Contents

Editorial .................................................................................................1

Towards a Country Parks Renaissance
Andrew Maliphant and Wendy Thompson
The Countryside Agency .................................................................2

Visitor Safety in Country Parks
Andy Maginnis, Visitor Safety in the Countryside Group (VSCG) ..............10

The Green Flag Award Scheme for Country Parks
Karen Lewis, Green Flag.................................................................14

Getting the Facts - Dog Walking and Visitor Numbers Survey at Burnham Beeches and their Implications for the Management Planning Process
Andrew Barnard, The Corporation of London .................................16

News ..................................................................................................20

Training and Events Diary..............................................................24

CRN Publications List .................................................................25

If you would like to have a flier or advert distributed with Countryside Recreation, which goes out to 3000 individuals working in the field of countryside recreation, tourism and leisure, please contact the Network Manager for details. A modest fee is charged to cover the increased cost of including the flier with the mail out.
A common theme between the articles in this edition of Countryside Recreation is one of providing a better quality recreation experience for visitors. I guess that's not really surprising – that's what most editions of the journal are essentially about and it's what many of you reading this are striving to do day to day! So what's new in this edition?

Well the prestigious Green Flag award (see the article by Karen Lewis) is a good measure of when a park is providing this quality experience. But the real issue for many parks is how to get there and what really struck me in reading this edition was the strong emphasis on the need for a good understanding of visitors. All of the articles in this edition are about country parks or sites at the managed end of the countryside recreation spectrum. Sites which generally get a lot of visitors and which need a degree of intervention to make sure that the level of use can be sustained both in terms of environmental capacity (so as not to damage wildlife, landscape and heritage features) and in terms of perceptual capacity (so that people are not spoiling the visit for each other).

At Burnham Beeches it wasn’t until the site became a candidate Special Area of Conservation (cSAC) that the need for better information to guide management decisions was highlighted. The article by Andy Barnard shows how the visitor survey, which was eventually undertaken, has given the Corporation of London plenty to think about in terms of how to manage the site in the future.

Understanding visitors is also important to managing their safety according to the Visitor Safety in the Countryside Group. The article by Andy Maginnis discusses the importance of striking a balance between keeping people safe without restricting their sense of freedom and adventure. The approach adopted at Worcester Woods Country Park is built around a strong understanding of the visitors to the site and their experience and behaviours.

Then the article on ‘Towards a renaissance for country parks’ - the report to the Countryside Agency about the future direction of country park management - also points to the need for better visitor information. The response to the survey carried out for the Countryside Agency suggested that less than half of country parks had completed visitor surveys in the previous five years. And yet without information about customer expectations, behaviour and demands it will be increasingly difficult to know how to provide a quality experience. I suggest that the spiral of decline, of which there is evidence, will only be turned around with better information about existing customers and potential customers. This will provide a stronger basis on which to make management decisions and will also provide the information required to demonstrate how relevant country parks are to society.

Wendy Thompson
The Countryside Agency
Introduction
The headline of the report to the Countryside Agency really came as no great surprise - good parks are continuing to improve whilst poor parks are continuing to decline. This mirrored the findings of the Public Parks Assessment and reinforced the message the Countryside Agency gave to a Select Committee Inquiry into Town and Country Parks in 1999.

However, the renaissance report was commissioned to gather the evidence we needed to demonstrate that this is the case. And beyond that it examined the role, function and viability of country parks. It aimed to set an agenda for country parks that would ensure they were fit for purpose. Also that they were able to rise to the opportunities and meet the challenges presented to them.

Summary of the report
A comprehensive questionnaire was sent to 267 country parks and 137 were completed and returned. The report draws on the detailed information provided by those parks which responded about:
• the physical composition of the parks;
• condition and trend in condition;
• finance and funding;
• use and users, including community/volunteer involvement; and
• management.

The report includes a review of the history of country parks and an assessment of the present situation. It also identifies a set of issues most likely to influence the future success and development of country parks and concludes with a set of recommendations.

Main findings – the present situation
The study found that:
• most of the 267 country parks in England are owned by local authorities;
• they receive an estimated 73 million visits per annum;
• approximately 2,500 people are employed in managing and maintaining country parks;
• two-thirds of country parks are located on the rural-urban fringe;
• country parks offer a range of benefits, services and recreational opportunities to diverse and varied visitors at a comparatively low cost;
• good parks are continuing to improve whilst poor parks are continuing to decline, which reflects funding patterns;
• the continued relevance and appeal of country parks as popular, multi-functional greenspaces remains clear.

The physical condition of country parks
The study found that country parks represent a substantial landmass, estimated to be in the region of 39,000 hectares. Over 70% of their area is designated as green belt or recreational open space, and an estimated 35% contain Sites of Special Scientific Interest.
Landscape planning designations within country parks

Nature conservation designations within country parks
**Condition and trend in condition**

More than 65% of responding officers reported that their parks were in either good or very good condition, and only 6% described their parks as in poor condition, with the rest described as average. The majority of parks (54%) were described as improving, nearly a third (31%) were stable and, encouragingly, less than a fifth (15%) were declining in condition.

Worryingly, of those parks that rated their overall condition as poor, 88% also rated their condition as declining and none rated it as improving. Twenty-eight percent of parks rated as average said that their overall condition was declining, and 33% said it was improving. But on the positive side, of those parks that were rated good, 65% stated their condition to be improving, with only 5% declining. Seventy-five percent of very good parks said they were improving, with none declining. Thus the majority of parks that were in poor condition were in decline, while those rated in good or very good condition were more likely to be improving.

**New charges by year**
Finance and funding

Responding officers were asked to provide information about the amount they spent on running and maintaining their park for four specific date periods, from 1984/85 through to 1999/2000. Only 23 (17%) country parks were able to provide total gross revenue expenditure figures for each of the date periods requested.

Initially the figures provided appeared encouraging, with an apparently small but steady increase over the years. However, when the effects of inflation were added to the equation, the financial situation facing country parks was reversed. In real terms, the amount of total gross revenue expenditure - applied to the 23 country parks responding to this section of the questionnaire - had declined significantly. The 1999/2000 budgets would need to be increased by 28% in order to have an equivalent value to the real term value of the 1984/85 budgets.

There was a significant increase in charge introductions during 1990/1991, most commonly for car parking, which relaxed until the mid-1990s when a marked increase was again observed.

New charges by subject

New charges introduced based on 77 examples

- A 1% BBQs
- B 1% Bird watching
- C 22% Car parking
- D 5% Children's activities
- E 1% Coach tours
- F 22% Education
- G 14% Events
- H 19% Guided walks/talks
- I 3% Sports
- J 3% Fishing
- K 3% Visitor maps
- L 5% Other
Use and users

Increasingly, country parks need a good level of knowledge about their customers. Park managers are under pressure to increase visitor numbers and the income generated by visitors in order to supplement the declining value of revenue budgets. Modernisation of local government through Best Value legislation and the introduction of Local Strategic Partnerships place a substantial emphasis on the involvement of the community and customer feedback.

