



# Newsletter

## Autumn 2013

### NORFOLK BIODIVERSITY AWARD

On the 23rd July the RGCG was presented with an award (Group Category) by the Norfolk Biodiversity Partnership at an event held at the Abbey Conference Centre at Carrow. Robin Combe, Carl Sayer and Ian Shepherd received the framed certificate on behalf of the RGCG.

Each year the NBP organises an awards programme for organisations, individuals, schools and businesses that have contributed to biodiversity conservation in Norfolk and engaged with local communities in the process. In the words of the notification letter to our chairman: "*The judging panel were very impressed with your groups' nomination which described all the efforts to protect the River Glaven from pollution, to improve water quality and to conserve and restore riverine wildlife habitats. We particularly liked how the project had worked directly with landowners, inspiring them to do different, resulting in excellent long term benefits for biodiversity alongside sustainable benefits for local people living in the floodplain*".



This last point links back to the October 2006 Cinderella Project, our first major project on the river. A key measure was to remove the spoil on a bank of meadow and re-connect river and the flood plain meadow. This restores the natural water gradient between river and meadow to the benefit of wildlife and natural functioning of the river – see the article on a talk by Charles Rangeley-Wilson on page 6. It also contributes to a reduction in flood risk to vulnerable properties downstream following a pronged and heavy rain event. The temporary 'hold-up' of flood water on the meadow has in addition the virtue of a 'fall-out' of soil carried by the flood water, and hence reducing deposition within the river channel.

Robin Combe gave thanks to the NBP for the award, which he attributed not only to individuals but as a Group and collective efforts of a team, and to the support we received from landowners. The award completes a hat-trick for the RGCG, with one from the Wild Trout Trust in 2007, and CPRE Norfolk in 2011.

### AGM at Glandford Mill

The AGM was held at Glandford Mill on the 29th June in beautiful sunny weather. The formal business saw the confirmation of Tony Aberdein and Henry Crawley as committee members, and Anne Rolfe as our new Treasurer and Membership Secretary. Our thanks went to Victoria Shepherd who stood down after three years interested commitment in the role while studying for a PhD on the Glaven; and a warm welcome to Anne who has very quickly and effectively settled into the role.

A good attendance of about 60 members and guests enjoyed the visit to Glandford Mill. They listened with interest to the talk by Tim Jacklin of the Wild Trout Trust, who related the importance in the life cycle of migratory fish such as brown trout and eel to un-impeded movement between river and sea.

Contd overleaf

## AGM at Glandford Mill contd

The installation of a fish pass under the mill, and the river restoration work between the mill and ford, was illustrated by slides, and then followed by a visit to see what had been done and walk about the grounds. Tim, Richard Hey and owner Willie Brownlow were on hand to discuss further and answer questions.

An additional bonus was to see a fine stand of marsh orchids on the meadow, and of course the tea and cake provided by the owners. Our grateful thanks go to Willie and Amanda for hosting the AGM, their hospitality, and a very pleasant and memorable afternoon.



## Mike Thurlow – The Miller of Letheringsett

Mike Thurlow died unexpectedly in his sleep on the 22<sup>nd</sup> June aged 66 years. This was a considerable shock to those who knew him as he always appeared to be in robust good health. Mike had however been invalided out of the Royal Navy after a serious accident in 1981 which left him with recurrent back pains. After several jobs in quick succession Mike found by chance what he wanted to do. A spell as a delivery driver took him to the water mill at Letheringsett, then in the early stages of a restoration.

Beryl Cozens-Hardy had been seeking for many years an individual who could take up the challenge of getting the mill back into working order as a water mill and establishing a viable business. Mike was the person who was enthused by this opportunity, and an agreement was quickly struck. The restoration work saw the mill become the only working and operating water mill in the County. His enthusiasm for the mill and the tradition it represented stood him good stead in the restoration work, giving tours of the mill working to visitors, and the customers who came to buy specialist flours and a range of other goods, and delivery of flour to restaurant and bakery outlets.



## *The Miller of Letheringset contd*

Letheringsett Mill won awards as a tourist attraction from the District Council. Mike was an effective early supporter of local foods, and won the Local Food Hero accolade organised by the UKTV television channel in 2006. The award came with a prize of £40,000 which enabled further improvements at the mill, and in particular the purchase and installation of a third pair of grind stones. The running of the mill and the sale of his flour and other products provided five local jobs. Mike was proud to be the miller of Letheringsett.

