

Minutes of the Annual General Meeting of The BMW Motorcycle Club held on 26th April 2025 at the Canberra Club, Blackburn

Prior to commencement of the formal meeting, Jim Bettley requested a minute's silence in honour of our late Treasurer, Jim Lepley.

1. President's Opening Address

Judy Lepley opened the meeting by thanking everyone for coming along and supporting the National Officers. Hopefully we will have a positive and productive meeting.

Judy went on to say that before we actually begin the meeting, she would like to make a presentation of the Spirit of the Club Award and this goes to Pam Harrison (Northern Section) who is always helpful, most willing, always cheerful and always has an opinion. A very well deserving recipient of this Award. The award was presented to Pam by Bruce Lepley. Applause.

2. Apologies for Absence

Mike Warrilow, Peta Warrilow, Barry Winter, Mike Delacoe, Sylvia Delacoe, Alan Orme, Judy Poundall, Erica Body, Gerry Chandler, James Ingham, Nigel MacDonald, Ian Campbell, Deborah Reddihough, Simon Edelstein

3. Appointment of Tellers

George Goldynek, Denis Rushton, Angela Rushton and Frank Gough were appointed.

4. Approval of the Minutes of the 2024 Annual General Meeting

Proposed by: Dik Langan
Seconded by: Les Butler
See Appendix I for voting
Minutes Accepted

5. Matters Arising From the 2024 Annual General Meeting Minutes

No matters arising.

6. Count of Members Present by Section

Section	Number of Full Members	Members Present at AGM	Number of Proxy Votes
East Anglia	280	4	0
Irish	105	2	0
Midland	266	7	3
North East	87	8	0
Northern	259	16	0
Oxford	181	0	1
Scottish	181	12	0
South East	163	2	0
South West	123	2	0
Southern	206	5	0
Ulster	174	2	0
Western	227	5	11
Yorkshire	190	8	0
HQ	18	0	0
Total	2460	73	15
Note: The defined proxy for the Oxford Section was not present at the AGM			

7. Officers Reports

Written copies of all Officer's Reports had been included in the 2024 AGM Booklet.

- a. **President:** Members were asked if there were any questions relating to this report. No questions.
- b. **General Secretary:** Peter Dunn mentioned every year he had the privilege of requesting nominations for the BMW Classics Friend of the Marque Award and Knocklein Awards. Most years we do have someone nominated. Fortunately we have a nominee for this year and potentially one for the year after but if anyone would like to recommend a member for one of those Awards please talk to Peter or a member of the National Committee so that we can review and potentially put their name forward. Jim Lepley was awarded the Friend of the Marque Award last year and it is a very prestigious thing to receive, so if you do have any Club member who you feel is worthy of an Award, please talk to us.
- c. **Editor:** Bruce started by asking if he could draw everyone's attention to the comment in his report that we are a bike club, so please take pictures of bikes, not just people eating. Regarding social media Bruce knows he keeps going on about it but we need a group controlling social media to encourage people to join the Club. We have 7,500 people on the Open Facebook page and if they all joined the Club, we would be £300,000 better off. Even 10% would be beneficial. Please spend a little bit of time putting things on Facebook, just by putting up a few adverts and telling people what we are doing or have done, let's just tell people.

Les Butler – Northern Section – Felt it is a problem not being able to see other Section Facebook pages and access would be advantageous.

Frank Gough – Northern Section – Would like to point out that the Northern Section has a Deputy's report for every café meeting they hold which is put on Facebook.

- d. **Social Secretary:** Jim Bettley regretted that it was not good news about this year's National Rally which was totally out of our hands. Entirely down to the College who were being extremely unhelpful. Numerous problems but the main sticking point was that they required everyone to pick their meals for every day at the time of booking, which meant that we could not advertise to book for the Rally until we had the menu. They did not supply the menu, despite frequent requests and our putting pressure on them all the time. They eventually came up with a menu and the Saturday night 3 options were curry, curry and curry, which was not acceptable. The person with whom we were dealing became more and more problematic to the point that the Southern Section were finding it difficult to know how to manage it and there is then the financial risk. With advertising it so late in the day were we going to get enough people to get our money back and it became a financial risk to the Club which is why it was stopped. Next year's National Rally will be addressed under Any Other Business and the reasons for that will become clear when we go through the other reports. We need to discuss the options for a National Rally for next year but we need to do that under AOB.

Jim pointed out that the social side of things in the Journal and on calendars proves that this Club is a hive of activity. You really could do something every weekend if you wanted to, something different with everybody, everywhere, reminding people that under the rules of the Club you are entitled to attend any function of any Section. As a Club socially we are really ticking along and actually increasing, giving Bruce the problem of what to advertise in the Journal as a social event because there is so much.

Lastly, bookkeeping, Jim requested that if you are a member of the National Committee and need to book a room for the October meeting, please send him an e-mail urgently, as later rooms become more expensive and rooms may become unavailable.

Members were asked if there were any questions.

Cliff Batley – East Anglia Section – Asked where next year's AGM is to be held. Jim Bettley replied that a suitable venue is simply about the cost. Nearest in cost to the current venue is Moffat, which would be an extra £1,000. The Southern Section venue looked at would be £1,500 more than here. You must bear in mind that at the time Jim was looking at that venue we had the President, Treasurer and Editor all coming from Scotland, their travelling to the South would be approximately 500 miles each way which would increase cost. On speaking to Northern Section, Pam answered for them and they are happy to host again next year. The Canberra Club are happy to host it here next year, so all we have to do is check with the Hotel that they have rooms available. On cost alone, we should hold our AGM here next year. In relation to accessibility this is pretty good, not as good as Birmingham, which is the centre of the membership. Some years ago Dik was asked to give two points of reference, one was the actual physical centre of the Club and the other was the centre of the Club in relation to membership. The centre of the Club is about Carlisle geographically but by membership, the centre is Birmingham. It has to be here on cost alone. Jim asked if anyone had any views on that.

Les Butler – Northern Section – We are more than happy to host next year, we have a fabulous team who take care of everything, especially Pam Harrison. Applause.

Piers Kurrein – Yorkshire Section - Is it possible to avoid the weekend of the Stafford Show? This was raised last year. This year Chris Wright was offered one bike to display which gave us one ticket so it was called off. Jim advised that he does bear it in mind but has to balance availability of the Canberra Club and the Hotel which is why we are here this weekend this year.

Jim wanted to thank all those people who had sent him possible locations but unfortunately they have all failed on one thing or another. The one which Phil Sampson sent which was really good but they had a Fire Certificate for only 90 people and they would not go above that for obvious Insurance reasons, so no go. A Birmingham venue had been found which was brilliant, the right price with a good hall, accommodation all around the centre of Birmingham but zero car parking,

so not possible. Jim Bettley asked if anyone knew of a possible venue to please let him know and he would follow up.

e. Membership Secretary

This year is the first time we have actually realised the fixed year membership and Colin would not go through his report but has some extra slides to explain why we had moved to a fixed year. If there are any questions on what was written in the report please speak up. Firstly he wanted to show the impact of the fixed year. The first slide showed the graph in the report which showed we have dips occurring in January each year. Previously we had a 50% membership who had a renewal date of 31st January indicated by the slight dips. Now we have the fixed year with all memberships renewing on 31st January, this has resulted in a much bigger dip. On 1st February we had 871 lapsed members and they do not receive any Journals from that point onwards. However, by 1st April, which is the date when their records are archived, prior to the archive option being available, membership records would have been removed from the Database, in fact there were over 200 actually renewed between 1st February and 1st April.

