

# Coombegreen Common: FAQs so far.

## General Questions

### 1. What's the point of these Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)?

The best way to start an investigation is by asking questions. The principle question is 'What do people want to do about the long term future of Coombegreen Common?'. From that has come many other questions that have been added to this list of FAQs. No one presumes to know every question or answer, so by fishing for questions and searching for answers, we learn together, what needs further investigation, and the impossible ideas can be sifted from the possible. Nothing has been decided, there are no 'done deals'. Please keep the questions coming! Contact David Armitage on 01684 560616 or [darmitage@worcestershire.gov.uk](mailto:darmitage@worcestershire.gov.uk)

### 2. Can you provide a glossary of words and ideas used in connection with common?

- a. Common Right: this is a specific right attached to a specific property. Of interest here, is the right to graze the Common Land Unit 9. The number of stock that the householder is entitled to graze will be specified in the deeds of the property and on the Commons Register held at Worcestershire County Council. People with these rights are often called 'commoners'.
- b. Countryside Stewardship/ Higher Level Stewardship: Countryside Stewardship is the new version of the Higher Level Stewardship grant: it is a scheme funded by DEFRA to assist farmers to farm on marginal land and to encourage them to undertake conservation work. Much of the Common Land Unit 9 is under such a scheme.
- c. Common Land Unit: This is the legal entity and a specified area of land that is designated as a 'common'. Coombegreen is part of Common Land Unit 9 which also has all the Castlemorton Commons within it.
- d. CROW Act : this is the abbreviation for the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. This defined most registered common land as Access land; and this means, amongst other things, that walkers do not have to stick to the public rights of way when walking on the common. Coombegreen is Access land, but the rest of the Castlemorton Commons are not, as they come under the Malvern Hills Acts.
- e. Enclosure Acts: these Parliamentary Acts of past centuries, enabled landowners to put fences around, and claim ownership of, land which had previously been land held in common. Land held 'in common' is how Commons got their name – a piece of land where rights are held by people who didn't necessarily own the land. This produced the open borderless landscape of the commons. A landowner placing a fence upon the common, 'enclosed' it and those ancient rights were extinguished.
- f. Poaching: the cutting up of the grass on the common, by livestock, humans and horses to create a muddy patch.

### 3. Where can I find out more about common land?

There are a couple of good websites –the Foundation for Common Land [www.foundationforcommonland.org.uk](http://www.foundationforcommonland.org.uk), and the Open Spaces Society [www.oss.org.uk](http://www.oss.org.uk) .

#### **4. What is Common land?**

Common land is a legal form of landholding. It has an owner of the land as well as people who have rights over that land, but who do not necessarily own that land. In particular there are the rights to graze the common. This form of land tenure stretches back to the Middle Ages, before land was enclosed by private landlords. Legally, the name for a common is a Common Land Unit, and this may incorporate many different named commons – but they are united by the right to graze over all the Common Land Unit.

#### **5. Who can use Common land?**

Only people who have specific common rights to do things on the common, and these come with the properties they own. These include the rights to graze a specified number of livestock. These rights are held on a register in Worcestershire County Council. The land at Coombegreen is also Access Land, designated under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act. This gives the public the right to walk over the land, and not necessarily stick to the public rights of way.

#### **6. Who owns the Common land?**

Castlemorton, Hollybed, and Coombegreen are one Common Land Unit. The unit has two owners; Coombegreen belongs to the owner of Birtsmorton Court, all the other 'Castlemorton Commons' are owned by the Malvern Hills Conservators. They own the physical land. Surrounding properties own the rights to graze the common land, but they do not own the common land itself.

#### **7. What's so special about the Commons?**

Commons are a very ancient form of land tenure going back to medieval times. The management of them, through grazing, over the centuries has produced this open savannah-like landscape. And over the centuries, wildlife and plants have colonised the commons to produce a landscape of broad vistas, that have been created by being continually grazed. As a result specialist species of birds, mammals and plants have colonised the commons. This is nationally recognised in that much of the Castlemorton Common is designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest. So what's so special about the Commons is that they have been under the same sort of land tenure for centuries. Over that time a characteristic landscape and unusual wildlife, both all too rare these days, has built up. Grazing also prevents historic earth heritage and archaeological features being lost to scrub.