His family plan to continue the business.



## *Gunthorpe stream restoration*

The Gunthorpe Stream is the longest tributary on the Glaven, at some 6 km. The headwaters arise in Gunthorpe Park and flow east through Brinton and around Thornage (alias Thornage Beck) to enter the main river by Beck Farm Hunworth. The stream had been identified by the Environment Agency in a survey of the species present as being below the potential for wildlife and a possible candidate for consideration for in-stream restoration measures.

The Agency contracted consultant Nigel Holmes to report and make recommendations for Gunthorpe Stream, and other streams and small chalk rivers in Norfolk. Nigel presented his findings on GS at the AGM held at Brinton Hall last year. The RCGC saw this as not only an opportunity to enhance the wildlife value of the stream, but also an opportunity to provide the volunteer hand labour, and as a means to extend our numbers of practical volunteers and our collective experience.



Henry Crawley then worked up a licence application, based on the findings of Nigel's report, for a programme of work which we envisaged would be spread over two to three years. The licence was approved after discussions with the County Council, Flood and Water Management Team, the body for 'non-main river' works. Henry also took on the task of organising volunteers for this and other working party projects. Our first major work day took place on the 12th April, when the work party implemented eleven measures on a stretch of some 300 yards of the stream on land at Brinton Hall, with Nigel Holmes in support. Henry with committee members Robin Combe, Jim Crossley and Ian Shepherd and with other volunteers did the 'spade work'; much of the activity was just that, the 'gardening tools' employed were garden spades and forks, rakes and loppers, and bow saw and chain saw.

## *Gunthorpe stream restoration contd*

The principles are simple. All materials used are at hand, either in the stream beds, the banks or nearby. Sand, gravel and stone in the stream bed are 're-arranged' within the channel sections to create narrowing and variation in flow rate and in depth, provide areas of clean grave or stone, and improved oxygenation. The use of wood materials is another technique to introduce narrowing of the channel and flow deflection, but importantly also provide a source of wood and leaf debris, the detritus supporting a wide range of invertebrate species- flies, caddis flies, beetles, crustaceans, mayflies, bugs, etc - to their benefit and those species higher in the food chain of the stream or river.

Much of the skill comes in identifying what should be done where, the choice of site and technique being influenced with what is to hand, and what will help low energy streams get to where they would 'want to be'. From this day of work a three page illustrated 'manual' was produced as a means of both recording how and why the measures were done, but as a means of encouraging a greater pool of volunteers to engage with practical conservation work; and on other local chalk streams as well as the Glaven.



**D-shaped deflector (sandy fines bed) and narrowing**



**Depth variation (stone, gravel bed) and narrowing**



**Extensive narrowing (stones) and depth/flow variation**



**Tree trunk single deflector, with woody debris**

Acknowledgements: Our thanks go to the Environment Agency for sponsoring consultant costs for our AGM talk and two training days; Nigel Holmes for providing this support; and the support being received from the landowners; Brinton Hall, Astley Farms, Stody Estate and Albanwise.

## AONBs National Annual Conference - July 2013

The Norfolk Coast Partnership and colleagues in the Suffolk Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty organised the national annual conference of AONBs in Ipswich in July. The theme was "water" and the challenges and changes ahead. The first and third day were taken up by a series of seminars and workshops, the second one of seven options on field trips across the two counties.

The RGCG principal interest lay in two excellent talks on key topics, water resource and river restoration, and the field trip to the Glaven.

Dr Charles Beardall spoke on "Water under pressure" and Charles Rangeley-Wilson on "Our river heritage"; both are reported below, as is the field trip. Charles Beardall started his career with the Suffolk Wildlife Trust and then held several posts within the Environment Agency Eastern Region, which embraces most of Norfolk, Suffolk and Essex, before becoming Area Manager.

Charles Rangeley-Wilson is co-founder and President of the Wild Trout Trust, an author and conservationist. He helped to establish the Norfolk Rivers Trust, and works with the WWF UK in their campaigns for the conservation of English chalk streams.

### Water resource under pressure

A very positive change for the management of water resource and the health of our rivers has been the implementation of the Water Framework Directive; our local example is the objectives set within the Catchment Restoration Fund and the granting of the bid by Defra and the Environment Agency for the Nine Chalk Rivers Project last August. The importance of the WFD came through in the talk by Dr Beardall in setting out the broad picture for the Region, the challenges ahead, and how these will be met.

