

SURREY WILDLIFE TRUST

Minutes of the Annual General Meeting held at 10.00am on Saturday 16 November 2024 at Sandown Park Racecourse and via Zoom

Present in the room

60 Trust Members

13 Trustees

Online

20 Trust Members

Current Trustees

Angela Swarbrick (chair)

Abigail Chicken

Christine Howard

Simon Humphreys (co-opted)

Matthew Pearce (co-opted)

Nina Powell (co-opted)

Amy Sellers (co-opted)

Peter Smith

Peter Sutton

Mark Turner

Peter Urquhart

Adam Wallace

Pam Whyman

Trustees Resigning

Andrew Beattie (resigned 16/11/24)

Nick Baxter (resigned 16/11/24)

Stephanie Todd (resigned 16/11/24)

Jason Gaskell (resigned 21/3/24)

Angela Swarbrick introduced herself as Chair of Trustees and welcomed Members to the meeting in the room and online. She explained the emergency procedures and advised that a hearing loop was available if required with a live transcript for those joining online which could be enabled at the bottom of the screen. Filming would be taking place today with a camera at the back of the room focussing on the speakers but, during the Q&As, the cameras would switch and show attendees to enable those online to see the questions asked in the room. The recording would be available later to view. There would be a Q&A section after each agenda item and if members in the room wished to ask a question they were asked to raise their hand and a microphone would be brought to them. Those attending online should use the Q&A function at the bottom of the screen and for technical assistance they should use 'chat'.

Voting in the room would be by voting cards which should be raised with the cards clearly visible during voting until the counters had been able to count the number of votes. Members holding proxy votes should hold up the red card alongside their own voting card. Online voting would use the online voting platform and UK Engage would be prompted to start and close the voting. When the vote opened members online would see a pop-up screen inviting them to select their voting preference - they would need to click either for, against or abstain and then press the cast vote button before the vote closed. All the votes would be consolidated and announced at the end of the meeting rather than after each resolution.

The AGM agenda was shown on screen. Ms Swarbrick advised she would chair the meeting up to resolution 11 with the election and re-election of Trustees agenda item and that the Treasurer, Peter Urquhart, would chair the vote seeking to re-elect her as a Trustee. She would then resume the chair

responsibilities for the remainder of the AGM. There were 4 new prospective Trustees this year, as well as 4 existing Trustees standing for re-election.

Refreshments were available, there were a number of stands where staff would talk about the areas of work undertaken this year and also some merchandise tables. After the formal part of the AGM, and after the break, there would be speakers talking about some of the work that the Trust was doing this year.

1. Approval of the Minutes of the 2023 AGM

There being no questions in the room, nor online, the meeting moved to vote on the Resolution, the result of which would be announced at the end of the meeting.

2. Receiving the Trustees Annual Report and Accounts for the year ended March 2024

Angela Swarbrick introduced Peter Urquhart, Trustee and Treasurer of the Trust, to give a financial overview.

Mr Urquhart advised that the role of Treasurer was a voluntary role which he had enjoyed for the past 2 years. He thanked the Finance team and Sarah Glasspool, Finance Director, for doing an excellent job in fulfilling their duties, stabilising the team and ensuring all commitments were met for the year. He felt the Trust had shown significant improvement in the financial systems and processes that had been put in place and the Trust now had a very strong financial governance system which gave the Finance Committee and the wider Trustee group much comfort.

The trust completed the financial year with a small surplus prior to spending any of the designated fund pot. This was a reserve of funds which was utilised on strategic or new areas of business and was all in line with budget. Income sources had remained stable and there had been an increase in income from the Ecology Services business. Inflationary pressures had pushed some of the Trust costs up but tight budgeting and monitoring had ensured a good oversight of these elements. The Trust would always seek to end the year ensuring that all financial commitments had been comfortably met and the majority of excess funds utilised for spending aimed at achieving the Trust's mission.

The audit this year had returned a clean report amidst ever-growing audit demands. The audit partner, Saffery, reported positively on the process and there were no issues to highlight in their closing report.