Through the questionnaire, the study sought to examine park managers' general awareness of their customer base and the needs and preferences of their customers. In order to achieve this, responding officers were asked:

- how often visitor surveys were being undertaken;
- whether visitor numbers were being estimated, at least on an annual basis;
- whether schools are specifically targeted;
- details about visitor activities catered for by the park.

Responding officers were asked to provide details of any visitor surveys carried out in the previous five years. Forty-three percent of responding officers (59 parks) said that they had completed visitor surveys in the previous five years, and provided the date of the last survey. Fifty-three percent of parks did not carry out visitor surveys.

Sixty-one parks (45%) provided total visitor numbers. A recorded 16,668,631 visits were made to these sites, an average of 273,256 visits per park. When projected forward, this gives a figure of nearly 73 million annual visits to country parks nationally. (This equates to approximately 6% of all visits to the countryside in England.)

Based on visitor survey comparisons or park staff impressions, 42% of parks felt their visitor numbers were stable, with 41% increasing and 17% declining.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity parks</th>
<th>% of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive walks/talks</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special themed events</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienteering</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angling</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse riding</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fetes</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBQ</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical events</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting events</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping/caravanning</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boating</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailing</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weddings</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock rearing</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miniature railway</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports pitches</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle hire</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf course</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markets</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairs</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder/mystery events</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water-skiing/power boating</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crazy golf/putting</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ski facilities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Management

Whilst 64% of responding parks reported the existence of a management plan, only 46% of these were updated at intervals of less than two years. The plans covered a broad range of subjects but were by no means uniform in their approach. The Public Parks Assessment(2) in May 2001 found a clear link between the presence of management plans and an upward trend in park condition.

Topics covered in management plans
The future

The report identifies a set of factors most likely to influence the future success and development of country parks:

- the need for a champion;
- a system of support;
- a shared identity and common goals;
- minimum standards;
- finance and funding;
- staff training and support;
- management plans.

The report looks in more detail at how this success can be achieved and one of the themes considered was whether country parks could become more successful if they can be shown to address many of the national issues facing society today. For example, country parks can contribute to:

- **Health** – via participation in sport and recreation, including healthy walking and green gyms, and the ability of greenspace to relieve stress-related symptoms;

- **Social inclusion** – by providing specifically for the needs of people with disabilities, families on low incomes and other excluded groups;

- **Social cohesion** – as places where a wide cross-section of society can enjoy a quality environment communally;

- **Culture, sport and the arts** – as venues in their own right, as quality environments, and for a diverse range of events;

- **Employment** – through education, training and lifelong learning programmes for staff and students as well as active members of community groups;

- **The needs of children and young people** – by providing safe and stimulating environments for play, learning, social interaction and sport and recreation;

- **Sustainability** – by acting as examples of good practice utilising sustainable resources and operational methods;

- **Biodiversity** – through their contribution to local and national ‘Biodiversity Action Plans’ and the active conservation and enhancement of nature and wildlife within the parks and surrounding areas;

- **Community engagement and active citizenship** – by engaging the local community and park users, by supporting community-based groups, and by offering opportunities for participation in a wide range of activities;

- **Linking town and country** – many country parks link town and country physically because of their urban fringe location. Country parks have an important function in the urban fringe, both in conserving strategically important greenspace and in providing recreational opportunities for both rural and urban dwellers;

- **Tackling the urban/rural divide** – country parks link town and country socially and culturally. Their principal users comprise urban or suburban dwellers making visits to the countryside;

- **Heritage and tourism** – country parks have the potential to play an important role in local tourism, especially where they are based around a heritage property;

- **Education** – country parks can provide important educational opportunities, not always in terms of the national curriculum, but also in terms of allowing a general appreciation and understanding of the countryside and countryside matters.
Conclusion

The report concludes with a set of recommendations:

• include country parks in local authority parks and greenspace strategies;
• ensure the continuity and enhancement of the country park image;
• develop incentives that encourage the participation of all country parks in the renaissance programme;
• develop a shared vision for country parks;
• realise the potential of country parks in linking the town to the countryside;
• develop a set of eight core activities in the work programme of all country parks, including recreation and sport, and education and interpretation;
• adopt a set of minimum quality/service standards for all country parks;
• address ‘people’ as well as ‘place’ in all country park work;
• promote, to all relevant bodies, the ability of country parks to assist in achieving social agenda objectives and targets;
• market and promote country parks, the services they provide, and the benefits they can offer;
• establish a national ‘delivery group’ to link strategic development to delivery on the ground.

What next?

In England the Countryside Agency will help to put some of those processes in place. We will champion country parks nationally - and we’ll help country park managers to champion their own parks locally. To do this we will continue to support the Country Parks Network(3) which will:

• provide a focus for all country parks to share experience and good practice;
• help country park staff to feel less isolated and more supported;
• develop and share information on minimum standards;
• share information about sources of funding;
• in partnership with the Countryside Management Association, work to develop a system of competence levels for all Country Park managers.

There is also much more to be done to make sure that country parks are noticed in Government policies and advice. Where there are ways of linking into investment programmes we need to be looking out for those opportunities and making the case for country parks.

And a final word on the shared vision. This is incredibly important. Country parks are varied and we are recommending they become more able to deal with a range of different agendas, to make them ever more relevant to society. But there are common aims and strength in being a part of a country park family. The CRN workshops in July and September provided some further thinking on this which we will build on to develop a shared vision for all country parks.

(1) The full report ‘Towards a renaissance’ is available at www.countryside.gov.uk

(2) Urban Parks Forum (May 2001): Public Parks Assessment – A survey of local authority owned parks, focusing on parks of historic interest.

(3) Contact Liz Gaunt at Greenspace on 0118 946 9060, or email "Liz Gaunt" <lizg@green-space.org.uk>.
Managing Visitor Safety in a Country Park
Andy Maginnis, Worcestershire County Council

Why manage visitor safety?
Any organisation that manages land with public access needs to consider visitor safety for moral, legal, financial and business reasons. Until recently, practical guidance on managing visitor safety was extremely limited. Furthermore, the issue of what risk control measures to employ is more problematic where the primary purpose of the organisation is to provide public access and to protect the natural and built environment. In order to address these issues a number of organisations including British Waterways, the Countryside Management Association, English Heritage, the Environment Agency, the Forestry Commission, the National Trust, RSPB and Worcestershire County Council, formed the Visitor Safety in the Countryside Group (VSCG) following a CRN conference on the subject.