The next slide for the three years 2023, 2024, 2025 where you can see how the membership was increasing and that is effectively the NEC. In 2023 we obtained 109 members, last year the rise was not so great as we only managed to sign up around half that number. One of the reasons for that, I believe, was the location for our pitch, the footfall was not very good. If you look at the new members how we stand this year, you can see it is below both the red and blue lines. If this trend continues, we are going to be in the region of 200/300 down on what we generally expect at the end of the year. It is, therefore, down to everyone to try to recruit new members. We have had some new leaflets printed which can be obtained from Judith and Jean at the back of the hall. Also we have some small cards which can be dropped off on someone's bike telling them about the Club and try to get some more members coming in that way. If you feel you can help in that way, please do so, as we need to increase our membership.

One of the reasons of changing from the rolling year was to reduce costs, reduce the Mailing House costs. Also to reduce the workload of the membership Secretaries. The next slide showed the postage costs, the difference from 2023 to 2024 is primarily due to the change in the way the Mailing House sent out our Journals. Prior to 2024 Jim would receive an invoice from Royal Mail which would be added to the cost from the Mailing House. Because the Mailing House were able to do something slightly different, we effectively lost that direct expense from Royal Mail. If you look at where we are now you can see there is a big drop in postage costs, primarily due to the number of memberships lapsed, so the number of Journals being sent out is less. The other element of the Mailing House is their fulfilment, in other words the task they do to provide the Journal for everyone. The Mailing House has "splits" – they divide the postage into: normal membership; members who get renewal forms; members who get membership cards; members plus associates who get membership cards. From January, due to the fixed year, that is the only month now that Renewal Notices go out. Once a year instead of twelve times a year, which removes that split from the workload of the Mailing House. Equally from April onwards we should not be sending out any membership cards, as all existing members have either renewed or lapsed, which is another split which has been removed. Any new members who join during the year, the sending out of membership cards is the responsibility of the Section Membership Secretaries when sending out their welcome packs. This is one area where we have reduced costs and you can see this fulfilment cost is where we are this year, which has started to drop and hopefully, we will see that drop a little more. All the expectations of reducing costs from the Mailing House seem to have been fulfilled.

Any questions.

Nick Jones – Yorkshire Section – Do you or the National Committee see any correlation between Committee members no longer riding (in the Yorkshire Section anyway) BMWs and new members not joining or leaving the Club because of this. The Yorkshire Section is split into two sections, for BMW riders and non-BMW riders. Because of this I have lost numerous people from

the Wednesday Wobblers who have been less than complimentary about the Yorkshire Committee who not only don't like BMWs but actually campaign and recommend other brands. How can we operate the Club if we carry on like that?

Colin replied that if you look at the M&AA and generally there is a note that if you have an interest in BMWs you can be a member, you do not have to ride a BMW to be a member of the Club.

Nick – Agreed totally but asked if there was no correlation, as we seem to be capitulating and membership is dropping dramatically.

Colin advised that it is not possible to do a correlation as in the Database it is up to the member to define what bikes they ride and not every member fills that in, so to define a correlation is not possible.

Jody Kurrein – Social Secretary, Yorkshire Section – Objected strongly to what has just been said as we do not recommend other bikes, we welcome any and as Colin has just said you just have to have an interest in BMWs. A lot of us who ride other bikes also have BMWs as well, we do not always turn up on them. It is not split into two Sections.

Piers Kurrein – Secretary, Yorkshire Section - Sees no split within the Club and no split within the Yorkshire Section and does not know where Nick is coming from at all.

Les Butler – Northern Section – In the Northern Section it is not about what brand you ride. It is about do you ride and you are welcome. He joined this Club not because of what he rides but because of the people you get to meet and the events you get to come to. The Committee needs to decide what is more important, people or the motorbikes and as we are all getting older, BMWs can be such a weight to push around.

Jody Kurrein – Social Secretary, Yorkshire Section – Agreed with the point that the demographic of this Club is getting older and BMWs are getting bigger and bigger and members are moving to other bikes as they are smaller and easier to handle. Does it matter what you turn up on?

Frank Gough – Northern Section - Northern Section see it as a social club, as well as a motorcycle club.

Colin added that the comments that Jim Bettley made earlier about the social side and the number of events that take place, demonstrates the social attitude of the Club. Certainly in the Western Section there is a mix of bikes, we do not criticise. We might take the mickey out of people coming on a Harley. People come to our events, any member is welcome regardless of what they ride. My wife is Secretary of the Western Section and when people have not renewed, she will ring them to find out why. On many occasions it is medical reasons, bikes are getting too heavy but very rarely do we have a finger pointed at the Club.

Dik Langan – East Anglia Section – Finds that every Membership Secretary he speaks to does contact members who are leaving the Club and asks why. Some of them tell us in their initial email, it is because funds are tight, stopped riding bikes. He has never had anyone in the East Anglia Section say it is because you are mixed bike brands or you are only BMW. He does not feel it is actually impacting, by the sound of it, on too many people outside the group who go on Wednesday Wobblers.

Nick Jones – Yorkshire Section – Has no particular love for BMWs, he has a BMW and continues to ride it as his wife feels as a member of this Club he should have a BMW and he does have other bikes. If you join a Club and turn up to a meeting, if there are more people in cars and on other brands, they do not re-join. He felt sure that two years ago at the AGM when a report was

done on membership, the number one reason for leaving was because they joined the BMW Club as an ultimate riding machine and we do not do enough ride outs.

At this point the President felt that it was appropriate to move on with the meeting.

- f. **GS Register Secretary:** Neville had nothing to add to his report but would like to explain that the last six months of last year he was restricted by health issues, which is why there is no foreign tour organised for this year. He is looking for ideas for this early September so if anyone is interested on going on a trip, he is open to any ideas. In the past we have been to Italy, Switzerland, Belgium, France, Spain.

Members were asked if there were any questions. No questions.

- g. **Sporting Register Secretary:** Robert advised that last year he had run 3 track days, 2 at Cadwell and 1 at Snetterton. Overall they covered costs but the first day at Cadwell lost a little with the other day at Cadwell having a short reserve list. The day at Snetterton just covered costs. This may be partly because we were not given Mondays. The advantage of a Monday is participants can travel on a Sunday and go home Monday evening, meaning only 1 day off work. This year Robert asked for 1 day at Cadwell and 1 day at Snetterton. Due to not being given Mondays he had only taken the 1 day at Cadwell on June 26th. At this moment in time he could still fit in another 10 people who would all go into the beginners. We just are not getting newcomers. Having organised these track days for 15 years now Robert feels it is time for him to stop. There is a possibility that someone in the Scottish Section has shown an interest in taking over. At the moment we do not get enough Club members taking part to make it worthwhile running at a loss. However, MSV the circuit owners do organise road bike only track days and this year instead of doing one at Snetterton we are supporting the MSV days which are actually £50 cheaper than our track days. We are going to support them and that might be the way in future that we take a group of members to commercial days. It will not be so good for beginners as they will not get the instruction but at least our experienced people will get out on track. This may be the way forward.

Any questions.

Les Butler – Northern Section - Felt that the idea of track days is brilliant but he could not think of many BMWs you would want to take on a track day unless you have very deep pockets. However, there might be alternative brands which brings us back to what was being said earlier about this being a brand specific Club, that if we open up track days to other Clubs perhaps we would get more people attending. When asked if he thought it was for BMWs only, Les felt it was how it was perceived when advertised as BMW track days. Robert confirmed it was open to anyone with a road legal bike but more importantly, people who are going to behave and show respect when they are on track. Les continued by saying it is not about the bikes it is about the people and we need to be more specific in our target audience to bring your Suzuki, your Honda, Yamaha not just BMW. Robert confirmed that on the entry form it makes it clear that any person on any make of bike, as long as it goes through the noise test and meets other regulations are welcome. In fact 60/70% are other makes of bikes. It has been done on Pan Europeans, possibly not a Harley. The information leaflet clearly states it is open to any person on any bike.

Colin asked what is the percentage of members to non-members. Robert had in fact had several people join to get the discount offered to Club members, it would be optimistic to say possibly about 20%, so it is not worth running at a loss for 20 people.

No further questions.

Sporting Award – Robert advised that this year the Sporting Award goes to Shaun Mulligan.

