

**THE DULWICH SOCIETY MINUTES of the SPECIAL GENERAL MEETING of the Society held on 28<sup>th</sup> June 2021 via Zoom**

Present: 168 Participants/members registered on Zoom including members of the Dulwich Society Executive Committee and Zoom hosts.

1. Introduction and Meeting Procedure – Chair (Ian McInnes)

See Appendix 1 for the introduction and meeting procedure.

2. Motion 1

Motion 1 was presented to the meeting and read out by the Chairman.

*That the process for appointment of members of the Society's sub-committees and all minutes of their meetings must be published on the Society's website, including declarations of interest.*

The Chairman reminded the meeting that the minutes and declarations of interest of the Executive Committee are already published on the Dulwich Society website.

After the reading of the motion, Tim Connellan spoke to propose the motion which was seconded by David Taylor.

**The statements of the proposer and seconder can be found in Appendix 2.**

The Chair thanked Mr Connellan and Mr Taylor for their statements.

Chairman Ian McInnes then made a statement on behalf of the Dulwich Society Executive Committee in response and confirmed the Committee would support Motion 1.

**The statement of Ian McInnes can be found in Appendix 3.**

3. Questions/Points on Motion 1 (responses if any in blue)

- Member KS – In the spirit of openness and transparency, why was there no mention on the agenda that the original proposer – MK – was a member of One Dulwich (1D) *Chair – we have members from both sides, not considered pertinent to the SGM meeting*
- Member BC - Could proposers/seconders provide their declarations of interest (DOIs)? *Proposer/Seconder outlined their DOIs. A question was also raised about membership of the T&E sub-committee. Chair – it is wrong to suggest that the T&E sub-committee is comprised of members of cycling groups. The T&E Sub-Committee has a varied membership.*
- Member JH would like to pursue his previous request to join the T&E sub-committee. *Chair – will follow up separately.*
- Member AT applied to join the T&E sub-committee, attended a meeting as a guest and wanted to know why she was not invited to join the sub-committee. *Chair – the decision was made in line with the recruitment process.*
- Member SE suggested there was a degree of hypocrisy by organisations seeking improved governance standards on the part of the DS when they themselves were not publishing their minutes or names of committee members. *Seconder – the meeting is about the DS. The DS has*

been in existence for many years as a charitable organisation and therefore should have appropriate standards.

- Member SW (T&E sub-committee member) said that Alastair Hanton, former Chair of the T&E sub-committee had always asked for declarations of interest which were recorded in the T&E minutes. AH was open about the organisations he was related to.
- Member SW queried why there had been an issue about recruiting new sub-committee members when at the SGM longstanding members of the DS were asking to join the T&E sub-committee. There had also been an influx of recent Society joiners as T&E sub-committee members. Chair reconfirmed there had been difficulties about recruiting new sub-committee members. The T&E Chair, HW, confirmed he was not a new member but a longstanding member of the Society as part of his household.
- Member AW was surprised to learn that sub-committee minutes were not routinely published and said there was nothing complicated about declarations of interest.
- Member PB (Executive Committee) said no one had come forward to join the Licensing Sub-Committee of which she was Chair.
- Member DT (Seconder) said there were myriad ways to recruit new members and focusing on achievements could make the sub-committees more appealing.
- Member SB (Secretary) reminded the meeting that the Society Executive had agreed to support Motion 1.
- Member DC suggested a maximum term of three years for Chairs of sub-committees. A time limit would encourage more people to volunteer. Chair – good in theory but another local society with a time limit experienced difficulties in finding new committee members when the time limit expired.

#### 4. Vote on Motion 1

The Chair then called for the vote on Motion 1 which took place on a Zoom Poll overseen by the Society Secretary. All votes were registered on the Zoom Poll.

[After the meeting, the results were vetted against the Society membership list and results published on the Society website and in the Society newsletter on 30th June 2021 – see **Appendix 5**]

#### 5. Motion 2

Motion 2 was presented to the meeting and read out by the Chairman. After the reading of the motion, Amanda Lord spoke to propose the motion which was seconded by Tyrrell Evans.