The factor that is outside our control is the basic source of water, the rainfall. The national average rainfall in a year is some 850mm; for Norfolk it is some 630mm, and 570mm for Suffolk and Essex, only marginally higher than Jerusalem. It is mainly the winter rainfall which penetrates into the underground rock strata, where it is held as 'groundwater'. In geological terms chalk is the principle aquifer for the region. Crag is locally important in Suffolk and Norfolk, and likewise river terrace gravels in Essex. It is groundwater held in these aquifers which has to meet the needs both for human consumption and the natural environment of our rivers, other water courses, ponds and wetlands.

The users of water resource across the region, as indicated by water abstraction licences, break out at the public water supply 62%, industry 23%, agriculture 11% and other 4% (NB behind this can lie much ble local variation within the overall figure; in North Norfolk industry uses much less than 23%, and agriculture much more than 11%). On the overall source of abstraction from the 4,500 licences in the region, some 60% comes from surface water (rivers) and 40% from groundwater.

As regards availability of water resources for new licences, the Environment Agency look at the pattern for summer low flows and the average winter flows. The maps for summer low flows show there is 'no availability' for almost the whole of the region. Average winter flows show availability in the north east of Norfolk, a central diagonal band across Norfolk and Suffolk of restricted availability, and for the southern band (part Suffolk, much of Essex) no availability. This situation allows for some scope for winter abstraction in the northern half of the region for storage in reservoirs and use for agricultural spray irrigation the following summer.

The re-charge of aquifers by rainfall occurs mainly during the winter. In summer there is little or no re-charge by rainfall due to higher levels of evaporation and loss to vegetation growth; at the same time consumption increases through a rise in per capita water usage in the summer, alongside spray irrigation for agriculture in particular, but also the greater numbers of visitors. In winter, with higher water table levels in the aquifers, and stronger river flows, the status in most of Norfolk changes to 'available'. This is the driver for the Environment Agency to promote 'winter storage' reservoirs for agriculture.

## Water resource under pressure contd

A key element of the Water Framework Directive has been to establish the ecological status of our rivers, and the elements within this which might be failing. At 2012 the ecological status of the rivers in the region was classified at 9% good, 67% moderate, 21% poor and 3% bad (the Glaven had nothing in the last two categories).

The failing elements in the rivers on WDF grounds was highest at 50% on the morphology (shape) factor, and ranging downwards through failure rates at 43% for phosphorus level (too high), 25% for fish (too low), 9% on invertebrates, 6% on too high ammonia levels and 4% on macrophytes. These failing elements are of direct interest in what river restoration projects in general might be aiming to improve.

The major challenges for our rivers are led by population and development growth and the public water supply, with the 37,000 houses planned to 2026 in the Norwich area being much the greatest in the region. In addition the level of hose-reel gun irrigation practiced across the region is not only significant but highly consumptive, that is there is no recovery element, as acknowledged by a NFU speaker.

The aim of the Environment Agency is to restore sustainable abstraction through the use of Catchment Abstraction Management plans; for the public water supply through the use of Resource Management Plans and Demand Management; and for agriculture making adaptations and storing water. In the panel discussion for this session the Broads Authority speaker voiced the concern that over the years there had been no movement on the impact of supermarket crop specifications on the use of water by agriculture. Much of the use comes down to cosmetic rather than yield or intrinsic quality reasons, and the financial and environmental costs are not reflected in the end product cost.

## Our River Heritage

**We print below an abridged version of the talk given by Charles Rangeley-Wilson to the 2013 AONB annual conference. It is an eloquent and thoughtful essay on the philosophical and practical issues in how we protect and enhance our landscapes and rivers.**

Not long after I had finished writing my book *Silt Road – The Story of a Lost River*, in which I tried to describe the layered histories that built one after the other to create the suburban landscape of a little Buckinghamshire chalk-stream called the River Wye, I started on another project: a Water Framework Directive catchment plan for a Norfolk chalk stream, the River Nar. This time I was writing a summary of the geography of the river, of the issues that were holding back its ecological condition, abstraction say, or the extent to which the channel had been modified, all aimed at a timetabled plan for its 'restoration'.

