

# Portsmouth 2003

Minutes of the National Trust  
Annual General Meeting held at  
The Guildhall, Portsmouth  
on Saturday 15 November 2003

**Chairman:** Sir William Proby Bt

**Present:** Henry Aubrey-Fletcher (Deputy Chairman and Chairman of the Properties Committee), Laurie Magnus (Chairman of the Finance Committee), members of the Council, the Director-General, members of the Management Board, staff and some 1,300 members of the National Trust.

## Welcome

The **Chairman**, William Proby, formally opened the 108th Annual General Meeting of the National Trust. He welcomed members to the Guildhall in Portsmouth and thanked them for coming.

The Chairman introduced Henry Aubrey-Fletcher, Deputy Chairman and Chairman of the Properties Committee; Tim Butler, The Solicitor & Secretary; Laurie Magnus, the Chairman of the Finance Committee; and Fiona Reynolds, the Director-General.

He also thanked those members of the local Centres and Associations who were helping with the vote counting at the meeting.

This was William Proby's first AGM as Chairman and he took the opportunity to tell those present a bit about himself, his first impressions of the Trust and the challenges ahead. Sir William described from his own experience of living in, and restoring, a large country house, why the wonderful places and landscapes the Trust was responsible for looking after for ever cost so much to open to the public, and why it was necessary to generate sufficient resources each year to plough back into the properties. He also explained why the new governance proposals were so important and why they were going to take some time to implement.

The Chairman went on to talk about the wonderful diversity of the Trust's properties and the sense of inspiration and joy visiting them gave to so many people. He described how the Trust was looking at new and different ways of explaining and interpreting its properties and involving different groups and sections of society.

In conclusion he described some of the exciting new acquisitions the Trust had made in the previous twelve months and thanked the staff, volunteers and members who had made it possible.

The **Director-General**, Fiona Reynolds, thanked William Proby for his opening remarks and congratulated him on making a terrific start as Chairman. She also gave a special welcome to Len Clark, who had been a stalwart of the Council and a great friend of the Trust, who had recently been highly commended in the Beacon Awards.

Fiona Reynolds reported that the positive results set out in the Annual Report had continued into 2003, with higher visitor numbers, more members than ever and increased profits from National Trust (Enterprises) to be ploughed back into the properties. She also described the challenges that the very hot

summer had presented, and highlighted the impact of the devastating fires on the Peak District.

The Director-General reminded everyone of the Trust's three aims

- to show leadership in the regeneration of the countryside
- to deepen understanding of our cultural heritage and
- to make lifelong learning central to everything we do

and emphasised that it was not only important to do the job well on the ground but it was vital to contribute to public debate about issues that affected the Trust's properties and to demonstrate why the Trust's work mattered so much to people.

She reported that over the past twelve months the Trust had been active on issues such as farming, heritage protection, aviation, GM crops, energy and land-use planning.

The Director-General also gave some examples of where the Trust was dealing with real issues on the ground, showing that the Trust preaches what it practises and speaks about what it knows about.

At Stonehenge and Hindhead the Trust had helped to persuade the Government to build tunnels to take the roads out of the landscape and to restore the settings to their former glory.

At Dunham Massey and Cliveden the Trust was acting as a developer itself, working in partnership to create sustainable housing developments to a high quality and with good environmental standards, to meet the needs of the local area.

And at Cuckmere and Birling Gap, on the south coast, the Trust had recognised that it could not hold back the sea, so was finding a solution which worked with the forces of nature and the local community.

The Director-General went on to explain why she wanted members to see and understand what was involved in managing change and how it often meant taking difficult decisions or making hard choices. She emphasised that that was why Tyntesfield was so exciting, because it was about enabling visitors to see the process of restoration, not just the job when it was finished.

It was also why a BBC documentary team had been invited to film some of the Trust's properties over the previous 18 months – to show the passion, dedication and enthusiasm of Trust staff, although there would also be some difficult issues covered by the programmes.

Fiona Reynolds concluded by thanking the members and volunteers for their fantastic support.