*The Society must undertake a formal, independent and impartial survey of its Membership about the remit the Membership wishes the Society to adopt with regard to the Society's long-term policy position on Travel and Environment. The findings of this consultation with members to be published in full on the Society's website and available on request to all members.*

*For clarity, the current remit of the Travel and Environment Sub-Committee is to foster safe and healthy streets in Dulwich by:*

- *Advocating clean air.*
- *Supporting improvements in public transport.*
- *Considering the requirements of those with protected characteristics\* and vulnerable road users.*
- *Developing safe active travel networks and reducing vehicle traffic.*
- *Supporting low traffic neighbourhoods. \*\**

*\*The Equality Act lists the characteristics that it protects as age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, and sexual orientation.*

*\*\*Note: “supporting low traffic neighbourhoods” does NOT refer to or mean supporting the Low Traffic Neighbourhoods imposed by Southwark Council without prior consultation.*

**The statements of the proposer and seconder can be found in Appendix 2.**

The Chair thanked Ms Lord and Dr Evans for their statements.

The Society Secretary Sue Badman made a statement on behalf of the Dulwich Society Executive Committee in response, opposing the motion.

**Sue Badman’s statement can be found in Appendix 3.**

6. Questions/points on Motion 2 (responses if any in blue)

- Member AH (Member of the T&E sub-committee) said there was a fundamental inconsistency within the T&E remit which needed rethinking to ensure it covered all aspects of the road networks.
- Member RA referred to an article in the Society Spring Journal by the Chair of the T&E Sub-Committee which supported evidence-based data rather than relying on gut reaction. Surely a survey would be evidence-based data?
- Member SE - paying for an independent survey could be tantamount to a misuse of charitable funds and asked whether the Society trustees had sought legal advice on this point and whether the proposers had conducted an internal review before rushing to put forward motions. *Society Secretary – no legal advice has yet been sought but we will seek legal advice if the motion is carried. Proposer – the main concern of the proposers of the motion is that views should not be represented as the opinion of the Dulwich Society unless first ascertained.*
- Member – We know the LTN issue has divided Dulwich. Holding a survey, which would cost the Society, would only demonstrate how deeply divided Dulwich is. The losing side would be unhappy with the results and the Society would have no option but to stand aside and be neutral.
- Member JL – surveys would have to be conducted by all the sub-committees which would increase the costs, and views will change over time. *Chair – Motion 2 would only apply to the T&E sub-committee.*
- Member HB – a survey is premature while the effects of the pandemic are still being felt.
- Member KS – Does the Society have an obligation to its members or to the wider community as well? *Chair – to the wider community.*
- Member BC – extremely narrow proposal which does not cover the whole of transport and certainly not the implementation of current legislation in relation to vehicles. How about a campaign to enforce the 20mph limit?
- Member SG – we need to change our habits due to climate change but has anyone thought of alternative options? There is a significant tranche of older people who will be unable or unwilling to cycle because it is not safe. It is disappointing the council did not pursue the camera-based permit system that was discussed during the “Our Healthy Streets” consultation.
- Member TH (member of the T&E sub-committee) – it is key to public engagement that expert voices are consulted before seeking input from the community. TH highlighted the need for more education on climate change.

- Member TH (member of the T&E sub-committee) How do the proposers suggest we seek the views of the wider community? **Proposers: The Society must take into the account the views of the wider community but the views that the Society represents should be those of the membership, not the wider community. Member TH: The T&E sub-committee does not put forward views but gives advice to the Executive Committee. We are not putting the views of members; we are trying to give an expert view.**
- Member JH – the motion asks the Society to find out what the membership thinks before it gives an opinion. It is quite unfortunate that the Society sends an opinion to the council saying we have not conducted a survey “but we are all in favour of a radical solution.” That is the heart of the problem. I support this motion that before we give a view that this is what the membership thinks, we should ask the membership. If we are unable to ask the membership for reasons of practicalities or cost, then we should remain neutral.

#### 7. Vote on Motion 2

The Chair then called for the vote on Motion 2 which took place on a Zoom Poll overseen by the Society Secretary. All votes were registered on the Zoom Poll.