The Visitor Safety in the Countryside Group
The VSCG seeks to promote best practice in managing visitor safety. It attempts to do this in a manner which addresses the proper moral, legal, financial and business concerns of the organisation while not unnecessarily restricting the visitor’s sense of freedom or adventure, or compromising the organisation’s conservation objectives. The Group has developed a set of guiding principles on managing visitor safety. In doing so it has recognised that a risk control measure that may be appropriate in an urban-fringe country park may be less appropriate in a remote upland area. Indeed, the Group has suggested that as the terrain becomes more wild and remote it is reasonable to expect the visitor to be more self-reliant and the landowner or site manager to intervene less. This approach is broadly mirrored by visitor expectations and
patterns of litigation ie most people would not expect to encounter uneven paving in a shopping mall and might expect reparations should they have an accident as a result of a minor discrepancy in levels - whereas most people would not expect even surfaces in an upland area and would not seek compensation should they trip over half way up a mountain.

Managing visitor safety in country parks
Most country parks are extremely popular with people of all ages and abilities. They tend to fall towards the end of the VSCG spectrum where managers should generally expect low user self-reliance and the need for a relatively greater level of management intervention. Using the VSCG guiding principles as headings, examples of visitor safety measures employed at Worcester Woods Country Park located on the urban fringe of Worcester are considered below. The country park is used informally for walking, cycling, horse riding, kite-flying, orienteering, swimming, camping and picnicking etc as well as for more organised events such as car boot sales, fairs and circuses. The park is one of a number of sites managed by Worcestershire County Council's Countryside Service and has its own Site Officer who is responsible for carrying out risk assessments, preparing safety plans, organising inspections, ordering remedial work and investigating accidents.

Fundamentals
Take account of conservation, heritage, recreation, cultural and landscape objectives.
In the centre of the country park a pond has developed in an old marl-hole that could easily be filled in thereby removing the hazard entirely. This has not been done because of the pond's historical significance and its value for wildlife. However, marginal vegetation has been encouraged to develop to limit access to the water. Similarly, the risk of children falling from a swing could be eliminated entirely by removing the swings. This course of action has obviously not been taken as one of the park's primary functions is to provide opportunities for informal recreation. To reduce the risk of injury parents are advised that they must supervise their children and the equipment is properly inspected and maintained.

Do not take away people’s sense of freedom and adventure
Children frequently build camps in the woods and there is some risk that these could be set on fire. However, it is felt that this is outweighed by the potential loss of the youngsters’ sense of adventure. Camps are only removed if they are structurally hazardous and could cause serious injury if they collapsed.

Avoid restrictions on access
The Park is open day and night 365 days a year. Access is only denied using physical barriers where other risk control measures are not considered adequate eg when forestry work is taking place. More subtle methods of steering visitors away from potentially more hazardous areas are employed such as the creation of waymarked trails.

Awareness
Ensure that your visitors know the risks they face
Visitors are made aware of hazards such as ponds, work activities, other recreational activities, seasonal biological hazards and so on through signage, leaflets, teachers’ packs and personal contact through guided walks and during routine patrols.

Inform and educate your visitors about the nature and extent of hazards, the risk control measures in place and the precautions they themselves should take
There are two lakes in the Park. Visitors are made aware of the fact that it is hazardous to swim or wade in them as there may be sharp objects underwater and there is also a risk of contracting leptospirosis. This is achieved through signage, leaflets and personal contact made by chatting to the youngsters at risk.

Partnership
Recognise that people taking part in similar activities accept different levels of risk
A family group pottering through the park along one of the waymarked trails might reasonably expect not to encounter steep steps, stiles and over-hanging branches whereas a group of ramblers might relish such challenges. Both groups are accommodated in the country park through the provision of level waymarked trails free from
steps, stiles, trip hazards targeted at the family groups and unsurfaced, unwaymarked, less manicured trails for the more adventurous.

Recognise that risk control measures for one group of visitors may create risks for others
No fencing has been erected around the ponds and lakes. This is not only because of the visual impact but because, ironically, the presence of a fence could make a rescue more difficult should one ever be required.

Work with visitor groups to promote understanding and resolve conflict
Users such as cyclists, walkers and kite-fliers have been encouraged to meet and understand each other’s perspective. This has been reinforced in a leaflet “Enjoy your visit” that sets out a code of conduct and explains that other groups are entitled to use the country park too!

Responsibility
It is important to strike a balance between user self-reliance and management intervention
It is considered appropriate to offer a reasonably high level of support at the park in terms of signage, leaflets, staff presence, first-aid provision and so on. However, a degree of user self-reliance is expected as outlined below.

It is reasonable to expect visitors to exercise responsibility for themselves
User groups are advised when organising events what is expected of them in terms of risk assessment, first-aid provision, marshalling and so on. Advice is also given on insurance requirements.

It is reasonable to expect visitors not to put others at risk
Most typical informal recreation activities are allowed in the country park provided they do not damage the site or put other users at risk. Kite-fliers have been restricted to certain areas due to problems of other users being inadvertently “dive-bombed”. Golf has been banned due to the risk posed to other users and the failure of the participants to recognise this.

It is reasonable to expect parents, guardians and leaders to supervise people in their care
This is made clear at the entrance to the children’s play area. The sign reads “You must be under 14 to use this play area. All users must be supervised by an adult”. If an
unsupervised child were to be injured this fact would be recorded in the accident book.

Risk control
Assess risks and develop safety plans for individual sites
A park risk assessment and safety plan have been developed by the staff. The risk assessment identifies hazards, who might be harmed, how they might be harmed, the likelihood of harm arising, the severity and current and proposed risk control measures. The safety plan sets out the actions to be taken to remove hazards or reduce the level of risk including lead responsibility, completion dates and budgetary requirements.

Risk control measures should be consistent
Because the country park has a history of local youngsters venturing on to frozen ponds, these are signed as hazardous. Care is taken to sign all of the ponds as visitors could be forgiven for assuming that one that isn't signed is not hazardous. A consistent approach is also taken to tree safety in terms of inspection regimes and remedial action. The regime distinguishes between trees in different zones with those in areas visited by more people or where people congregate being inspected more frequently and remedial action being more stringent. However, there is a consistent approach within similar zones.

Monitor the behaviour and experiences of visitors to review visitor safety plans
Visitors to a car boot sale held at the park began to park in potentially hazardous places. The site risk assessment was therefore reviewed and new risk control measures put in place including coning and liaison with the police. All known accidents and near misses that occur on the park are recorded and analysed to identify trends in accidents. This resulted in a barrier being erected to prevent children inadvertently wandering in front of other children using the swings in the play area.

Make sure that your work activities do not expose visitors to risk
When trees are felled, warning signs are erected in key areas, hazard warning tape is placed around the work area and contractors are briefed to stop work if visitors or their pets enter the work area.

