Malvern Hills Trust

Ordinary Meeting of the Board
Colwall Park Hotel, Colwall, Malvern, WR13 6QG
Thursday 9 July 2026 at 7 pm

Present: John Michael (Chair), Simon Baggaley, David Baldwin, Paul Bennett, Robert Berry, Jenny Burford, David Core, Allan Cottam, Mark Driscoll, David Edwards, David Fellows, Richard Fowler, David Mead, Andrew Myatt, Cynthia Palmer, John Raine, David Reynolds, Felicity Robinson, Chris Rouse, John Stock, Frances Victory, Malcolm Victory.

In attendance: CEO, Secretary to the Board, Finance and Administration Manager, Land and Property Manager, Governance Change Officer, 17 members of the public.

1. Apologies for absence

Richard Bartholomew, Lucy Hodgson, Chris McSweeny, Peter Rogers.

2. Chair's announcements

2.1 The Chair welcomed David Edwards, newly appointed to the Board as Worcestershire County Council nominee on behalf of Castlemorton Parish.

2.2 The Chair welcomed Mark Small to the Ranger Team.

2.3 The Chair announced that there would be a Special Board meeting, provisionally on Thursday 27 August, to discuss the progress of the Malvern Hills Bill and review the budget for preparation and promotion. Trustees were urged to advise the Secretary to the Board of their availability as a matter of priority.

2.4 The Chair invited trustees to see the new robot mower in action on Link Common between 10 am and noon on Wednesday 5 August. Trustees had previously expressed a wish to see its safe operation.

2.5 The Trust was happy to support Malvern Town Council in its upcoming 'In Bloom' judging visits in July and August and wished them success in the regional and national competition.

3. Declarations of interest

Robert Berry said that he had worked extensively with Clyde and Co and might have received hospitality from them (agenda item 21).

The Chair confirmed that there were two items on the agenda where councillors were conflicted. District councillors and David Fellows, Guarlford parish councillor, were conflicted on agenda item 10, Guarlford and Madresfield Community Review, and county councillors were conflicted on confidential agenda item 22.2, Foley Terrace. All trustees concerned had been advised of the relevant conflict prior to the meeting.

4. Public Comments

Public comments were received from David Smallwood, Malcolm McCrae, Katharine Harris and Catherine Swire (read by Sasha Munn); these are attached at Schedule 1, together with the Trust's responses.

Malcolm McCrae said that he had been asked to read a comment from another member of the public. However, this had not been received by the Trust and so was not allowed by the Chair.

5. **Confirmation of Previous Board Meeting**
Andrew Myatt asked to speak and commented as follows:

I remain concerned that the Trust minutes exhibit a consistent pattern of bias and produce a skewed record. The Trust's explanation and positions are generally given a fuller record than the challenges made to them. The use of the word 'assert' is applied to positions they don't agree and 'confirm' used when they do. Therefore I do not believe the minutes are a true record.

The Chair thanked Mr Myatt for his comment, but said he completely disagreed with it. The CEO said there was no evidence for the allegation and that it was opinion only; Mr Myatt said he would provide evidence.

On the proposal of Malcolm Victory, seconded by John Raine, it was RESOLVED, with 12 in favour, eight against and one abstention, to approve the minutes of the Ordinary Board meeting held on 14 May 2026. Andrew Myatt asked to have his vote against recorded, for the reason given above.

6. **Matters arising from the previous meeting**
Minute 8 – Investment advice review
A trustee had previously raised concerns around managed and tracker funds returns. They had been asked to put their concerns in writing but had not done so. Consequently the query had not been progressed.

Minute 9.3 – Designated and restricted funds
The SttB referred to a trustee question to the FAM concerning the contract labour line in the accounts. The FAM had responded by email with an answer to the trustee on 26 May.

7. **Committee appointment**
This item was deferred, pending trustee completion of the skills audit.

8. **Communications and Reputation Management**
The Board received a paper from the CEO on communications and updates made on various projects: Bill communications; the new website; the Land Management Plan consultation, and; incident-related communications. She reported that a paper had gone to the FAR Committee meeting, but there had not been time for the committee to discuss it and so she had updated it for this meeting. She had been delighted to attend one of the recent Land Management Plan 'meet and greet' events and had found the qualitative feedback from the public very interesting. There had been requests for further events of this kind, which the Trust would certainly provide. The

Trust was monitoring metrics devised by Alder UK to demonstrate progress in communications, as requested by FAR Committee.

