

Dear Jon

10.10.2020

With regards the pinch point yes / no vote requested by a very small minority of residents following a meeting with chairman Simon Scaddan and committee member Julie Mills, to which I believe you were part and the rejection of the majority vote of the last more inclusive poll.

You state in your post "*it is your understanding the whole reason for there being another vote on the PP was because of claims that the two PP votes had not been handled correctly or even handedly by the committee.*"

You are indeed mistaken and the committee has never acknowledged this. The first PP vote taken at the 2018 AGM was in accordance with past voting parameters with a majority show of hands in favour of the PP. The reason for the revote put forward by anti PP residents to the committee was that it was not an Agenda Item and the whole road should have been consulted together with its legality.

This was because it was proposed by a member of the attendees on the night and strictly the vote should have stood.

The Committee then bowed to the minority request for a second Yes/No vote of the whole road by paper ballot. This was independently adjudicated by No 19 Derby Road who was not on the committee with again a majority vote received in favour of 72.5% for the PP to go ahead.

The committee by way of neutrality agreed to a six month trial with a review at the AGM 2019 and a revote.

Following review of our files at no time was it stated or promised that the PP re vote would be a Yes / No vote.

Following discussion, the committee concluded a more comprehensive vote / survey following the six month trial period would be informative with regard to how the PP was received and operated, should it be retained.

The committee did not agree with the assessment, again by a small number of residents, that the questions favoured the retention of the PP. Should a strong enough majority have existed for the PP removal this could have been achieved with the above poll.

The revote has not arisen because of concerns from residents about the manner and quality of the previous votes but our chairman's eagerness to please all.

So we are where we are, a final Yes / No vote and even before the completion of the voting we have the same dissenting voices that requested the yes / no vote earlier in the year.

The full committee gave due consideration to the voting format and it is not influenced or in contradiction to the incoming constitution and so will be taken as the final vote on the retention or removal of the PP.

To clarify Helen Savage's confusion at the end of the post, the 70% Simon Scaddan refers to in the last meeting minutes was indeed relating to the proposed Constitution.

Since that committee meeting this has been changed to a 51% majority vote and so accords with Paula's post.

This was agreed by the majority of the committee.

Nor will the installation of a new committee influence the outcome of the vote.

Regards David Moro
Treasurer
F & B O Derby Road Fund