VSCG publication
The VSCG believes that the more organisations that follow the guiding principles, the more they will become accepted as industry practice in legal circles. To this end the Group has published “Managing Visitor Safety in the Countryside - Principles and Practice” which, besides expanding on the guiding principles, has chapters on risk assessment, the law, accident reporting and emergency planning. The publication can be ordered from the VSCG website at www.vscg.co.uk

Andy Maginnis

Andy is Worcestershire County Council’s Countryside Estates Manager, Chairman of the Countryside Management Association and is the Local Government Association’s Countryside Advisor on CRN.
Green Flag Awards
Karen Lewis, Green Flag Award Manager

Many people think that in order to win a Green Flag Award the site has to be a town park or a big flagship park, but as our 28 winning country parks can testify it is just as relevant to these sites as to the more formal town park/garden site.

You may ask how can that be? Well the Green Flag Award scheme is the national standard for parks and green spaces that are well used, well looked after and held in high regard. This is regardless of type of site and the strength of the Green Flag Award scheme is that it positively celebrates distinctiveness. There is no desire to see all sites looking the same but rather the recognition of the uniqueness of every site and the role the site plays within its locality. The origins of our winning country parks demonstrate this diversity - Vicar Water Country Park in Newark was a colliery spoil tip, Lickey Hills Country Park in Birmingham was a royal hunting reserve in the time of William the Conqueror, and Daventry Country Park on the fringes of Daventry is centred round an old reservoir.

However there are two conditions that are applicable to all sites: firstly the site must be freely accessible ie open in daylight hours and free to enter and secondly the site must have a dedicated management plan. This document should state what the site is about, what is there, how it is looked after and what plans exist for future management and development of it. Ideally the local community should be involved with the management and development of the site - this may be a Friends Group, sports people, local residents or any other party that has an interest in the site.

Entries from country parks have grown steadily from 10 in 2001 from which there were 9 winners, 12 in 2002 from which there were 11 winners and 33 this year from which there are 28 winners. The ratio of success against entries is high in this category as it is in local nature reserves. Two of our six year winners are country parks, namely Worden Park in South Ribble which was originally the grounds to Worden Hall, and Cockington Country Park with its old fashioned atmosphere of cottages, pastures, woods and Devon lanes.
The eight Green flag Award criteria were designed to reflect what people should expect from a park and again have relevance regardless of the site. They are
1. A welcoming place
2. Healthy, safe and secure
3. Clean and well maintained
4. Sustainability
5. Conservation and heritage
6. Community involvement
7. Marketing
8. Management

Sites are scored against these criteria and any site that gains greater than 65% will win the prestigious Green Flag. For more detail on the criteria you can visit our section on the Civic Trust’s website on www.civictrust.org.uk or purchase a copy of the Green Flag manual ‘Raising the Standard’, price £60.

In addition you may be interested in becoming a Green Flag judge - a number of our existing judges are managers of country parks and they bring their specialist skills to the judging process.

For further information contact Lorraine Scanlon on 0151 709 1969.

Karen Lewis, Green Flag Award Manager
Getting the Facts - Dog Walking and Visitor Number Surveys at Burnham Beeches and their Implications for the Management Process

Andrew Barnard, Superintendent of Burnham Beeches National Nature Reserve (NNR)

Background
Burnham Beeches is a National Nature Reserve (NNR) and candidate Special Area of Conservation (cSAC) in South Buckinghamshire and has been owned by the Corporation of London since 1880. The site consists of 540 acres of ancient woodland, veteran beech and oak pollards, wetland, heathland, grassland and secondary woodland. For those unfamiliar with the work of the Corporation of London, it is the local authority for the ‘Square Mile’. The Corporation owns and manages around 4250 hectares of land in the London area (including Epping Forest) acquiring much of its land between 1878 and 1885 to protect it from development and to provide natural areas for recreation - a pre-cursor to the National Trust if you like. Somewhat unusually the Corporation of London funds the management of much of this land privately, removing all burden from the taxpayer.

Why Consult?
Like many local authorities, the Corporation is keen to consult its customers on the services it provides. As the site manager I rely on consultation techniques to assist and inform often-difficult management decisions and to give an early indication of likely responses to change.

Having said that, the site has been successfully owned and managed for 123 years with, until quite recently, little or no consultation. Even so, Burnham Beeches has avoided the conflicts between management and visitor expectations experienced at many other sites. So why bother to consult if all is well? In truth some of the most contentious issues have been avoided over the years. Fundamental concerns such as the ‘carrying capacity’ of the site and challenges involving the management of dog walking had been noted but remained largely unresolved. Recent changes in the status of the site particularly cSAC means that ‘avoidance’ is no longer an option if the Corporation is to provide and maintain habitats ‘in favourable condition’ as well as offer the opportunities for ‘high quality’ recreation expected by visitors.

The need for more information to guide decisions on these issues was highlighted during the last management plan review (1999) and built into the work programme during 2002/03. This gave time to develop ideas and ensure that funding and up to date information are available for the next review of the management plan in 2004.

Problems, What Problems?
A brief walk around Burnham Beeches provides many of the signs of wear and tear associated with high visitor pressure. The need to establish the site’s carrying capacity is evident if we are to manage these issues sensibly with the obvious first step being to accurately define the number of visitors coming to Burnham Beeches each year. The impact of dog walking also features significantly during this same brief excursion especially the problems of fouling and poorly controlled pets. In this case, it is clear that positive management is required to minimise the impact of dogs on other site users, habitat and wildlife whilst ensuring that dog walkers also enjoy their visit. There is a real need to establish patterns of behaviour and attitudes from the perspective of dog walkers and non-dog walkers alike.

Both of these subjects lend themselves to the survey ‘style’ of consultation and the remainder of this article attempts to share knowledge in terms of techniques used, outcomes and their future usefulness.
Visitor Numbers Survey
The main objectives for this survey were:

Primary
• Define the total number of visitors to the site each year.
• Identify a single, cost effective, indicator/model for estimating the number of visitors each year.

Secondary
• Define the modes of transport used.
• Identify seasonal variation in visitor numbers.
• Indicate how many cars pass through the site using it as a ‘rat-run’.
• Ascertained the volume of visitors for each entry point.
• Calculated the ‘estimated error’ in the technique.

How We Did It
A trial study was designed to test ideas and resource requirements. The trial included the use of an observation form and the installation of automated traffic counters (ATCs) on the solitary road that passes through the Beeches providing access to the main car parking area. The ATCs were to provide the long-term traffic figures allowing data from the observation survey to be converted into an annual total. The results of these trials were passed to researchers at the Manchester Metropolitan University. They suggested some alterations to the design and were also employed to carry out the data analysis and provide a summary report at the end of the survey.