The Chairman invited members with detailed questions to attend the Chairman and Director-General's surgery sessions that afternoon.

## 2. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held in Birmingham on 9 November 2002 were approved by the meeting and signed by the Chairman.

## 3. Matters Arising

The Chairman stated that the main matter arising was the Governance Review, on which there was a Council Resolution later in the meeting. He asked for other matters to be raised under the Annual Report and Accounts item.

## 4. Council Resolution: the Governance Review

The Chairman introduced the resolution by explaining that it was 30 years since the way the Trust was governed had been comprehensively reviewed and that the time was right for the Trust to update its governance arrangements. He reminded members that the Council had commissioned a review group, independently chaired by Michael Blakenham. He introduced Viscount Blakenham, who was present at the meeting and available to answer questions.

The Council had received the group's report in April and had given overwhelming support to its recommendations, believing that it would lead to better, more timely, decision-making and much clearer accountability. William Proby commended the proposed changes to the Annual General Meeting as they would simplify and open up the Trust's governance arrangements, and make them more robust.

He explained that some of the changes would require amendments to the National Trust Acts, and that although this was a long and complex process the Trust hoped to have the report fully implemented within two years. There would be a further resolution to the 2004 AGM seeking members' approval in detail to the new rules relating to AGMs.

The Chairman proposed the resolution and **Henry Aubrey-Fletcher**, the Deputy Chairman, seconded the resolution, emphasising the Council's overwhelming support for the report's findings.

The Chairman invited questions from the floor.

**Mr Carl Newton** of Eastbourne asked a question about

democracy and how it could be maintained when only half the Council was elected.

**Michael Blakenham** first thanked all the members who had contributed their views to the Governance Review. He then explained that the Review Group had concluded that the Council's current structure of half elected and half nominated members worked well and that their collective expertise and breadth of experience would be helpful in identifying those people best suited to serve as Trustees.

In response to a question from **Mr Chris James** of Chandlers Ford, Michael Blakenham explained that the new form of Nominations Committee would have a very considerable degree of independence. He also reported that members had told the Review Group that they wanted to have guidance on who would be the most suitable candidates for election to the Council.

**Mr Len Clark** of Godalming asked two questions – the first about how those members who might otherwise have been involved on some of the Committees could continue to be involved; and the second about whether the new Nominations Committee process for recommending names for elections to Council would diminish the role of individual members in electing the Council. The Chairman responded by highlighting the very important role the Trust's expert panels and its Regional and Country Committees would continue to play in the new structure. He also emphasised that the guidance was to be provided by the Nominations Committee for those members who wanted it and that, as now, members would be free to vote for whichever candidates they wished.

In response to a question from **Mr Steve McCombie** of Abergavenny, William Proby explained that he expected there to be a process for regular review of the changes once implemented.

**Ms Gillian Comins** of London asked how appraisal of the Council, Trustees and the Chairman would be carried out. Michael Blakenham explained that the Report did not set out how it should happen, but that he envisaged a collective appraisal by each committee of its own work, an appraisal by the Chairman of individual members, and a closed session each year when the Council would discuss the performance of the Chairman in his absence.

**Mr Peter Bate** of Minehead expressed support for the review, as it would allow, for the first time, the many thousands of National Trust tenants to stand for election to the Council.

William Proby read out a question that had been sent in advance from **Mr Peter Ratzler** of London who was concerned that there was a fundamental conflict in having the same person chairing the Council as the governing body. Michael Blakenham explained that this issue had exercised the Review Group, but they had concluded that the benefits of having the same Chairman – the close working relationship and good communication – outweighed any general sense of a conflict of interest. Where specific conflicts arose, the Council meeting could be chaired by the Senior Member of the Council.

**Mr Robert Clark** of London asked about how members could raise concerns without having to bring members' resolutions to the AGM. Fiona Reynolds responded by highlighting the need to make sure that there was good communication with members on the ground and at regional and national levels. Michael Blakenham explained that the Review had recommended a complaints procedure to avoid issues having to be brought to the AGM.