Last year riding an old Boxer 100 Shaun found it much easier to ride than the K100 he rode previously. After it was tuned and modified by Jim Cray it was fast enough and handled well

enough, to win the Pre 90s Over 750 class in the British Historic Racing Club Series. With rounds at Darley Moor, Anglesey, Pembrey and 2 at Cadwell, consistency paid off. Finishing and scoring points in all races, Shaun accumulated enough to win his class in the Championship. Pictures shown on the screen. Well done Shaun. Applause while Robert presented the glass memento.

- h. **Sidecar Register Secretary** – Not present but the President advised that Keith Thomas is willing to carry on but if anyone else wants to take it on he would be happy to hand over.
- i. **DVLA Liaison Officers:** Not present but Peter Dunn advised that he had been working with Robert Freeman recently as they have had some quite interesting queries about pre 1969 BMWs including a potential R51RS. The Club did not have the necessary technical knowledge to be able to comment on this particular motorcycle but due to our contacts with BMW Classic and BMW Clubs Europa, we found a specialist in Germany who was able to look at photographs of the bike and provide very detailed analysis of what it was and we also then checked up with BMW Classic again who provided feedback and we were able to give that feedback direct to Bonhams who had this particular motorcycle for auction. Robert takes his responsibilities for being factually correct and representing the Club in the best manner, very seriously and he did an exemplary job in actually working on this bike.
- j. **Tool Hire Secretary:** Mike Delacoe asked if there were any questions on his report. He is quite happy to carry on doing the role which has been quite busy last year and continuing this year and thanked his wife Sylvia for putting up with it all.

The President thanked Mike as he brings in an awful lot of new members with his expertise. He is on the Forum and answers peoples' questions and quite often people are joining the Club because of the answers he gives them. He really deserves a huge vote of thanks. Applause.

Bob Ingram – Midland Section - Feels that Mike's report gives a clear indication of the extent of detail associated with his efforts and deserves congratulations. Applause.

k. **Technology Officer:**

No questions.

President commented that without Dik we would be floundering in many many ways, he keeps us all straight with the technology side.

- l. **Treasurer:** President advised we have a new addition to the National Officers and are very pleased to welcome Peter Wilson, who put his head above the parapet and took over, without any handover etc and we are so relieved he stepped forward.

Peter introduced himself as being from the East Anglia Section which he joined in 2013 and has been their Treasurer since 2022. His motorcycling history is that his first bike was a Honda 50 and the first BMW he bought was an R87. There was a period when family came along and he didn't ride. Currently he has an R1250RT and a K1600. Peter has been riding bikes since he was 17, he loves being out and being with people, which is why he joined the Club.

He confirmed that he is a Chartered Accountant, having worked for PriceWaterhouse and worked around the world. He is semi-retired, still doing a little corporate finance for people. Looking after the finances of the BMW Club is a welcome relief from the real world of finance. The books were previously kept by a firm of Accountants and Peter has now taken them in-house. It would have taken Peter as long to prepare the information for the bookkeepers, as it does for him to put it into a cloud-based system which is set up.

The Accountant's report prepared by Jim will have been read by you all but it is quite difficult for Peter not having been involved in the finances 12 months ago but he has looked at what is going

on at the moment. Sadly the position is not very good and you have heard quite a lot of comments about membership and with membership dropping the costs of the Club are pretty static. The cost of producing the magazine, while there are some variable costs associated with mailing, the main item of producing the magazine is a fixed cost. There is a fixed cost of organising this meeting here. There are fixed costs associated with organising Committee Meetings. If our volume of members drops and we have all those fixed costs the Club is only going in one very sorry direction and if you look at the Accounts for two years running, we have had significant losses. The subscriptions were put up last year and if you look at Jim's report from the previous year, it tells you that we do not see any benefit of that for quite a long period of time. It was January 2025 when we started to get the benefit of that. The situation at the moment is that if we do not do something either to increase our revenue or to reduce our costs or both, then if we continue on the current trajectory we will not be worrying about an AGM in 3 years' time as we will not have a Club. This is a pretty stark situation to say but it is within all of our hands to fix that problem. Moving on to the things we are looking for, sadly we do need to increase our subscriptions again and Peter would be recommending we put them up by another £5. However, if every existing member recruited another member that would wipe away the problem. We are not in a position to say that we will not increase our subs, we will just go and get new members because as you see from the graphs our history of recruiting new members is not good but if there is an incentive for every member. So what we are proposing is that when your subscription renewal comes round, it is £45 but if you recruit someone you can have that £5 back, so that then you have a way of avoiding that increased cost and you have a way if increasing the membership of the Club, which is what is going to make the Club survive in the long term.

Peter apologised, as that was something of an introduction. He confirmed that the proposal as far as subscriptions was concerned is to put them up to £45. Peter was happy to take any questions.

Cliff Batley – East Anglia Section – Asked if Peter was doing the bookkeeping now, that would save us the cost of the bookkeeping. Peter confirmed that would save us £4,000 a year. Cliff commented that would be £1.50 a member on our current numbers and with savings at the Mailing House, do we really need an increase of £5? Cliff commented that in the past membership had been increased from £18 to £21 and then without an increase for a number of years it went from £21 to £25. It was said at the time would it not be better to increase by £1 a year on a regular basis which would keep up with inflation, rather than a big jump which some people object to and do not renew. Peter felt yes, we may lose members if it is £5 but if we go for a lower amount, we increase our risks associated with the Club's survival and being able to produce the magazine, which Peter feels is a sacrosanct situation. There are other cost savings which we are trying to put in place but what must be borne in mind is that last year we lost £20,000. Even with £4,000 saving on the bookkeeping that is a big step in the right direction but members do not have to pay the extra £5, they have a way of avoiding it.

Nick Jones – Yorkshire Section – Do we really need to pay for someone to organise a camping weekend, ride outs etc? He has fought for the last 9 years not to get paid for the ride outs. If we had a paid leader then we would have problems if there was an incident on a ride out. Does somebody need paying £50 to organise a camping week-end. Is that not a way that we could reduce costs. Peter replied by saying that the costs referred to were Section costs not central costs. Nick commented that money was being transferred to the Sections in order to pay for those. Peter went on to say that if the suggestion was that we reduce Capitation charges that would have to be a separate discussion.

Frank Gough – Northern Section – When you take the percentage of the membership to the cost of running a bike, that is miniscule.

Peter went on to say that a comment he has heard a lot is, that when we are at Shows recruiting, nobody bats an eyelid at £40 and felt sure that the same thing would apply at £45. Adding that you struggle to get a meal out for £45 these days!

Colin added a comment for Cliff regarding the Mailing House costs. The Royal Mail costs continue to go up and he has received an email from the Mailing House that their costs are going up due to increase in National Insurance and increase in the minimum wage, so what we are trying to save is going to be offset.

Marjorie Burnett – Scottish Section – It is vital to future proof the Club and thinks an increase to £45 with a £5 discount is ideal. We should stop worrying about £5 here and there because we want the Club to exist and we want to keep money in the coffers to offer more to members. Marjorie fully endorsed the suggested increase. Applause.

Shaun Mulligan – South East Section - Questioned how much would be saved if all members who could, read the Journal on line and did that instead of a paper one. He is happy either way and does not object to £5 increase but how much could be saved. Peter replied that if we reached a majority situation, the issue we then have is that it would still cost the same to produce a very much smaller number of magazines. He has always viewed the magazine as being sacrosanct and for many years was a member of this Club but doing nothing other than read the magazine and would certainly not have done that on line. That is something for the National Officers to think about. Shaun went on to say that things are changing and younger people are more used to doing things on line.

Frank Gough – Northern Section – Advised that they do give Journals to Bowker Motorrad in Preston and they are for customers going into the showrooms to read and we do get people joining the Club as a result.