[After the meeting, the results were vetted against the Society membership list and results published on the Society website and in the Society enewsletter on 30th June 2021 - **see Appendix 5**]

#### 8. Chair – Closing Remarks and End of Meeting

The Chair closed the meeting, thanked members for a constructive meeting and reiterated when the results would be available.

Sue Badman

Secretary, Dulwich Society

3 September 2021

#### POST MEETING:

An anonymised and annotated transcript of the **Zoom Meeting Chat is available at Appendix 4.**

The Secretary downloaded the Zoom Participant List and Poll results which were sent to the Co-Host Sharon O’Connor and Membership Secretary for vetting and checking against the Society membership list. The results were reviewed and approved with the Society Chair and Secretary and the results were then published on the Society website and in the Society enewsletter on 30<sup>th</sup> June 2021. **The results are available at Appendix 5.**

## **Appendix 1 - Dulwich Society Special General Meeting 28<sup>th</sup> June 2021**

### Agenda Item 1: Introduction by the Chair, Ian McInnes

1. Introduction: I am Ian McInnes, Chair of the Dulwich Society. Good evening and welcome to the Special General Meeting. This has been called at the request of a number of Society members. Please ensure you are muted and that you have posted your first name and surname otherwise your vote will not be counted. Households each have one vote.
2. Motions: The purpose of the meeting is to discuss two motions proposed by members and there will be no amendments. There will be NO discussion on the current Southwark Council LTN consultation. All questions or comments about the current set of temporary traffic measures MUST be addressed to the Council through their communication channels and not at the meeting.
3. The Travel and Environment Sub-Committee: While the two motions are directed specifically at the make-up and ongoing remit of the T&E Sub-Committee, there are six other Sub-Committees which will be affected by Motion 1 and the decision will impact on these committees.

The other Sub-Committees are:

- Planning & Architecture
  - Gardens
  - Licensing
  - Local History
  - Trees
  - Wildlife
4. Validation of voting: An online vote will be taken after each motion. It will not be possible to give the result this evening as all names have to be checked against the society's membership list. The results will be published in the next eNewsletter, which is due out on Wednesday evening, and on the society's website.
  5. Behaviour: In view of recent events and abusive comments on social media, attendance at the meeting will require civilised behaviour and the chat box has been disabled – any questions will require attendees to raise their hands or use the Zoom hand signal. An individual or group who is disruptive, is aggressive or rude about other individuals or groups, or refuses to cease talking when asked to by the Chair, will be asked to stop. If the behaviour continues, the participant will be moved to the waiting room for five minutes before being re-admitted. If the behaviour recurs, the participant will be ejected from the meeting. The Chair reserves the right to close the meeting prematurely if behaviour from participants is unacceptable after warnings.
  6. [The Agenda is shown on a slide.] The 3-minute speeches will be timed. There will be an opportunity for questions after the speakers. 15 minutes has been allowed for questions which

can be put to the proposers/seconders of the motions and to the responders from the Society Executive. The vote will take place after the questions.

7. The meeting must end by 9.30pm.

## **Appendix 2 - Dulwich Society SGM Monday 28 June speeches by the proposers and seconders of Motions 1 and 2.**

### **Motion 1 – proposer Tim Connellan**

We believe a clear process about the appointment of members to sub-committees should be published on the Society's website, together with minutes of all meetings, and declarations of interest.

With regard to the process of appointing members to sub-committees, the current explanation on the website (which differs from the insert in the Society's Journal) is that interested members attend the next meeting of a sub-committee as a guest. After this (and I quote): 'A decision would then be made whether to invite you to join the sub-committee at that point, based on an assessment of your potential contribution and on the need for a balance of views and skills within the sub-committee.'

Unfortunately, there is still a lack of clarity here. This goes against the [Charity Governance Code](#), which says that the board of trustees must make sure that the charity is clear and open about the ways that members can participate in the charity's governance, including serving on committees.

To demonstrate this lack of clarity, we put forward some sample questions about the process of appointment, which the Society answered in the newsletter briefing it sent round to members on 23 June. From these answers we now know that a potential member is assessed by three people – the sub-committee's chair and secretary, and the Society's chair – rather than by the whole sub-committee; that there is no time limit for members to serve on sub-committees; and that the ideal size of a sub-committee is about 12. This is all new information that hasn't been shared before, which seems to suggest that the process of appointing members to sub-committees is being made up as we go along. This is not good governance.