The Chairman concluded the questions by inviting members to submit any further questions in writing after the meeting.

**The Secretary** explained the procedure for voting. He also reported that, as was the usual practice, the Executive Committee had required that there should be a ballot on all the resolutions.

## 5. Elections to the Council

The Chairman drew the attention of members to the note in the AGM packs about Clarissa Dickson Wright's resignation from the Council. He explained that this meant there were eleven vacancies to be filled rather than the ten mentioned in the papers for the meeting and that in order that members voting at the AGM and those voting by proxy did so on the same basis, members were asked to vote for ten candidates, even though the eleven candidates with the highest number of votes would be elected.

The Secretary, Tim Butler, announced the arrangements for the election of eleven members to the Council. He asked the members who had not already done so to select up to ten candidates and to complete the green ballot paper marked 'B' for elections to the Council.

## 6. Annual Report and Accounts

The Chairman proposed the adoption of the Annual Report and Accounts for 2002–03.

In presenting the Accounts for 2002–03, the **Chairman of the Finance Committee, Laurie Magnus** seconded the adoption of the Annual Report and Accounts.

The meeting noted the exceptionally good results for the year, from the membership figure of 3.3 million to a 30 per cent increase in National Trust (Enterprises) contributions and a record £45 million in legacies received. Laurie Magnus highlighted the achievement of raising £8.2 million in 100 days to save Tynesfield for the nation, and the generosity of the National Heritage Memorial Fund in making its £17.4 million contribution. It was noted that there was a great deal of work still to be done to achieve a full endowment and therefore secure the long-term financial future of the property.

Laurie Magnus reported the impact of unavoidable significant external pressures on the Trust's finances, including the stock market decline hitting the investment portfolio by £101 million, pressures on farm rents, and increased costs of the pension scheme, National Insurance contributions and insurance rates. It was also noted that a considerable investment was being made in information technology to catch up after previous under-investment, to improve the efficiency of the Trust's operations and to service the needs of members more effectively.

He explained the need to increase the Trust's annual operating surplus, by drawing attention to the enormous repair backlog, the cost of conservation projects and the many under-endowed properties. The meeting noted that expenditure had been increasing more quickly than income and that the total net incoming resources of £2.1 million was far too small for the size of the organisation.

Laurie Magnus set out the work that had been started to control costs and increase income. He spoke of the changes that were being made to improve the efficiency of the Trust's operations and the need for continued growth in the Trust's membership. He also emphasised that, in addition to focusing on the conservation and presentation of its properties and the visitor experience, the Trust had to be more open to commercial opportunities.

He concluded by mentioning the recently approved Strategic Plan, setting the foundations for a robust financial position, and assured members that they could expect to see a significant improvement in the financial results in future years.

William Proby thanked Laurie Magnus and invited questions, explaining that if there was not sufficient time to cover all questions, he was happy to answer questions at the Chairman and Director-General's surgery sessions later in the day.

In response to a question from **Ms Cherry Lavell** of Cheltenham, Anne Dixon, Director of Customer Services, explained that a survey in *BBC Good Food Magazine* had wrongly reported that the Trust served French apples to staff at its Queen Anne's Gate office and had subsequently printed a retraction. She reaffirmed the Trust's commitment to local sourcing and confirmed that the necessary contractual arrangements were in place to underpin this commitment.

**Mr Chris Gillham** of Winchester asked why the National Trust had not made a statement that it was opposed in principle to the current Highways Agency's plans to destroy a significant area of the World Heritage Site at Stonehenge.

**Martyn Heighton, Territory Director, West** explained that the National Trust recognised that the present situation at Stonehenge was not acceptable and that the Trust was therefore doing everything it could to ensure that the proposals which came forward would provide a good solution for Stonehenge.

In response to questions from **Mr Philip Matthews** of Wells, near Salisbury, Martyn Heighton reassured members that access would continue to be free for anyone wishing to walk to the stones from any part of the road system around Stonehenge. He agreed that future visitors to Stonehenge would be likely to spend longer at the site and therefore would probably spend more time in the area, not just stopping off on the way to a more distant destination.