The final methodology consisted of 3 weekday and 3 weekend observation days. Observation points were located at the site’s main access points between 07.30 hours and dusk. ATCs were installed on the road to the main car parking area for a total of 75 days split over three periods. All survey periods were chosen to reflect the perceived seasonal variation in visitor numbers in a 12-month period. Data analysis was carried out using StatViewV.5 and Excel 2000 software.

Summary Findings
The survey found that the site is visited by between 403,474 and 562,078 people each year (16.4% variation) with the consultants stating that their greatest level of confidence is much nearer the top of the range than the lower. As a headline figure we are confident that Burnham Beeches receives 550,000 visitors each year and that this figure can be refined in years to come to act as the baseline for future management decisions including carrying capacity.

Crucially, the consultants managed to produce a simple computer model to estimate annual visitor numbers based solely on the number of cars counted by the ATCs. The survey showed that 77% of visitors arrive by car and travel along the road to the main car parking area. In future ATCs will be placed on this route and their data fed into the computer model to provide visitor figures ‘on demand’. The ability to easily monitor visitor numbers in this manner is a very positive achievement. For the first time we not only have an accurate idea of visitor numbers but also can begin to relate this figure to management issues allowing their effects on visitor numbers to be monitored. A cost effective and scientifically robust ‘early warning system’ for potential problems is now in place.

Dog Walking Survey
If you want to start an argument try a gentle criticism of the behaviour of someone’s pet and ‘fireworks’ are practically guaranteed. Dog walking is the biggest challenge in terms of recreation management at Burnham Beeches. This perception is often reinforced by the number of lost dogs reported, evidence of poor control and harm to wildlife as well as complaints from visitors...
about the amount of dog mess on the site. All this despite
the provision of dog bins, free poop scoops and regular
messages in newsletters, walks, talks and leaflets over
many years. There seems to be a deep-rooted culture
amongst some dog walkers that Burnham Beeches is a
great place to bring your dog and ‘let it have its head’.
Whilst it is accepted that many dog walkers ensure their
pets are well behaved it is thought that the high number
of dogs on the site means even a relatively small
percentage of ‘irresponsible’ dog walkers provides a large
and highly visible problem.

We have often made life difficult for ourselves as well! The
byelaw governing dog walking at Burnham Beeches
requires that dogs should be kept under ‘effective control’.
However, no one finds it easy to agree a single
interpretation of what this actually means and over the
years this has led to inconsistency and management inertia.

To challenge the culture of dog walking at the site it made
sense to garner opinion. To this end the consultants
‘England Marketing’ were asked to design and implement
a survey to provide data on the following basis:
A) Provide a robust estimate of the number of dog
walkers and dogs visiting the site each day.
B) Investigate visitors’ attitudes to dog fouling to establish:
   The acceptability or otherwise of not clearing up
dog mess.
The levels of awareness/usage of dog bins and
poop scoops
   Dog walkers were asked to indicate if they would clear
up after their pet and if so in which areas they
would/would not feel inclined to do so.
C) Investigate visitors’ attitudes to dog behaviour
   concerning:
   Chasing wildlife, dog fights and worrying of live stock
   The desirability of a dog walker’s code, dog free zones
   and ‘dogs on lead areas’ at the site.
   The level of control visitors were perceived to have/felt
   they had over their pets.
   The positive and negative effects dog walking has on
   visitors enjoyment
   What amounts to effective control
D) Implement an observation study of the actual
   behaviour of dog walkers particularly in terms of
   clearing up dog faeces.

Survey design
To obtain a representative sample of visitors there were
three main elements to the survey:
1. Face to face questionnaire - carried out over three days
   at several locations around the site.
2. Distribution of 1300 ‘self-completion questionnaires’
   (same as used in face to face interviews) delivered by
   hand or posted to local addresses.
3. Observation Study - carried out over a different three-day
   period to the face to face survey. Here staff & volunteers
   simply observed the behaviour of dog walkers at a variety
   of locations noting if owners cleaned up after their pets.
   This would allow responses from the questionnaires to be
   compared with what actually happens.

Summary findings
The results thrown up by the survey were profound and
we are still trying to absorb their implications.

Behaviour
• 39% of visitors come to the site to with the prime
  purpose of walking their dogs
• The average number of dogs per walker is 1.4.
• Just over one in five visitors felt that dog walking at
  Burnham Beeches hinders their enjoyment of the site.
86% of visitors felt that leaving dog mess on the site
was unacceptable.
• Around 95% of visitors claimed to clear up after their
  pets at all times.

Control
• 67% of visitors felt that most dogs were kept under
  effective control
• 22% felt that few dogs were under effective control
• 63% of visitors felt that a dog was under effective
  control if ‘it is kept in sight and returns to its owner
  when called’
• The creation of a dog free zone received support from
  56% of our visitors whilst 32% objected to the idea.
• 69% of visitors felt that a site-specific ‘dog walking
  code’ setting out what behaviour is expected would be
  a good way of managing dog-related issues.
• 76% felt that it was unacceptable for a dog to be
  chasing wildlife

Observation study – In stark contrast to the results of the
questionnaires the observation study revealed that:
• The highest incidence of people cleaning up after their dogs in any area was 46%.
• In the worst area only 19% of dog walkers cleaned up after their pets.
• Some visitors pretended to clear up after their pet but left it in-situ once they felt fellow site users could no longer see them.

The percentage figures from the dog survey become more meaningful when viewed in terms of the 550,000 visitors per annum provided by the Visitor Numbers Survey. From the two surveys we can conclude that:
• Over 300,000 dogs are brought to Burnham Beeches each year equating to almost 1000 dogs per day (1) or 100 dogs per hour
• As a rough estimate it is thought that around 60 tonnes of dog faeces is ‘deposited’ on the NNR each year.
• Of that figure it is estimated that between 33 - 48 tonnes of faeces is left on the NNR each year.
• About 30,000 litres of dog urine is deposited on the NNR each year.
• Whilst 95% of dog walkers are aware of the importance of clearing up the mess left behind by their pets there are around 200,000 occasions each year when dog mess is left in-situ.
• Women are almost twice as likely as men to clean up after their pet
• 125,000 visitors each year have the impression that dogs are not under effective control at Burnham Beeches and that this hinders their enjoyment.
• Some 135000 ‘visitations’ to the site each year will be people who aren’t sure if it is acceptable for a dog to chase wildlife and typically, another 11,000 may think that this is acceptable for their pets to do this.
• There is common ground concerning a definition of ‘effective control’ between visitors and the Corporation (1) Where a day equals 08.00 hours to dusk over a year. The site is locked to cars at all other times)

Good Value?
Clearly some profound information has been gained from the surveys that will have a long-term impact on the way we manage the site in the future. In broad terms both surveys help to demonstrate that the Corporation of London is being proactive in its management and has sent clear messages that change is imminent.