We understand that sub-committees are not decision-making bodies. But they do make recommendations to the Executive Committee and so have influence. Because of this, clarity on appointments is vital. There have been recent cases of members putting themselves forward for the Travel and Environment Committee who have been turned down (even though others were appointed) because of some unspecified standard or requirement. I declare an interest here – this happened to me. I wanted to join the committee to help represent a balance of views, as so many of its current members, including the chair and secretary (who we now understand are key to appointing new members), belong to lobby groups that publicly favour road closures.

I urge you to support this motion in the interests of openness and transparency

### **Motion 1 – seconder David Taylor**

I second this motion.

As a charity, the Dulwich Society has to be clear and open in all its work. Tim referred to the Charity Governance Code, which identifies openness and accountability as one of its key principles. A clear process explaining how members are elected to sub-committees, and how long they will serve, should be on the website as a matter of course, as should minutes of sub-committee meetings and declarations of interest. This is simply good governance.

Publishing declarations of interest – which would include, for example, membership of other organisations and lobby groups – would be a good way of helping us all to see that there is indeed a balance of views on each committee.

This kind of clarity would also avoid the Society putting itself in the position of turning down people who have offered their time and skills as volunteers – something that can't be a pleasant experience for the person concerned and doesn't do the Society's reputation any favours either.

In addition, the Society should consider publishing minutes retrospectively, so that members in June 2021 – and especially new members joining the Society – have a record of past meetings over previous months and years. As members of the Society, we might have found it helpful to know, for example, that our two Dulwich Village ward councillors regularly attended the Travel & Environment sub-committee meetings – but not other sub-committee meetings – until the beginning of this year.

It's important to remember that the Dulwich Society is a membership organisation. The members are the Society. We elect the Executive Committee, and the chairs of sub-committees, at the AGM each year, trusting that they will act in our best interests. Key to this is genuine and open two-way communication about values, decisions, processes and achievements. Publishing minutes of meetings, and declarations of interest, is one way of ensuring that this communication is open and effective.

I commend this motion to you.

### **Motion 2 – proposer Amanda Lord**

The [Charity Governance Code](#) advises that trustees should make sure that charities look for, value and take into account members' views on key issues.

A formal, independent and impartial survey on the Society's long-term position on travel and the environment – a crucial issue that affects the daily lives of residents and the wider local community, and directly impacts the amenities of Dulwich – would help the Society to look for and value its members' views.

Such a survey would be completely separate to any consultations or surveys carried out by the Council on specific measures or schemes.

However, because the Council regularly consults the Society, treating it as one of its key stakeholders in Dulwich, the Society should take particular care when adopting a position on behalf of its members. If the Society does not conduct a survey of its members on its long-term position on travel and environment, and so doesn't know what its members' views are, it should remain neutral in all Council consultations.

This has not been the case in the past. In Phase 2 of [Our Healthy Streets Dulwich](#) for example, in December 2019, the Society formally responded by saying, "While the Society has not carried out a systematic survey of its members' views, it appears clear that the membership is in favour of radical solutions..." Presenting Phase 3 in early 2020, the Council echoed the same wording, saying: "You told us you favoured radical action..."

The Society's recent briefing of 23 June includes a letter sent to the Council on 16 February 2020 which it is said "supersedes" its earlier correspondence cited above, and concludes "In summary, the Society is sympathetic to the aims of the proposals, but it must be guided by its members." However sympathetic the Executive Committee may be, the Society cannot purport to represent the views of its membership unless and until it has ascertained what those views and sympathies are.

Finally, we are confused by the inclusion of the recently re-drafted remit of the Travel & Environment committee in the Society's response to this motion, unless this is intended to show the Society's long-term position. If so, it could be considerably improved. For example, the Society asserts that "low traffic neighbourhoods" is generic rather than specific, even though the phrase is now understood to mean exactly the kind of scheme of road closures currently operating in Dulwich. It is also hard to believe that support for such measures can be unqualified, because there must be circumstances in which a particular "low traffic neighbourhood" would benefit one part of Dulwich but have a negative impact on Dulwich as a whole.