The two pieces of work couldn't have been more different, except that they each described a river. And yet, though they came at this common subject from different perspectives and for different reasons, both asked more or less the same questions:

- how in this overcrowded and much altered landscape do we give rivers the room they need to express their true nature?
- and what exactly do we mean by 'restoration', what wilderness or man-made state do we aspire to?

The British landscape is a thing much altered many times over, bearing not only traces of its original form but of all the subsequent forms, each super-imposed layer upon layer, shaped by what came before, shaping what came after.

Looked at like this, the landscape and its rivers, what on earth *do* we mean by river restoration? Which of those former states do we aspire to? And if we are hoping to create some kind of proto-wilderness, what about all these other layers in our landscape? What of the medieval channels to feed carp ponds, for example, or those diversions dug to facilitate the construction of ancient priories? What of water-meadows or mill streams: doesn't each layer in the landscape form its own discrete and complex mix of history and ecology?

## Our River Heritage contd

There is an ancient water-meadow at Ovington in Hampshire, on the upper River Itchen, which has not been altered or improved, has seen no fertiliser and no plough and only light grazing for the past three hundred years: it is of *historical* interest but it is one of the richest *ecological* sites on the whole river: in one part this is because it is a man-made water-meadow, and in another because it has been left alone since it became one. It is a preservation of one tier of the layers of change: the era of water-meadows.

Reaching back further in time the functioning mill-leat and flood channel must once have created a modified ecology comparable to water-meadows. The languorous flow of the leat, the deep, swirling mill-pool, the faster flow below and the original, meandering river managed as a relief channel: deep water, fast water, slow water, shallow water – a rich diversity of habitat created as a byproduct of the milling process.

Most chalk streams are punctuated by as many mills as their gradient and flow allowed and have been for many centuries. And yet now the mills present a more ambiguous legacy: stagnant leats are filled with silt that we daren't wash downstream and the relief channels have been left to choke up and dry out. The era of milling is of unarguable historical interest, but the unused milling structures left behind often impoverish habitat, when once they might have enriched it.

If the original parchment of our chalk rivers was the diverse, natural ecology of the landscape left behind by retreating glaciers and evolved by a warming world over the millennia and centuries since, then each subsequent imprint has subtly or greatly altered that ecology. Many changes have been benign. And the influence of some others has changed over time. Certainly until the mid-Twentieth century and notwithstanding the mills and water-meadows, estate lakes and ornamental cascades, the ecological diversity of our chalk rivers had not been greatly compromised, even if it had been subtly and variously changed. Waterside land was dedicated either to summer pasture, or hay-making, or being too unproductive to farm and difficult to drain was left as wet woodland and marsh.

In the decades following the Second World War a drive towards agricultural intensification and efficiency almost erased the wetlands of southern England. Farmers were subsidised per acre 'in production' or 'per head' of livestock and through the Fifties, Sixties and Seventies diggers became the new megafauna of the landscape; chalk-streams were lost behind banks of spoil, quite literally turned on their heads. Through dredging and channelisation, through a wringing out of the wetlands, water-meadows were modified to take higher densities of livestock, or to grow wheat, and vast tracts of formerly uncultivated land were brought into production.

The entrenched chalk-stream now lost in deep canyons has been doubly hit by abstraction: bloated and uniform channels carry half their natural flows. Sometimes they dry up altogether. A moving essay *The Passing of a River* published in Blackwoods Magazine in 1947 describes how the upper few miles of the River Kennet were dried by abstraction after only one, small public water supply pump had been installed.

During dry summers here in Norfolk flows on the River Nar are cut in half by abstraction. And the situation is getting worse year after year as actual abstraction moves ever closer to licensed abstraction. If those two lines ever meet there won't be a river in summertime.

A river is a live and dynamic and self-managing entity. So, what is it that we should aim to overcome in the act of restoration? The answer must be, or ought to be, only the man-made limit to that dynamism and capacity for self-management. The act of restoration ought to begin and end with that aspiration: not so much an imposition of structure, as an unbridling of process.

Dredging and abstraction are the two intertwined modifications that have between them imprisoned our chalk rivers like never before, that have divorced them from process. Chalk-streams are very low energy systems which evolved over millennia inside valleys carved by forces which have long since retreated from our landscape. A chalk-stream is therefore particularly vulnerable to modification, because this side of another ice-age it will never have the energy to overcome, to erase that imposition.