Cliff Batley – East Anglia Section – Having been on the Committee in the past, confirmed that putting the Journal on line was looked at some years ago and it was made accessible through the Forum at least 10 years ago. When looked at back then there was hardly any saving if 20% of the membership went on line and did not have a Journal, we would possibly just save a little on postage. The Mailing House cost would not change and neither would the cost of producing the Journal. Peter reiterated that this is the point he made previously, in that the costs of running Club are pretty fixed and it is the volume that fixes the problem or causes the problem. We have it in our hands to recruit new members and fix the problem.

Les Butler – Northern Section – How would you monitor who you introduce. He introduces a lot of people to the Club and pushes the Club at every opportunity, some join some do not. Peter confirmed that we have a plan.

Ron Thackeray – Yorkshire Section – Regarding the cost of the Journal, would it be of any benefit to go bi-monthly. What is the income from the Journal? Peter advised that there is no specific income from the Journal as it is the subscriptions which cover the cost of the Journal. Ron asked about advertising. Peter agreed there is some advertising but it would not make a difference going to bi-monthly in terms of advertising revenue, it is not significant. Ron asked surely costs would be reduced if bi-monthly. Bruce commented at this point that costs would definitely not be reduced. If we go bi-monthly we double up the pages, pretty much. We need more Calendar, more Section News, more Mutual Aid, so the Journal would be bigger, thicker, cost more money to print and cost more to post as it would be heavier. Ron felt that there were items in the Journal which are repeated month after month and pages could be saved by not repeating. Bruce replied that if we went bi-monthly Diary of Events would cover 4 months not just 2 and it would also be out of date and it would be so far out of date if anything changes. Going bi-monthly would not work, it will not reduce costs. If it did it would be absolutely minimal as the Journal would be a bigger publication, weigh more and cost more to post and print. It would also take the Editor a lot longer to put it together. We have 44 pages at the moment, if you add on another 10/15 pages, more time spent to do the job.

Dik Langan – East Anglia Section – As the previous Marketing Secretary he feels we would lose quite a few of the advertisers if we were reaching out to people only 6 times a year instead of 12. So we would lose some income as well.

Frank Gough – Northern Section - Feels that even now with monthly we are so far behind. If we went bi-monthly we would be miles behind. We should stay with monthly and if it could be got out faster that would be better but we don't want to give Bruce more work.

John Twigg – Ulster Section – Personally likes the magazine coming every month, likes the regularity. Regarding a cost of £45, even £50 a year is minor compared with the cost of running any form of transport. Why not go up to £50 and for new members for their first year £40 and get them tempted in. Peter commented – an interesting idea.

The President asked for acceptance of the Annual Accounts.

Proposed by: Jody Kurrein
Seconded by: Cliff Batley
See Appendix I for voting numbers
Accounts Accepted

8. Appointment of Accountants

Peter pointed out that the current Accountants are based in Scotland, which is not very convenient for him in East Anglia. Peter would like to propose that the National Officers vote for a more local Accountant, once he has done some research to find some people who would be interested in doing it, hopefully at a lower rate than the existing rate. Peter would like to propose that the meeting give authority to the National Officers to appoint Accountants.

Proposal: To authorise National Officers to appoint Accountants later in year.

Proposed by: Peter Wilson
Seconded by: Dik Langan
See Appendix I for voting numbers
Proposal accepted

9. Confirm the Subscriptions from 1st October 2025 according to Club Rule 10

Treasurer has listened to comments about going up to £50. As a Chartered Accountant he is very risk averse and having heard some of the negativity about increasing the subscription feels that £5 is sufficient on this occasion. He would stick at this point with the proposal which is:

To increase the Subscriptions next year by £5 on the basis that we will offer every member the opportunity to recruit a new member and have that £5 back – subscription to be £45.

It was pointed out that the Proposal does not include an increase in the Associate fee.

Proposed by: Peter Wilson
Seconded by: Bruce Lepley
See Appendix I for voting numbers
Proposal accepted

Peter confirmed 2 things we did not cover was that there is no change in the Associate fee. Also with regard to HQ and Overseas members living outside the UK (apart from the Republic of Ireland), we propose to increase those by £10 above the UK membership to cover the additional administration associated with people being abroad, so the proposal is for Overseas membership subscriptions to go to £55 a year.

Membership Secretary advised that this has come about following an analysis last year of the postal costs and effectively what was happening was that the UK members were subsidising the

Overseas members because of the cost of posting welcome packs and the subsequent monthly Journals. This increase will effectively balance the books, which is the objective.

Piers Kurrein – Yorkshire Section – Asked regarding the posting of Journals to the Irish Section. President advised that discussions are still ongoing but the situation has virtually been resolved.

Lynn Sumner – Northern Section – Capitation Officer – Questioned the amount of proposed Overseas membership increasing by £10 as it is currently £46 resulting in a new amount of £56 not £55. Peter and Colin confirmed that the proposal was for an increase of £10 over the new UK membership rate (not £10 on the existing Overseas rate) giving £55.

Bob Ingram – Midland Section – Questioned whether Overseas members would be fully informed about the reason behind the increase. Membership Secretary replied that he sends welcome packs out to Overseas members and he has had some of those members come back to him and comment that the initial postage cost is almost the difference in the annual membership cost. You also have the increased Mailing House costs to Overseas members. If the subscription was increased at the same rate as the UK increase it would be £51 and we are only asking for an extra £4 to cover costs which is not unreasonable and feels explanation is unnecessary.

The Proposal is to increase subscription for Overseas members to £55.

Proposed by: Peter Wilson
Seconded by: Dik Langan
See Appendix I for voting numbers
Proposal accepted

Colin explained that there were no Proxy votes on this item as it was not included on the Proxy Forms sent out. Based on the number of positive votes the proposal was carried.

Peter Lawson wanted to thank those people who had made contact with him to thank him for standing up to take on the role of Treasurer and also thank you all for giving him the platform to explain the situation of the Club and support in getting us to successful votes. Applause.

Summary of the new fees as agreed:

Description	Current Fee	Fee for following year (Applied 1st Oct)
Full membership for UK residents †	£40	£45
Associate membership for UK residents	£5	£5
Full membership for Irish residents (paying online) †	£46	£51
Associate membership for Irish residents (paying online)	£5	£5
Full membership for Overseas residents †	£46	£55
Associate membership for Overseas residents	£5	£5
Capitation for Full members †	£5	£5
Capitation for Associates	£1.70	£1.70

† - Note that these are pro-rata adjusted based on the quarter they are applied

10. Election of Club Officers for 2025 to 2026

Colin Ross explained that it was not possible to have a vote en bloc for those officer positions which were uncontested, due to the differing number of proxy votes relating to each position. Therefore, independent voting for each position took place with the following results:

See Appendix I for voting numbers

1.15 pm - AT THIS POINT THE MEETING PAUSED FOR LUNCH

1.55 pm – THE MEETING RECONVENED

11. M&AA Articles 76 & 77

Jim Bettley advised that this is a straightforward administrative change. In 2020 we adopted a new discipline process and one of our Officers at the time was supposed to re-draft this but it never happened. It is more of a housekeeping job to put Articles 76 & 77 in line with the current Discipline Policy. Nothing changes basically other than the fact that the current Discipline Policy will now make sense. Does anyone have any questions. No questions.