The visitor numbers survey allows, with a high degree of confidence, percentages provided by other surveys to be converted into tangible numbers. The process of carrying out studies into other areas of visitor impact such as erosion can begin as there is now a datum against which to compare cause and effect. The long-term findings of this survey will be an essential tool in the discourse between the Corporation of London and site stakeholders.

The dog walking survey has provided a better understanding of the problems involved and gauged how much public support is likely when the time inevitably comes to proactively ‘manage’ the issue. Importantly the surprises provided by the survey have caused us to reassess the current approach. The resultant action plan will now cover a longer period than originally perceived and provide regular and imaginative initiatives backed up by a long-term process of information/education. Importantly, confident that we have done our homework thoroughly, staff can begin to modify the negative elements of the current dog walking culture at Burnham Beeches.

The next management plan will be a better and more powerful document because of the knowledge provided by these surveys. Their cost was around £18000 with the visitor numbers survey accounting for 2/3rds (2) of that amount. 
(2) Future costs are likely to be in the region of £3000 per annual survey using ATCs and the new model.

Whilst undoubtedly expensive (and in hindsight some corners could have been cut to minimise costs) the impact and benefits of this work to the management of the site and the enjoyment of its many visitors over the next decade or so is priceless.

Andy Barnard is the Superintendent of Burnham Beeches NNR. For further details on these issues, he can be contacted by email at andy.barnard@corpoflondon.gov.uk or by phone on 01753 647358.

References
75% REDUCTION IN CAR THEFT FOR BRECON BEACONS NATIONAL PARK

An innovative car park watch scheme, set up a year ago to cut crime in the Beacons Area of the National Park, has proved a resounding success. The scheme, funded by Forestry Commission Wales, Brecon Beacons National Park Authority (BBNPA), Dyfed Powys Police and Powys County Council, has reduced car theft from forest car parks by an incredible 75% in just one year.

Jon Pimm, Central Area Warden for BBNPA, said: “This is a fantastic achievement for all concerned, and the car park watch scheme has gone a long way towards ensuring that visitors can leave their cars in safety and enjoy the National Park”.

Forestry Commission Wales are now encouraging more volunteers to join this scheme, to cover the whole of the Brecon Beacons National Park Area, and are hosting a volunteer recruitment day at Garwnant Visitors Centre on Saturday 27th September 2003. Volunteers will be responsible for watching over parked cars, liaising with police and helping raise awareness of car crime among the public.

Mansel Jones, Local Area Manager for Forestry Commission Wales, said “Being a volunteer for the car park watch scheme is a great way to get out and about into the woodlands and help the local community. The volunteers that monitor the scheme are usually between the ages of 40 and 60, but we would be happy to hear from anyone that has some spare time on their hands”.

The volunteers are trained and supported by Dyfed Powys Police and issued with fluorescent jackets and badges. Satellite phones, linked to police cars patrolling the area, are used to maintain close contact with local police. Powys County Council will be setting up a similar scheme in North Powys next year, following the success of the project in the Brecon Beacons.

Jackie Heighway, Community Safety Officer for Brecon Police said: “In common with many remote car parks located in beauty spots around the country, car crime had become a growing concern. This naturally puts many people off walking in some of the most beautiful countryside in Wales. We are delighted that the presence of volunteers has had a dramatic effect on reducing car crime. We urge vehicle owners to help the volunteers and themselves by securing their vehicle and leaving nothing of value on display”.

Further details of the car parks watch scheme can be obtained from Mansel Jones, Forestry Commission Wales, 01550 720394

COMMONS AND GREENS: A VITAL NEW BOOK

We too readily take common land and village greens for granted, yet they are of great value for their history, wildlife and recreation opportunities, and local councils have an important role in their protection. This role, along with those of other organisations and interests, is clearly spelt out in the new edition of Our Common Land: the law and history of common land and village greens by Paul Clayden MA, published by the Open Spaces Society.

The book will give you guidance on the various rights over commons and greens, their management, control and legal protection, and the new right of access to commons under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, among many other issues. This book should be the first port of call for local councils with a query about their community's commons or greens.

The book is available from the society at 25 A Bell Street, Henley-on-Thames, Oxon RG9 2BA, telephone 01491 573535 or email hq@oss.org.uk. The price is £25.00, but for members of the society it is £14.00 (both prices include postage and packing). So if you are not yet a member of the society, why not join and buy the book at a reduced price at the same time?
HERITAGE LOTTERY FUND
LOTTERY DISTRIBUTORS CELEBRATE EUROPEAN YEAR OF DISABLED PEOPLE

The Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) aims to ensure that everyone can learn about, have access to and enjoy their heritage. It is therefore encouraged that all applicants look for ways to remove barriers that may currently limit people’s involvement with their heritage, as part of their projects. In total, The Heritage Lottery Fund have made more than 12,000 grants, worth over £2billion. Some of these are specifically targeted towards helping disabled people whilst others improve access so that everyone benefits.

As a contribution to the European Year of Disabled People 2003, HLF is proud to have co-ordinated, with other Lottery Distributors, a booklet which celebrates just a few of the ways in which Lottery funding for the arts, heritage, sports and community has helped benefit disabled people across the United Kingdom.

If you would like to know more information about the Heritage Lottery Fund or would like a copy of the HLF booklet, please contact the HLF helpline on 020 7591 6042 or email enquire@hlf.org.uk.

PRESTIGIOUS AWARDS RECOGNISE SCOTLAND’S CUTTING-EDGE TALENT

Scotland’s excellence in the field of design, innovation and regeneration will be celebrated in the 2003 Dynamic Place Awards.

The prestigious Scotland-wide initiative is the only event of its kind to recognise and reward leading projects that are helping to drive Scotland forward into the 21st century.

Now in its third year, the Dynamic Place Awards put the spotlight on pioneering examples of urban and rural development that makes Scotland one of the world’s most innovative nations.

The awards, which are organised by Scottish Enterprise, recognise top Scottish talent in five categories - Buildings, Open Spaces, Making Connection (both digital and transport), People/Training Developments and Sustainability. Additional awards are also presented to Individual of the Year and Team of the Year.

Sponsored by the Highlands and Island Enterprise, Communities Scotland and Scottish Natural Heritage, the 2003 Dynamic Place Awards play a vital role in regenerating numerous locations across Scotland.

Neil Hood, Deputy Chairman of Scottish Enterprise, said: “Each year the Dynamic Place Awards get bigger and better and they reveal we have some of the finest examples of creative regeneration and development projects of anywhere in the world”.

“I am looking forward to seeing this year’s entries and I would urge anyone involved in projects that fall into any one of the five categories to get their entry in as soon as possible”.

