

# **Orwell Yacht Club Management Committee Meeting** **Friday 19<sup>th</sup> December 2025 at 7pm in the Library**

*Meeting commenced 19:30 due to issues setting up Teams communications as normally this would be done by the Treasurer who was not present and the request for Teams access was only made earlier in the day due to unforeseen events.*

## **Present:**

John Hazelton (JHn): Samantha Mills (SM): Fred Codling (RC): Phil Naylor (PNr): Jenny Naylor (JNr): Andrew Witherley (AW): Peter Parker (PP): Mike Fry (MF): Peter Hibberd (PH) (PB) Peter Small (PS) John Owen (JO)  
**Via Teams:** Paul Belton (PB)

**Trustees:** Mark Wilson (MW): Robert Jones (RJ)

**Via Teams:** Steve Gilson (SG) Trustee

## **2. Apologies for Absence**

Julia Norman

## **3. Quorum Check & Eligibility to Vote**

PNr taking notes and in role of HR quoted appropriate section of Rule 5 to confirm a quorum was present. Eligibility to vote. - JHz, RC, JNr, AW, PP, MF, PH, PB (via Teams).

Mark Wilson (Trustee) and John Owen (Co-opted House Secretary) were appointed as Scrutineers being ineligible to vote.

PB on Teams was requested to phone his vote through to Mark but also to speak to John so both scrutineers were party to PB's vote.

PNr stated he is not eligible to vote as raised complaint in his HR role about T.Mills regarding the May MC and that he was present at this meeting in role of HR.

SM questioned whether JHz was eligible to vote.

As he has not been a part of the investigation nor seen any of the documentation he has a vote.

## **4. Purpose of Meeting**

Following three complaints against Terence Mills, alleging breaches of Club rules, that the MC to be presented with the evidence of inquiries undertaken by Robert Jones and Peter Small into the alleged breaches and related matters.

- a) For the MC to consider the evidence so obtained.
- b) For the MC to consider the evidence in consultation with Club rules.
- c) For the MC to consider any action(s) thought necessary.

RJ shall not make any recommendations.

Notes shall be taken to record the procedure of this meeting

## **5. Confidentiality**

Any inquiry information, materials or discussions in this meeting shall remain confidential to the assembled indefinitely. This is to protect the Club and individual Members. Breach of this trust would be considered against the Club's Constitution.

## **6. RJ overview**

Following complaints RJ & PS were appointed by the Commodore to make inquiries.

It should be noted that no other member is aware of details of the inquiry.

Statements were taken from witnesses and other information gathered as necessary.

The process was iterative as inquiries led to further items and events becoming apparent which, in turn required investigation.

Investigations were completed and all materials were delivered to Terence Mills' home address 24<sup>th</sup> September with a request for an interview to hear his evidence.  
No meeting took place.

On 28<sup>th</sup> November, T. Mills' legal representative stated that the formal response was included in the Letter before Action(LBA) dated 7<sup>th</sup> November.

The information presented will be from what the Club has in its possession.

### **6.RJ Overview - Presentation**

Presentation based upon the script (T.Mills Hearing document.pdf) which was prepared for TM's interview  
T Mills statement (LBA) – see LBA

RJ to clarify any information

RJ and any others with a conflict of interest to withdraw from the meeting.

MC to make its deliberations per 4 a,b,c.

### **Body of Meeting**

SM asked about the quorum as the contents of the meeting had not been shared., *“but because there's eight of us here, you decided to do a quorum, is that correct”?*

PNr replied *“No, as per Rule 5 a quorum requires eight voting committee members of the management committee meeting to be present, which there is, so we have a quorum”.*

SM asked with reference to the email calling the meeting, because of confidentiality. the contents of the meeting had not been shared

PNr confirmed the email stated: *‘Meeting to Consider the Inquiry Relating to Complaints About a Member’*.

SM questioned who has had access to the LBA: Confirmed as RJ, PS, & PNr.

The Commodore, JHz has not been involved as he had nominated RJ & PS to undertake investigation and PNr to liaise with insurers and later legal.

RJ handed out a **Presentation Check and Analysis sheet** to all present.

### **RJ commenced the presentation.**

RJ read out the following:

Following the complaints, Peter and myself were appointed by the Commodore to make enquiries. It should be noted that no other club members are aware of details of the enquiry.

Statements were taken from witnesses and other information gathered as necessary. The process was iterative. As enquiries led to further items and events becoming apparent, which in turn required investigation.

Investigations were completed and all materials were delivered to Terence Mill's home address on the 24th of September with a request for an interview to hear his evidence. No meeting took place.

On the 28th of November, Terence Mill's legal representative stated that the formal response was included in the letter before action dated 7th of November.