Proposed by: Peter Dunn
Seconded by: Cliff Batley
See Appendix I for voting numbers
Proposal accepted

12. M&AA Article 45 to Clarify Role of Vice-Presidents

Jim Bettley explained that the purpose of this proposal was to address the situation with respect to the Vice Presidents as there is a difference of opinion in this regard. The first thing is to save money and the other is to actually lay out the role of the Vice Presidents. If you look at the M&AAs it doesn't actually say what Vice Presidents do, it says that we will have 3 Vice Presidents and they will be elected every 3 years. This has all been laid out in the report. What is being proposed is the main change would be to the role of the Vice Presidents. The two roles that they have, the first and foremost is to stand in for the President should the President be unavailable. Additionally, if you read the Discipline Policy, the Vice Presidents play a major part in the implementation of the Discipline Policy. The second change is about saving money, in that the Vice Presidents must come from members already serving on the National Committee. Two purposes here, one is that as people on the National Committee have to attend National Committee Meetings, so there would be no additional travelling or accommodation costs. Secondly, all members of the National Committee are by law Directors of the Company and as a Director they are duty bound to act in the best interests of the Company/Club. Your representatives on the National Committee are not there to push forward your points but they must vote in accordance with what they think is best for the Company/Club. For instance his own Section a few years ago asked him to take something forward to the National Committee, which he did and then he voted against it, as he felt it was not what the Club should do. This is the kind of independence you are required to have by law. Under the current system you can have a Vice President who is not part of the National Committee so you have to pay for the travel and accommodation for someone who has no vote on the National Committee and who cannot be held responsible for what they say and do, even though they are there to influence members of the National Committee. This seems something of an anathema and not right. This is something on which Cliff Batley and Jim have never agreed. Cliff's argument, which he argues with great passion, is that it is about being independent from the National Committee. Most Vice Presidents come from one of our Sections, so what is it they are independent of. Jim proved his independence by voting against his own Section. It is a moot point and would not argue against Cliff's logic.

To confirm: (1) To lay out the specifically within the rules what is the job of the Vice President – to stand in for the President and to have responsibility for the Discipline Process. (2) To make sure they are part of the National Committee so there is no additional expense for the Club and they should be held accountable for what they do.

Cliff Batley – East Anglia Section – Agrees that Vice Presidents should be Directors which would enhance the right to vote. He comes from the point of view from first joining the National Committee 20 years ago, the main one he remembers was Bruce Preston who was completely independent of the National Committee. Cliff felt that it was better that the Vice Presidents back then were not there representing anything on the National Committee and would be unbiased.

He feels that most of it is right but does not think we should actually have to have someone who is also serving on the National Committee or at Committee Meetings or a Section representative. Cliff feels that the independence of the Vice Presidents is sacrosanct. He does not feel that it is right that all the VPs are already on the Committee in one job or another, which gives them a bias. For example in Jim Bettley's case, or Bruce or GS Register. The first time Cliff was involved in a Disciplinary with Graham Walker (both Vice Presidents), with Stewart taking the Minutes, he felt that it was important to the Section where the problem was, that they were independent of that Section. It is just that loss of independence that Cliff objects to, he is okay with the rest.

Frank Gough – Northern Section - Frank's understanding of the role of a Vice President is that they represent the interests of the President when standing in for the President.

Ashley Boal - North East Section – Could we make it that 2 Vice Presidents are on the National Committee and the third one is independent and reword what is proposed. Jim Bettley advised that would have to come back as a separate proposal next year. Jim would suggest that if everyone is happy as a group representing the Club to vote on what we have now, with a caveat that next year we come back with the proposal, that one of the Vice Presidents does not have another role on the Committee.

Neville Jones – Western Section – Neville would just like to clear a number of points. The reason he is on the National Committee is as the Western Section representative. As the GS Register Secretary he is entitled to attend the meetings but does not have a vote. As the Western Section representative he has a vote and a VP he has no vote. From his point of view he represents the Section but does not see that makes him less independent than anyone else in the Club. In the same way that Jim voted against his own Section's proposal, Neville would feel that the interests of the Club are paramount and would vote for what is in the interests of the Club rather than interests just for his Section. As a VP with responsibility for the disciplinary system, it is quite difficult sometimes to be able to project that you are not influenced by local factors. At the moment you have Bruce who comes from the far North, Jim comes from the far South and himself who comes from the middle. If one of them needed to do a disciplinary at the moment, a VP who is remote from the Section involved could easily take care of it. It has worked by that by accident, possibly, but in terms of who the National Committee put forward as the next VP, they could always look at it from the point of view of maintaining that status, that the different areas of the Club are represented by different VPs.

Jim Bettley reiterated that one of the points of having someone who is a Director of the Club as a Vice President is that they can be held to account for what they say and do. In the past people have been removed from the Club who were Directors who did not comply with the necessary behaviour required by law as a Director. It seems quite important that you can shuffle the cards, whereas if you have a Vice President who is not a Director of the Club there is no action in that respect if they behave in a way that is prejudicial to the Club but that is a separate issue. It is about taking responsibility for what you do.

Bradley Gane – North East Section – Having listened to Jim and Cliff's opinions, they both make sense independently. Question relating to M&AAs earlier as to what VPs do. To clarify his understanding relating to a VP being independent and be in a position to make decisions for the benefit of the Club as a whole, in terms of actually putting something in the M&AAs to reflect that requirement of the role of a VP moving forward, however this gets sorted out in the future will it be actually written down as to what is expected of a VP in the terms of behaviour and how they conduct themselves in representing the Club. Jim asked, is this if a VP they were not a Director of the Club, because if they are a Director that is already written down. Bradley added if as suggested earlier someone was an independent VP but not a Director how would that work. Jim confirmed that was exactly his point that they would not fall within the Director's rules. Bradley asked potentially if we went forward with that, would the M&AAs be adjusted accordingly. Jim confirmed they would have to be adjusted.

Ashley Bole – North East Section – What was suggested earlier of one of the VPs being independent, could they be made a Director. Jim Bettley agreed that would be possible and would resolve some of his issues. Jim could look at bringing that forward next year but what you have to accept is that that would increase costs to the Club, as you now have someone else with travelling and accommodation.

Jim asked that we have a vote on the proposal as it is and we minute the fact that he undertakes to review this and he also undertakes to continue to talk to Cliff on what he is doing for his views and has no doubt that we can work together on this. He will bring something back next year that both of them are happy with.

Proposal: To amend Article 45 of the M&AA - to lay out the specifically within the rules what is the job of the Vice President – to stand in for the President and to have responsibility for the Discipline Process. To make sure they are part of the National Committee so there is no additional expense for the Club and they should be held accountable for what they do.

Proposed by: Jim Bettley
Seconded by: Jason Goodwill
See Appendix I for voting numbers
Proposal accepted

Jim Bettley will undertake to review this matter in line with above comments and bring back something for next year.

13. To fix a date for the 2026 Annual General Meeting

Saturday 25th April 2026 at the Canberra Club.

14. Any Other Business

- a. **Nick Jones – Yorkshire Section** – Can a Section legitimately hold an AGM without presenting the Minutes from the previous meeting? Peter Dunn advised he would look at the M&AA in order to reply.
- b. **National Rally 2026** – Jim Bettley advised that a location has been identified and a date of availability has also been identified. Enquiries in relation as to what we could do to make it better and different for the 75th. However, you have heard about the finances of the Club and the normal run of the mill National Rally costs the Club between £2,000 and £2,500 as a deficit. We have gone through the figures as best we can and to hold a Rally with significantly more to it for the 75th, will cost between £6,000 and £7,000 as a deficit. The average turnout to a National Rally is between 190 and 200 and it has been like that for quite a few years. Raising this as an issue, do we spend £6,000 or £7,000 on a National Rally that may be 200 people turn up to and the effect of that on the money held in the centre which you have heard from Peter is significant. Jim is really uneasy about affecting the Club's main finance like that at a time like this for that Rally. It has been discussed at great length among the National Officers about where we go with this. Yes, the 75th is significant but at the end of the day we probably have 3 options. Not putting forward as a proposal at this stage but would like you to talk about it amongst yourselves. The three options are:

- i) We cancel the Rally and we then put finances in place over a period of time so that the 80th Rally can be significant. We will not need to worry about that, as we will already have put money in place for whatever we want to do.
- ii) We suck it up as a Club, risk £6,000 or £7,000 and we hold the Rally. If we do that and then come back here whingeing about the fact that we have no money, we had the opportunity not to spend the money. We can spend it if you wish, it is not something someone in my position feels I have the will and authority to do, when it is so impacting on the Club's finances.
- iii) This is the option I am asking you to think about. This is, that each Section sponsors that Rally with a payment from Section funds. Section funds are almost double what we hold centrally at the moment. If you are asking how much - that would be sponsorship from each Section of £500. Even this is not straightforward. What if one or more Sections declined. If for example one Section declined would that mean people from that Section could not attend the Rally. The answer is that no you cannot stop them coming, as they may have voted for it, if that Section allowed them to hold a vote. If we go down that route of Sections sponsoring the Rally, all Sections have to sponsor or it won't work.

