Malvern Hills Trust

Ordinary Meeting of the Board
Colwall Park Hotel, Colwall, Malvern, WR13 6QG
Thursday 10 September 2026 at 6.30 pm (open session starting at 7.30 pm)

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

In attendance: CEO, Secretary to the Board, Finance and Administration Manager, Land and Property Manager, Conservation Manager, Operations Manager, 22 members of the public.

The open session of the meeting followed confidential session on this occasion. Proceedings commenced at 7.37 pm.

---

9. Apologies for absence

Simon Baggaley, Richard Bartholomew, David Mead.

10. Chair's announcements

10.1 Seven members of the public had asked to give a Public Comment at this meeting. The Trust wished to give all those wanting to speak the opportunity to do so. Given time constraints, there would not be individual responses to each comment on this occasion, but written replies would be provided.

10.2 The Charity Commission had written to all Trustees setting out expectations regarding their conduct. The Trust had published the letter on its website in the interests of transparency.

10.3 Malvern Environment Protection Group had held a public meeting about the Malvern Hills Bill on 5 September. The Trust's request to speak had been refused. The CEO and Vice-Chair had attended to listen to people's concerns but had not been allowed to answer questions from the audience.

10.4 The CEO and Trustee John Raine had held a productive meeting about the Bill with Baroness Therese Coffey.

10.5 The press had been promoting the Trust's campaign on livestock worrying. A lamb had recently had to be put down due to injury and this was not an isolated incident.

10.6 The Chair was looking forward to presenting medals at the Malvern Hills Challenge on 12 September.

A trustee interjected at this point to state that they and some other Trustees did not believe the Charity Commission to be the regulator of Malvern Hills Trust.

11. Declarations of interest

All those present who were Malvern Hills District Councillors (Paul Bennett, Mark Driscoll, Chris McSweeny, John Michael, Frances Victory, Malcolm Victory) declared an interest in the item on the Guarlford and Madresfield review[1].

12. Public Comments

Public comments were received from Malcolm McCrae, David Smallwood, Graeme Crisp, Philip Stubbings, Catherine Swire, Anthony Madigan and Andrew Pitt; these are attached at Schedule 1.

A trustee asked whether responses to comments would be circulated to Trustees in advance of being sent out. The Chair said that they would be copied to Trustees at the same time. The arrangement was purely to save time in the meeting.

13. Confirmation of Previous Board Meeting

Andrew Myatt reported that he had proposed amendments to the open minutes, which had been circulated to Trustees. He gave some examples of points that he considered inaccurate. The Chair said that he had accepted a few, factual amendments as proposed by Mr Myatt, but that he didn't necessarily agree with his other suggestions. He reminded Trustees of what constituted good minutes (meeting detail, attendances, quorum, agenda items, decisions, votes, actions and corrections) and what did not (verbatim dialogue, heated debates, personal opinions, off-topic discussion and appended documents). He asked the Board to take a balanced view as to whether the minutes as produced by the SttB were an accurate representation of the meeting, or whether they wished to vote for Mr Myatt's changes.

It was proposed by Andrew Myatt, seconded by David Fellows, that the draft open minutes of the Board meeting held on 9 July 2026 be amended to incorporate the changes put forward by Mr Myatt. There were 10 votes in favour, 12 against and one abstention. The proposal was therefore not carried.

On the proposal of Frances Victory, seconded by John Stock, it was RESOLVED, with 12 in favour, nine against and two abstentions, to approve the open minutes of the meeting held on 9 July 2026, as received in the Board papers. Andrew Myatt asked for his vote against to be recorded, together with the reason, which was that the minutes were not an accurate and reliable record of the meeting.

14. Matters arising from the previous meeting

Minute 5 – Confirmation of previous meeting minutes

Andrew Myatt referred to his statement that he would provide evidence of bias in the minutes. Accordingly he had produced a document, which the SttB had circulated. He said he had analysed 40 sets of minutes and had found that those prior to 2024 showed slight bias, while those since early 2024 showed strong bias.

[1] Since the meeting ran out of time, this agenda item did not take place.

He alleged that an analysis of meeting transcripts would show the bias to be even higher. He proposed that in order for the Board to be able to have trust in its minutes, which he did not have, a bias and unreliable minutes working group of Trustees should be established.

David Edwards left the meeting at 8.20 pm.