The awards recognise significant investment in Scotland and are now established as the premier place to showcase Scottish talent.

More than 100 entries were submitted last year, representing a total investment of £250 million in Scotland.

The Falkirk Wheel scooped the top prize last year, with Crichton Campus in Dumfries named overall winner in 2001. St Andrew’s-in-the-Square won a building award in 2001, attracting new investment of approximately £15 million.

A panel of high profile judges, including renowned horticulturalist Carole Baxter, engineer Iain Hart, architectural expert, Professor Andy MacMillan and representatives from the sponsors, will select a shortlist of approximately 35 entries in September.

The final winners will be announced at a prestigious ceremony in Glasgow in December where top Scots broadcaster Lesley Riddoch, who compered last year’s event, will be the after dinner speaker.

“The Dynamic Place Awards recognise excellence in many fields. Never mind mega projects, the face of Scotland is made up of many small features,” said Lesley.

“The accessibility of a park; the skill of new design based historic monuments; the cheerfulness and optimism of a hospital foyer; the cleverness of a plan to fell a forest without building new roads and ingenious ways of getting people back into employment have all qualified for the new awards and won.”

More information about the 2003 awards and applications is available by logging onto www.scottish-enterprise.com or by contacting Josie Saunders, PR Consultant working for Scottish Enterprise on 0141 333 9585 or 07881 816283.
INVESTING IN THE FUTURE OF THE COUNTRYSIDE
Rural affairs manager launches good practice guide.
Improving the prospects for young people in rural areas by giving them access to the services they need is a priority as we build strong rural communities for the future, said Countryside Agency director, Margaret Clark, speaking at the launch of The Implementation of Connexions in Rural Areas* in London on Tuesday 28th October 2003.

The report produced jointly by Connexions and the Countryside Agency, launched at the Connexions Rural Mini Forum by Rural Affairs Minister, Alan Michael, is a good practice guide aimed at practitioners responsible for delivering services for young people in rural communities. The Minister told delegates:

“Giving an adequate service to young people in any community is directly linked to the task of building the sustainability of that community as a whole. That is a fundamental point which is now beginning to be much better understood. By empowering young people through access to services we can help channel the energies of one of the most productive sectors of society in a positive direction, rather than allowing that energy to stagnate or be directed into less welcome activity. This guide will provide an important tool for those taking forward that empowerment.”

“There is still more to be done and meeting the need for young people in the rural areas is one of our priorities.”

Margaret Clark said “This guide is a celebration of the innovative work undertaken by Connexions Partnerships working in rural areas. There are imaginative and effective working practices being developed, such as One Stop Shops and moped schemes, to suit the particular needs of the areas and to provide better opportunities for rural young people. the good examples demonstrated in this report will help others provide a brighter future for young people in the countryside.”

Many young people in rural areas have to overcome major hurdles to access basic services that their more urban counterparts take for granted. Previously, a lack of joined-up working between transport, education and health bodies means that quite often, young people need to rely on others to bridge this service gap. Without transport it’s near impossible for many young people to see the doctor, join a training course, meet friends or use the Internet. With health or personal matters this issue becomes more acute. This guide encourages those responsible for delivering these services to consider and find solutions to specific issues.

Anne Weinstock, Chief Executive, Connexions said “I very much welcome publication of the report. I am sure that it will become an essential tool for practitioners in its focus on good practice amongst Connexions Partnerships in delivering services to rural communities”.

Case studies include:

Tiverton Market Drop-in Centres: Connexions is collaborating with Tiverton Market Drop in Centre to create a One Stop Shop - providing young people with information, advice and legal advice, counselling and life skills.

Wheels to Work, Teesdale: This initiative between the Countryside Agency, Connexions and Groundwork West Durham, provides an affordable means of transport for a small number of young people living in rural Teesdale to enable them to get to work, or to raining courses. Young people are loaned a moped and relevant equipment for six months, and contribute £2.50 per week. The project aims to benefit around 40 young people over two years.

North Dorset Homelessness Strategy Group: Homelessness is a key problem for young people in Dorset. Treads, a voluntary-sector youth advice and information centre in Blandford Forum is working with Connexions to help young people with housing needs.

For a full list for case studies please contact the press office.

For further information and copies of the report please contact Mel Capper, Countryside Agency press office on 020 7340 2909, Louise Angel, Connexions press officer on 020 8238 8568 or Beverley Parr, DEFRA press office on 020 7238 6751.
NATIONAL FOREST TRANSFORMS MIDLANDS AND BOOSTS ECONOMY BUSINESS LEADERS TOLD

Britain’s boldest, most exciting and ambitious environment transformation has helped create hundreds of jobs, resulted in rural diversification and attracted additional investment, according to the chief executive of The National Forest Company.

Speaking to business leaders at The Breakfast Connection (ICC, Birmingham) Thursday 2nd October 2003, Susan Bell said The National Forest was transforming a huge swathe of the Midlands by radically improving its landscape and invigorating the region’s economy.

The Forest, which spans 200 square miles of Staffordshire, Derbyshire and Leicester, is on Birmingham’s doorstep - just 45 minutes from the city centre - and is creating an environment that is good for business, and businesses that are good for the environment, she said.

“A healthy environment is vital to us all and to future generations. A healthy economy is equally important but its very development has hitherto been seen as a threat to the environment. The National Forest is proving the two are far from incompatible. Indeed they can and should be mutually supportive.

Independent studies have shown a rapid rate of development in the Forest and a growing population. Some 3,000 new homes are being completed each year - many in former coal field areas previously ignored by developers. Unemployment has remained below the national average since 1995, a good performance given the loss of traditional employment.

Between 1995 and 2001, more than £32.5m was invested by government and European programmes producing nearly £6m in additional leverage and creating more than 500 new jobs.

Tourism, including the new visitor’s centre of Conkers, is generating £100, of income and more than 330,000 new visitors a year. “The National Forest’s mosaic of different land users within a woodland framework is wholly different from the coniferous plantations associated 20th Century upland forests”.

“This forest in the Midlands is so much more than the timber production factor. It is improving wildlife habitat, enhancing both the landscape and environment, and providing opportunities for leisure and recreation stimulating economic generation,” said Susan Bell.

Issued on behalf of The National Forest Company, Enterprise Glade, Bath Lane, Moira, Swadlincote, Derbyshire, DE12 6BD by Clarke Associates, Centre Court, 1201 Stratford Road, Birmingham, B28 9AP

For further information about this article, please contact Susan Bell OBE, The National Forest Company - Telephone 01283 552671 or David Clarke, Clarke Associates - Telephone 0121 702 2525.