**Mr P. H. Hale** of Shrewton in Wiltshire asked if National Trust members would have free entry to the new English Heritage visitor centre. Martyn Heighton confirmed that entry to the site and to the visitor centre, car-parking and travel on the transit system would all be free to National Trust members.

In response to a question from **Mr J. Price** of Farnham, Martyn Heighton reported that the Trust was reserving its position on tunnel length until the Public Inquiry. He gave details of the Trust's continuing discussions with English Heritage, the Highways Agency and other partner organisations and explained that the Trust was still assembling its evidence for the Public Inquiry in February 2004.

**Mr Colin Fuller** of Frant in East Sussex asked about the possible impact of the pension fund deficit on the Trust's operational activities. **Andy Copestake, Director of**

**Finance** confirmed that the deficit had fallen from £80 million in the 2002-03 accounts to about £50 million, but that it would be necessary to make further contributions to the scheme in two years if the stock market did not recover considerably. He re-emphasised the point made earlier by Laurie Magnus that the annual operating surplus needed to be increased considerably.

In reply to a question from **Mr R. Salisbury** of Portsmouth, **Sue Saville, Director for the South East** confirmed that the Trust was supporting the proposed establishment of a South Downs National Park. She explained that the Trust was working with many other organisations, and would in future work with any established national park authority, to ensure that the impact on National Trust property, and on every other part of the landscape of the area, was positive.

**Mr David Baines** of Portsmouth asked if more could be done to involve local members in the hosting of the Annual General Meeting. Fiona Reynolds welcomed the role that local Centres and Associations already played in the arrangements for an AGM, particularly in organising the counting of ballot papers, and said that the Trust wanted to do more to reach active local members.

Responding to a question from **Mr James Rowe** of Bicester, Anne Dixon reported that the Trust was encouraging young people to become members by offering a very low rate for 18 to 26 year olds. It was noted that the young person's membership had become the fastest growing category of membership.

**Mr Robert Clark** of London asked how much of the land owned by the Trust was actually covered by the definitions of open country in the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 and whether the Trust had done or planned to appeal against the inclusion of any land on the draft maps. **Peter Nixon, Director of Conservation** explained that the Trust's holding of 66,000 hectares of common land plus other areas of heath, mountain, moor and downland would be included on the maps. The Trust had appealed on a number of occasions, where it believed land had either been left out that should have been included or included where it should not have been.

In response to a question from **Mr Jonathan Neil-Smith** of Guildford, Anne Dixon reported that Clandon Park was the only one of the Trust's properties which closed on a Saturday for civil wedding ceremonies to take place. The meeting noted that the property was severely in debt and raised much needed funds by hiring out its facilities. Anne Dixon said that

the situation was being reviewed but it would not be possible to implement any changes immediately.

**Mr David Bonney** of Exmoor asked whether the Council would review its policy on the issue of stag hunting licences in the light of a new report on the contribution of stag hunting to the economy of the National Park. Peter Nixon emphasised that the report was very new but that he thought that the extent to which the information was new or new to the Council was questionable. He explained that when the Council took its decision in 1997 it was informed by a report from the Royal Agricultural College, Cirencester, which had very similar terms of reference to the Promar International Report. On the point about the number of deer in the West Country being important to tourism, Peter Nixon reported that numbers of deer on the Trust's Holnicote Estate were increasing and that the deer themselves were thriving in terms of nutrition, body weight and fertility.

In response to **Mr Karl Lawrence** of Taplow, Maidenhead, Anne Dixon reported that generally between 89 per cent and 91 per cent of members renewed their membership each year and that the latest figure had been 91 per cent. She also reported that the average period of membership was nine years.

The Chairman thanked all the speakers for their questions.

The Chairman reported that the Executive Committee had resolved that the vote be taken by a poll.

## 7. Appointment of Auditors

Laurie Magnus explained that a formal tendering procedure, led by the Audit Committee, had taken place to select a firm of external auditors for the Trust and for The National Trust (Enterprises) Ltd.