A number of trustees disagreed with the suggestion of bias in the minutes, all of which had been agreed by the Board. Andrew Myatt proposed that a discussion about the 'unreliable minutes' should be included on the agenda for the Special Board Meeting.

15. Trustee Mediation Proposal

The Board received a paper prepared by the Chair of Governance Committee and the SttB on the proposed Trustee Mediation process. The Chair of Governance reported that there had not been formal cover for the initial expenditure on the process, which had been within the CEO's authorisation limit. The paper requested retrospective approval for this, along with approval of £10k for further activities and for delegation of the management of the process to four Trustees. Since the paper had been prepared, the Trustees representing the 'Unaligned' group of Trustees, Robert Berry and Andrew Myatt, had withdrawn from the process. They were asked whether they wished to comment on their reasons for withdrawing, but Mr Berry said that the confidentiality agreement signed by all parties still applied, and so he would not be commenting. Mr Berry informed the meeting that since there would be no mediation, the proposed £10k budget would not be required.

On the proposal of Robert Berry, seconded by Andrew Myatt, it was RESOLVED, with 13 in favour, seven against and two abstentions, to remove the approval of a £10k budget for mediation from the list of recommendations.

On the proposal of David Core, seconded by Malcolm Victory, it was RESOLVED, with 13 in favour and nine abstentions, retrospectively to approve expenditure of £3,840 for Phase 1 of the mediation process, including preparation by the mediator and a meeting on 18 August 2026.

And, that if mediation were to take place:

- A mediation process would be pursued in accordance with the agreement prepared by the mediator;
- Responsibility for pursuing the mediation process would be delegated to Robert Berry, David Core, Andrew Myatt and John Raine;
- Petitioner trustees would be able to participate in further discussion of Bill matters resulting from the current stakeholder engagement and mediation processes, including access to additional legal advice that might be sought.

16. Tractor Purchase

The Board received a paper from the Operations Manager, proposing the purchase of a new tractor to replace on the two tractors disposed of in April 2026. The appendix to the paper explained the requirements and brands considered, which had led to the recommendation to purchase a John Deere Compact 4066R for the

sum of £45,100. The Finance and Administration Manager (FAM) asked the Board to decide on a preferred funding split, with 50% of the purchase being funded by General Fund and the remainder from either Capital Land Management or the Unrestricted Gift Fund.

Questions from Trustees were invited. A Trustee asked how much was available in the Gift Fund; the FAM referred them to the Management Accounts, which always included a statement of the Gift Fund balance. Another Trustee asked a question on a change in balance of the Fund that they had noticed between the May accounts and the most recent accounts. The FAM said she did not have the information in front of her and said she would respond separately to the Trustee. There were various comments from Trustees on the model chosen and operational issues; it was pointed out that Trustees were being asked vote on the purchase of a tractor and how it would be funded. In answer to a question, the FAM said she had a slight preference for using the Unrestricted Gift Fund rather than Capital Land Management.

On the proposal of Lucy Hodgson, seconded by Mark Driscoll, it was RESOLVED, with 12 in favour, six against and four abstentions, to approve the purchase of the John Deere Compact 4066R tractor as detailed in the Board paper.

On the proposal of Lucy Hodgson, seconded by David Core, it was RESOLVED, with 11 in favour, one against and 10 abstentions, to fund the purchase of the tractor 50% from Stewardship Fund and 50% from the Unrestricted Gift Fund.

17. Urgent Business

17.1 **Bin review**

The Land and Property Manager (LPM) gave a verbal update on work undertaken over the last year to review waste management arrangements across Trust land. A range of investigations and trials had been completed, including monitoring bin usage, reviewing locations, assessing waste types, testing alternative bin designs and collection methods, and gathering staff feedback.

Restricted-opening bins had reduced misuse and waste volumes, and larger wheeled bins had reduced manual-handling requirements. However, the external contractor involved in the wheeled-bin trial had been unable to continue the arrangement due to health and safety concerns arising from offensive waste.

The Board noted the wider implications of bin provision for staff wellbeing, manual-handling risk, operational efficiency, vehicle access, waste-disposal costs and the deployment of Ranger and field staff resources. The LPM advised that a limited trial of a specialist dog-waste collection service was being considered before longer-term recommendations were brought forward.