“RESCUE BLUESTONE FIASCO” PLEA TO MINISTER

The National Parks watchdog the Council for National Parks (CNP) (1) has today urged the Welsh Assembly Government to ‘call-in’ the Bluestone proposal (2) and hold a public inquiry. CNP says that political pressure on Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority members threatens to make a mockery of National Park principles.

CNP’s Head of Policy Ruth Chambers said: “The political pressure being placed on members of the Park Authority to approve the Bluestone proposal is in danger of preventing a fair and impartial decision. The situation has become so serious that it could lead to a complaint to the Ombudsman”.

“Given the highly politically charged nature of this development proposal, we consider that the Environment Minister has no choice other than act to safeguard the integrity of the planning process by taking the decision out of the hands of the National Park Authority”.

Ruth Chambers concluded: “By calling in this application Carwyn Jones would make it crystal clear that the Welsh Assembly Government is serious about its commitment to open government, transparent decision making and its core principle of sustainability. To leave this decision in the hands of the National Park Authority, whose members we understand have been put under intense pressure to approve the development, would in our view result in a serious loss of public confidence in the Assembly”.

For further information please contact Ruth Chambers on 020 7924 4077 ext. 222 or 07769 676 397 or Sylvia Davies on 029 2045 0433.
Countryside Recreation and Training

COUNTRYSIDE RECREATION NETWORK
Tel: 0114 225 4494
Email: M.Bull@shu.ac.uk
URL: www.countrysiderecreation.org.uk

ENVIRONMENTAL TRAINERS NETWORK
Tel: 0121 358 2155
Email: ETN@unite.net
URL: www.btcv.org/etn

ACCESSIBLE GREENSPACE
With a keynote address by Professor Chris Baines, long-term advocate of better greenspace management; a look at the experience of current initiatives and operators such as Groundwork, the Community Forests and Doorstep Greens; and an opportunity to find out more about the role and approach of CABEspace.

Target Audience
The seminar is aimed at both (a) agency and local authority staff working at a strategic level who may influence policy and funding relating to greenspace in and around towns and cities, particularly those with a responsibility for developing recreation, health and social well being and protecting wildlife and historical features, and (b) practitioners involved in managing accessible greenspace. There are 50 places available on this seminar.
Venue: Norfolk Heritage Park, Sheffield
Cost: £95

NOVEMBER 2003

4 November 2003
WELCOMING DIVERSITY & REDUCING PREJUDICE
Venue: Birmingham
Cost: £100/£150

5 November 2003
WRITING EFFECTIVE FUNDING APPLICATIONS
Venue: Doncaster
Cost: £100/£150

19-20 November 2003
COMMUNITY CONSULTATION TECHNIQUES
Venue: Manchester
Cost: £180/£235

25 November 2003
INTERPRETATIVE PROVISION FOR VISITORS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS
Venue: Bristol
Cost: £100/£150

26 November 2003
SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES
Venue: Bristol
Cost: £100/£150

DECEMBER 2003

3 December 2003
PRACTICAL APPROACHES TO PLAY IN THE ENVIRONMENT
Venue: Birmingham
Cost: £100/£150

11 December 2003
GETTING LOCAL PEOPLE ACTIVE & INVOLVED
Venue: Manchester
Cost: £100/£150

FEBRUARY 2004

ECONOMIC BENEFITS OF RECREATION AND TOURISM
Venue and date to be confirmed.

For further information on Countryside Recreation Network Events please contact:
Melanie Bull
CRN Manager
Countryside Recreation network,
Sheffield Hallam University
Unit 1, Sheffield Science Park
Howard Street
Sheffield S1 2LX
T: 0114 225 4494
F: 0114 225 4488
Email: m.bull@shu.ac.uk
## Countryside Recreation Network Publications List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Price (incl.postage)</th>
<th>Tick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REPORTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Exclusion in Countryside Leisure in the United Kingdom - the role of the countryside in addressing social exclusion (2001)</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removing Barriers; Creating Opportunities: Social Inclusion in the Countryside (2001)</td>
<td>£15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing the Challenge of Access (2000)</td>
<td>£15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the Honeypot Overflowing? (1998)</td>
<td>£15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making Access for All a Reality (1997)</td>
<td>£15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Today's Thinking for Tomorrow's Countryside (1995)</td>
<td>£15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities in their Countryside (1994)</td>
<td>£15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WORKSHOP PROCEEDINGS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Parks (2003)</td>
<td>£12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Rights of Way Improvement Plans (2002)</td>
<td>£8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding for Social Projects (2002)</td>
<td>£8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening Up Access In and Around Towns (2002)</td>
<td>£8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Payback Schemes (2002)</td>
<td>£8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Access Forums (2001)</td>
<td>£8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising and the Lottery (2001)</td>
<td>£8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are We Getting There? Delivering Sustainable Transport in the Countryside (2000)</td>
<td>£8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaking New Ground in Sustainable Tourism (2000)</td>
<td>£8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Local Distinctiveness as an Economic Development Tool (1999)</td>
<td>£8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just Walking the Dog (1999)</td>
<td>£8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship (1998)</td>
<td>£8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making Ends Meet (1997)</td>
<td>£8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS &amp; Countryside Management - Theory and Application (1997)</td>
<td>£8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Water - Sharing Access on Reservoirs and Rivers (1997)</td>
<td>£8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus in the Countryside II (1996)</td>
<td>£8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus in the Countryside I - Reaching Shared agreement in policy, planning and management (1996)</td>
<td>£8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Brush with the Land - Art in the Countryside II (1996)</td>
<td>£8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Brush with the Land - Art in the Countryside I (1995)</td>
<td>£8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS &amp; Access to the Countryside (1995)</td>
<td>£8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport in the Countryside (1995)</td>
<td>£8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Drive in the Country? - Examining the Problems of Recreational Travel (1994)</td>
<td>£7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Economics, Sustainable Management and the Countryside (1994)</td>
<td>£6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CRN RESEARCH DIRECTORY</strong></td>
<td>An annual directory of the research work carried out by the CRN agencies during the year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Directory 1998</td>
<td>£5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Directory 1997</td>
<td>£5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Directory 1996</td>
<td>£2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Directory 1995</td>
<td>£2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since 1998 we have been developing a searchable database on the CRN website. This has replaced the traditional hard copy of the Research Directory (this is in the process of being updated)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Day Visits Survey 1994 (1996)</td>
<td>£15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Day Visits Survey 1993 (1995)</td>
<td>£15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: ........................................ First name: ................................................ Surname:..................................................

Address: ...........................................................................................................................................................................

.................................................................................................................................................................................... Postcode: ....................................................

E-Mail: ......................................................................................................... Tel: ........................................................................

For more information, please contact: Melanie Bull CRN Manager, Leisure Industries Research Centre, Unit 1, Sheffield Science Park, Howard Street, Sheffield, S1 2LX

25