The Trust ended its financial year positively despite ever-present uncertainty in Government environmental policy. There were some small signs of economic stability, although high interest rates and prices still remained a challenge in the current economic climate. The Trust had been able to deliver on its financial objectives successfully despite all of these factors and remained in a very healthy financial position with a strong net asset base of just over £9 million, which was stable from the prior year.

The Trust also had healthy cash reserves which were managed in line with its investment policy, so enabling confidence in a sound base to continue its objectives long into the future. The strong income levels for this year were underpinned by contributions from members, something which the Trust was hugely appreciative of and which was never taken for granted. Membership numbers had

remained stable over the year and the Trust was truly grateful for the other donations and legacies received which continued to support its operations.

The Trust was continuing to expand its existing income streams and explore others. Partnerships continued to be key for the Trust, both from a financial standpoint and also on an operational level, and continued development of both large and small partnerships had provided a multitude of opportunities for biodiversity.

The Trust maintained a healthy Strategic Development Fund which was a pot of money that had been built up from surpluses over many years that could then be invested in developing new income streams, more efficient processes, or pursuing new initiatives. This fund was a good indicator that the Trust had financial resilience and could be utilised to ensure future financial growth and stability.

One such initiative was a recently signed 35-year lease agreement on a 170 hectare farm in the East of the County. Financially, the arrangement would work well by providing layback land for the grazing herd and, from a future benefit viewpoint, it also provided a test bed to learn and understand more in areas like green finance and how to unlock more funding to enhance biodiversity in Surrey. This was a great demonstration project which showed how the Trust was positioning itself to make the best of all opportunities that were available in addition to its ongoing core conservation and reserves management work.

The Trust was in a fortunate financial position going forward which gave it the ability to remain confident about the work being done and continuing to work to ensure the health of nature in Surrey. Mr Urquhart thanked Members again for their support and passed the floor to Sarah Glasspool to provide more detail on the numbers and financials.

Sarah Glasspool introduced herself as the Finance Director of Surrey Wildlife Trust and thanked Peter Urquhart for all of his support over the past year. She proceeded to provide some of the details in the Annual Report and Accounts which were on the SWT website.

- The Trust had a net movement of funds of -£128,000. There was a positive movement of £28,000 for unrestricted funds and £156,000 negative for restricted funds. This was in line with the budget. Restricted funds related to the income where the provider had been specific on their use and tended to be grants for specific projects. Unrestricted funds did not have such a restriction. Restricted funds were often received in advance of their expenditure which could be over a number of years and this negative movement showed that usage.
- The income for last year was £6.8 million - an increase of £0.2 million from 2022/23 thanks to the generosity of Members and supporters. Income from donations, legacies and membership increased from £2.1 million to £2.2 million. Given the economic uncertainty and situation, this was a positive reflection of the Trust's work.
- Ecology Services was the consultancy arm who provided expert ecology advice and consultancy. That continued to grow and its income increased from £1.3 million to £1.5 million. They generated a profit of £251,000 and gave £298,000 to the charity via gift aid.
- Reserves management income remained stable at £1.4 million, the majority of which was received from the Government in the form of countryside stewardship grants.
- Income for conservation partnership and projects decreased a little from £1.3 million to £1.2 million. The Trust received income and grants for a wide range of conservation activities and projects and included in this was the second tranche of the grant for the Space for Nature project which was £0.6 million received from the People's Postcode Lottery. This was a three-year project and was shown in restricted income.

- Income was also received from members of the public and schools for the Trust's educational activities that it delivered mainly from its Nower Wood private nature reserve near Leatherhead.
- Expenditure increased to £7 million in the year. Part of this was due to an increase in staff costs, due to cost of living increases and also an increase in overall staff numbers to support the income growth.
- Spend on conservation partnerships and projects increased from £1.7 million to £1.9 million due to inflation, as well as spend on restricted projects such as Space for Nature, Hedgerow Heritage, River Partnership, as well as investing in Trainee Reserves Officers for which a kind donation was received.
- The financial position at the end of the year: Net assets were £9.1 million and heritage and tangible assets increased from £3.8million to £3.9 million. This consisted of the land and buildings and plant and equipment that the Trust owned across the County.
- The Trust's investment and cash reduced from £5.7 million to £4.1 million, largely because it received a countryside stewardship grant in April after the end of the year, rather than in March as per 2022-23. This was also reflected in an increase in the debtors amounts due within one year which increased from £1.5 to £1.8 million just for payments made shortly after the end of the year.
- The total funds were £9.1 million with £3.1 million put aside for future spend on restricted projects, £4.5 million on the designated fund and £1.5 million for free reserves to support the mission in forthcoming years.