#### **8. What would be our ideal result?**

The ideal result would be to keep the forces of nature, especially those that cause the Common to scrub up, in balance; and that balance should be sustainable for many years. Grazing with a mixture of sheep and cattle has, over the centuries, created this open aspect to the common; this seems the best way of maintaining the landscape and access that people enjoy. Ideally local people will be involved, and the cultural traditions continued.

## 9. Can we have a map of the commons?

Yes. We will find a way of supplying these to those who request it. There are some maps of the common attached to the draft Coombegreen Common Management Plan which is available on Birtsmorton Parish Council's Website at <http://e-services.worcestershire.gov.uk/MyParish>

# The Problem

## 10. What's the problem with the Common?

The fundamental problem is the decline in grazing is allowing the Common to be taken over by bramble and scrub. The scrub then destroys the open aspect of the common, prevents access, and changes the habitat for all the special species that inhabit the open Common. It conceals the archaeological and geological features, and makes the checking of livestock on the Common even harder.

## 11. What evidence is there that Coombegreen has changed over the years?

A number of local parishioners have noticed that changes that are occurring, and get together, in particular to pull thistles. There are also a few aerial photos that show the growth of scrubby areas over the Common. Then there are those that can remember cattle on the common and even pigs – each type of livestock creates its own characteristic landscape. The loss of these animals from the commons has inevitably led to a change in the landscape, both by their absence and their effect.

## 12. What would happen if humans and their livestock did not intervene on the Common?

Change is the only thing that never changes; and this is especially true when it comes to Nature. 'Doing nothing' implies not trying to maintain the common as it has been maintained in the past. Without a level of grazing, Nature will take control of the common and scrub plants such as bracken, brambles, gorse and thickets of trees will abound. To witness this, take a walk on the Malvern Hills and see how the trees are now obscuring what was once extensive views on the lower slopes. The scrub and trees will destroy the existing precious wildflowers and limit where people can walk without their thorn-proof trousers. And restoring such a degraded landscape to its unscrubby and open past would be very costly. So public access to the common and livestock grazing the Common, are linked.

## 13. Why has grazing declined?

Conversations with graziers and families who have lived a long time in the area point to a number of causes for the decline in grazing. There's the time it takes for the grazier to retrieve their stock once it's walked off the Common, roadkill and livestock worrying by uncontrolled dogs. There's also a social change, with many of the houses that have common rights being sold to people who don't exercise those rights to graze. And finally, the financial return for grazing on the Common is not as great as that from other ways of earning a living. All these, to different degrees, for different individuals, has led to the decline in grazing.

## 14. How many graziers are exercising their rights now?

Over the whole of the legal entity which is Common Land Unit 9, and this includes Coombegreen, there are 5 graziers. There are, however, over 200 properties with registration

for Common rights on Common Land Unit 9. And this is one of the problems: the Common is set up to have much more grazing on it and has been much more heavily grazed in the recent past. The decline in grazing has led to the increase in scrub on the Common.

**15. How many animals currently graze the common?**

In April 2016 the numbers, for the whole of Common Land Unit 9, are approximately 565 sheep excluding lambs and 53 cattle.

**16. What is the recommended number per acre and therefore will the number increase in the future?**

There isn't a 'recommended' number per acre, but as a guide for conserving the common, a stocking density of 1 livestock unit per hectare is about right. A livestock unit is 1 cow or between 6 and 7 sheep per hectare. Common Land Unit 9 is 275 hectares which makes 275 livestock units a target. Currently there are 565 sheep (94 livestock units), and 53 cattle (53 livestock units) which gives a total of 147 livestock units. So just under half the guide number of livestock units are grazing the Common. We are hoping that the number of livestock will increase, or at least stabilize, but there is some way to go before the guide numbers are exceeded.

**17. Can you bring in extra graziers who may not have rights on the Coombegreen Common, to graze?**

This is something we are looking into, but it would seem likely. In any case, Malvern Hills Conservators, the owners of the rest of the Common, can bring in graziers, and since the stock will be able to travel all over the Common Land Unit, they would also be able to graze Coombegreen Common.

**18. Are there other graziers who have indicated an interest in grazing the common?**

Yes there are other graziers who have indicated an interest in grazing the Common Land Unit; but they have cautioned that they would not want to risk their livestock on the road. It is true that there is only one principle grazer on Coombegreen, but under the borderless common that stretches to Welland, those who can and do graze at the Welland end, can legally graze Coombegreen. So potential graziers could be drawn from a much wider area than just Coombegreen.

