

Older People's Council

Monday 1 August 2018, 10-11.15am.

Brooke Mead, Albion Street, Brighton

No	Item	Who
	<p>Present:</p> <p>Elected</p> <p>Colin Vincent (Chair)</p> <p>Mike Bojczuk</p> <p>Francis Tonks</p> <p>Co-opted</p> <p>Michael Whitty</p> <p>Jack Hazelgrove</p> <p>John Cook</p> <p>Attending</p> <p>Mel Willson, Possability People</p>	<p>CV</p> <p>MB</p> <p>FT</p> <p>MW</p> <p>JH</p> <p>JC</p> <p>MWI</p>
425	<p>PROCEDURAL BUSINESS</p>	
425.1	<p>All agreed to change the Members section of the Agenda/minutes to elected and co-opted and remove the Older Peoples Council reference as they all know who is part of the OPC.</p> <p>ACTION: To amend future agendas and minutes as above.</p>	MWI
426	<p>CONSTITUTION</p> <p>426.1 JC- Why is this meeting on a Monday?</p> <p>CV – I agree it is not normally on a Monday, however this meeting was called for a special reason.</p> <p>JC – Before we start we need 2/3's majority to make changes. There are 2/3's here that will not be voting for the changes.</p> <p>MW – We need a resolution before deciding. Why are you here?</p> <p>JC – For the interest and wellbeing of older people in Brighton and Hove. I am raising a point of order. It's a waste of time knowing that we are not voting.</p>	

<p>FT – Can't be changed without 2/3's, we are here to have a discussion. It is clear we will not be voting for a change.</p> <p>MW – This is out of order, it is mutiny to sign outside of the meeting and is disruptive and disorderly. It's outrageous.</p> <p>MB – We need to push forward to keep OPC existing. The constitution is out of date and we are here to get views and move forward. Shame if it falls apart as shows we can't exist as a body and we should dissolve. We can agree to dissolve as in the constitution?</p> <p>JH – Sad state of affairs for us to get to by not having the amount of elected members. There are no women in OPC. Priority is rebuilding membership, consulting with the wider public and then address the constitution.</p> <p>FT – We do need to discuss with the public, hold open meetings and decide if we are a membership organisation with money or showing interest. I am not happy to go with this, it is not criticism to MB and thank you. It is right to take out the reference to the council. We need a radical change.</p> <p>MW – I agree the numbers are sadly depleted and there are no women. We can appeal at AGM for members to co-opt for a 2 year period and then go back to the constitution after. We do need things to do and to motivate people.</p> <p>JH – Thanks for the reminding us of the 1 year extension, this gives us more time to reconsider where we are going and time to lobby the councillors who might not be aware of 1. Failed to consult and 2. Year's extension of £5,000. I am in no means convinced they are right in thinking there is no support for the OPC. We can take note of the proposals and take to the next meeting. The council have been spending lots of money on older peoples stuff since the change.</p> <p>JC – It is clear there is not 2/3's to change the constitution. Without consulting the wider membership will be disrespectful.</p> <p>FT – We need a press officer, we are concerned about toilets, benches, transport and 101 things, and this is done on the quiet as lobbying.</p> <p>MW- We can go the September meeting to see who is interested, they can come to one meetings to see how we work then co-opt and following on can change this to the wider membership. We need to show we are still working and not doing nothing, showing we use the £5,000. It is a policy document for executive members of OPC.</p> <p>JC – Not correct.</p> <p>CV – It is correct.</p> <p>MB confirmed the current constitution does say amendments are to be made by elected and co-opted members, doesn't allow opening to wider members.</p>	
--	--

	<p>JC – OPC can make a decision.</p> <p>CV – As the committee members (elected and co-opted) we make changes in the constitution, not the public. The constitution is written by the OPC.</p> <p>MW – The council are not involved any longer, should be OPC writing the constitution and any amendments by the members can be put forward. We must draft it. The meeting should be about the draft regardless if 2/3's are not voting. We would discuss, verify and clarify.</p> <p>CV – There seems to be underhanded activity, disappointed this is this case. JH rightly said we should be doing these things. Nothing to prevent what's been said today to have been said a long time ago. There has been a lack of effect and more effort needs to be put in. It has become more naval gazing over the last 3-4 months. If the feeling of the majority is not to do anything we should close the meeting and see what happens at the AGM. In many respects I agree with JD and we should do these things.</p> <p>MW – We need a vote and on their heads if OPC disappears.</p> <p>JC- Comments are irrelevant, we need to discuss with members.</p> <p>MW – The constitution states we can amend here.</p> <p>JC – Of course we can amend, we need 2/3's majority.</p> <p>MB – Article 15, Para D – for the constitution to be change, 2/3's majority is needed.</p> <p>CV – To close the meeting.</p> <p>JC – You have no authority to do this, the chair is to listen to the council, and the council has power to discuss at the meeting.</p> <p>JH – There is nothing backhanded, we are trying to save an hours meeting.</p> <p>MW – Why sign a document outside of a meeting?</p> <p>FT- It is impossible to get things on the agenda.</p> <p>JH- We can propose, don't debate or decide on the constitution as per MB. It will be 3 for 3 again.</p> <p>All agreed to take a vote on whether to continue with changing the constitution today. 3 voted for and 3 voted against.</p> <p>CV – In light of what has gone on this morning, as the chair I abstain from voting.</p> <p>The vote changed to 2 for and 3 against.</p>	
427 427.1	<p>Speakers</p> <p>CV – Anyone for speakers?</p> <p>MWI – Lilly has arranged 2 speakers for 10 September 2018; Sarah Potter (from adaptations to a talk about the disabled facilities grant from 10am and</p>	