Overall, it had been a positive year for the Trust, meeting its budget and delivering some large projects. This year would bring further new projects related to heathland and rivers across the County as well as managing the new farm - Elm Farm. The Trust would also be continuing its activity in the new arena of BNG, supporting a sustainable financial position, enabling it to continue to support nature recovery.

Sarah Glasspool invited questions from Members:

Q. Where does the Trust invest its assets?

A. Ms Glasspool confirmed Investments were a mixture of deposit accounts, government gilts and longer-term deposits, so keeping them secure but also generating sufficient income from interest.

Q. How are the Trusts going to manage with the single farm payment being phased out and what sort of position that would put SWT in?

A. Ms Glasspool advised that the budgets for the forthcoming years were being reviewed and those considerations would be factored into those discussions, along with the increase in National Insurance.

Q. Given what was happening at the RSPB with a sustainability drive and reduction in staff numbers, looking into the long term for SWT, what do you feel about the financial position looking forward?

A. Ms Chimbwandira responded that it was going to be challenging as the National Insurance increase was quite significant and the reduction in the basic payment scheme was going to be accelerated. In the short term there would be quite challenging discussions, but the Trust had been very clear in its strategic approach over the last 5 years that it was not about growing as an organisation and becoming bigger but about working with others across the County. One of the reasons for that was that it provided more resilience against some of the

economic challenges. The Trust would remain its current size and other ways would be found to deliver its mission rather than swelling staff numbers.

It was really important to remain financially resilient over the coming years. The budget would be challenging in the short term because of the changes expected next year but it was not anticipated to have a long-term impact and the Trust would continue working hard to retain that financial resilience. The work done with membership and raising donations through the generosity of people across Surrey was an important part. Five years ago the Trust looked at diversifying its income streams, which is why it now has the Ecology Services wholly owned subsidiary, so it would be a strategic blend of the Trust not growing bigger and doing everything itself whilst ensuring that it was financially resilient through good cost control and diversification of income.

There being no further questions in the room or online, the meeting moved to vote on the Resolution, the results of which would be announced at the end of the meeting.

3. Re-appointment of Saffery LLP as Auditor of the Company and authorising the Trustees to agree the Auditor's remuneration

There being no questions in the room, nor online, Ms Swarbrick moved to vote on the Resolution, the results of which would be announced at the end of the meeting.

4. Election and re-election of Trustees

Prior to the commencement of the voting Ms Swarbrick advised Members that, since voting was made available online, Trustee Andrew Beattie had decided to step down and would not now be standing for re-election (Resolution 8). So, while some proxy votes had already been received for Mr Beattie, there would be no in-room and online voting for him.

There were 8 votes for the election and re-election of Trustees. The meeting moved to vote on the following Resolutions, the results of which would be announced at the end of the meeting:

Resolution 4: The appointment of Simon Humphreys as Trustee

Resolution 5: The appointment of Matthew Pearce as Trustee

Resolution 6: The appointment of Nina Powell as Trustee

Resolution 7: The appointment of Amy Sellers as Trustee

Resolution 9: The re-appointment of Abigail Chicken as Trustee

Resolution 10: The re-appointment of Christine Howard as Trustee

Resolution 11: The re-appointment of Angela Swarbrick as Trustee

Resolution 12: The re-appointment of Pam Whyman as Trustee

Ms Swarbrick noted that a number of Trustees were standing down this year – these were: Nick Baxter, Andrew Beattie, Stephanie Todd and Jason Gaskell. She was hugely grateful for the

contribution and commitment that those 4 Trustees had made to the board and to the wider activities of the Wildlife Trust over the years that they had been involved. Thanks too from the whole board and the Surrey Wildlife Trust team – they had been superb Trustees and were all wished well in the future.

5. Any other business

Ms Swarbrick advised that no requests for additional items had been received from members prior to the meeting, and no items were raised in the room or online, therefore there was no business to discuss in this regard.

