

## Jon Lloyd Facebook

Dated 11.11.2020

I have to agree with Helen Savidge on this. If this vote on the pinch point isn't in adherence with what the upcoming Constitution is proposing should be the framework for voting procedure and also with the terms for the vote that the Committee has already agreed at its own recent meeting, then surely it cannot be binding.

As the Committee is in a state of flux at present, it would make more sense to get the Constitution sorted first so that there is a commonly agreed procedure to be followed and THEN to hold any votes based on this procedure (although I'm not clear whether the Committee, lacking the necessary numbers at present to sign off anything, have the necessary ability to approve the Constitution at present?). Holding a vote first and then putting a framework in place for holding votes afterwards seems absurd. What is the rush to hold the PP vote first?

As I understand it, the whole reason for there being another vote on the PP was because of claims from some residents that the previous two PP votes had not been handled correctly and even-handedly by the Committee - and specifically that they did not honour their promise that the 2019 vote held after the PP had been in place for its trial period would contain a simple yes/no option on whether to retain it or not. Holding yet another supposedly 'definitive' vote that leaves itself open to further questions and challenges is hardly going to settle things.

I do wonder if it might be best if this all waits until a new Committee is in place. It does feel like we're going round in circles at present.

## Paula Facebook comment to Jon Lloyd

Jon Lloyd I must confess it was my idea to separate out the Constitution from the AGM paperwork. Because there was quite a lot of reading involved my reasoning was to get half term and Hallowe'en over, thereby giving those with families time to devote to it. Certainly nothing underhand involved I can assure you. Where the PP vote is concerned as you've stated we had requests for a straightforward yes/no vote and have an independent adjudicator to open the envelopes. It will be simply a majority vote to keep it or not. I had hoped my letter of 9/10 to you had explained our position. Perhaps residents who aren't happy with the timetable could comment on their voting forms please. We have three names willing to join the committee so if enough residents want a delay then I'm sure they would take this into account.

## Helen Savage comments to Paula

I am not understanding why it is a simple majority vote when the minutes of the committee state it is a 70% majority. Why are the remaining committee appearing to ignore their own minutes? This does not give me confidence. As Jon has said the vote has arisen because of concerns from residents about the manner and quality of previous votes.

The committee has a draft constitution ready to go out to residents, it has 3 new people ready to stand. Why is the remaining committee not able to make the decision to postpone the vote? Procedure and constitution could then be seen to be followed and would help give residents confidence in the new committee#