	<p>Daniel Yates for the last half hour).</p> <p>JH – The next meeting should be a full discussion and debate, where MW presents the paper, with no speakers. To debate the future of OPC with members of public. MW presents the constitution and we have wider discussion on how the OPC should continue in the future.</p> <p>MB – It is disrespectful of OPC to turn around and say no to the speakers now. Open up the following meetings to the public.</p> <p>JC - We are not saying we no longer need the speakers, just postpone.</p> <p>MB – Have both speakers, announce following meeting is open to everyone.</p> <p>MW – It might encourage more people to attend.</p> <p>CV – Need to get the leader of the council to the meetings, listen to what he says and what the future is. To get the attention of the leader of the council before discussing our future. JH is keen to have this and we have the opportunity.</p> <p>JH – In the run up to the election, to invite leaders of all parties to a public meeting in turn.</p> <p>MB –I propose to keep the speakers as booked and members come to the following meeting to discuss the constitution and ask for co-opted members for 2 years.</p> <p>MW – I second this, concerned about the debate at next meeting with speakers there and will not attract members .I support MB.</p> <p>Vote took place; 3 voted in favour of speakers, 3 voted against.</p> <p>CV – We will maintain the speakers.</p> <p>CV – I asked Lilly to put in the press.</p> <p>MWI handed out the posters created.</p> <p>MB – I will email people and put on Facebook.</p>	
428	<p>Co-opting of member</p> <p>428.1 JC – We can put items forward for the agenda, is that correct?</p> <p>FT – Yes</p> <p>CV – Yes</p> <p>JC – The item I sent you, you have decided not to include, what right have you to exclude?</p> <p>CV – This is a special meeting for the constitution, I have exercised this right as chair.</p> <p>JC – The chair has no power or rights apart from chairing, power rests with OPC. Items were submitted and I expect you to acknowledge.</p>	

CV – I have not seen the items.

JC – I emailed them to you.

MW – I have seen.

JC- They were sent weeks ago. Why have they not been discussed?

CV- I have not seen.

MB – We can have a discussion about this and then AOB for next meetings.

MW – Can raise and don't have to give answers on the day, without advanced notice.

JC – Are we going to discuss?

CV – Discuss at the business meeting

JC – Why not here?

CV – John is not here, we are unable to have a proxy vote.

JC- Why not discussing co-opting?

CV – Call to discuss agenda items?

JC- Not good enough.

CV – Closing meeting now and happy to discuss the items, guided by you.

FT/JH – To discuss now?

MW – If not put on AOB it shouldn't be on there and if we agree to do it today it is setting a precedent to raise any other items, which could cause problems/issues.

CV – Agree to discuss? We don't accept proxy vote.

JC – We are lacking proper representation, in particular women.

JH- Can I formally propose the potential co-opted member and give a few words?

CV – Yes.

JH provided an overview of the proposed new co-opted member of OPC.

JC – I second that.

MB – I also know the person, maybe consider being a secretary at some point?

JC – We spoke to her about being co-opted, not specific roles.

CV – To put this on the agenda for the next meeting as didn't include as an item for this meeting.

JH – This is out of order.

JC – Ridiculous as had a proposal. Have you seen the 2nd item on the agenda?

MB – Can I ask is there are reason why we need to vote today and not

	<p>September?</p> <p>JH- Every standing agenda has an AOB.</p> <p>CV – This was not mentioned before.</p> <p>JH – It was mentioned, proposal given but the Chair says no.</p> <p>MB – Is the meeting closed?</p> <p>CV – Yes.</p> <p>Meeting Closed.</p>	
	<p>Next meeting date:</p> <p>OPC Public Meeting & AGM</p> <p>Tuesday 11 September, 10am – 1pm</p> <p>Brighthelm Centre, Brighton</p>	