Q&A

Ms Swarbrick advised that 2 questions had been submitted in writing before the meeting which would be taken first and then the floor would be opened for questions. Sarah Jane Chimbwandira would read out and respond to the first question and then read out the second question, which James Herd would answer.

Q1: “You mentioned a vision of a nature recovery network. How important is the up and coming Climate and Nature Bill in achieving this? The second reading in Parliament in January 2025 led by Liberal Democrat MP Roz Savage. And how will you be engaging with your MPs, County, district and town councils to support this? Hawley Town Council has already supported the Climate and Nature Bill. I refer you to Councillors Steve Wooten and Victoria Chester. Who else, in terms of councils, has pledged to the Climate and Nature Bill and how will you engage with the others?”

A: Ms Chimbwandira replied: The Wildlife Trusts did support the ambition of the Climate and Nature Bill and were signed up as one of the supporting organisations of the Bill. At a time when the UK Government remained largely off track to meet its environmental ambitions, and nearly one in six species were threatened with extinction from Great Britain, more must be done to ensure that the UK met its nature and climate targets. The Trust was pleased that Liberal Democrat MP Ross Savage had chosen the Climate and Nature Bill as her Private Member's Bill and fully supported its goals to ensure the UK government had a clear and deliverable plan to reverse nature's decline and achieve net zero. The Trust would support the Bill at its second reading in Parliament on the 24th January 2025. Various versions of this Bill had previously been tabled in Parliament and had fallen because they did not reach the required stages in the parliamentary process - Private Member's Bills were typically given limited time and the Climate and Nature Bill faced significant challenges to pass through the required parliamentary process. The Trust remained committed to supporting and advocating for the UK Government delivering on the promises that already existed within the Environment Act and through the improved environmental improvement plan and, whilst supporting the Bill, did not want to take the pressure off in terms of existing legislation.

Q2: From Brian Austin: “Despite unease about pest control, I've seen enough evidence to convince me that mink eradication would make a major and sustained contribution to the improvement of Surrey's biodiversity. I should like to hear the Trust's view.”

A: James Herd, Director of Reserves Management, thanked Mr Austin for the question and agreed that mink eradication would make a major and sustained contribution to the improvement of Surrey's biodiversity. The trust had a vertebrate control policy under which the control of mink would fall. The principles of the policy were that the Trust aimed to manage rather than control vertebrates in the first instance. Control was considered when preventative methods had failed and published scientific studies had shown control could be an effective management tool. Vertebrate

control for conservation reasons usually related to predators which affected important wildlife species or to herbivores which affected habitat management. The Policy stated that the control of predators would normally only be considered where scientific evidence had shown that the predicted results were expected to benefit a significant population of an important wildlife species or an important assemblage of a wildlife group, for example, where American mink were a threat to water vole populations. The Policy was in place but it was a last resort and no one wanted to be dispatching animals. It was a recommended approach and there was a case study where there was a big regional collaboration and co-ordinated effort to control American mink, and water vole populations did extremely well as a result of that co-ordinated approach at a regional scale. The Trust had been involved in conversations as to how that could happen in Surrey and the wider South East.

Ms Swarbrick then opened the floor to questions both in the room and online:

Q. "With reference to the last question, how much of a problem are American Mink believed to be in Surrey?"

A. Mike Waite (Director of Research and Monitoring) responded that mink were certainly responsible for the extinction of water voles in Surrey and many inland Counties in England. Water voles were now mainly confined to coastal grazing marsh. Mink also preyed on many other riparian riverine wildlife such as young coots and moor hens, so they were very impactful on native wildlife and were the prime reason for the widespread decline of water voles in this country. Mink were found throughout Surrey and all the major catchments on the Wey and Mole, being especially concentrated on the Middle and Lower Wey. This was the area where the first trials of the new mink trapping system, which sent a signal automatically when a trap was sprung, were held. That enabled people to get to the trap more quickly, so making the trap more effective and also being a far better system in terms of the welfare of the animal that was in the trap. It was an important area and the Trust would continue to watch the science to deal with mink in an appropriate way in the County.