## Our River Heritage contd

This is why the dredged river is locked in and will never escape, and why of all the modifications visited on chalk-streams over the centuries the era of dredging and abstraction was ... and still is ... by far the most damaging. A dredged chalk-stream of diminished flows can only rise and fall within the confines of the man-made channel. It cannot deposit where it needs to, it cannot erode where it needs to: its riparian and in-stream plant community is impoverished and so are its flows and so is its ecology.

I have been lucky enough to see at first hand unmodified spring-fed streams in other much less busy parts of the world: in New Zealand, Patagonia, Iceland, Montana and Bhutan. What has always struck me about these rivers and what they have in common with the comparatively un-spoilt parts of chalk streams I have seen in England is a very simple spatial relationship between water level and ground level. Put simply they have never been dredged and because of this they function like a river.

A natural chalk-stream flows close to bank height and in that way it relates to the land which surrounds it. That close relationship – call it ‘connectivity’ – creates the riparian community that allows a river to breathe: to expand in winter, shrink in summer, to meander, to erode and deposit: to be in other words the live, dynamic, self-managing system that we ought to want at the heart of our landscape. In chalk stream restoration therefore I strongly believe we should *most of all* look to ways of reuniting the stream with a living riparian margin.

If we restore that connectivity, we will restore process. If we restore process, the river will restore itself.

***An abridged version of the talk given by Charles Rangeley-Wilson to the 2013 AONB annual conference.***

## AONB Field Trip to the Glaven

The second day of the AONB conference consisted of group field trips with an option between seven different sites in Norfolk and Suffolk, and one of these was to the Glaven. This was on the 17th July, a very hot and sunny day. Estelle Hook of the NCP organised an itinerary starting at the Baconsthorpe headwaters and finishing with the Norfolk Wildlife Trust at Cley and the National Trust at Blakeney. In between was the visit to Bayfield and Glandford, with the group seeing the recently de-silted Bayfield Lake, the river and lunch at Natural Surroundings, and the riverside walk to Glandford to see the restored section of the river and the fish pass at Glandford Mill.

Also leading the party were Jonah Tosney and Gemma Clarke of the Nine Chalk Rivers Project. In his talk to the conference on the previous day Jonah had described the overall aim of the Project as helping the rivers to function as natural systems, including the re-connection of river and floodplain meadow. The work on the Glaven had been mentioned in this context.

The buffet lunch at Natural Surroundings was prepared using local products. Andrew Cannon said in his introductory comments about the site that he was an ecologist rather than a chef, but the lunch was much praised by the visitors. It took some time to move the party past the red squirrel quarters, in part because the shade provided by the trees was most welcome. Likewise at the river, where Jonah quickly caught a number of invertebrates species using a net.

These were identified by Richard Chadd, Senior Ecologist with the Environment Agency in Lincs, along with a colleague based on the River Stour. They included crustaceans (fresh water shrimp, water hog louse); mayflies (greendrake, blue winged olive and flattened mayfly); banded demoiselle damselfly; bugs (water cricket, lesser water boatman); diving beetles (two species) and caddis fly (three species). It is not surprising that this stretch of river is a good place to see brown trout.

Over lunch the visitors had the opportunity to look at the new RGCG poster stands before walking to Glandford to hear about the recent project at the mill and then being bussed down to the estuary visits.

## Visitors to Letheringsett Ford

Those familiar with Letheringsett Ford at Little Thornage will know that it provides quiet enjoyment and recreation for many local people, and also in summer by visitors on holiday. It is good to see this, especially young children who play in the river and perhaps seek to catch some fish in a net by turning up a stone in the gravel river bed - and later return their catch to the river. Using stones to build a dam is very popular in the school summer holidays, and this can be harmless; but not if every stone in the area is gathered up to build it, and less so again if stones are pulled out of the river bank, and aquatic plants are ripped up to stuff between the stones to make a water-tight 'wall'. In a family, Dads' are often the most zealous in this respect.

The occasional but most anti-social visitors are some in 4WD vehicles who drive not just across, but up and down the river bed. This happens most years at Letheringsett, and recently also at Gland Ford, where post and wire fencing had to be erected to prevent the repetition of 4WD vehicles driving on the newly created riffle areas downstream of the ford, and towards the Mill.

The Letheringsett Ford river bed is a good aquatic habitat, favoured by other visitors in the quiet winter months, who are interested in the fishing, for such as bullhead and minnow. See the photographs of kingfisher, little grebe and the rare Scandinavian black bellied dipper at the ford.