Evidence gathered to date indicated that the current number of bins across the Hills was unlikely to represent a sustainable long-term solution, and that a smaller, targeted network of bins at key locations was likely to be more practical, safer and more sustainable.

A trustee observed that the Japanese Suzuki truck had been purchased to assist with bin collections and wondered if this had been forgotten. The LPM said that the trucks were regularly used by the Rangers and Field Team.

A trustee asked why a bin had been removed from West Malvern. The LPM said that a vehicle had reversed into it.

A trustee asked if the Trust was gathering data from users and looking at the cost benefit of different options. The LPM confirmed this and offered to engage with the trustee ahead of the final recommendations being produced.

18. Land Management Committee

18.1 **Approval of the minutes of the meeting held on 2 July 2026**

On the proposal of Felicity Robinson, seconded by Mark Driscoll, it was RESOLVED unanimously to approve the minutes of the Land Management Committee held on 2 July 2026, subject to the correction of a date.

18.2 **Adoption of the minutes of the meeting held on 2 July 2026**

On the proposal of Felicity Robinson, seconded by John Stock, it was RESOLVED unanimously to approve the minutes of the Land Management Committee held on 2 July 2026.

18.3 **Chair of Committee updates**

The Committee Chair reported that the development of the new Land Management Plan (LMP) was on track. She thanked trustees who had attended the recent workshop.

18.4 **Resolutions**

None – dealt with at the Board meeting of 9 July 2026.

19. Governance Committee

19.1 **Approval of the minutes of the meeting held on 16 July 2026**

On the proposal of Lucy Hodgson, seconded by Robert Berry, it was RESOLVED unanimously to approve the minutes of the Governance Committee meeting held on 16 July 2026.

19.2 **Adoption of the minutes of the meeting held on 16 July 2026**

On the proposal of David Core, seconded by Allan Cottam, it was RESOLVED unanimously to adopt the minutes of the Governance Committee meeting held on 16 July 2026.

19.3 **Chair of Committee updates**
None

19.4 **Resolutions**

On the proposal of David Core, seconded by Lucy Hodgson, it was RESOLVED, with 16 in favour and three abstentions, to approve the proposed changes to the Governance Handbook as listed in the Board papers for this meeting.

On the proposal of David Core, seconded by Lucy Hodgson, it was RESOLVED, with 18 in favour and one abstention, to add a new provision to the Governance Handbook to specify that when an amendment to a resolution is proposed, a vote on the amendment will be taken before the substantive resolution. If necessary, the Chair will adjourn the meeting to allow for the amended resolution to be prepared in writing.

On the proposal of David Core, seconded by Mark Driscoll, it was RESOLVED, with 15 in favour and four abstentions, to approve the revised Conflicts of Interest Policy and Procedure, as amended in the Governance Committee meeting.

On the proposal of David Core, seconded by Lucy Hodgson, it was RESOLVED, with 18 in favour and one abstention, to approve the revised Complaints Policy and Procedure.

20. Management Accounts to 30 June 2026

The Board received the accounts and accompanying notes from the FAM. She reported that the July accounts were also now ready and would shortly be published on the Board Member area of the website. FAR would be considering the draft accounts for the 2025-26 financial year at its meeting on 24 September.

The FAM drew particular attention to the following points:

- G1- The levy accounted for 42% of total income to the end of the first quarter; the figure remained the same at the end of July.
- G2 - Car park income was noticeably under-budget due to the on-going road closure at British Camp, where income was down 20% on last year. The FAM was monitoring this closely but didn't propose to alter the budget.

- G9 – the legal and professional fees budget had been split into land, staff and governance for the sake of clarity. The FAM expected to reduce the overall budget for 2027-28.
- G10 - The NJC pay award had been agreed and staff would receive an increase of 3.3 % with their September salaries, backdated to 1 April 2026. This line was currently showing as under-budget; it would catch up due to the pay award but with recruitments having been delayed it was likely that it would remain under-budget at year end.
- G11 – The FAM referred to a public comment on the interest payments on the Bill loan and pointed out that these were disclosed in the statutory accounts. They appeared in management accounts as a total.
- Restricted – there had been a final drawdown on the land purchase fund loan of £66k at the end of June.
- The FAM responded to a question raised earlier in the meeting about the difference in reported reserves levels across reports and confirmed that the difference was the value of a tractor.
- A trustee asked about the level of spending on graziers. It was confirmed that this was in the region of £100k per annum, but that most of that was covered by countryside stewardship grants.