The information will be presented from what the club has in its possession. I'll be making a presentation which is based upon a script of questions I was going to ask Terry at an interview.

There's also Terry Mill's statement which came in the form of a **Letter before Action**.

I'm happy to clarify information. At the bottom I've said here, myself and others with a conflict of interest to withdraw from the meeting. The Management Committee to make its considerations per for A, B and C.”

RJ then presented the script which was prepared for TM's interview: see **T.Mills Hearing document.pdf**

CCTV shown & SM confirmed that it was her husband who put the notices up if we wish to save time.

RJ stated that the information flow is to be one way.

SM asked if all the info been sent to TM? - RJ confirmed that a memory stick was delivered to home address on 24<sup>th</sup> September.

SM asked for clarification of complainants and subsequent statements in relation to MC May meeting. Clarification given that PNr had issued a complaint because of his HR role, all other documents were witness statements.

SM: *"All this stuff that you are showing, has anybody else in the room seen it? Will we be making a decision about this tonight as it is very difficult to read on the screen and you have given us a lot of information that we need some time to absorb the information if we are here tonight to make a ruling- I don't think this is an unreasonable question".*

RJ responded *"Yes, there is a lot of documentation, but the documentation is still confidential to protect the club and individuals".*

SM *"Absolutely, you started the meeting by saying everything in this room is confidential but to make an informed decision regarding Mr. Mills."*

RJ said *"all the information is there, and I am going through the questionnaire as would have been put to Terry with the questions for him to respond. There is a response later in this process".*

SM asked if *"these were the questions that would have been put to Terry if you had the meeting with him"*.

RJ said *"correct, Terry has had the questions, he has had all the information, and he has made a response through his solicitor."*

JHn asked *"what is that response"?*

RJ said, *"we will get to that"*.

JO reminded the meeting *"that it was meant to be one way: it is meant to be presenting"*.

PNr said *"I think the point Robert is making is regarding the accusations – is there any foundation in them? and as all the information is there on the table, surely you can hear what is said, so a decision can be made"*.

MF asked RJ if he could respond to SM as she was making a point. *"To make a decision tonight, but that's up to us at the time, as all the information is in the file and if we're willing to sit here till 2:00 in the morning or whatever that is up to us. We cannot take the information away because it is confidential and the trouble is we can't take it away and what I am saying is that there are eight of us that can vote and we will then decide whether or not we're able to come to a decision, I think this answers the point that Sam was making"*

JNr said *"all the information is available in the file"*

#### **20:25 Pause in proceedings for natural break.**

SM: *"I am not going to interrupt anymore, because of this situation and as I have been kept out of all the discussions, I feel it is inappropriate for me to be at this meeting and obviously I will not be able to make any comment or any choice anyway so I don't see the relevance of me being at this meeting, so without finishing I would like to withdraw from the meeting because I don't think it is right that I am at this meeting and I don't understand why I was invited to the meeting if I can't vote".*

PNr: *"Samantha, you like everybody else is being presented with the information"*

SM: *"yes I am"*

PNr: *"like everybody else"*

JNr: *"and you are the Rear Commodore"*

SM: *"Yes, but I haven't got time to absorb this information as I have been kept out of the discussions"*

PNr: *"That is your prerogative but then you must understand that you can't then claim that you have not been informed"*

SM: *"No, you are absolutely right and I haven't been informed about everything and as I cannot vote, that there is a lot of information to be taken in and it is not a lot of point in me remaining in the meeting."*

#### **20:55 SM departed meeting**

RJ continued with item 4 of the PNr personal investigation into the allegations against the Vice Commodore

On completion of the 14 points, RJ then covered the following matters:

- Emergency Meeting of 28<sup>th</sup> July
  
- P. Baker incident
  
- LBA

RJ commented that it is in the LBA that T.Mills first acknowledges that he put the notices up in April.

**RJ concluded the presentation.**

PNr was requested to provide an update with communications with our legal representation and did so.

**22:30 RJ & PS leave the meeting.**

PNr requested by committee to remain in the meeting as per the role of HR.

The Presentation Check and Analysis sheet listing 30 occurrences for consideration was used by each committee member to facilitate an understanding of all the issues and aid the decision-making process. This helped guide the decision-making process to ensure that no decisions were pre-determined or a fait accompli and that all decisions would be fair, transparent and proportionate.

On conclusion of the presentation covering the investigation, the Commodore led a review of all the findings for each point on the Presentation Check and Analysis sheet to ensure that those voting had a full understanding of all the issues before a decision was made.

