directions.*
- 3. We will press for the improvement of existing one-way systems via speed reduction measures, introduction of two-way cycling and improvement of pedestrian crossing facilities.*

11. Motion 4 (Creating LCC's Vision for a Cycling City)

- 11.1 Mustafa Arif proposed the motion and spoke to it.

11.2 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.

11.3 The amended motion was then voted upon and **carried overwhelmingly**, reading as follows:

Noting that:

1. *Whilst LCC is increasingly winning the argument for installation of cycle tracks on main roads, there is still much work to do on winning the argument for filtered permeability.*
2. *The most successful examples of filtered permeability schemes are based on area-wide planning, and with the broad support of local communities.*
3. *Modal filters currently being considered or implemented as part of Mayoral cycling programmes (with the exception of some mini-Holland schemes) are primarily piecemeal closures without area-wide considerations, often facing local opposition.*
4. *Whilst LCC policy dictates that motor traffic above 2000 PCUs/day or 20mph must be separated from cycle traffic on the core cycle network, our responses to scheme consultations are sometimes inconsistent in deciding whether to demand cycle tracks or street closures.*

LCC resolves:

1. *To create a comprehensive LCC vision of what London's street network should look like as a cyclised city. Such a vision must not only serve as a reference point when assessing schemes, but also include clear recommendations for schemes on a location-by-location basis enabling LCC to lead, not follow.*
2. *That LCC's vision must incorporate the Dutch concept of 'unbundling' (sometimes referred to by British campaigners as a 'motor grid'), clearly identifying the primary and secondary distribution routes for through-motor traffic (including buses). The assumption is that through-motor routes will normally require cycle tracks (or parallel routes) whilst other streets should normally be filtered to provide safe and inviting space for cycling.*
3. *That LCC's vision must highlight the core cycle networks and seek to ensure these are protected by the authorities.*
4. *That the active participation of all LCC campaign groups, especially local groups, as well as the active inclusion of wider London civil society is critical to successfully creating and achieving LCC's vision.*
5. *To mandate the Board of Trustees to consult with the wider LCC family and propose a plan, strategic priorities, energy and resources to deliver this resolution. Such a plan should ideally achieve the following milestones:*
 - a. *Principles behind LCC's vision defined in time to influence the next Mayor's revision of the London Plan.*

- b. Sufficient detailed scheme recommendations defined to support local campaigning in the 2018 elections.*

12. Motion 5 (Presumed Liability)

- 12.1 David Hamilton proposed the motion and spoke to it. He explained that LCC supports strict liability and that it exists in the Netherlands. Road Peace has campaigned for it since 1997.
- 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:

We believe that the number of fatalities and injuries to London cyclists is unacceptably high. Currently, those injured, or the families of those killed, go through an often harsh and protracted process to gain much needed treatment, care, or compensation.

We note that versions of a Presumed Liability rule exist in the civil law of most European countries. Apart from the UK the other exceptions are Ireland, Malta, Romania and Cyprus.

Presumed Liability means that in civil actions after a collision with a cyclist or pedestrian, the motorist would be presumed to be at fault, unless they could prove that they were not to blame. It would not mean the motorist was criminally liable: it would just be for the purposes of compensation.

Presumed Liability would deliver fairer and faster justice for injured vulnerable road users.

We call on the London Cycling Campaign to campaign for Presumed Liability to be incorporated into law, and to work with other organisations involved in campaigning for Presumed Liability.

13. Motion 6 (Policy on DBS Checks)

- 12.4 Jerry Matthews introduced the motion, explaining that she thinks that LCC cannot be expected to 'protect children' and that DBS checks are process for checking that people who undertake regular work with children – which LCC doesn't.
- 12.5 Dan Barsed spoke on behalf of the Board, proposing that the motion be amended to include make sure that no activities were undertaken by LCC that may require DBS checks until a satisfactory safeguarding policy is in place.
- 12.6 Jerry spoke against amendment, saying that in reality there will never be a sufficient safeguarding policy; she gave examples of the depth of safeguarding training at the Methodist Church, and said that borough groups will never have the resources manage the types of activities concerned.
- 12.7 Ann invited a vote on Dan's amendment, which was carried with 26 in favour, 24 against and a large number of abstentions.

- 12.8 Christian Wolmar proposed a procedural motion to move on to next business, which was accepted by the Chair.
- 12.9 The Chair called a vote without debate on this motion, which was **carried overwhelmingly**, and the meeting proceeded to the next item of business without further debate or voting on this motion.