21. Benchmark report on Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)

The Board received a paper from the CEO, which had been deferred from the last meeting. She reported that over 80 KPIs had been listed in the 2022 Business Plan; many of these had been achieved, while others hadn't because they were unfunded. Questions from trustees were invited.

- A trustee queried the inclusion of the value of the Hills in the calculation of the reserves levels and said that it should be categorised as capital. The FAM agreed that this was not a KPI, but rather a statement of fact. She reminded the meeting that a free reserve calculation was carried out every quarter.
- A trustee said that what was required was a fully costed business plan; they would be happy not to have KPIs at all, but if they were to be used, there needed to be reference to spending on frontline services.
- A trustee expressed concern that there was no KPI on health and safety. The CEO said she was happy to include one if the trustee would suggest it. She pointed out that the indicators in the paper were high level and that committees would receive more detail of KPIs in their area. A trustee noted that it was not possible to affect most of the indicators listed and suggested that therefore there was no point having them.

22. Land Management Plan Consultation responses summary

A paper was received prepared by the Conservation Manager and the Community and Conservation Officer. The CM went through the paper, explaining that this marked the end of the consultation process. There had been five stages, with stages 3-5 included in this report. The next stage would be the drafting of the Plan, to go out for comment.

The Trust had held 'meet and greet' sessions to discuss the new Plan and these had been well attended. Land management issues only had been discussed; it was clear that people really welcomed the opportunity to attend these events and give feedback. The Trust had been pleased by the desire of local groups to help it achieve what it aimed to achieve.

Staff had also held one to one meetings with around a dozen invited local and national organisations and again there had been lots of offers of help and sharing of expertise.

The Vice-Chair of Land Management Committee thanked the CM for all his work on the consultations, commenting that he had attended a couple of meet and greets and had much appreciated the opportunity to hear people's views. Concerns about climate change had been at the top of the list for all consultations and what impact that had on land management.

23. Governance updates

Item deferred due to lack of time.

24. Land and Property updates

Covered under item 17 – nothing further to report.

25. Trustee Exchange feedback

Item deferred due to lack of time

26. Red flags on the risk register

No report due to lack of time

26.1 **Risk Management Workshop**

The CEO announced that the annual workshop would be arranged.

27. Date of next meeting

Thursday 12 November 2026 at 7 pm – Annual Meeting

The meeting closed at 10 pm.

Public Comments

Malcolm McCrae

At the Board meeting in May I asked a number of questions concerning the Chair and Vice Chair's knowledge of and subsequent actions in relation to misinformation contained in the evidence presented to the House of Lords Select Committee in support of the Trust's draft Private Bill. As no response was forthcoming at the meeting or subsequently, at the last Board meeting in July I made a further request for answers together with a query about the validity of the Chair's statements in the press that the Trust had qualified as a Charity since 1804. The only responses made to-date are the insults contained in the draft minutes of the last Board meeting.
When can I expect this type of behaviour by the Chair and Vice Chair to cease and proper answers made to legitimate concerns raised levy payers under this agenda item.

David Smallwood

There is considerable disagreement about the cost of the Bill. The Trust quotes one figure, those opposed to the Bill quote a much higher amount.
The main reason is that actual costs and budgeted costs have been muddled together.
Budgeted costs
The budgeted costs are those that you as Trustees have approved. A total of **£705,430** comes from the papers for today's meeting
However, you must include the interest payment of nearly £451,000 because you have approved the loan scheme and therefore it is part of the budgeted costs. You may repay some of the loan early, but that has nothing to do with the budget.
That takes the total budget to over **£1,156,000**
And, you have no budget to deal with the large number of petitions which will be submitted to the House of Commons.
Actual costs
The actual costs are what you have spent. A total of £562, 284 is taken from the papers for today's meeting.
You have also made the first two interest payments on the loan, but these amounts are not itemised separately in your accounts, so we don't how much they are.
Grey areas
There are other costs which the opponents of the Bill believe should be included.

- The cost of the Charities Act scheme which failed. £145,000
- Public relations. Over, £22,000 spent and further £15,000 budgeted for.
- Legal advice dealing with conflicted Trustees and Cynthia Palmer's bullying claim, nearly £22,000
- A mediation budget of £10,000 is being requested today and an additional £3840 has already been spent.