Comments were invited from trustees.

- The Chair of Land Management Committee expressed her appreciation for the work that was going into communications, especially around the Land Management Plan.
- A trustee pointed out that communications was a two-way process. Their view was that the Trust chose to hear some things and not others, ignoring any criticism.
- A trustee acknowledged the improvements to communications and social media posts, including the Trust replying to posts from members of the public.
- There was some discussion on the clean up after the fire at Happy Valley and a trustee asked whether as part of the Land Management Plan trees were being cut down on Trust land. This was not directly related to communications and the CEO offered to respond separately to the trustee.

8.1 **Trustee Relations**

The Chair invited Simon Baggaley and Andrew Myatt, who were leading on establishing a trustee mediation process, to address the meeting. Simon Baggaley reported that he had carried out research into how conflict between trustees might be resolved and had proposed a workshop, facilitated by an experienced mediator, whose credentials were tabled for trustees' information. Mr Baggaley had previously worked with Andrew Willmott, before the latter's resignation from the Board, and he was now liaising with Andrew Myatt. He confirmed that all correspondence was being shared with Mr Myatt and that Mr Myatt had proposed terms of reference for the mediation.

Andrew Myatt acknowledged the excellent collaboration between himself and Simon Baggaley, saying that he supported mediation in the best interests of the Hills. He considered that it was necessary for both parties to have what he termed 'equality of arms' and that to achieve this, work on the Malvern Hills Bill must be suspended and both sides would need full access to information and access to independent professional advice. A trustee objected that Mr Myatt was talking about mediation but laying down terms before it had even started. Mr Myatt reiterated that the main stage could only commence with this agreement, suggesting that mediation would involve substantive agreement to the Bill amendments and changes to it, in exchange for significantly reducing the risks that the Bill would fail at the next stage.

The Chair recorded his thanks to Simon Baggaley and Andrew Myatt for their work to date.

A trustee deemed conflicted on the Private Bill asked why the Chair had written to eight trustees to suggest informal meetings with him, when trustees were already working on trying to set up mediation. Andrew Myatt had responded to decline on behalf of all of them. The Chair insisted that his aim had not been to hinder the mediation process, but to assist it, and he had responded accordingly to Mr Myatt.

9. Management Accounts to the end of May 2026

The Board received the accounts for April and May 2026, together with explanatory notes from the FAM. She reminded the meeting that the opening position as at 1 April 2026 was still subject to audit confirmation. The audit was proceeding on schedule; all the planning and field work was complete and going well. The accounts should be finalised in time for the FAR Committee meeting on 24 September. Included with the accounts would be the Trustees' Annual Report; this would be drafted by officers, but it was important for trustees themselves to review the draft and make any comments.

The accounts were in the standard format with supporting notes. The FAM drew the meeting's attention to the following.

9.1 **General Fund**

- The FAM reminded the meeting that the levy income was now split evenly over 12 months. The levy represented 41 % of income as at the end of May 2026. The report also showed the average percentage over the last seven years.
- Grant income was also now spread month by month so that results appeared more even.
- Income on car parking tickets was notably down over the first two months.

At this point, a trustee raised a point of order, suggesting that it was unnecessary for the FAM to go through her report, because trustees would all have read it. The FAM said she usually identified the main points to the meeting but need not if this was not required. The trustee suggested that she highlight three points on restricted funds and three on designated. The Chair asked her to continue giving her report as normal.

- Legal costs were currently under-budget, but the FAM did not expect that position to continue.

9.2 **Designated and restricted funds**

- The FAM referred to the Board's decision in May to revise the Other Costs budget for the Private Bill and confirmed that the agreed change had been reflected in these accounts. The Charity Commission had now given its approval to the s74 request for the Promotion and Preparation budget to be increased by £31,500; this approval had been received at the end of June, which was too late for it to be incorporated into this report.

- The Trust had purchased a new John Deere tractor at the end of May and it was proposed to pay for this from the unrestricted gift fund.

- Following discussions at the last meeting about appropriate use of the Urban Tree Challenge Fund (UTCF), the FAM had, as promised, had further discussions with the Conservation Manager. The Trust had waited before transferring applicable staff costs in case there were any unexpected costs for completion of the works; officers were satisfied that these costs could now be transferred. A trustee expressed concern about this and did not believe the case had been made.