**19. Does it matter in the grand scheme of things if the common does become overgrown?**

A couple of the defining characteristics of humans are that they adapt their environments to suit themselves and they keep the histories of centuries. Coombegreen has been adapted over the centuries by human farming methods to give this open space that delights visitors. So losing it to scrub, loses that living history, and represents a retreat from being human?

**20. Can you provide examples from elsewhere of successful grazing schemes?**

The decline in grazing is a common problem on many of the British Commons; and lots of Commons have introduced fencing and grids to halt the decline. The nearest example is the Malvern Hills. Here both cattlegrids and fencing have been used to contain stock successfully. There are many examples further afield such as the Stroud Commons of Minchinhampton and Rodborough or in Worcestershire at Hartlebury Common.

**21. What are the alternatives to grazing?**

Power mowing using heavy tractors is a short term option for beating back scrub that has grown up because of the decline in grazing. However, no mower that can cope with the bumps of the Common, will be able to mow as closely as sheep can graze. So the sward will change away from the precious plants to ranker grasses. Mowing will also need to be paid for; and who would do that? Grazing is more-or-less, a self-financing system, once established.

Before the 1990's scrub and stubble in the fields could be set fire to as means of control; now this practice is banned in the UK.

**22. Can scrub and trees be controlled manually?**

Scrub and trees can be controlled manually but this needs a Herculean effort throughout the years to do this. There was a time when burning the scrub was permitted but this is no longer an option under the law. A recent idea is to arrange 'thistle pulling' work parties' ; if you are interested, please get in touch.

**23. Why not use invisible fencing?**

Invisible fencing and electronic collars have been used elsewhere, but only work for cattle. A sheep's fleece is too variable in thickness to allow the contacts to always work. The Common needs grazing by both sheep and cattle as they individually eat different lengths of grass. If invisible fencing for sheep had any prospect of being developed, we would prefer this.

**24. Why not use electric fences?**

Electric fences do have their place in managing the Common, however, they are time-consuming to keep moving, require water to be brought to the stock, restrict public access to parts of the Common, and are a temptation to light-fingered. They could be best deployed to graze areas outside the 'post and wire' area, such as the top of Birts Street.

**25. What are the numbers for roadkill?**

The official data on road-kill across the commons isn't collected by the police unless there is an injury to a person. So we have to go on the good knowledge that the current graziers have. This indicates that there are on average, each year 6 ewes, 10 lambs and 2 head of cattle killed, with more being injured.

**26. Why not display the number of animals killed on a sign, as they do in the New Forest?**

Would this deter graziers or drivers?

**27. What are the financial responsibilities of Birtsmorton Court towards the common?**

Birtsmorton Court, as the owner of the Coombegreen Common, has no direct financial responsibilities towards the common. There is no expectation for a landowner to pay for anything on land they own.

**28. How would you prevent ruts being made by wheeled vehicles on the common?**

This is difficult to do as there are, we believe, several sources of these ruts. Firstly there are those who see open ground as a challenge for their off-road vehicles. We can all do much by reporting them to the police. It might be imagined that a fence line and cattlegrids could deter such activity. Then there are those who look after the Common and drive their vehicles across it

to do so. Looking after the Common, does mean stopping it from becoming impassable with scrub, so it could be argued that although there are ruts in places, walkers can step round them on unscrubby ground; small price; big prize. It should be noted that Commoners are legally allowed to drive on the Common for the purposes of tending or inspecting their livestock.

**29. Why can't the Parish Council just keep doing the scrub clearance as before?**

It can, provided the parishioners are willing to pay for it. The loss of grazing on the common will vastly increase the amount the Parish Council would have to do, and therefore the amount they'd have to raise from the parishioners. Is there an appetite in Birtsmorton for raising the Parish Council's precept on the Council Tax by such a large amount?