Q. "I wondered whether prospective funders ever ask you to demonstrate your success as an organisation in attracting volunteers. In other words, do they ever ask you to put a financial value on the hours of volunteer work that people put in to show that you are a very sound organisation in that way."

A. Ms Chimbwandira responded that funders did require information from the Trust, not only around demonstrating its financial sustainability, but also demonstrating the strength of commitment and engagement that it had with its volunteers and it was a very important aspect. Some funders, particularly the Heritage Lottery Fund when applying for grants, did ask the Trust to articulate that volunteer effort in a monetary way. There was guidance through a monetary formula that was used to assess the contribution of volunteers and the level of that commitment and often that commitment and contribution could be used as match funding for the submitted bid.

Q. Is there a likelihood of bringing beavers into the county?

A. Mr Herd replied that there was. There were many beaver reintroductions throughout the country and the Trust was currently working on a feasibility study in partnership with the MoD to consider a beaver re-introduction on one of the range danger areas. It would assist in the re-wetting of heaths and allow bog systems and sphagnum to form that would allow for peat formation via carbon and help contribute to carbon sequestration. It would work with flood alleviation and help with wildfire resilience on heaths. Dr. Rasheen Campbell-Palmer from the Beaver Trust had visited these sites and advised that, with some work and an infrastructure to keep the beavers in, this could be

considered. The area would be an enclosure of 250 hectares in size - the whole range danger area. The Trust felt a larger enclosure would enable the beavers to decide where they felt was suitable habitat, ie where there was access to water. The trust was proactively looking at this and it was hoped that at a future AGM it might be possible to have a presentation about how close beavers were to being re-introduced.

Q. "Could you just clarify, are there any changes to your government funding following the change in government and the budget? I know you get some government grants and government funding, but I haven't really quite picked up on whether that's affecting you or not?"

A. Ms Chimbwandira replied that the Trust had a number of different sources of Government funding - Central Government funding was grant funding for land management and that had not been impacted to date from the information received. The key impact was on something called the Basic Payment Scheme which, after leaving the European Union, the Trust knew would reduce to zero by 2027, so that reduction has been profiled and some of the countryside stewardship grants now had higher payment rates in part to replace some of that funding. The difference following the budget recently was that, because the Trust was one of the larger claimants of the Basic Payment Scheme, there would be an accelerated reduction in that payment and it was not yet known what that might mean for next year's funding. So, there has been a change but the Trust had other streams of funding that had come into place which were designed to address the reduction in the Basic Payment Scheme.

Ms Swarbrick moved to questions received online:

Q. From Mike Garrett. "How many members does the trust have?"

A. Ms Chimbwandira replied that there were approximately 27,000 members.

Q. From John Basendeen. "Are the major rivers in Surrey affected by sewage overflows and what testing is done by Surrey Wildlife Trust?"

A. Zoe Channon, Director of Business Development and Partnerships, replied. She advised that she worked with the South East Rivers Trust on both river catchments within Surrey, chairing the River Wey and co-chairing the River Mole. Ms Channon advised there was a huge impact from pollution on rivers, not just from sewage outfall but also from land runoff as shown by the news and statistics. Ms Channon would respond on behalf of the river catchments as it was not specifically Surrey Wildlife Trust who did the river testing. There was a very large volunteer group across Surrey that did a huge amount of citizen science testing within both river catchments. A joint working group had been set up predominantly to standardise methodologies but also to cover off conversations with Government agencies such as the Environment Agency. There was no point in testing if those organisations could not take that data and do something useful with it so there was a concerted effort going on. People felt passionately about the topic which was very encouraging. Presentations had been given and Ms Channon chaired an annual event for the river catchment partnerships. As well as the work on integration of data, a lot of river fly testing was being carried out as smaller invertebrates were really sensitive to pollution.

Q. From Valerie Stubbings: "Is there still any culling of badgers allowed in the Surrey area? And, if so, is there anything the trust can do to protect them?"

A. Mr Herd responded that he was not aware of any culling of badgers in the County and did not think it was carried out in this area. Surrey was a TB4 zone, so a low risk zone. This meant the whole

bovine herd was TB tested every four years. The trust was recently flagged as a reactor as someone had bought cattle from another part of the country and brought them to Surrey. The Trust's cows were not affected but, due to the close proximity of where this cow did test positive, the Trust had to have 6 monthly testing for the past 18 months – the cycle completed last week with the cows clear on all of the tests. Mr Herd did not think badger culling was carried out in this County, and the Trust's herd was TB free. The incidence of bovine TB in the County was low, but it was in all the neighbouring counties around Surrey.