The resolution to appoint Messrs PricewaterhouseCoopers of 31 Great George Street, Bristol, BS1 5QD as auditors for the ensuing year was proposed by Laurie Magnus and seconded by the Chairman.

The Chairman reported that the Executive Committee had resolved that the vote be taken by a poll.

## 8. Members' Resolution on the Trust's position on genetically modified crops

**Ms Janet Perry** proposed the following resolution:

'That this National Trust AGM is in favour of the Trust having a position on genetically modified (GM) crops which includes:

- Preventing any GM crops from being grown on Trust land by employees of the Trust
- Including a clause in all new farm tenancy agreements, preventing the growing of GM crops by tenants
- Inserting into current tenancy agreements, at any point when such agreements are amended, a clause preventing GM crops from being grown
- Contacting all existing tenants informing them of the Trust's policy on GM and requesting them to consider not growing any GM crops for the duration of their tenancy agreement.'

In addressing the meeting, Ms Perry drew attention to the economic and biodiversity implications of GM crops for the National Trust. She highlighted the dependence on agri-chemicals and on the GM seed suppliers that accompanied the introduction of GM varieties and how this would be at odds with improving the profitability of the farms in the Trust's landholding.

She referred to the results of the UK Government's farm-scale field trials where wildlife numbers had dropped in areas where two of the three crops were tested and that the third crop had been tested using a herbicide that was already being discontinued.

Ms Perry spoke of the risk of GM crops, and the linked use of agri-chemicals, leading to GM contamination of other plants, and the spread of herbicide-resistant weeds.

She concluded by emphasising that there would be no financial or wildlife benefit for the Trust in growing GM crops on its land.

In seconding the motion, **Mr Jeremy Herbert** spoke about the importance of sustaining the farming industry by specialising and offering the public extra value in their food – including environmental, social and cultural value. He referred to the huge potential market for GM-free food and the increasing opposition to GM crops in the agricultural sector in North America. He concluded by stating that if the Trust did not sign up to stay GM-free it stood to lose tradition, heritage, wildlife, local identity, local jobs, local culture and reputation.

Speaking on behalf of the Council, **Patrick Casement** explained that the Trust wished to have as much control as possible over the possible use of GM crops on its land. The Trust, as a major owner and manager of farmland, understood the concerns surrounding GM crops, but it also recognised that GM technology had the potential to deliver benefits, even if these benefits were not yet fully apparent. He emphasised that as a champion of locally produced, environmentally friendly, high-quality food, and as a caterer and retailer of food products, the Trust had a real interest in the GM debate and had been involved in the debate right from the start. The Trust had done its best to encourage its members to contribute to the public debate as well. However, the Trust felt that there was not yet enough information available on which it could make a final decision on the use of GM crops on its land.

Mr Casement stated that the Trust could not sign up to all the aspects of the resolution though there was much in common between the spirit of the resolution and the Trust's own position. He welcomed the opportunity for this important matter to be debated at the AGM, and explained that the Council had deliberately chosen not to make a recommendation to members as to whether or not to support the resolution.

**Dr Alan Dewar** of Bury St Edmunds drew on his experience of working in GM research on farm-scale evaluations to point out that it was not the GM crops that caused problems but the management of the crops. He described how some experiments looked at increasing yields at the same time as ensuring weeds and insects continued to thrive. He concluded by asking the members to reject the resolution, so that tenants would be allowed the choice to grow what they wanted in order to remain profitable.

**Ms Cherry Lavell** of Cheltenham questioned the likelihood of increased crop yields with GM crops and whether they would lead to a disease-prone monoculture. She supported the motion, suggesting that a lot more evidence for increased yields and reduced agri-chemical use was needed before the Trust should consider allowing GM crops on its land.

**Mr Guy Trehane** of Wimborne stated that, as a farmer, his decision as to whether to grow GM crops would be an economic decision. He said that the Trust would be ill-advised to close the door on science, especially as that would allow others to criticise the Trust as being against science and against progress.