## The Future?

**30. What would fencing and cattle-grids look like on the western side of the B4208, as it crosses the common?**

The fencing would probably be about one metre from the edge of the tarmac, and be post and wire. Within that fence would be a number, yet to be decided, of gates for pedestrian and horse access. The cattle-grids themselves would be wide enough to allow for fire engines and septic-tank lorries to pass over them. They would be of solid construction with a post and rail fence around the side. To one side of the grid would be a bypass track and gate for those who would not wish to cross the grid itself. The grids would be in the access tracks to the Common and not on the tarmacked Highway. Three such grids are anticipated.

**31. When could grids and fences be seen on Coombegreen Common?**

There is no assumption that anything will happen in terms of man-made structures on the Common. Anything that happens at Coombegreen will be dependent on the Malvern Hills Conservators deciding to act on containing livestock on their land under the Commons Act 2006. Over and above that any structures on the common will need Secretary State permission. We believe there is no statutory time scale for this, but previous applications to the Secretary of State have taken a couple of years. Should permissions come, then funding would have to be found to execute the work; another inestimable time. The take-away-point from this is that the process might take years and there will be plenty of time to consult and resolve issues.

**32. Why can't we have grids on the main roads?**

Three cattle-grids, two either end of the B4208 on the common, and one on Birts Street were proposed 15 years ago when this was last looked at. It faced great public opposition. It was also a very expensive option, estimated to be over £200,000 for the set, today. With the political chorus of 'this financial climate' that selects the best value for money, the option of fencing and cattle-gridding the access tracks along the roadside of the B4208 (est £15,000) chimes with the times. It also prevents livestock that may escape from the Common elsewhere, being herded by vehicles over the grids on a main road.

**33. The Common is already poached and muddy because of stock; would more stock add to this?**

It's believed that the poaching tends to occur where the common narrows, and livestock bunched up to pass through. And some of these places aren't well drained which adds to the poaching. The drainage can be looked into, but livestock cannot be restricted from making their

way where they are legitimately entitled to go. Another effect could be that the more scrub there is, the more restricted the livestock movements become, which concentrates their footfall on ground that has become shadier and wetter, because of that scrub.

**34. Who would manage the grazing so that it was appropriate and not detrimental leading to too much mud on the common?**

The graziers' rights limit the number of stock they can have on the common. Where the stock goes cannot be controlled. Mud on the Common may be as much about soft going, as too many hooves and feet. And some of those hooves and feet may have as much to do with visitors to the common as the grazing stock. This complex matter deserves more detailed investigation.

However commons are largely self-governing, and that's the point about the 4C's Committee which meets to discuss the whole of the Common, and is made up of local people and graziers.

**35. Could there be too many livestock on the Common?**

There is a truth that if all those properties with common rights, exercised all the rights they had, then the common could become over-grazed. And one of the symptoms of overgrazing would be hungry-thin livestock. The graziers would not want this so would reduce the level of stock; a self-regulating system.

However, with the decline in grazing on the common, this scenario seems unlikely. A further layer of control could come through the grants system that support the current graziers on the Common. This is not currently relevant to Coombegreen.

**36. Where's the money coming from for this?**

The money can be divided into two broad categories: the one-off capital costs (fences, cattle-grids, gates) and the revenue costs (maintenance for the grids, fences and grants for graziers) that occur over the years. The capital costs would be funded by grants; for instance the Heritage Lottery Fund funded the cattlegrids on the Malvern Hills. The revenue costs are more uncertain. Unlike the rest of the Castlemorton Common, Coombegreen is not in Higher Level Stewardship, a source of revenue funding; it could be. This is an area for further consideration and any suggestions would be helpful.

**37. Would fencing spoil the open aspect of the common?**

The question assumes that the common will remain with an 'open aspect' if there's no fencing and no grazing; it's unlikely to remain 'open' without it, and so would end up 'spoilt'.

Nonetheless, an observer will be able to see the roadside post and wire fence. Small price; big prize; the intrusion of the fence, a small price, should enable graziers to continue grazing and contain the scrub on the common; the big prize. And if this prediction didn't come to pass, a post and wire fence isn't so difficult to remove.

**38. Will grids and fences solve all the problems of difficulty grazing on the commons?**

It would be a major help in reducing road traffic accidents with livestock, and encourage more graziers to put stock on the common, knowing they are safely confined, and allowing the graziers to meet other commitments they have, such as jobs. The problems of livestock worrying and financial viability of grazing would remain.