Ashley Boal – North East Section – Asked what would be done differently that might cost the £6,000.

Jim answered by saying that we would be bringing in people to give additional benefit for example Mike Delacoe, who we have already spoken to and he is prepared to give up 2 days and bring his kit and show people how to use the GS 911 on both days. If that happens, we have to pay for his accommodation, as he is not attending the National Rally he is just there helping. We have traders to bring in, which is when the money starts to build up. We are pretty sure if we go ahead now, we can get Motorrad to bring bikes for test rides. We can get IAM to come in, we have a contact here from IAM. They could assess rides and give feedback on rides. We can get Biker Now in and the Heelite people to bring their stuff in. Jim could pester his tyre people again to sponsor and show tyres. All that takes money. It also requires money for people setting up as you have to travel to meet people. When you start putting in the cost of a band you are probably looking at a cost of £2,000 each night. For three nights you easily reach £6,000 although you may not have a big band each night but you would still want entertainment on the Saturday. Even bringing in speakers can be £1,000 a time. We can recoup some of that and we have looked how we can but we have also got to keep the charge down so as not to discourage people from attending. We have to keep it realistic so that you all want to come to the Rally and there is enough happening for you all to want to be there and the price is such that you won't be put off. There is also the accommodation which you want to be decent, as the whole demographic is moving away from camping. It used to be nearly all tents, with a few caravans and a few in accommodation, whereas now it is completely the reverse. Two thirds of people easily, are in hired accommodation, as that is what they want, with the rest in camping, motorhomes etc. Making it happen during the day is important, as at the Fire Station new members turned up to the Rally on the Saturday afternoon asking where everyone was. They were all out on rides but they expected other things to be going on. This made Jim think that if you are going to have a special Rally you have to have things going on during the day as well. There needs to be a reason for you to be there and say that was good. If you think of the 60th that cost £30,000 to put on, we do not have that kind of money now. Jim feels he does not have either the moral, or

even within the rules, the right to put the Club at risk for that kind of money. He feels that decision should be made by the members.

Cliff Batley – East Anglia Section – Was thinking about sponsorship Companies but feel that Jim had come up with the best idea for the Sections to contribute. Not a fixed amount, say £1 per member or £2 at the most, which would be fairer on the smaller Sections. Cliff would also be happy for £2 capitation fee to go to a fund to support the National Rally and feels a great many people would be happy with that. Last time Cliff looked a few years ago most Sections had quite a bit of money in the Bank and it would not be much of a dent for most of them to lose £2 a head of the capitation fee for example as one way. Also look at sponsorship from Companies to sponsor the event, including himself as Adventure Bike Shop.

Colin Ross – Membership Secretary – Was going to suggest the same as Cliff. Due to the variation in number of members which can vary as many as from 120 to 300 that the fee that would be put forward be proportional to the membership, which makes it fairer to the Sections depending upon how much capitation they receive.

The following documents, as best possible, the subsequent discussion about this topic. The bold parts are the questions/comments from the floor unless otherwise noted:

- **Who can attend Club events?**
Members only due to Insurance cover. Guests are always welcome at any event but we need to ensure guests do not attend events on a regular basis but actually join as a member.
- **Could Rally be opened up as a general event for non-members to attend?**
This would involve special Insurance cover which could be very costly.
- **Have we looked into the possibility of joining up with another event?**
Recently approached Harley – not interested. Previous occasions contacted Triumph and Goldwing – not interested. The disadvantage of joining with another Club would be lack of volunteers to run such an event
- **From experience of track days, club members attend Club events but not other events.**
Combined event would not work.
- **Possibly approach Moto Guzzi – age demographic similar to our Club?**
Jim Bettley will enquire.
- **Need to do something as a Club to encourage younger people to join.**
Other Clubs are experiencing similar problems. Modern generation not interested in Clubs.

From the National Team: There are four options to consider:

1. We do not hold a National Rally
 2. We hold a National Rally but not a 75th
 3. We hold 75th Rally and central funds pay
 4. We hold 75th and ask for sponsorship from Sections in one form or another
-
- **If we do not have a National Rally until the 80th a good many of current members may not be around.**
If we do wait until the 80th – the Treasurer is saying we only have 3 years money – by then we will not have a Club.
 - **The Club have voted to increase subscription by £5, this should put us on an even keel we expect. We have no way of knowing what inflation will do in the next 12 months. In 5**

years' time plenty of other things could happen.

We should have a National Rally however it looks. It is the one main annual event we have as a Club where members can get together to celebrate being in the BMW Club. Have always enjoyed meeting up with members from other Sections from all parts of the country. Good excuse to get together as a Club.

- **Question asked by National team - as there are quite a few Section Committee members here at the meeting – what is the feeling about the Sections contributing to the National Rally, whether it be 75th or a basic? There is a lot of money in the Sections which could be used.**

- Sections indicating support – East Anglia, Scottish, Yorkshire, Irish, Northern, North East.
- South West against.
- It was pointed out that if one Section declines this would basically cancel the Rally.

- **Why can't we just charge an admin fee to fill the void?**

Good idea but you do not know how much money you will get until you know how many people are attending. It is very difficult to budget that particular Rally when you have no idea of your income.

There has been resistance in the past to a Rally fee.

- **Extra money from capitation would that just be one year or every year up to the Rally?**

This would be a one-off charge.

- **As their membership numbers are not very high South West would prefer to go back to their Committee to see if they would be in favour of support or not.**

If £1 per member, total Club membership currently about 2,500. Would need to be £2 per member minimum. Currently would cost SW about £250.

- **Could the support be in two halves? One half this year and one half the year of the Rally?**

{No time was given for a response before the next comment from the floor was raised}

- **If we are all so keen on attending Rallies why doesn't each individual Section who want to attend, hold fund raising events specifically for the Rally? Suggesting every time one attends a coffee morning just put a £1 in a pot?**

{Again not time for a response before the next comment came}

- **Recently at a Section event members' attending asked a question: If the National Committee, who quite a few members see as a remote group of people who should be running their financial affairs correctly, are unable to manage their financial affairs correctly, why should we as a Section bail them out. Whether this is a totally representative view is unclear. Financially, support from the Section for the Rally would not be a problem but whether many would attend is another question.**

As we have around 3,000 members, including Associates, and we have 81 people here. If they are saying they do not understand where all the money has gone, they could get on their bike and ride it to the AGM to find out.

- **From the National Team: We need to start narrowing down our choices – a general indication:**

1. **Should we completely abandon the idea of a National Rally for 2026?**

None in favour

2. **Have a standard Rally in 2026 bearing in mind the cost?**

36 in favour

3. **Have a proper 75th Rally in 2026?**

33 in favour.

- **Where is the suggested venue for the 2026 Rally?**
In Shropshire.
- **It would appear we will be having a Rally as the indication is roughly 50/50. If we are going to have a Rally could a final decision as to the 75th be delayed until we see how fund-raising progresses?**
Not practical as venue, entertainment etc have to be booked now and will require payment. We then have a commitment.
- **How much did it cost the Club to run the Stirling Rally?**
Stirling Rally cost around £2,500. Venue proposed for 2026 is very similar to Stirling with the advantage of camping. One could expect a deficit of £2,500. If there is £5,000 available for enhancements where will that come from. Either centrally or support from the Sections?
- **If Sections contributed in whatever form, one would hope that they would be encouraged to attend the Rally?**
Only concern would be if one Section refuses, we could not go ahead.
- **Surely when the AGM decides then a decision is made. If members object, they should have been at the meeting. If they do not attend, they are leaving the representation to those of us who are in attendance and the Committee to make the decision. The easiest way is to take the funds from capitation payments?**
What is being said then is that we pass a resolution here that a compulsory £2 is taken from every Section for every member in their Section.
There was a general agreement of this.