9.3 **Resolutions**

- **On the proposal of Andrew Myatt, seconded by John Stock, it was RESOLVED, with 19 in favour and three abstentions, to use the Unrestricted Gift Fund for the purchase of the John Deere tractor at the cost of £65,400.**
- **On the proposal of Malcolm Victory, seconded by Allan Cottam, it was RESOLVED, with 12 in favour and nine against, to release the UTCF balance to General Fund, since the conditions on the grant had been met.** Robert Berry asked for his vote against to be recorded, on the basis that he was concerned the Trust would not meet all the grant requirements if the balance were released to General Fund.

10. Guarlford and Madresfield Community Governance Review

Prior to this meeting, the SttB had advised all those who were Malvern Hills District Councillors, or a Guarlford Parish Councillor , that they had a conflict of loyalty on this item. This meant that they might remain in the meeting and contribute to the discussion but not vote.

The Vice-Chair took the chair for this item since the Chair was conflicted. Some trustees did **not** accept that there was a conflict of loyalty. A vote was therefore required.

On the proposal of David Core, seconded by John Stock, it was RESOLVED that all trustees who were also MHDC councillors[1] had a conflict of loyalty on this item. There were six votes in favour and six against. David Core used his casting vote as Chair and the motion was carried.

On the proposal of David Core, seconded by Frances Victory, it was RESOLVED, with 11 in favour, nine against and one abstention, that David Fellows as a Guarlford Parish Councillor had a conflict of loyalty on this item.

The Board received a paper from the Governance Change Officer (GCO) on the implications of the review for the Trust. She confirmed that the decision of the parish councils on whether or not to merge was not the Trust's business, but an amalgamation would have an impact on the Trust's governance. A trustee interjected at this point to state their belief that the whole Trust had a conflict of interest because some residents within an amalgamated council would be liable to pay the levy and others would not, and that the Trust should not therefore comment at all. There were further interruptions and laughter from individuals and the Vice-

[1] Paul Bennett, Mark Driscoll, Chris McSweeny (not present) David Mead, Cynthia Palmer, John Raine, Frances Victory, Malcolm Victory

Chair repeatedly had to warn them to allow the GCO to speak. The GCO said that there was no money at stake for the Trust, because the Board set a levy and the District Council collected it; whatever the outcome of the review, there would be no change to the amount of income received.

The issue for the Trust was purely a matter of interpretation of the current statutes and those Trustees deemed unconflicted on this item had been given a copy of the legal advice that the Trust had received.

Some trustees queried whether it was necessary to respond to the consultation at all, since the issue appeared to be contentious for some Board members. The GCO insisted that there were issues for the Trust around voting arrangements and it was important for the Trust to explain these to MHDC, because they ran the Trust's elections. She suggested that she could discuss these privately with the MHDC if that was the Board's preference, but the Council would expect some sort of response. At the time of the first consultation, she had been phoned and asked directly for her opinion.

It was proposed by David Core and seconded by Felicity Robinson to delegate to the GCO to respond to the second Guarlford/Madresfield consultation. There were four votes in favour and eight against and so the motion was not carried.

On the proposal of Simon Baggaley, seconded by Allan Cottam, it was RESOLVED, with six in favour, five against and one abstention, to delegate to the GCO to respond to the second Guarlford/Madresfield consultation, *following circulation of a draft to Trustees for comment.*

11. Urgent Business

There were two items of urgent business, to be discussed in the confidential session.

The Chair called a recess at 8.40 pm. The meeting resumed at 9 pm. Five members of the public remained in attendance at this time. The Chair advised of a change in the agenda order, with FAR Committee being taken first.

12. Finance and Administration Committee (FAR)

12.1 **Approval of Minutes**

On the proposal of David Core, seconded by John Raine, it was RESOLVED, with eight in favour and one abstention, to approve the minutes of the FAR Committee meeting held on 4 June 2026.

12.2 **Adoption of Minutes**

On the proposal of David Core, seconded by John Raine, it was RESOLVED, with 19 in favour and two abstentions, to adopt the minutes of the FAR Committee meeting held on 4 June 2026.

12.3 **Chair's Comments**

- The Chair had no further comments.
- A trustee asked if there was any update on advice received from the Data Protection Officer (DPO) or the Charity Commission about records retention by trustees. The CEO said that she had some generic advice from the Charity Commission but had yet to hear back from the DPO. She would report back to the next FAR meeting. The trustee said they would prefer to receive it before then.