**39. Is my horse going to get stuck in a cattle-grid?**

Evidence has been scant of this ever happening. It is of course conceivable, but seems very unlikely. Grids are used all around the UK in popular horse-riding places such as the New Forest. This was one of the concerns about the cattle-grids installed at Chase End, British Camp and Hollybush 10 years ago; those concerns have not been realised. The grids will have by-pass gates beside them with horse friendly mechanisms for opening and closing them. The British Horse Society has an advice leaflet on cattlegrids; that advice would be followed.

**40. What about animals that get stuck in the cattle-grid?**

Firstly there's not much evidence of livestock getting stuck in grids; if you know better, do say. And secondly, cattle-grids these days are fitted with 'hedgehog ramps' that allow small animals to escape.

**41. Why not put back the fences and grids further from the roads to help horse riders?**

The grids could be set back from the road; 'how far back?', would be the question. We are currently not aware of any recommendation on this from the British Horse Society in their advice note on cattlegrids. We'd be interested to hear what the riders hope to achieve by setting the grids further back from the main carriage way.

**42. Are the grids going to be noisy?**

Old fashioned cattle grids were almost like xylophones, composed of loose scaffolding poles attached by bolts to the substructure; and these rattled. Modern grids are welded solid and so won't rattle. The noise of a vehicle crossing them will be different from the noise from the track, and the volume of both noises will be in proportion to the speed of the vehicle. The cattle-grids at Coombegreen will be on the access tracks to the Common where vehicle speeds should be low; and the noise likewise.

**43. Are the grids and fences going to restrict my walking access onto the Common?**

Small price; big prize. There will be a small price to pay in access onto the common that will be slightly restricted by a fence line. However gates for pedestrians and horses will be put in along the fence line, and these positioned by common agreement. At the cattle-grids there will be by-pass gates. The big prize is keeping the scrub in check by grazing and keeping the Common fully accessible within the boundaries of the fence, for walkers and horse-riders.

**44. Are more cattle going to be unsafe for dog walkers?**

Risk will go up with numbers, both of dogs and cattle. But up from what? Currently little is known about incidents with dog-walkers and cattle on the Castlemorton Commons and Coombegreen: any information would be gratefully received.

Coombegreen Common as Access land under the CROW Act, requires that dogs be kept on the lead between the 1<sup>st</sup> March and the 31<sup>st</sup> July (the breeding bird season) and at all times in the vicinity of livestock. This would also restrict the worrying of livestock and reduce the chances of the worried turning on their worriers.

Castlemorton Common has hosted far higher numbers of cattle, around 180, in recent decades with few incidents. Gentle breeds would be encouraged.

**45. Who decides where the cattle grids might go?**

The landowner would make a proposal but the final decision lies with the Secretary of State; and the Secretary of State would want to see that wide consultation had been done on the suitability of fences and grids, with all interested parties.

**46. How will it affect my easements?**

If you have to maintain the surface of your easement, then you would be exempt from maintaining the cattle-grid. So there would be no effects on your right of access granted by your easements. The land under your easement is still the property of the landowner.

**47. Will cattlegrids stop sheep?**

The cattle-grids have two purposes; one is to encourage graziers to put stock on the common by showing that efforts have been made to make the common suitable, and the other is to try to contain the stock. It has to be said that they are CATTLE-grids and not sheep-grids: any deterrent is better than none.

**48. What's happening at Hollybush and the rest of the Common ?**

Coombegreen is just one piece of the jigsaw that secures the whole of the Common. It's currently being treated separately because it has a different owner, Birtsmorton Court, to the rest of the Common. Malvern Hills Conservators own the rest of the Common. They have commissioned a report to look at the future of their land holding which comes to similar conclusions about fencing as close to the perimeter as possible, and putting cattlegrids across the access tracks. At the time of writing, April 2016, they are committed to conserving the Commons and investigating ways in which future livestock grazing can be made more viable.

**49. Will only cattle be able to deal with the rough scrub?**

Cattle are the heavy cavalry that could make in-roads into the scrub, trample bracken and eat some saplings. However tractors and flail mowers could also be useful in breaking down the scrub and allowing in the less powerful livestock, sheep, to help recreate the traditional sward of the Common.

**50. What's going to happen to the area at the top of Birts Street if fencing happens along the B4208?**

There are currently thoughts of putting cattle/sheep there temporarily within electric fencing, as well as using mechanical means to control the scrub.