**David Riddle, Land Use Director**, summed up for the Council. He emphasised the need to consider the introduction of new crop varieties on a case by case basis and the fact that there would be different benefits and risks arising from each form of GM crop. He noted that there was much in the resolution that the Trust could undertake to deliver, but it was not possible to determine the crops grown by farmers under agricultural tenancies let before 1995. He concluded by underlining the importance of the Trust's role in the long-term custodianship of the land in its care, especially where it had the potential to make irreversible decisions.

**Janet Perry**, summing up, pointed out that the proposers of the resolution were not anti-science, but were opposed to the speed with which people were expected to accept GM technology. She explained why she felt that GM was not the solution to the problems of feeding people in developing countries. She pointed out that in future, the Trust might decide that it needed GM crops, but until then, it was important to make sure that what it did was reversible – which GM crops were not. She concluded by reminding members that the Trust's land was held inalienably and for the nation; it was not a laboratory for GM crops. She called upon members to vote for the resolution.

The Executive Committee having previously so requested, the vote was taken by a poll.

## **9. Members' Resolution on the Trust's plans to develop the Cliveden Hospital Site**

**Mr Euan Felton** proposed the following resolution:

'The Annual General Meeting of the National Trust deploras the decision by the National Trust to build a housing estate of 192 unrestricted open-market dwellings on inalienable land, part of the Trust's Cliveden Estate in Taplow, Buckinghamshire.'

In addressing the meeting, Mr Felton questioned whether the Trust should compromise its basic duty to conservation and its principles to seek the maximum financial return for Cliveden. He also said that the development was not in the right place, was not an appropriate development for the site and did not conform to current planning principles or the Trust's own guidelines.

He stated that a study by Buckinghamshire County Council showed that the development would generate an additional 2,000 car trips each day and that developments within existing urban areas would meet housing demand up to the year 2016.

He said that the Trust had turned down an offer of £10 million from a developer to implement the existing planning permission of 135 care and retirement homes. Mr Felton drew attention to the opposition to the scheme from conservation bodies. He said that Lord Astor had expressed the wish that the Cliveden Estate should not become a speculator's building estate. He concluded by drawing attention to the implications of the development for other Trust properties.

In seconding the motion, **Mr Karl Lawrence** described the determined opposition to the development, despite the Trust's claims that the proposal enjoyed local support. He asked why the Trust claimed that Beechcroft Developments had withdrawn its offer to build the retirement community, when Beechcroft had said its offer was refused. He criticised the Trust for resorting to scare mongering by threatening the closure of Cliveden if the development did not go ahead.

Speaking on behalf of the Council, **Henry Aubrey-Fletcher** gave members a brief overview of what made Cliveden so popular with visitors and explained how, without an agricultural estate to support it, it was reliant on the income which had, until 1987, come from the hospital site. He pointed out that already there was a backlog of repairs amounting to £9 million. He emphasised that the proposals did not breach the Trust's principles on planning, inalienability or on donor wishes. He called upon members to support the Council in its endorsement of the proposed development.

**Mr Max Lipman** of Taplow stated that 93 per cent of local residents were opposed to the scheme and asked whether similar developments were planned on National Trust land elsewhere.

**Ms Shirley Hardy** of Seaview, Isle of Wight expressed support for the mixed-use development to increase the supply of affordable housing in the area.

**Mrs Eva Lipman** of Taplow explained that the local school was over-subscribed and that there was a desperate need for retirement homes. She asked if the Trust had any support from outside organisations.

**Mr Tim Anderson** of Taplow said the site was a very isolated one. He also asked whether it was in the Trust's remit to create a development with streetlighting and pavements in the greenbelt, which would generate a considerable increase in traffic on local roads.

**Peter Nixon, Director of Conservation**, summed up on behalf of the Council, addressing the concerns expressed. He

began by explaining that there had not been a written offer by Beechcroft Developments for the previous retirement housing scheme.\*

He stated that of the Trust's holding of 250,000 hectares of land, just 50 hectares was designated as being appropriate for that kind of development, and Cliveden was the only example on inalienable land. He emphasised that it was the local plan, part of the democratic planning process, which had identified the site as being a priority site for housing. He referred to the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment as supporting the scheme, along with the results of a telephone survey of the wider area where 80 per cent supported development of the site. It was noted that Lord Astor's letter was clear in expecting the Trust to use the income from the hospital site to protect the rest of the estate.