12.4 **Resolutions**

- **On the proposal of David Core, seconded by Robert Berry, it was RESOLVED, with 21 in favour and one abstention, that easement fees should increase by an inflationary uplift of 49% (measure RPI) and thereafter increase annually by an appropriate index and a full review carried out within twelve months.** The original recommendation from FAR had been for a review to be carried out within six months, but officers advised the meeting that this was impractical.
- **On the proposal of Mark Driscoll, seconded by John Stock, it was RESOLVED, with 13 in favour, eight against and one abstention, that the set of identified KPIs[2] should be monitored for the remainder of the current Land Management Plan and Business Plan periods.**
- **On the proposal of Simon Baggaley, seconded by Mark Driscoll, it was RESOLVED, with 12 in favour and ten abstentions, that a fundraising group should form to work with the CEO on defining future fundraising activities.**
- **On the proposal of Malcolm Victory, seconded by Andrew Myatt, it was RESOLVED, with 20 in favour, one against and one abstention to raise the Free reserves level from £350k to £375k**. It was noted that the FAR Committee had considered it rational to give the reserves level more headroom, although the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Committee had both voted against the motion.
- **On the proposal of Robert Berry, seconded by Andrew Myatt, it was RESOLVED, with 20 in favour and two abstentions, to record a reserves assessment of satisfactory as at 31 March 2026.**
- **On the proposal of Andrew Myatt, seconded by Robert Berry, it was RESOLVED, with 20 in favour and two abstentions, that FAR Committee should consider the position of the Unrestricted Gift Fund and report back to the Board within the next six months.**
- **On the proposal of Malcolm Victory, seconded by John Raine, it was RESOLVED unanimously to approve the revised Anti-Bribery Policy and the revised Fraud Prevention and Detection Policy, subject to the caveat in the Anti-Bribery Policy that only gifts of higher value**

[2] See Paper C received at the FAR Committee meeting on 4 June 2026.

than £25 would require CEO approval. Gifts to the CEO were to be approved by the Chair of the Board and the Chair of FAR.

David Core left the meeting at 9.20 pm

13. Land Management Committee

13.1 **Chair's Comments**

The Committee had met on 2 July; the minutes were not yet available. The Committee Chair noted with disappointment that several committee members had been absent from the meeting without submitting apologies and that attendance at the last Land Management workshop had been poor. The next workshop was scheduled for 14 July at Lyttelton Well and she urged trustees to attend.

The Committee Chair recorded her thanks to the U3A Natural History group for providing some evidence for the Land Management Plan.

There was one resolution arising from the meeting, which would be taken in confidential session.

14. Benchmark report on Key Performance Indicators

Item deferred due to lack of time.

15. Red Flags on the Risk Register

Item deferred due to lack of time.

16. Trustee Exchange Feedback

Item deferred due to lack of time.

17. Reports from Outside Bodies

A report of the Wildlife Panel meeting held on 18 March 2026 had been circulated with the meeting papers.

18. Date of Next Meeting

Thursday 10 September 2026 at 7 pm at Colwall Park Hotel

Confidential

Since all members of the public had by now left the meeting, there was no requirement for a resolution to exclude the public and the meeting therefore moved straight into confidential session.

The meeting closed at 10.50 pm

Public Comments for Board Meeting on 9 July 2026

David Smallwood
In response to objections raised by petitioners, some significant changes to the Bill were made by the House of Lords Committee.

However, other major issues such as the levy were not addressed and opposition to these and other matters remains unabated. It is inevitable that a further wave of petitions will be submitted to the House of Commons, probably considerably more than previously, asking to be heard under their discretion granted by Standing Orders.

The Trust has had the experience of seeking to disqualify most of the 50 petitioners to the House of Lords, and then of opposing the changes proposed by those who were granted the right to be heard.

If only the same number petitions are submitted to the House of Commons and the right to be heard is only granted to the same number as in the Lords, what budget would the Finance and Administration Manager recommend to the Trustees to cover the costs of disqualifying and opposing these petitioners and what provision is for this in the existing budget?

Response from the Chair:
I've already announced that the Trust will hold a Special Board Meeting provisionally on Thursday 27 August, to discuss the progress of the Malvern Hills Bill and review the budget for preparation and promotion. At that time, the Board will have a projection of costs and how the Trust intends to pay for them.