**51. How would the fences and cattle-grids be maintained?**

This needs further investigation; but an idea might be that those who graze might be prepared to undertake the maintenance, since they would be the beneficiaries of the fences. The grids themselves should have a 50 year life, and the fences 15 years; so the hope is that this is not a regular or insuperable problem.

**52. Can we see more options for managing the common?**

Yes these can be found in the draft Coombegreen Common Management Plan found at <http://e-services.worcestershire.gov.uk/MyParish>

**53. Why can't any money be invested in maintenance rather than spoiling the character of Birtsmorton?**

The 'money' as such does not exist at the moment. It would be provided by grants. Grants tend to be for capital projects, such as grids and fencing, but not for ongoing maintenance. So where would that maintenance money come from; a precept on the Council tax by the Parish Council? The advantage of trying to encourage grazing by a capital expenditure on grids and fences is that once done, the grazing is financially self-sustaining.

The 'spoiling of the character of Birtsmorton' may well come about if grazing ceases, the parishioners are not prepared to pay for other types of maintenance, and the common scrubs up. A fence and grids would be a change, but a small change compared with losing the Common to scrub.

**54. Would there be any drainage of the common to make it a pleasant place to walk?**

Wetland areas on the common do harbour unusual wetland plants and are part of the character of the common, although there are places where drainage will not affect the vegetation, and would be beneficial.

**55. What are the costs of managing the commons in ways other than fencing?**

Absolute costs are hard to determine for any means of managing the common, and it is especially difficult to calculate these costs over many years. And how do you put a price on the views, the open landscape and public access? Then there's also the issue that the 'product', or the Common, will vary according to which alternative method is used. Using mechanical means to maintain the Common will give very different grasses and flowers, losing the special ones that still grow there. It's very difficult, when doing a cost benefit analysis of all the different options, to accurately and absolutely, factor in all these elements. What we do know is that the costs of thistle and scrub topping on the common cost just over £650 in 2015/16. The Malvern Hills AONB paid £300 towards this, as a one off contribution to the Common.

That said; grazing, once secured by fences and grids, is financially self-sustaining. Cutting grass and scrub by tractors would require an annual payment. As a very rough guide to the cost of this: mowing with a tractor would cost around £30/ha (John Nix: Farm Management 2016). Coombegreen Common is just under 20ha making £600 for each mow. Anyone who mows their own lawn, will know how frequently it needs to be mown to provide a passable sward, and so can calculate the total cost each year, and forever. Quite apart from the bank-balance cost to such an operation, the carbon footprint from using a tractor is likely to be higher than using livestock to graze.

**56. How long can fencing be put up for?**

Legally, the time period can be specified from a number of years to 'permanent'.

**57. What provision would be made for cars that park along the Gloucester Road and might these create a place for anti-social behaviour?**

The two existing 'pull-ins' will remain; so there won't be any change. Do let us know of any evidence of anti-social behaviour.

## Traffic Calming:

**58. Sheep on the road are one of the special aspects of the area and calm the traffic.**

And so is the roadkill a special aspect as well? It is true that roads and cars are the intruders on the common –livestock's rights pre-date by centuries, the car's arrival. It's also true that many drivers don't appreciate this – and of those, there are some that don't slow down and some that run over the 'traffic calming' livestock. It can be a messy way of calming the traffic. And whatever the sympathies on this, if those that care for the livestock get fed up with having their stock destroyed, and remove them from the common, you still lose the 'special aspect' and the traffic calming. So regarding livestock on the road as 'traffic calming' is only a short-lived and expensive measure. Apart from the cruelty aspect, each animal that is killed or injured is a cost to owner, for disposal of the carcass, vets bills and replacement.

**59. What traffic calming measures will be introduced to substitute for the sheep?**

This question also arises if the graziers don't put their sheep on the common because they get run over by the vehicles. What evidence is there that traffic needs calming? Are there lots of road accidents on the lengths of roads away from the Common? This question is a matter for the Highways Authority to consider.

**60. Why not put sleeping policeman in the road, more signs and a speed limit to slow traffic down on the roads?**

Speed bumps in B roads would be unusual for the UK, and more signs might just slow down the drivers that care to read them and act upon them. We're happy to ask the Highways Authority about these measures but none, in and of themselves, would help keep the common grazed.