In conclusion, we believe that understanding members' views in order to define the core principles that will shape the Society's future policy on travel and environment is a crucial next step.

### **Motion 2 – seconder Tyrrell Evans**

I second this motion.

The Council consults the Society, believes it has influence, and has in the past suggested that it considers that the Society reflects the views of local residents. In this context and on this particular issue, while there is no requirement in the constitution for the Executive Committee to canvass members' opinions, it is crucial that the Society either conducts a formal survey so that it can be sure it is reflecting what its membership thinks, or it takes a neutral position when formally asked for its views.

By way of example, let me explain how I am approaching the task of representing my neighbours' views on the Burbage Road Residents' Association, where I am acting chair of our traffic and roads sub-committee. I have lived in the road, in the same house, for nearly 40 years and know many of my neighbours very well. But when we make a formal presentation from the RA to the council about the local road measures, I don't believe I can guess what people on my road think about this issue specifically without asking them. So we are conducting a survey. I believe surveys like this are an essential part of representing people's views. If a survey can't be conducted, no formal summary of views should be attempted – it simply wouldn't be fair or accurate.

And it is important to understand that this motion is not asking the Society to conduct surveys on each and every issue. That would be impossible. The Executive Committee says – in the Society's newsletter briefing – that the survey we propose "would be fraught with difficulty as any view the Society would hold on this subject would change to reflect the circumstances at the time". But this completely misses the point, as the motion is about securing a survey to establish the CORE PRINCIPLES that will determine policies on particular traffic and environmental issues that will arise going forward. It is hard to see how such an approach can be objected to – the Executive Committee, surely, would not wish to argue

that the Society should not be aware of the core principles the members would expect the Society to pursue?

This motion is entirely reasonable and sensible, and I commend it to you.

## **Appendix 3 - Minutes of the Dulwich Society SGM 28<sup>th</sup> June 2021**

### **Speeches by Responders to the two motions from the Dulwich Society**

#### **RESPONSE TO MOTION 1 – Ian McInnes**

##### **The Dulwich Society Executive Committee has no objection to the first motion.**

The Society looks for new members of sub-committees in several ways. Firstly, in new members' welcome letters we invite them to contact members of the Executive Committee if they wish to play an active part in the Society. Secondly, we place advertisements for new sub-committee members, when necessary, in the Society's eNewsletter and Journal and, if that fails to attract applicants, the Society relies on personal contacts or recommendations. The Society's chair and secretary review the names with the relevant sub-committee chair and the potential member is asked to attend the next sub-committee meeting as a guest. After this meeting a decision will be made whether to invite the person to join the sub-committee. This decision will be made by the Chair, the Secretary and the Chair of the Sub-Committee based on the need for a balance of views within the sub-committee as well as an assessment of whether a new member would contribute constructively to its work. This is in line with rule 8 of the Society constitution.

We need the sub-committees to function correctly and don't want endless infighting. Up to now this has been the method we have used; the web site is quite clear about this. This is the way we have done it and there have been no complaints up to now on that score.

*(There may have been a slight variation in words used during the meeting)*

#### **RESPONSE TO MOTION 2 – Sue Badman**

##### **The Dulwich Society Executive Committee is not in favour of the second motion.**

The aims and objectives of the Society are quite clear, they are to foster and safeguard the amenities of Dulwich, both in the interests of its residents and the wider local community of which it is a part, and to increase awareness of the varied character that makes the area so special.

The Society is managed by the Executive Committee comprising the Society chair, vice-chair, secretary, treasurer, membership secretary and the chairs of the specialist sub-committees. This is the decision-making body and members are all elected at the Annual General Meeting. We follow the Charity Commission's guidelines which state that we must be governed by our rules. There is no requirement in the Society's constitution for the Executive Committee to canvass the members' opinions, nor would it be appropriate given the Society's objective of serving the wider local community.

In this case, a survey of members' views on the Society's long term policy position on Travel and the Environment would be fraught with difficulty as any view the Society would hold on this subject would change over time to reflect circumstances at any one time.