If you add together what has been spent and what is budgeted to be spent, it comes to almost £1.4 million.
In conclusion

Myth Busters 5 on the web site is an example of how the Trust misleads the public over the cost of the Bill
I quote:
"The Trust will be spending over £1 million on the Bill.
This is not true. The budget for legal costs is currently £503,472".
There is no mention of interest payments, no mention of the budget of £202,000 from your "Other Costs" fund, and no mention of any of the other costs which would have never been incurred if were not for the Bill.
You are selectively publishing information in order to disguise the truth.
So I have one question: So far as Myth Busters is concerned, who is responsible, who gave the final approval for what is published on the web site?

The SttB said that a short response had been prepared for Mr Smallwood, but she would not be answering the question about the web site, because that was operational. Mr Smallwood demanded an answer and told the CEO to 'look him the eyes'. The CEO said that she was happy to take responsibility for the website content as communications lead. She added that she wished to register that she was being harassed by Mr Smallwood and that harassment from him had been consistent in Public Comments.

Graeme Crisp

The arrangements for today's meeting of the Board do not conform to standing orders. Additionally they do not conform to the Trust's governing documents. All meetings of the Board are supposed to be open to the public unless a motion is passed by the board to exclude the public. That motion needs to include the reason that the public are to be excluded.

Philip Stubbings

On the 24 April 2025 I submitted an SAR to the MHT Board. In due course I received a response from the CEO informing me that they only held 3 pieces of data in respect to me and that these were in respect to applications for parking tickets. I subsequently responded saying that I didn't accept that and asking for my request to be revisited.

On 15 July 2026, I submitted a 2nd SAR and received a response saying that as I had already previously submitted an SAR it was presumed that I was asking for copies of data only from the date of the previous request. I subsequently replied stating that as my initial request had not been complied with I was seeking copies of all data held on me.

On the 27 August I received an email from the CEO confirming receipt of my (2nd) request and an explanation as to how it was being dealt with and an assurance that I would be kept up to date as to progress.

Some 2 days later I received a further email from the CEO informing me that because of the scope of my request involving a large amount of data that MHT were applying the

extension that affords an additional 2 months to the standard deadline to respond to such requests and that I would be kept up to date as to progress.

Given the failure by MHT to properly deal with my initial SAR and it took a second one to start taking it seriously - no doubt realising what would happen if they didn't. It is clear to me that MHT is not only a dysfunctional organisation and needs to come up to speed as soon as possible, but also, an organisation that cannot be trusted to provide accurate and honest information to those seeking it.

I would therefore welcome an assurance from the MHT Board that they intend to rectify this situation.

Catherine Swire

Since the MHT meeting in July, I can report no progress on the repair to this principal access route to the hills. The fissure has collapsed further, and now, although only a thin layer of tarmac remains in places over crumbling earth - with cars nevertheless now also using the track - an accident pedestrian or vehicular is inevitable.

I was away for a lot of the summer in part because of the distress caused in trying to get into our home, the impossibility of access to older family and ill friends and the very risk of wild fire - the fire station and ambulance service are now being approached by us directly to get a fairer assessment of the situation and our risks.

Immediately after return, on August 10th a serious accident where a man's foot was run over, including ambulance and police occurred - as a direct result of the backing up that results daily from the road closed sign. (The road should be closed now except to residents and Google Maps should be notified) . I know one of the parties involved so have heard direct statements about this. On 21st an ambulance was again called to an accident in the same place. The barriers have fallen several times leaving pedestrians open to the large hole and jagged railings. The young often go up this track drunk at night. Barrier restoration seems to depend on us hauling them up again or monitoring them for the Trust - neither is reasonable. My daughter and son both live at the house and struggle to get out of it now, they have pressing and responsible daily work outside the home.

We have had a ruling from our complaint to the ombudsman for the Council, through a neighbour, that responsibility for the collapse and lead response lies with the Trust. We also have had a letter from the Trust refusing both responsibility and accountable timescale - it seems to us and to everyone consulted this cannot in any scenario be fair. It has been hard to see a way forward but we are advised legally the County Council takes precedence and so are reporting MHT to the Charity Commission for dereliction of charitable duty on two counts - and reluctantly seeking legal advice.