**Pictures by courtesy of local wildlife  
photographer Richard Brooks**

**Website – [www.richard-brooks.co.uk](http://www.richard-brooks.co.uk)**

## *River Restoration: River Glaven Fishing Association A Celebration*

The River Glaven Fishing Association, with project partners from the Norfolk Rivers Trust and the Environment Agency, had a celebration event on the 31st May. Members and guests met upstream of Wiveton Bridge, where river restoration work which would improve the trout fishing had been undertaken in the winter. The principal measures were to introduce riffles and river narrowing at selected points.

Funding had been provided by the RGFA, the Norfolk Rivers Trust, the Environment Agency and SITA. Following the visit to the site to see the narrowing and riffle work that had been done a very pleasant and convivial lunch was provided by RGFA committee for invited members, project partners, and other guests, including the RGCG.



## *Hunworth River Restoration: The Backwaters*

The river restoration work at Hunworth was carried out in August 2010. This was a very carefully and thoroughly planned project, and required a number of specialist skills. It represented a major departure from traditional river channel restoration methods in that sections of new channel were cut, and then 'woven' into lengths of the existing channel. 'Redundant' lengths of old channel were to be back-filled by using that soil that came from excavating the new cuts.

**Contd>**

## The Backwaters contd.



A visit this spring to the site showed that, after three winter flows, silt was being deposited in the backwaters, most noticeably at the mouth, creating a bar between backwater and river, and a more partial connection between river and back water. This process is being monitored, and it may be that at some stage for at least some of the backwaters, we carry out a manual de-silt, or a partial de-silt at the 'mouth' of the backwater; but it may be that we find the silt results in a different but equally interesting place for life in a backwater. It all goes to show that it is not just in the 'fast lane' of the main river is where it all happens.

The new cuts had the advantage of breaking away from the over-widened and deepened river after 60s-70s dredging, and the uniformity of depth and river bed profile. The new cuts could have a narrower channel, and a sculpted river bed which went from deep pool areas into 'high' sections, which become riffle areas when topped with gravel material. Also built in to the calculations was a more sinuous channel, making the whole some 50% longer; and one that had a stability built into the river and pool sequence, and low banks to give a re-connection of the river channel with the meadow floodplain.

One opportunistic change was made to the plan. The intention to completely backfill the redundant lengths of existing channel were modified once the new sections had been cut. It was decided that much of the downstream lengths of the existing channel could be left as it was to form a backwater to the re-aligned main channel. The amount of back-filling when joining new to old was decreased as we went downstream along the whole length, so that in creating the backwaters, the two at the lowest end were the longest. No backwaters existed at this time anywhere along the whole length of the Glaven.

The thinking behind this change in the plan was that juvenile fish have a refuge when river level and flow rates rise following heavy rain; and we could have extra river bank for the water vole population. However it was soon clear that there were additional benefits. These still water areas were a micro-habitat which favoured both invertebrates and amphibians, and frogs made great use of them as a spawning area.





# Newsletter

Autumn 2013

## Meadows at Little Thornage



### News in brief

- The Norfolk Rivers Trust held community events at Weighton Village Hall for the River Stiffkey on the 23rd March and 11th May. The original RGCG poster stands have served well, but since then thanks to Tony Leech we now have eight excellent posters to display the RGCG interests and activities. In late August these NRT 'walk-ins' were also held again for Stiffkey (Wells and Walsingham), the Glaven at Bayfield, the Gaywood in Kings Lynn, and the Babingley in Flitcham.
- Several Himalayan Balsam 'clearing' sessions have taken place this summer, the largest in volunteer numbers and area covered on the 10th July.
- Jonah Tosney and Ian Shepherd did a 'walk-over' of the Astley Farm stretch of river downstream of the Holt-Thornage Road. Previous information and data are being re-evaluated by the NRT and river-meadow restoration work is likely to start early next year.
- Conservation grazing has been re-established this year at Little Thornage with a family herd of Dexter cattle on site.

We aim to work in friendly collaboration with landowners and farmers, conservation organisations and relevant public bodies.

**Robin Combe** Chairman 01263 712058  
**Ian Shepherd** Secretary 01263 713370  
**Anne Rolfe** Treasurer & Membership Secretary  
Web site [www.riverglaven.co.uk](http://www.riverglaven.co.uk)