14. Emergency Motion 1 (Cycle Carriage on Eurostar)

- 14.1 Ann invited Mustafa Arif to table this motion, which she had accepted onto the AGM agenda.
- 14.2 Mustafa reminded the AGM that LCC had successfully campaigned in the past for cycles to be allowed on Eurostar trains; and explained the negative consequences of the new policy of Eurostar bike boxes, which would require disassembly of cycles prior to carriage.
- 14.2 Tony Levene proposed a procedural motion that the matter be put straight to a vote, which the Chair accepted with the general assent of the meeting; the motion was **carried unanimously**, reading as follows:

Noting that:

1. *Carriage of cycles on Eurostar was an LCC campaign success in 2008 (see press release "Campaign victory: Bikes on Eurostar", 3 April 2008. <http://lcc.org.uk/articles/campaign-victory-bikes-on-eurostar>).*
2. *Eurostar has recently announced that from 1 November 2015 they will require carried bicycles to be mechanically dismantled and carried in a 'bike box', introducing a significant usability barrier to efficient integrated cycle and rail transport.*
3. *Eurostar's action will set a damaging precedent for cycle carriage by other operators, at a time of renewed UK public investment in rail infrastructure serving London (Crossrail, HS2, Crossrail 2).*
4. *Eurostar is due to launch direct services between London and Amsterdam in December 2016, which could provide an opportunity for Londoners to more easily experience Dutch cycling provision - including integrated cycle-rail provision.*

LCC resolves to:

1. *Proactively campaign for Eurostar to abandon its current proposals and preserve (or re-establish) the ability to carry cycles on Eurostar services without disassembly.*
2. *Engage constructively with like-minded allies in this campaign, in particular cycling campaigners in Amsterdam, Calais, Kent, Lille and Paris as well as national lobby organisations.*
3. *Publicly protest against this change to the Eurostar conditions on or before the date they are due to take effect.*

15. Emergency Motion 2 (Road Building and the Silvertown Tunnel)

- 15.1 Mustafa Arif talked about the Silvertown Tunnel and Richard Lufkin explained he would like to see a walking and cycling crossing, but mentioned that the additional motor vehicle

crossing would make walking and cycling more dangerous and more traffic would be in the area.

15.2 A number of amendments were proposed, debated and voted upon.

15.3 The motion was then put to a vote and was **carried overwhelmingly**, reading as follows:

Noting that:

1. *On 5th October TfL launched another consultation on their plans to build a new motor traffic river crossing from Greenwich to Silvertown; and that the consultation closes on 29th November; and that the access roads and increased motor traffic generated by a new tunnel are likely to compromise safe and convenient cycling and walking across east London on both sides of the river.*
2. *Subsequent concerns have been raised on the LCC-ISSUES mailing list about LCC not taking a decision to campaign against this, and other major road schemes, despite there being no policy disagreements that they are bad for cycling.*
3. *In the past LCC has supported its local groups in successfully opposing the Thames Gateway bridges and Oxleas Wood link road; and that by supporting other community organisations opposed to the Silvertown Tunnel we can help widen the debate and ask our members to express their views.*
4. *LCC has not centrally supported its borough groups who are campaigning against the transport scheme for the Brent Cross Cricklewood regeneration, which is currently under a planning application logged with the London Borough of Barnet; and that Staples Corner is already a big barrier for cycling with a marked drop in cycling levels north of the junction; and that the proposed scheme will replace the roundabout and flyover with a high speed, high capacity motorway interchange and inadequate provision for cycling.*
5. *Whilst there are no disputes about opposing currently proposed schemes, LCC does not have policy clarity on circumstances in which we may support road-building schemes.*

LCC resolves to:

1. *Campaign on wider road-building schemes in London when they affect cycling, not just Mayoral cycling programmes.*
2. *Direct the Board to campaign against the following current proposals:*
 - a. *Silvertown Tunnel.*
 - b. *Brent Cross Cricklewood regeneration transport scheme (especially Staples Corner A5/A406/M1 interchange).*
3. *Develop our policies on road building, and impacts on cycling, to support campaigning decisions.*

And LCC also resolves that when campaigning resources are limited, choices should be made on a case-by-case basis.

E. BOARD ELECTION & AOB

16. Board Election

- 16.1 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:

Mustafa Arif
Daniel Barnes
Ann Kenrick
Tony Levene
Terry Patterson

- 16.2 Ashok offered his commiserations to:

Oliver Schick
Peter le Masurier

- 16.2 He finished by congratulating the winners, and thanked all those who stood for election.

17. AOB

- 17.1 Alistair Hanton, Chair of the Action on Lorry Danger group, spoke about Charlie Lloyd and his imminent retirement. He highlighted Charlie's momentous contribution to cycling across London, in which he very effectively brought to bear his extensive experience and knowledge of truck driving (as well as of London itself). He added that on top of all of this Charlie was active member of his local LCC group. He concluded that all of us who cycle in London will benefit from the work Charlie has done.
- 17.2 Alistair finished his remarks by thanking Charlie again and presented a book and other gifts to him by way of thanking him for his work and wishing him well on his retirement.

There being no other business the meeting was closed.