Response from the Governance Change Officer:
David, you are I'm sure well aware that the Trust isn't able to promote any changes to the levy provisions in the existing Acts of Parliament and also you are very well aware, because you were there, that all the petitioners were given an opportunity to make their case before the Select Committee of five independent people. They heard the petitioners and they heard the Trust. They've made changes to Bill, as you've alluded, and it would be a great shame if the people who petitioned don't respect the conclusions of the Select Committee.

Malcolm McCrae
At the last Board meeting under this agenda item, I and others asked a number of questions concerning the evidence submitted to the HoL Select Committee, the financing of the Private Bill process and concerns expressed by the Select Committee and others over the Trust's communications with Stakeholders. Despite having sight of these questions ahead of the meeting no answers were forthcoming on the night and that continues to be the case in the statements made by the Chair of the Governance Committee in the draft minutes of the meeting.

Also linked to the proposed Private Bill; since he took up his position as Chair of this organisation we have seen a stream of what can be euphemistically termed ‘alternative facts’ about the organisation being pumped out, the most recent example being a letter by the Chair in the Gazette concerning the charitable status of the Trust.

When can the public expect this type of behaviour to stop, the factually correct situation to be properly endorsed by the Board and a public apology for the behaviour having occurred be forthcoming?

If the Board members who seem happy to support these types of behaviour do not start adhering to the Nolan Principles set for them as public servants, the controversy surrounding the Private Bill proposal is only likely to continue and grow, putting the whole future of the organisation in jeopardy.

Response from the Chair:
I provided you with an answer at the time and it is unfortunate that you won’t accept it.

The Board will have a chance to speak about its communications this evening.

The Trust’s statements to the press are always factually accurate. I believe ‘alternative facts’ are in your domain.

Katharine Harris
I note that the Governance Change Officer is proposing herself to be given delegated powers to respond to the Consultation on behalf of the Trust to the Madresfield/Guarlford proposed merger.

I would suggest that the most appropriate people to be involved in any response should be the Elected Trustees for Guarlford and the Chase Ward, perhaps together with 2 other Elected Trustees, who have genuinely been elected to their positions, such as the Priory Ward Trustee, Malvern Wells Trustee or West Malvern Trustee. They at least know the area, the people and the sensitivities involved.

In any event, the proposal of a delegated power for this matter, is above and beyond the agreed and publicised role of the Governance Change Officer.

The proposed response whoever produces it, together with any legal advice obtained, should be brought back to the Board for ratification.

Response from the Chair:
There is a paper to be discussed under agenda item 10, after which the Board will make a decision on next steps.

Catherine Swire, read by Sasha Munn

I'm writing this very simply to express our growing sense of despair at no longer being able to access our drive because of the collapse of the track, in the care of the Trust, on the way up to St Ann's Well.

The distress it causes is three-fold. Firstly, it is now a daily juggle to get in and out of our house, in a car - it often takes up to twenty minutes to manoeuvre. For a larger car, if the road is parked up, easily a sixteen-point turn. Sometimes, we try to reverse all the way along the road. Often, we meet vehicles coming the other way. Always, we have to carry all our equipment and books (my daughter and I both teach) and (often) lead then lift our ancient dog to where we have parked, at considerable distance from the house. From September four driving adults will be living with us. Our drive can accommodate those cars. The road cannot. Sometimes, steered by the Trust we have parked on the track - this so far has resulted in three abusive notes and our car being severely keyed down one side. Just to be clear it is not simply those of us who live here, who struggle now daily with access into our own home. As a dear friend of mine with a heart condition, who used to visit weekly, points out "I struggle now to reach you, I can't park at the Unicorn and walk up". As another friend who is a regular visitor observes, "It takes thirty minutes now to get up your road".

Secondly, safety is compromised at a number of levels. It has not, from the beginning, demonstrably been either the Trust or the Council's first priority, even though ethically, it is hard to argue for any other. I wrote to both Trust and Council, in November 2025 months before the track's collapse to say it was inevitable, unless some remedial action was taken. I pointed out then the wall could collapse on a pedestrian or a car (as well as being assuredly cheaper to repair intact). It was luck that no one was killed when it fell. For the first few months of the collapse, as young and sometimes drunk people wandered up the hill, the barriers were regularly flat. Weak, thin police tape blew off in the first night. People still use the, certainly under the legal metreage, aperture between barrier and our house, to walk down the swiftest way by the crater - often stopping to observe how terrible it is - and how they feel for us - and how it would be different in another country; the US, Japan. (Has the Trust considered that this is a central, international threshold for the Hills and for Malvern). My father is now ninety and my mother and godmother in their late eighties struggle now to visit. It is no longer safe for them or any mobility vehicle to come to the house. Should we need an ambulance or fire engine they will not be able to get access to the house. This feels particularly relevant given we have already had a nearby wildfire on the hills this year and more heat waves are predicted.