It should be noted that the T&E sub-committee cannot make any decisions on behalf of the Society but is expected to investigate a wide range of issues affecting the community across

the full demographic including air pollution and monitoring, rail services and infrastructure, new public transport services, accessibility, aircraft noise, road safety, use and layout, parking, government & TfL guidelines and mandates on the climate emergency. We work closely with organisations like the London Forum of Amenity Societies as well as the council and other local bodies.

The survey proposed by this motion is not a survey about the current emergency temporary traffic measures. The Council is currently running a detailed public consultation on these measures where everyone in the area, not just Society members, is able to comment. This will be far more representative than any survey that the Society could carry out.

There is also the question of resources and funding - the Society is a volunteer organisation, and a registered charity, and running a survey would not be a good use of the Society's resources when there is no obvious benefit to be gained.

There is free survey software for a small survey, but this approach would certainly not be formal, independent or impartial. Ipsos Mori rates start at £1000 for an online survey, and we have been told that a first base independent survey could cost about £10,000-£20,000. It is not clear though what size a survey would be nor how questions would be developed. It might be difficult to reach agreement on a set of meaningful and impartial questions, and there would be cost/resource in analysing any free text permitted – the costs would be likely to escalate substantially. It should be noted the Council themselves have struggled with the effort required to analyse free text in their surveys.

Turning to our response to the two year Our Healthy Streets (OHS) programme, it quickly became clear at public meetings that opinions in the community were sharply divided and the messaging from the council unclear over permits and traffic pilots. Our final OHS letter to the council in Feb 2020 highlighted concerns about pollution, traffic volume and displacement, that improving public transport was essential for a holistic solution, and the needs of the less mobile & disabled were crucial. The Society was sympathetic to the aims of the proposals but with differing views it was up to members to write individually.

OHS was suspended due to the Covid emergency, and the Secretary of State for Transport fast-tracked statutory guidance in the expectation that local authorities and TfL would move quickly to deliver schemes to promote active travel in their areas. This led to the experimental schemes in Dulwich Village. The ETMO decision record by the Cabinet Member promised "that any necessary adjustments that need to be made can be done so during the experimental period", yet the consultation has been delayed, little has been done over the past 12 months to relieve difficulties experienced by residents over the displacement in the boundary roads and by the poor signage. **The Society has been very vocal to both Southwark and Lambeth Councils about its concerns on the traffic measures and the raw deal that residents are experiencing. Our recommendation though is that members should direct their concerns to Southwark Council and complete the council survey.**

*(There may have been a slight variation in words used during the meeting)*

## Appendix 4 - Dulwich Society Special General Meeting 28th June 2021

### Chat Transcript (redacted – members full names removed - and annotated)

- 20:12:45 From Sue Badman, DS Secretary: The statement about appointment of committee members is on the About the Dulwich Society page below Exec minutes.  
<https://www.dulwichsociety.com/about-the-dulwich-society>
- 20:13:48 From two members to Sue Badman, DS Secretary (Direct Message): There were 60 who asked for this.
- 20:16:14 From Sue Badman, DS Secretary: To clarify, it was made clear that the proposers wished to be known as a group of members of the Dulwich Society.
- 20:22:07 From Sue Badman, DS Secretary: Please note we have had a published Conflict of Interest Policy on our About the Dulwich Society page since 2016.  
<https://www.dulwichsociety.com/about-the-dulwich-society>
- 20:27:30 From Member S to Sue Badman, DS Secretary (Direct Message): Sue, Ian stated that any changes for the Traffic and Environment C'ttee would have to apply to all other sub c'ttees. What is the basis of that?
- 20:30:55 From Sue Badman, DS Secretary to Member S : Hi S, Happy to give you a full answer by email. (Secretary responded after the meeting and confirmed that the declaration of interest rules would apply to all sub-committees without exception)
- 20:32:32 From Member S to Sue Badman, DS Secretary (Direct Message) : Sue, thanks
- 20:33:13 From Member R to Sue Badman, DS Secretary (Direct Message): Where is the voting form??
- 20:34:33 From Member D to Sue Badman, DS Secretary (Direct Message): Presumably one of Colin & Brian has already voted! (Secretary note: Member D noted that Colin and Brian were sharing a screen but were two different households and paying members so entitled to a vote each)
- 20:34:53 From Members C & L to Sue Badman, DS Secretary (Direct Message): we are 2
- 20:35:37 From Member R to Sue Badman, DS Secretary (Direct Message): I couldn't find the voting form, so can you log me in favour?? [Secretary: Yes, this was done]
- 20:36:11 From Member J1 to Sue Badman, DS Secretary (Direct Message): Hi Sue are you publishing results of the polls now?
- 20:37:25 From Member J2 to Sue Badman, DS Secretary (Direct Message): Hi Sue, is there an estimate of how much such an independent and impartial survey and analysis would cost? How can we vote on a motion with no understanding of the motions impact or costs?
- 20:38:13 From Sue Badman, DS Secretary to Member J1 : No. We will publish in the newsletter on Wednesday.
- 20:38:34 From Member J1 to Sue Badman, DS Secretary (Direct Message): ok thanks I thought I heard that but wasn't sure.
- 20:38:52 From Sue Badman, DS Secretary to Member J2 : I will refer to this in my response. (Secretary SB made the response to the 2nd motion)

