

2018 AGM Ruled Out of Order Motions

The motions below were received for consideration for the Cycling UK 2018 AGM. The reasons for ruling the motions out of order is recorded below.

Motion passed at the Cycling UK 2016 AGM:

This AGM proposes that any amended or rejected motions should be published (redacted if confidential personal information is involved) on the website with subsequent communications.

No.	Motion	Reason	Proposer	Seconded	Board response
1.	The CTC to promote research (hopefully DfT funded) investigating any connection between wearing helmets and the accident rate which, according to several reports, appears to increase with helmet usage.	<p>Reports and accident data raise concerns that helmet usage results in a higher accident rate per km or hour cycled.</p> <p>Robinson's 1996 report provided injury data for children from Australia. For children in NSW and Victoria the relative injury rate proportional to cycling levels increased 59% and 15% respectively.</p> <p>Erke and Elvik 2007 reported; "There is evidence of increased accident risk per cycling-km for cyclists wearing a helmet. In Australia and New Zealand, the increase is estimated to be around 14 per cent."</p> <p>Porter 2016 USA report detailed that cyclists wearing helmets had more than twice the odds of suffering an injury than cyclists not wearing helmets.</p> <p>Clarke 2012 reported on New Zealand and changes to the injury rate per</p>	Colin Clarke	Adam Peters	<p>This motion is ruled out of order because it is not Cycling UK's role to promote new research and Cycling UK does not have the resources to commission such research in any event. Even if it did, there would be other priorities above commissioning new research on helmets, where we have a much debated and long settled policy that decisions and choices regarding helmet wearing are matters of personal choice, and we would prefer to focus on other issues wherever possible.</p> <p>Cycling UK does however already publish the existing research concerning helmets. With one exception, the evidence cited in this motion is all contained in Cycling UK's evidence briefing on cycle helmets. This is downloadable from https://www.cyclinguk.org/campaigning/views-and-briefings/cycle-helmets, along with Cycling UK's evidence-based policy stance on helmets. We will add the</p>

No.	Motion	Reason	Proposer	Seconded	Board response
		<p>million hours of travel following helmet legislation in 1994. By 2003–07, cyclists had a 20% higher accident rate compared with pre-law. Other information shows a much larger increase than the 20% figure. Following Alberta’s helmet law, child cycling reduced, and injuries increased relative to cycling levels.</p>			<p>missing reference (namely the report by Porter, 2016), and thank the proposer of this motion for drawing it to our attention.</p>
2.	<p>The CTC provides (either alone or with others) a biennial (every two years) road safety 'Bikesafe' conference.</p>	<p>This would allow for technical research papers on topics and presentation of information, together with discussions of how best to improve conditions for cycling. A publication of 'Bikesafe' conference papers could be published every two years. This would promote UK cycling related research and highlight issues where improvements could be made based on current knowledge and where gaps in knowledge exist. This could be in addition to one day events that CTC already provide or combined in some form. Hopefully UK universities could be encouraged to become involved and provide suitable research or host the event. Cycling UK Right To Ride representatives should have access to the mini Velo type conference and contribute with their experience to the level of understanding required to advance the conditions for cycling. The above would be more than key note speakers and discussions, it would help promote and provide new research together with a publication of the research papers. This would result in UK cycling researchers coming together on a regular basis and</p>	Colin F Clarke	Adam Peters	<p>This motion is ruled out of order because organising a local volunteers’ conference on cycle safety research would involve a significant expenditure of both time and money. Hence, we have to decide whether it is a high priority, compared with other potential uses of those finite resources.</p> <p>The main focus of local campaigns volunteers’ efforts is on securing quality cycling infrastructure, and the funding and political support needed to achieve this. Unsurprisingly then, when local volunteers are asked to identify their top training needs, they focus on: the planning and design of cycle-friendly infrastructure; local transport and planning policy frameworks, understanding and influencing their local authorities and other decision-makers (e.g. local enterprise partnerships), effective use of the media and social media, and forming / running effective groups. Cycle safety research is not among the topics requested.</p> <p>Nor is it especially important to encourage local campaigners to engage with this topic. The issue of cycle helmets in particular is one we deal with</p>

No.	Motion	Reason	Proposer	Seconded	Board response
		working together to promote and improve conditions for cycling.			<p>primarily at the national (rather than the local) level – for instance, it will feature in our response to the Government’s Cycle Safety Review and our calls for a review of the Highway Code (as mandated by previous AGM motions). Meanwhile the few local campaigners who do deal with the helmet issue (e.g. those with local schools seeking to impose helmet rules) already have plenty of information to support them, through Cycling UK’s evidence briefing on cycle helmets – n.b. this is downloadable from https://www.cyclinguk.org/campaigning/views-and-briefings/cycle-helmets. This comprehensive summary of the evidence is well used and provides ample evidence to meet their needs.</p> <p>In short, organising a conference for local volunteers focusing on cycle safety research would therefore be costly and time-consuming, without any clear benefit.</p>
3.	That the time and place of the AGM be advertised better in the future and more widely; in the Cycle magazine, clearly on the website and via e-mail to the members.	Constitutional arrangements demonstrating openness and encouraging participation are what modern society demands. Lack of notice and information about the 2018 AGM adds to existing concerns about lack of transparency.	Ken Barker	Yann Maidment	This motion is ruled out of order because all reasonable measures to clearly advertise the AGM have been taken – way beyond the notification allowance in the Articles of Association. The date of the AGM was first published in the December/ January edition of Cycle magazine almost six months prior to the AGM on May 12 th (with the venue tbc); and further details including location of AGM published in the February / March edition (over three months prior to the AGM). Further details of the AGM have been included on the Cycling UK website - https://www.cyclinguk.org/agm ; and final details will be communicated to all

No.	Motion	Reason	Proposer	Seconded	Board response
					members in the April/May edition of Cycle and in our CycleClips newsletter.
4.	That the process of how the Trustees determine the mechanism by which ERS run the election of Trustees is made public and readily available on the website.	Forcing people to deploy all their preference votes is profoundly illiberal, undemocratic and works against the aims of the charity (by making members vote for candidates (s) whom they do not feel appropriate for election, in order to have their other preferences counted).	Ken Barker	Yann Maidment	<p>This motion is ruled out of order because the Trustees instruct ERS (the Electoral Reform Society) to manage the election of Trustees in order to ensure that the process is operated in a way that can be seen to be unbiased and comply with recognised best practice. Many charities use ERS for this reason.</p> <p>The decision to require members to use all their votes was made to reduce the risk of distorting the results. The trustees have already undertaken to consider this issue again when the election process is reviewed later this year and will communicate the result of that review to the membership.</p>
5.	That a reasonable and fair period of notice be given for the submission of motions to the 2019 (and subsequent AGMs), that being a minimum of 8 weeks.	Constitutional (and Binding) statement of minimum periods of notice for AGMs are democratic safeguards widely recognised and very commonly deployed. Departure from these norms is unusual and mostly regarded as poor corporate practice	Yann Maidment	Ken Barker	<p>This motion is ruled out of order because the Trustees receive and consider proposals for AGM motions throughout the year. The invitation for members to submit motions for the 2018 AGM went out in the December/January issue of Cycle as usual, which is well over 8 weeks before the meeting.</p> <p>The Trustees would welcome the early submission of suggestions for motions to future AGMs. They can then be considered, with input from the policy team in planning future AGMs.</p>