JHz commented on the check sheet *“that he had completed it as RJ went through the presentation*

A long discussion ensued with various comments made:

*Aggression, intimidating behaviour on more than one occasion*

*TM cannot be considered to be a 'fit & proper member of the club*

*Repeated denial and lies*

*Resigned which should have been an end to it all, but then looked to reinstate himself back onto the committee following resignation of Vice Commodore*

*Lack of contrition*

*Damage to club property in the area of the building where the posters had been affixed required a special chemical to remove and building is still marked which is actually an example of criminal offence.*

*Interfering with CCTV*

*Also, that interfering with a computer is illegal under the Computer Mis-Use act”.*

*Duty of Care to other members of the club as he has shown himself to be potentially violent*

*Letter of claim sent to Secretary with wrong name and the written copy “Not for Publication” by mail sent to an incorrect address*

*Secretary suffered increased stress requiring medical intervention*

PNr read salient sections of OYC Code of Conduct and handed out Rule 12 and Rule 14.

PNr handed out the Suggested Voting Procedure and gave the voting slips to the Scrutineers.

Voting was a two-stage process by secret ballot with members present and eligible to vote to cast a first vote to determine whether reinstatement without disciplinary action was appropriate.

If this motion was not passed, then Stage 2 applies with a second vote to consider whether reinstatement with conditions was a possible sanction.

JNr, Welfare Officer assisted PP with reading the voting procedure and voting slips as he had forgotten his spectacles.

# Suggested Voting Procedure

The decision making process must be in accordance with the following:

- Any decision cannot be pre-determined or a fait accompli
- Without bias
- Fair
- Transparent

Any sanction:

- Must be justified against other options
- Proportionate

## **Stage 1: Determination of Discipline – Is a sanction appropriate?**

Motion: “That the member, Terence Mills be reinstated without disciplinary action.”

*If this motion passes by a two-thirds majority, the matter ends — the member is reinstated fully.*

*- If this motion fails and is not passed, the meeting proceeds to Stage 2.*

## **Stage 2: Form of Disciplinary Action**

Motion: “That the member, Terence Mills be reinstated subject to conditions.”

The conditions must be defined being:

- a/
- b/
- c/

*If this motion passes by a two-thirds majority, the member is reinstated with conditions (conditions must be clearly specified and recorded).*

**If this motion fails and is not passed,  
the default outcome is**

**Expulsion.**

# Voting Slips

## **Stage 1: Determination of Discipline – Is a sanction appropriate?**

Motion: “That the member, Terence Mills be <u>reinstated without disciplinary action.</u> ”	Please delete as appropriate  <b>YES    NO</b>
--	--

*If this motion passes by a two-thirds majority, the matter ends the member is reinstated fully.*

*If this motion fails and is not passed, the voting proceeds to Stage 2.*

## **Stage 2: Form of Disciplinary Action**

Motion: “That the member, Terence Mills be <u>reinstated subject to conditions.</u> ”	Please delete as appropriate  <b>YES    NO</b>
--	--

*If this motion passes by a two-thirds majority, the member is reinstated with conditions (conditions must be clearly specified and recorded).*

**If this motion fails and is not passed, the default outcome is**  
**Expulsion.**

**23:20** PNr then asked if he could leave the room if there were no more questions for him as he wished to leave the meeting to allow discussions to continue in readiness to vote.

**23:50** PNr summoned back to the meeting.

PNr informed by Commodore that the vote had been completed.

Scrutineers confirmed that 7 ballot papers and 1 'Teams' vote were received for both Stage 1 and Stage 2.

- Outcome of Stage 1 to determine whether reinstatement without disciplinary action was appropriate was unanimous in rejecting reinstatement without disciplinary action.
- Outcome of Stage 2 was therefore enacted with a vote to consider whether reinstatement with conditions was a possible sanction. There was 1 vote for reinstatement with conditions and 7 votes against.

PNr then confirmed that the threshold of a two-thirds majority as per Rule 12 had been reached (for 8 voting members this equates to  $8 \times \frac{2}{3} = 5.333$  - so 6 votes).

Therefore, in accordance with Rule 12, there was a more than a **two-thirds majority who did not support reinstatement with conditions meaning that the outcome was expulsion.**

**23:55** RJ & PS back in meeting and advised of outcome.

PNr then summarised the salient points that would be noted and these were agreed.

**24:00** Meeting closed

#### Meeting timeline

19:30: Commenced

20:25: natural break – *approx. 10 minutes*

20:55: SM departs meeting

22:30: Presentation concluded - RJ & PS leave meeting

23:00 *approx: Tea, coffee, biscuits, mince pies provided*

23:20: PNr leaves meeting

23:50: PNr requested back to meeting as voting completed

23:55: RJ & PS back in meeting

24:00: Meeting closed

#### Related documents:

T.Mills Hearing document.pdf

Presentation Check and Analysis sheet.xls

LBA