From the National Team: The proposal by Jim Bettley is:

That the Resolution passed by the AGM is that the Club will compulsorily take £2 from each Section for each member for that money to go directly to help fund the National Rally for 2026 for a proper 75th Rally and the funds will be removed this year. We will then know how much money we have.

- **An effective date needs to be established as to when funds will be taken as to current membership or whenever?**
As at January 2026.
- **Thought we had decided that we would just have a Rally not a 75th?**
That was just an indication as to whether we should have a Rally. We have now moved on to say that if we take £2 per member, we can have a proper 75th.

From the National Team: We need to clarify when money will come from Sections as the amount of capitation to be paid to Sections between now and January 2026 is minimal. From the Treasurer's perspective it should be from January 2026 subscriptions. We could set it on the basis of the members this year but it will come from payments made in January.

Membership renewal for 2026 commences in December and capitation is paid over two quarters. Those two quarters would need to be used to reduce capitation (i.e. claim payment from Section if agreed).

- **Surely as soon as the Committee get the funds, the sooner they can start to get arrangements moving, which is most important?**
The only issue now is that the membership number is relatively low. By the time we get to December/January we would hopefully have gained 500/600 members. Therefore the amount we would receive would be considerably more than if you based it on the membership now.

- **If we go ahead now, is there money in central funds now to pay and take it back from the Sections at a subsequent date?**

That could be accommodated.

- **This is a very important decision and do we have the right to make such an important decision to take money from all the Sections. In favour but we do not want to open up a can of worms and cause a lot of grief. If Sections feel they did not vote on this. Doesn't something this important have to be in the meeting Agenda so you could attend the meeting in order to vote and if necessary, speak against it. The few of us here out of 3,000 are making decisions which affect them all. Do we have the right to make such an important decision?**

{No time for a response before the next point was raised}

- **Could we put an article in the Journal so they have the opportunity to read it and vote. It would be up to them.**

{No time for a response before the next point was raised}

- **We should be able to take this to our Committees and then come back in a month's time with an answer.**

{No time for a response before the next point was raised}

- **Sections with all this money, what do they intend doing with the money?**

Treasurer made a point that all money belongs to the BMW Club. It is all one Club as far as the law is concerned. If the centre goes belly up, the Sections' money all goes to support that. As does every member because it is a Company limited by Guarantee every member would have to contribute £1 to that situation. All of the funds relating to all of the Sections would go to support that.

- **We have to make a decision today so that planning can get underway. Going into longer and longer consultations it will be too late to get anything underway for next year. Stirling last year was very good.**

This Group cannot make any decision relating to capitation as the M&AA state that is the responsibility of the National Committee. We could make a recommendation to the National Committee and then the decision would come from them.

To clarify we are not changing the capitation, all we are doing is asking the Sections to contribute £2 per member to the National Rally. Nothing to do with capitation.

Jim Bettley will withdraw his previous motion. He will personally write to every Committee asking if they agree with a donation of £2 per member towards the National Rally with this because if they do not agree it will not take place.

Suggestion that we have a vote here at the AGM and to include that vote in your message. If the majority here feel it is the right thing to do that would add weight to your message.

- **Is it possible to email every member to ask for their vote?**

It may be that certain Section's Committees are likely to vote against it, even though the membership may support it. It would be better if every member had the opportunity of a vote. This got general agreement.

- **Asking for clarification – we had a vote earlier as to whether we had an ordinary Rally or having a 75th. If we vote now on this financial support issue, are we voting for a 75th or standard Rally as there must be a difference in cost?**

Difference in cost would be about £5,000. What has become clear, and the reason we voted was to see what the numbers were like, slightly more people in the room would be happier with an ordinary Rally rather than a 75th but that is not binding and just gave us an idea and it was virtually 50/50.

- **At previous Rallies where there was camping and it was not expensive, it is believed they did not make huge losses. If camping was included at the venue in Shropshire would that have a financial benefit?**

If we had the whole thing, camping, motor homes, caravans, accommodation we would get more people attending as we are catering for all requirements. There have been issues previously over pricing structure. Rising costs have made it difficult for events to break even unless we charge ridiculous amounts for everything. It is the balance of getting the charge correct so people feel it is good value and they will be encouraged to attend. The financial situation of the Club is such that if we go ahead, the money coming out of the centre is at risk. How are we going to deal with this if one Section says no to sponsoring the Rally. Is that to be included in a letter to members advising that their Section has voted not to sponsor Rally and therefore no member of that Section will be allowed to attend the Rally as you have opted out of it as a Section. If we do not do that every Section could vote no and not pay any sponsorship and central would be down at least £7,000.

- **If we are going to email all members then we are effectively going to get a majority of members agreeing to this and it therefore removes the need to take it to the Sections. Obviously if the members themselves vote no that is a finite answer. If the members vote yes, surely the Sections do not have any say in this as it is the membership who have the say?**

{No time for a response before the next point was raised}

- **If we email every member and get a majority vote that is what we should do. If we do not do a Rally just down to cost, we could suffer even more. A Rally is a group pull and could be used to attract new members. If you remove that it is all Section based. If you go down the Section route and one opts out for whatever reason, but we have the majority who want to support the Rally would we still have a reasonable income to support the Rally?**

If we go to individuals and it is a majority vote to go ahead, then the National Committee can impose that there will be a £2 levy against every member for the National Rally.

- **Do you have to force every Section to contribute? You only need a certain amount of money and yes it may not be fair if everyone does not contribute. If one Section says they will contribute a certain amount and another Section says they will contribute a different amount. You may build up the financial amount you need.**

{No time for a response before the next point was raised}

- **When you put things in the magazine people don't always read it. If you do put it in the magazine what should be asked for is that this is an option we may have to go down. If you do not agree please let us know and vote against it. If you ask people to respond to agree the number you receive bothering to respond will be very small in proportion.**

Leaning toward emailing every single member asking them if they agree to £2 per member being taken and if you do not respond we will assume you accept.

- **The way the email is worded is important. We can decide here and now if we are going ahead or we are proposing to, the email needs to say if they have any objections to let you know. If a Section is feeling generous and wishes to donate more than £2 a head, let them.**

{No time for a response before the next point was raised}

- **Approximately 10% of the membership attend a National Rally. If we ask the membership why would 90% vote in favour of donating money to a National Rally. We have here at the AGM possibly 2% of membership – surely, we just need to make a decision and see what feedback we get, knowing that you have the authorisation to do it if you need to and if the feedback from the membership is no way thank you very much, then you go down the**

road of a very basic Rally and you are not going to get the money.

By saying in the message that we intend to go ahead with this unless you vote to decline. We would then have to get more than 50% of the membership declining for it not to happen. Basically the message says this is what we intend to do, if you do not agree please let us know. We then add up all those that disagree with it and if that is less than half the membership we go ahead.

This got General agreement.

- **What about those members who do not use computers, what about letting them know?**

A note will be sent out to Section Secretaries/Membership Secretaries asking that they contact those members to put them in the picture and ask their opinion.

Jim Bettley confirmed that he intends to email every member with an email address to say that this is what was agreed at the AGM and this is what we intend to do. If you object, please notify us by this date. He will also contact Section Secretary or Section Membership Secretary to ask them to contact people who do not have an email address to obtain their views. If we have less than 50% to say no then we will go ahead.

- **Can we vote on what the room thinks, which could then be added to Jim's message?**

Yes

Proposal that Jim Bettley goes ahead with that email with those provisos just described.