Thirdly, we are suffering a significant practical and economic impact. We were in discussion with Estate Agents about putting the house on the market this year. This plan is now scrapped - it is impossible to market or sell a house without access! We cannot make the major repairs we need to undertake - roof and window work - because of the drive blockage. Major deliveries are impossible. I have discussed with neighbours the possibility of simply withholding Council Tax to express our distress and am advised eventually bailiffs would come and take away our white goods - frankly, let them try! The Council and Trust may then better understand the trouble we are in. We have been encouraged towards and are seriously considering legal action - it is extremely daunting -

and depressing - to hire Counsel at high cost, when the only, longed for possible win - is everyday access to our own home. While we understand, very clearly, there is a dispute between the Council and the Trust about boundary, it seems to us, literally, incredible that after the contest metres away, a more efficient protocol has not yet been developed! The cost of construction materials will only escalate over this year. A year-long legal dispute between both parties could swallow the entire cost of a rebuild. Pettiness can turn out to be very expensive. So far, in both their responses, it is clear to us that the Trust and the Council are ducking responsibility by expressing their deepest regrets - but basically implying the other side bears the brunt of the delay. Both the Trust and the Council should be of no doubt, we consider both equally and fully responsible. The track is Trust land. The road is Council. Would not a 50/50 split be an equitable shouldering of this responsibility the first priority of which should be not an abstract battle for funds, but the safety and well-being of people who live here? It should not take sixteen months. Or, truthfully, sixteen hours to determine.

It genuinely grieves me to have to complain so vociferously about a charity I have admired, spoken up for, voted for and supported - and about a Council whose political purpose I uphold.

But the truth is that the conduct of both bodies has from the outset been negligent. No response but painted lines that gradually vanished, to the widening fissures and my warning. No response to my email about having my car keyed ('we didn't know what to say' Deborah Fox explained, having reassured me that she did understand because she once lived somewhere where people often parked to block her own drive). We have watched the arrival of a Council digger without diesel at the debris site, that had to be loaded back on the lorry on arrival and returned. Rumours abound about some geological fault or impasse. If this is the case, then surely that information should be shared with those who are affected. So far, in terms of sharing and formal time setting, a representative of the Council and the Trust without appointment or warning wandered into our kitchen when I was at work and asked a friend to pass on the message orally, that our drive was likely to be blocked (after four months) for another year. The casual haphazard rudeness in imparting such vital and devastating information only confirmed that neither body has any idea of the day-to-day attrition their pacification without action is causing.

Wall collapse as anyone who has lived long in Malvern knows, can happen to anyone. I understand only a few residents are affected. But it takes a certain callousness to respond to it the way the Trust and Council have on this occasion. Pretty much every day you meet someone saying on the road how incompetent and indifferent the Trust and Council appear. Your reputation at least should concern you. Our distress, already keen, has been worsened by response. I can approach the ombudsman about the Council but do not know yet how to bring the Trust to account. That really should not be the - desperate - question I am researching at this moment.

I hope very much that in communicating some of the impact of the track collapse at the AGM some awareness is raised about the day today impact of this solvable problem.

Please mend the track - and give us back access to our own home - now.

Response from the Chair

We don't normally allow such long speeches to be presented to the Board, but I used my discretion to allow it because I felt that it was really important for everyone to hear the problems that have been going on in the Terrace.

Firstly, I acknowledge Catherine's distress. I also thank Catherine for her warm words of support for the Trust until now.

We invited her to make this comment as I feel it is important that all of our Board members hear about the impact of the track collapse on her life and that of family and friends.

I felt it was important for Deborah and me to meet with Catherine and we are following up on some actions in the short term.

Pedestrians can walk between the barrier and Catherine's property.

The Trust has primed Rangers to put fences back up, which were erected by the Public Rights of Way Team.

We are aware of the importance of this access to St Ann's Well and the significance of this property to Malvern and as an historic asset.

We are continuing to work collegiately with Worcestershire County Council on a solution and will keep in touch with Catherine throughout this.