I predict that if the Trust continues to ignore its responsibility to repair this track and negotiate more openly with the council we are likely looking at another death on the hills as a result of the collapse over this year. The fact that a neighbour interviewed the

surveyor staying at the Malvern Hills Hotel to quote for repair and that the cost quoted was well under a tenth of what the Trust has spent on abstract conflict in reorganising its structure against the will of many of its trustees and residents in Malvern only strengthens the power of our complaint. The key to MHT is the word Trust. As a resident on the hills for over twenty years the Trust's failure to respond intelligently to the fact we are at risk, our cars have been damaged and we cannot get access to our own house has broken it.

Anthony Madigan

I was at the public meeting held by the Malvern Environmental Protection Group on 5 September in Christ Church. While I wasn't converted, it was a decent attendance for a meeting on a warm Saturday afternoon.

I have two asks and two matters of record to make, and I don't need a response on any of them today.

The resident who lives close to the track up to St Ann's Well spoke on Saturday about the real access problems they're having. It was raised at the last Board meeting, and something has clearly gone wrong there. Civil engineering issues are never straightforward, we only need the example of the Wells Road to know that, but communication is the easiest problem to fix. Whatever the underlying issues getting in the way of resolution, a good flow of information about this and similar works in progress would be helpful all round.

The update on the Bill's progress made at the meeting on Saturday seemed accurate as far as it went. What it did not cover was all the important areas of the Bill that the Select Committee examined and upheld, and there was little detail on any of the changes that have been recommended as part of a healthy process of scrutiny.

It was a protest meeting, and it was never their job to share information that undermines their arguments. But there is a real information gap that makes it easy for selective truths to take hold. Sure, the Select Committee's report was hard on the Trust in some places, and those aspects were widely quoted locally. But the main findings of the report for all levy payers were that the case for the Bill had been made, that with amendments the clauses of the Bill are "expedient and necessary", and that it could go to the next stage. I suggest that most people in Malvern don't know that and they should.

So I would ask the Board to look hard at communicating in plain English for the benefit of all levy payers, on the channels people use, what the Select Committee (in this case) supported and what it changed. There's no such thing as overcommunication in this space.

Now, I want to put on record two examples of things that were said on Saturday that the report does not support, and I would encourage anyone to check with the Select Committee report itself rather than take my word, or anyone else's word, for it.

An extract from the Committee's proceedings was read out to argue that the Trust is a public body and not properly a charity. Paragraph 136 addresses the argument that a body cannot both be a charity and levy people who have no choice about paying, and the Committee's settled answer is that there is no incompatibility.

It was also said that the Bill's general power would let the Trust sell easements to developers. Paragraphs 90 and 173 of the report say the opposite. That power expressly cannot be used to acquire or dispose of land, to grant any interest in land, to borrow money, or to erect any building or fencing. An easement is an interest in land. It cannot be granted under that power.

The more that people have ready access to useful information, the harder it is for misunderstandings and their related fears to take hold. Everyone in Malvern should be able to understand the reality of the Bill and the process so they can make up their own minds about what they hear. The Trust can definitely play its part in doing that.

Andrew Pitt

When asked at the last Board meeting how much more money he was prepared to sanction to be spent on the Bill, the Chair replied ‘watch this space’ or words to that effect, and stated that there would be a meeting in August when Trustees and The Public would learn what funds Officers considered to be necessary to continue to support the Bill through Parliament.

It is therefore clear Officers have engaged in work to understand the additional costs.

The Trust must now fund activity related to the ‘take note’ debate even before the Bill gets to a third reading, where it appears certain Peers will table amendments, again requiring Parliamentary Agent time and expense. Also there are costs related to the passage of the Bill through the Commons, where, if it gets that far, it is sure to face a record number of petitions ~ this time not just from private individuals, but other statutory authorities, thus incurring yet more expense.

Therefore can I learn what the Chair thinks this Bill is going to cost us all in the end?

Can the Chair please tell us what risk analysis work he has undertaken in respect of ensuring he does not allow his Board to blindly throw good money after bad? If he has done this work, has he shared it with the Board, will he now share it with the Public?

Finally, there is an increasing likelihood that this Bill will not survive its passage through Parliament. So will the Chair please give us all a personal assurance today, if at any point he considers the Board is proposing to throw good money after bad, he will step down as Chair and resign as a nominated trustee from Malvern Hills District Council*?*