20:39:01 From Member J2 to Sue Badman, DS Secretary (Direct Message): Thank you.

20:39:25 From Member J2 to Sue Badman, DS Secretary (Direct Message): From past [elected office] work I'd guess £10-20k

20:40:06 From Member J2 to Sue Badman, DS Secretary (Direct Message): Will every sub-committee need to do this more generally?

20:44:17 From Member J3 to Sue Badman, DS Secretary (Direct Message): Apart from being a distraction these motions just feel like an attempt to drag the Dulwich Society into a culture war.

20:51:31 From Sue Badman, DS Secretary to Member J3: Thanks, J3 and noted.

21:01:14 From Member J4 to Sue Badman, DS Secretary (Direct Message): I wish to record that I am not only over 50, but 72 and I cycle every day in Dulwich.

21:02:29 From Sue Badman, DS Secretary to Member J4 (Direct Message) : Noted, thanks. Thumbs up. That is terrific.

21:06:38 From Members C & L to Sue Badman, DS Secretary (Direct Message): we are joint members C & L S

21:08:30 From Member S to Sue Badman, DS Secretary (Direct Message): Tune Sailing by....

21:08:55 From Member D to Sue Badman, DS Secretary (Direct Message): thank you Ian

21:09:19 From Members T & L to Sue Badman, DS Secretary (Direct Message): When will results come out?

21:09:29 From Member S to Sue Badman, DS Secretary (Direct Message): Sue, Ian, Thank you.

21:09:31 From Member J5 to Sue Badman, DS Secretary (Direct Message): Just to say thank you very much Sue, well done

Produced by: S Badman, 2021

## **Appendix 5 - DULWICH SOCIETY SPECIAL GENERAL MEETING – POLL RESULTS ON MOTIONS**

Following the end of the meeting, the Zoom reports on participants and voting were downloaded. These were cross-referenced with the membership list and the votes were then counted and validated. The results were as follows:

Motion 1: That the process for appointment of members of the Society's sub-committees and all minutes of their meetings must be published on the Society's website, including declarations of interest.

The motion was carried by 90 votes to 53, with 4 abstentions

The Society's Executive Committee had already agreed to this motion and, following the next Executive Committee meeting on 12th July, a more detailed statement about the process for the appointment of members of the Society's sub-committees will be prepared and published on the Society's website, along with minutes of the future sub-committee meetings, including declarations of interest.

Motion 2: The Society must undertake a formal, independent and impartial survey of its Membership about the remit the Membership wishes the Society to adopt with regard to the Society's long term policy position on Travel and Environment. The findings of this consultation with Members to be published in full on the Society's website and available on request to all members.

The motion was rejected by 79 votes to 67, with 3 abstentions

Published by the Dulwich Society on 30 June 2021

Note: Only one vote per household was permitted – membership is per household. 168 participants were registered as attending the SGM on Zoom but not every participant voted in the polls. 8 were not registered members and therefore not entitled to vote. In addition, one household voted twice so one set of votes was discounted.