Proposed: Jim Bettley

Seconder: Peter Dunn

See Appendix I for voting numbers

Proposal accepted

Referring back to item 14a above:

Peter Dunn's reply to Nick Jones referred to Clause 86 of M&AA with regard to Section Officers – "Elected Officers shall be responsible for management of their local affairs, which must be conducted in accordance with the Rules of the Club."

If you then refer to item 55 which is how you manage an AGM or National Committee Meeting, same as a Section AGM, it says – "Items for discussion, including all reports, shall as reasonably possible be submitted in writing to the Secretary on or before the twenty eighth day prior to the date of the Meeting. The Secretary shall include such items on an Agenda which include Minutes of the previous Meeting."

Yes, if you have a Section meeting the previous Minutes should be presented.

Nick Jones – Yorkshire Section – That was not done at last year's AGM.

Piers Kurrein – Yorkshire Section – A mistake was made at the Yorkshire AGM. The circumstances were that the previous long-standing Secretary, John Elvidge, made it known that he was not going to re-stand and he also made it known that he was not going to be able to attend the Meeting. The error was that normally we relied upon John to turn up with 30 or so copies of the Minutes of the previous AGM and the standing Committee did not realise that there was not going to be any copies there. We apologised to the Meeting and asked if they would still like to

vote in favour and proceed, which the Meeting did and the Meeting was successfully concluded. At that point I was voted on as Secretary of the Yorkshire Section and undertook to offer at this year's AGM to present both AGM Minutes for 2023 and 2024. Indeed things have already been prepared so that will be done and everyone will be notified in advance of the Meeting. If Nick wants an apology, we can do that and apologise for a small error which makes very little difference to the Club and then for us to proceed as it has all been sorted out.

DRAFT

c. Proposal by Nev Jones

A copy of which had been forwarded to the General Secretary. What he would like to point out is that the current set of figures showing a loss of £20,000 and the National Committee has already decided to cut one of the three meetings, going down to two, showing a saving of £5,000. Other ways have been looked at today of saving money but it is going to cost the Club £7,000 to run this event because the money which is already in the Sections is part of the Accounts. We have just voted to spend £7,000 on a 75th Anniversary. Additional money which would increase any potential loss. We have a situation where we have lost £20,000, the National Rally could cost £7,000, so we are looking at a potential loss of £27,000 if we did nothing. The National Committee saving of £5,000 and the membership increase of £5 to say 2,500 members, that would come to approx. £12,500, which means we are looking at additional income of £17,500 against a potential loss of £27,000 and that means a £9,500 loss is likely to happen, if we did nothing further. Unless we can be given actual figures where additional income or where a reduction in expenditure is coming from, I would like to put forward a proposal, which is:

That the AGM directs the National Officers to conduct a study to identify options to reduce the costs of managing the Club. The study must be completed in time for the 2026 AGM. The study report should be circulated prior to the AGM listing the options considered and a recommended course of action, with explanations as to why each option is recommended. The President shall chair the Study Group and any proposals from the study must be presented for adoption at the 2026 AGM in accordance with the M&AAs.

The proposal is that the National Committee have to come up with further savings as it is no good us being in a situation next year having lost another £9,500 or more. We must have proposals for the following year in place, without any question, to put to the membership. It is no good people standing here next year and saying we have to go back to our Sections. We need to be voting next year for actual savings recommended by the working party of the National Committee.

Richard Norris – South East Section – Identifying options to reduce costs, is that not the job of the National Officers anyway, why do you need an action to actually do that.

Jim Bettley explained that the reason behind this is that the recommendations will change the rules of the Club. If you mandate the National Officers to actually come up with a plan, there is no requirement in the rules for us to do this, we can just carry on following the rules. It is not thought that is appropriate. If you made a resolution that we must come back next year with some sensible realistic savings about how we manage the Club to bring the costs down. If you start bringing the costs down yearly, it is not a one-off cost here and there, you are actually reducing the cost of running the Club. Whatever that might be who knows but whatever it will be it will mean a change to rules within the Club. If you mandate it, it does not appear that the National Officers have suddenly opened a box of magic tricks and come up with an outrageous plan to save money, you have actually required the National Officers to do that.

Proposed by: Neville Jones
Seconded by: Jim Bettley
See Appendix I for voting numbers
Proposal accepted

- d. Piers Kurrein – Yorkshire Section** – Piers would like to urge everyone with regard to recruitment. New leaflets have been printed for circulation to prospective members and possibly more importantly some business card which can be handed to prospective members or put on their bikes. We have some here and please take some to hand to your members to give out to get more people to join the Club.

President thanked Piers for his huge patience in finally getting the cards agreed, which involved a great number of emails!

- e. Frank Gough**, on behalf of Northern Section had great pleasure in presenting flowers, as a token of their esteem to Judy Lepley for all she has done for the Club. Applause.

The President thanked everyone for attending and for the in-depth discussions.

The Secretary closed the meeting at 3.40 pm.

After the meeting:

The raffle was drawn, with proceeds going to the North West Air Ambulance.

Appendix 1

2025 AGM Voting Statistics

	Topic	Voting From	Votes		
			For	Against	Abstain
4	Approve Minutes of 2024 AGM	Floor	67	0	0
		Proxy	14	0	0
		Total	81	0	0
8	Acceptance of the 2023 / 2024 Accounts	Floor	67	0	0
		Proxy	14	0	0
		Total	81	0	0
8	To Authorise NATO to appoint new accountants later in the Year	Floor	72	0	1
		Proxy	14	0	0
		Total	86	0	1
9	Confirmation of Full Member Subscriptions	Floor	62	6	5
		Proxy	14	0	0
		Total	76	6	5
9	Confirmation of Associate Member Subscriptions	Floor	No Vote as no change proposed, fee remains at £5		
		Proxy			
		Total			
10	To Elect Judy Lepley as President	Floor	69		4
		Proxy	14		0
		Total	83		4
10	To Elect Peter Dunn as Secretary	Floor	69		4
		Proxy	14		0
		Total	83		4
10	To Elect Jim Bettley as Social Secretary	Floor	71		3
		Proxy	14		0
		Total	83		3
10	To Elect Bruce Lepley as Editor	Floor	71		3
		Proxy	14		0
		Total	85		3
10	To Elect Colin Ross as Membership Secretary	Floor	72		2
		Proxy	14		0
		Total	86		2
10	To Elect Neville Jones as GS Register Secretary	Floor	72		1
		Proxy	14		0
		Total	86		1

Agenda Item	Topic	Voting From	Votes		
			For	Against	Abstain
10	To Elect Keith Thomas as Sidecar Register Secretary	Floor	72		1
		Proxy	14		0
		Total	86		1
10	To Elect Robert Bensley as Sporting Register Secretary	Floor	71		2
		Proxy	14		0
		Total	85		2
10	To Elect Deneys Schreiner as Vintage & Classic Register Secretary	Floor	71		1
		Proxy	14		0
		Total	85		1
10	To Elect Bruce Lepley as Vice President	Floor	71		2
		Proxy	14		0
		Total	85		2
11	To Amend Articles 76 & 77 of the M&AA	Floor	72		1
		Proxy	12		0
		Total	84		1
12	To Amend Articles 45 of the M&AA	Floor	70		3
		Proxy	14		0
		Total	84		3
14	AOB - Email to members with respect to 2026 National Rally	Floor	71	0	2
		Proxy	0	0	0
		Total	71	0	2
14	AOB – National Committee study to identify costs of managing Club	Floor	69	0	4
		Proxy	0	0	0
		Total	69	0	4

Under AOB the topic of the 2026 National Rally was discussed and included an indicative vote (i.e. no formal proposal) as follows:

	Yes	No	Cost to the Club
1. No 2026 Rally		All	
2. Ordinary Rally in 2026	36		£2,500
3. 75th Enhanced Rally	33		£7,500
4. Vote for JB to contact members	71		