

Langford Drive
Māpua

21 November 2023

The Executive
Māpua & Districts Community Association

Dear Executive Team

I attended the November public meeting of the MDCA and was very disappointed at the manner in which the meeting was conducted. The MDCA constitution states that the chair shall act 'impartially'. This was not evident at this meeting. The chair's disdain for me was, in my view, obvious and entirely inappropriate. I am a paid up member of the association, attended the meeting in my personal capacity and have lived in this area for more than 27 years. Advising the meeting of my membership of another organisation (that he also clearly disapproves of) that I belong to in my private capacity was also inappropriate.

The chair refused to answer questions put to him during the meeting to clarify points raised in the Agenda pack – despite being asked at least twice to do so regarding one of the questions. I do not see this as being conducive to meeting the objectives of the association as per the constitution.

There are a number of ways that this could be improved upon eg

- rather than dismiss an issue that is raised*, the chair could clearly reference the relevant source or section of a document that he is using to make this decision to allow a fuller understanding of the reasons for the decision
*eg stating that a non-member may not put a motion
- when a member asks a question about what is written in his report, the chair could answer that question – and if he is not prepared to answer the question, then the chair should omit such comments in his report
- I suggest that when a member asks a question about why he proposes a meeting minute be changed**, the chair answer that question. If asked to describe why he believes what he has stated as fact, rather than reiterating his opinion, it would be more valuable and allow more transparency to just answer the question
**eg stating that a member's perception was factually incorrect
- I suggest that the chair run the meeting in such a way that when another member advises the meeting of a member's membership of another group, that that member is asked to refrain from doing this as it is not relevant to this meeting
- in order for the chair to meet his obligation for impartiality, the chair consider omitting subjective terms from his reports eg 'conspiracy' 'lazy thinking'. These are opinions rather than facts.

It is entirely inappropriate for the chair to publicly humiliate a member who asks a question for an explanation of a term that he has used in a documented report of the association. It was appreciated that a fellow executive member spoke to this during the meeting.

It should be noted that I approached the chair after the meeting and explained that one in particular of my questions was genuine and I would like an answer. He offered to send me some material and I accepted this offer (not received to date). When I asked if he could give me an idea of what he was talking about, he did not answer my specific question but instead asked me a variety of questions about my beliefs – none of which I see as relevant to what was discussed in this community meeting. The conversation was further evidence of the chair's disdain for me on a personal level – despite my remaining calm and polite in answering his questions.

The chair's comment in the meeting that he is 'here to tidy things up' strongly suggests that he may have reasons for standing for the position that are not consistent with the impartiality required of the chair as stated in the constitution.

As a long term member of this community who has volunteered in a good number of roles, I am very sad to see the way members who may disagree with the chair's personal views are treated. My concerns for the community are as legitimate as the next person's and having a chair who believes differently from this would be extremely worrying.

By the way, the *Members' Meetings* booklet that is referred to in the association constitution could not be found in the 'Mapua Community Library' by either me or the duty librarian, yet the constitution states a copy will be held there for the information of association members.

Yours sincerely

Lynley Worsley