He emphasised that the 191 home scheme with 20 per cent affordable homes would provide a thriving community with guaranteed public transport provision and without a significant increase in car journeys above those envisaged for the 135 retirement homes scheme. He asked members to vote against the resolution as the future maintenance of Cliveden depended on having the resources the development would provide.

In conclusion, **Mr Karl Lawrence** made the following points: that the current derelict state of the site was due to the National Trust's approach to managing it, that the site was isolated and car-dependent, that the development breached planning principles; that the National Trust had withdrawn its traffic figures given at an earlier public meeting and that Buckinghamshire County Council's own figures showed the new development would more than double the car journeys generated by the original retirement scheme; that the affordable houses in the scheme were likely to be sold for

\* Secretariat note: On further investigation after the AGM it was established that Peter Nixon had misunderstood the position with regard to Beechcroft's offer. The correct position is that at the time the offer was received, the Trust was not in a position to accept Beechcroft's written offer because it was by then already developing proposals for a non-retirement scheme and was about to test this new approach on the open market. The revised scheme reflected a change in planning guidance, a change in the market and the Trust's desire to design a scheme that was as environmentally sound as possible. In response to the market testing, the Trust received over 40 expressions of interest from developers, including Beechcroft, which was not successful.

£280,000; and that the local plan identified the site as being a possible location for restricted development, not a priority site for open market development. He concluded by asking members to vote for the resolution.

The Executive Committee having previously so requested, the vote was taken by a poll.

## 10. Conclusion

The Chairman thanked all who had taken part in the AGM and looked forward to seeing as many members as possible in Newcastle upon Tyne on Saturday 6 November 2004.

## 11. Results of the Ballots

The results of the ballots were subsequently announced as follows:

		For	Against	Abstain
Resolution A	Specified	64,695	3,182	4,566
The Governance Review	Total	64,695	3,182	4,566
Resolution C	Specified	60,656	454	2,462
Annual Report and Accounts	Discretionary	21,120	0	7
	Total	81,776	454	2,469
Resolution D	Specified	59,220	1,732	2,263
Appointment of Auditors	Discretionary	21,580	0	7
	Total	80,800	1,732	2,270
Resolution E	Specified	50,392	12,414	3,552
Genetically Modified Crops	Discretionary	20	161	18,907
	Total	50,412	12,575	22,459
Resolution F	Specified	32,632	28,758	4,226
Cliveden Hospital Development	Discretionary	484	19,094	16
	Total	33,116	47,852	4,242

### Elections to the Council

	Specified	Discretionary	Total	Elected
Gregory Slay	40,858	21,444	62,302	Elected
Richard Moisey	45,441	21,444	66,885	Elected
Hugh Matheson	41,710	21,428	63,138	Elected
Hilary Lade	49,218	21,443	70,661	Elected
Hugo de Ferranti	37,202	21,422	58,624	Elected
Laurie Magnus	38,083	22,233	60,316	Elected
Robert Jones	39,902	21,427	61,329	Elected
Martin Bull	28,579	21,435	50,014	Elected
Roger Scruton	32,990	11	33,001	
Charles Collins	39,746	21,420	61,166	Elected
John Townsend	40,520	21,434	61,954	Elected
Robin Page	35,926	1	35,927	Elected
Edward Lord	35,284	10	35,294	
Henry Keswick	31,814	6	31,820	
Nicholas Fry	27,002	18	27,020	

© 2004 The National Trust  
Registered charity no. 205846

The National Trust  
36 Queen Anne's Gate, London SW1H 9AS  
[www.nationaltrust.org.uk](http://www.nationaltrust.org.uk)

Typeset by Blacker Design (4308)  
Print managed by Centurion Press (GRA)