In response to the earlier question regarding beavers, Mr Waite added that people might not be aware that beavers had been introduced into the County a few years ago on the border with West Sussex by the National Trust on their Black Down estate. Mr Waite understood the beavers were alive and doing well. They were just within Surrey because the actual water course was the border between West Sussex and Surrey. There was also a landowner that the Trust was working in partnership with who had recently obtained a license to introduce beavers, so that would not be far away from happening.

Ms Swarbrick returned to questions from the room:

Q. "Just following on badgers, the other threat to badgers around the whole South East is development. On the Wisley Airfield site, which was sadly, given permission, although it is going to the High Court on the 5th of December, so we have one last chance on that, there's a number of badger setts there and the mitigation is that those animals will be moved/relocated. Can anyone comment on how that's monitored because there are ecologists who do it, but there are ecologists who are paid for by the developer. And, as far as I know, Balfour Beattie on the M25 Junction 10 relocated some badgers to the other side of Wisley Common and I believe they stayed for a while and then abandoned the sett. So, in other words, is there a system to monitor how well this relocation process works? Because surely we must be running out of sites for badgers to go to as the development encroaches in areas like Wisley, which is 300 or 400 acres, and Gosden Hill, which is another 2,000 houses. We're losing the actual habitat."

A. Mr Waite responded that the Protection of Badgers Act very strictly protected badgers and their setts and was primarily a welfare piece of legislation because the conservation status of badgers was not threatened and they were probably doing as well as they had ever done. In terms of numbers. This did not mean that they were not deserving of that protection, so when there was a potential conflict in development with badger setts, people would normally get permission to close a sett if it was not a main sett or move it if it was a main sett. The main setts were the key ones that could have been there for hundreds of years with generations of badgers and to move them was a big thing for that extended family of badgers because they had probably been there for a very long time. The license meant you must monitor your mitigation and not just action and leave it - it was required to report on the success, or otherwise, of the mitigation strategy. The M25 junction 10 scheme mitigation involved a main sett and their mitigation strategy was to construct an artificial sett and then move the badgers into it. Mr Waite believed this was initially successful but that the artificial sett was now empty so this should go down as a failure. How the experience of that incident was viewed across the whole strategy in line with the Protection of Badgers Act, and any how changes to the legislation and circumstances under which those licenses would be granted, was a question for Natural England who were like the licensing authority. It was a difficult exercise, certainly with main setts, and difficult to achieve.

Q. "It's really a follow-up question to the previous one. Obviously, there was a failure in this attempt to move a badger sett. Is it a question of how far away they were moved so they just came back? Or is it how far away do you have to move them before they will come back or try to?"

A. Ms Swarbrick replied that there may not be a definite answer other than continuing to look at those situations where there were failures. Mr Waite stated that, in the case of the Junction 10 scheme, there was so much disturbance there that the badgers were unlikely to settle into their artificial sett and ignore all of the activity - they were more likely to flee the area as it was not a stable situation. Mr Waite was aware of some road traffic casualties on the carriageway.

Ms Swarbrick thanked members for their questions and the wide range of topics raised. The Trust did not have the answers to everything, and could not do everything, but it did get involved where it could and where it was appropriate. It was good to hear the questions that were on members minds which helped the Trust to know where to focus some of its efforts. The Q&A session was closed.

Honorary Memberships

Ms Swarbrick advised there was one final section of the meeting before the close where the Trust would present Honorary Memberships to celebrate the contributions that members had made over the years. Ms Chimbwandira, CEO, stated that it was one of the nicest ways to recognise the amazing contribution made to the Trust by its volunteers. There were 3 honorary memberships to announce this year:

- Philip Gorton
- David Cocovini
- Jane Saunders

Ms Chimbwandira read the citations received for each Member prior to them being presented with their award.

Ms Swarbrick proceeded to announce the results of the votes for each resolution [preliminary figures]:

Resolution 1: Approval of the Minutes of the 2023 AGM
In favour: 161
Against: 0
Abstentions: 4

Resolution 1 - passed

Resolution 2: Receiving the Trustees Annual Report and Accounts for the year ended March 2024
In favour: 162
Against: 0
Abstentions: 3

Resolution 2 - passed

Resolution 3: Re-appointment of Saffery LLP as Auditor of the Company and authorising the Trustees to agree the Auditor's remuneration
In favour: 160
Against: 2
Abstentions: 2

Resolution 3 - passed

Resolution 4: Appointment of Simon Humphreys as a Trustee
In favour: 162
Against: 2
Abstentions: 3

Resolution 4 – passed

Resolution 5: Appointment of Matthew Pearce as a Trustee
In favour: 166
Against: 0
Abstentions: 2

Resolution 5 – passed

Resolution 6: Appointment of Nina Powell as a Trustee
In favour: 164
Against: 0
Abstentions: 2

Resolution 6 – passed

Resolution 7: Appointment of Amy Sellers as a Trustee
In favour: 162
Against: 2
Abstentions: 3

Resolution 7 – passed

Resolution 8: Appointment of Andrew Beattie as a Trustee – cancelled due to resignation

Resolution 9: Re-appointment of Abigail Chicken as a Trustee
In favour: 162
Against: 2
Abstentions: 3

Resolution 9 – passed

Resolution 10: Re-appointment of Christine Howard as a Trustee
In favour: 161
Against: 4
Abstentions: 4

Resolution 10 – passed

Resolution 11: Re-appointment of Angela Swarbrick as a Trustee
In favour: 165
Against: 2
Abstentions: 2

Resolution 11 – passed

Resolution 12: Re-appointment of Pam Whyman as a Trustee
In favour: 165
Against: 0
Abstentions: 2

Resolution 12 – passed

Ms Swarbrick advised that this concluded the formal part of the AGM.

.....
Chairman

Note: There are some minor variations between the votes read out at the meeting and the final verified number of votes in the table below. The differences make no material difference to the outcome of the voting.

APPENDIX

Post-meeting table of Votes - AGM 2024

Resoluti on Number	Vote	Advance Paper Proxy Votes				Online In Advance Proxy Votes			Show of Hands Vote (in the Room)			Poll Vote Live Online			Total For	Total Against	Total Abstain
		Proxy For	Proxy Against	Proxy Abstain	Proxy Chair	For	Against	Abstain	For	Against	Abstain	For	Against	Abstain			
1	Approval of the Minutes of the 2023 AGM	1	0	0	0	86	0	0	59	0	2	9	0	1	155	0	3
2	Receiving the Trustees' Report and Accounts and Auditor's Report for the year ended 31 March 2024	1	0	0	0	86	0	0	62	0	1	15	0	2	164	0	3
3	Re-appointment of Saffery LLP as Auditor of the Company and authorising the Trustees to agree the Auditor's remuneration	1	0	0	0	86	0	0	60	0	1	13	0	2	160	0	3
4	Appointment of Simon Humphreys as a Trustee	1	0	0	0	84	2	0	61	0	1	15	0	1	161	2	2
5	Appointment of Matthew Pearce as a Trustee	1	0	0	0	84	2	0	62	0	1	16	0	2	163	2	3
6	Appointment of Nina Powell as a Trustee	1	0	0	0	86	0	0	60	0	1	17	0	1	164	0	2
7	Appointment of Amy Sellers as a Trustee	1	0	0	0	86	0	0	60	0	1	17	0	1	164	0	2
8	Re-appointment of Andrew Beattie as a Trustee					84	2	0				0	0	0	84	2	0
9	Re-appointment of Abigail Chicken as a Trustee	1	0	0	0	84	2	0	60	0	2	17	0	2	162	2	4
10	Re-appointment of Christine Howard as a Trustee	1	0	0	0	82	4	0	61	0	2	17	0	2	161	4	4
11	Re-appointment of Angela Swarbrick as a Trustee	1	0	0	0	84	2	0	62	0	1	17	0	1	164	2	2
12	Re-appointment of Pam Whyman as a Trustee	1	0	0	0	84	2	0	61	0	1	18	0	1	164	2	2