

Survey Results 2004

Thanks to the support from local people and visitors, the Peak District National Park Authority received 388 responses to the Help Shape the Future survey.

A total of 1750 surveys were distributed by the Authority via email, at local summer agricultural shows, local libraries and Tourist Information Centres.

Please Note: some percentages do not add up to 100% because some respondents gave more than one response per question.

Where were responses generated?

Bakewell Show	29%
Penistone Show	19%
Manifold Show	16%
Hope Show	15%
Tourist Information Centres	10%
Staffordshire Moorlands CVS	6%
Local libraries	4%
(Bakewell, Matlock, Buxton and Ashbourne)	

Where do these people live?

Visitors	63%
Residents	34%
No reply	3%

Farming

How do you think farming should develop in the National Park?

No change	14%
Economic diversification	17%
Environment and landscape management	35%
Linking environment and economy	42%
Other	11%
No response	2%

'Other' suggestions included:

- So farmers can make a living
- Possibly linking to leisure
- How farmers sees fit
- Environmental landscape management linked to economic health of the farms
- Good food
- Attempting to link needs of farming and those of tourism
- A profitable industry
- Sympathetically
- It is the farmers who have shaped the Peak District
- Give farmers a better deal
- More arable farming

Environmental management is becoming a more important part of farming in the National Park?

Yes	81%
No	7%

No opinion	10%
No reply	2%

Overall, what impact does farming have on the Peak District landscape?

Positive	89%
Negative	5%
No opinion	5%
No reply	1%

Farmers within the Peak District find it difficult to make a good economic return from their land. Would it be acceptable for them to change the landscape to improve their income?

Yes	59%
No	33%
No opinion	4%
No reply	4%

If yes, what changes would be acceptable?

More sheep and cattle	45%
More woodland	48%
More agricultural buildings	15%
Bigger buildings	4%
Other	4%

'Other' suggestions included:

Better returns on what they do now
Diversification into organic, tourist etc.
Crops
Linking to leisure
However they see fit for their future
Only positive improvements to the area - not huge conifer woods
Holiday chalets, tourism, recreation
More income to encourage land management. The problem is supermarkets
Camping
Different crops
Wildlife improvements
Fewer restraints on use of land
To diversify
More facilities for equestrian pursuits - facilities for children - investment in cottage industries especially craft and fine art

Village Life

Does it matter who lives here?

Yes	76%
No	20%
No opinion	4%

What is important about community life?

Shop	65%
School	71%
Post office	65%
Housing	59%
Other	24%

'Other' suggestions included:

Active communities

Village Hall (x12)
 Pub (x16)
 Young peoples' activities
 Church (x15)
 Everything (x8)
 Doctor
 Public transport (x7)
 Businesses
 The people - community (x8)
 Farming
 Community events
 Local employment
 Leisure facilities
 Jobs for local people
 Social groups/ clubs
 Affordable housing (x6)
 Economic Prosperity

What detracts from village life?

Isolation	13%
Lack of services	58%
Visitor intrusion	21%
Traffic impacts	48%
Lack of public transport	41%
Other	10%

'Other' suggestions included:

Too many holiday homes (x8)
 Parking
 Commuting, lack of community spirit and working women
 Nothing (x2)
 All of the above
 Poor village hall facilities
 Over done developments
 Lack of amenities
 Lack of community cohesion
 Lack of housing for young locals
 No broadband
 Being ignored by policy makers
 High housing cost (x3)
 Housing estates being added
 Unbalanced community
 Lack of policing, traffic problems
 Litter (x2)
 Destruction of modern life
 Lack of local employment
 Unsympathetic developments
 Commuters out of area
 Quarry traffic
 Anti-social behaviour

How important is it to conserve and enhance the traditional village scene?

Unimportant	3%
Quite important	23%
Very important	73%
No opinion	1%

What is most attractive about living in the Peak District villages?

The place	78%
-----------	-----

The people	36%
Services	4%
Safety	13%
Tranquillity	50%
Distance to work	3%
Other	3%

'Other' suggestions included:

Born in one
 Surrounding countryside
 The whole package
 Environment in general
 Community life
 Wildlife and scenery
 Permanent residents
 Community spirit

Tourism

How well do you rate visitor information and interpretation about the National Park?

Excellent	19%
Good	58%
Adequate	17%
Poor	3%
No opinion	3%

How well do you rate the general quality of the public facilities - car parks, toilets, picnic sites etc?

Excellent	12%
Good	48%
Adequate	30%
Poor	7%
No opinion	3%

How well do you rate access to the countryside?

Excellent	24%
Good	52%
Adequate	19%
Poor	2%
No opinion	3%

How well do accommodation providers and visitor attractions convey positive messages about environmental and conservation issues in the Peak District area?

Very well	15%
Well	39%
Adequately	22%
Poorly	10%
No opinion	14%

How well do you think the area promotes the traditions of the National Park - markets, festivals, natural sites etc?

Very well	24%
Well	41%
Adequately	27%
Poorly	7%
No opinion	1%

Quarrying

To what extent should quarrying continue within the National Park?

As now	49%
Reduced	44%
Increased	3%
No opinion	4%

Are the environmental effects of quarrying acceptable on the National Park, its residents and visitors?

Yes	43%
No	41%
No opinion	12%
No reply	4%

What is an acceptable end use for a quarry in a National Park?

Recreation	31%
Conservation and wildlife	85%
No opinion	4%
No reply	3%

How visible is quarrying in the Park?

Too visible	22%
Aware of them	63%
Well hidden	13%
No opinion	2%

Transport

Would an entry fee into the National Park be acceptable if you could park for free once here?

Yes	34%
No	59%
No opinion	7%

Should public transport spending be on resident services or visitor management?

Residents	75%
Visitors	32%
No opinion	8%
No reply	4%

Should cross-Park traffic be reduced?

Yes	47%
No	30%
No opinion	18%
No reply	5%

How would you like to see traffic managed?

Road tolls	15%
Speed cameras	30%
Traffic calming	38%
Other	20%
No reply	9%

'Other' suggestions included:

Open up rail line between Buxton and Matlock which would help. Reduce traffic on cross park roads

Visitors on public transport only
 Leave it alone (x6)
 Depends on the road
 Lights which show you exactly what speed you are doing
 Don't know!
 Let it flow
 Larger secure car parks out of over crowded areas and frequent transport around the Park area
 Education
 More public transport better advertised
 What's wrong with it now?
 More public transport options
 More car parks
 Park and ride compulsory
 Bridleways closed to non farming vehicles
 Park and ride
 Not managed at all with less street furniture
 Fewer lorries
 Speed limits in villages
 Weight limits
 Free (or cheaper) public transport; incentives for car sharing; park and ride from Chesterfield, Sheffield and Manchester
 Better alternatives and more buses
 Licence to drive in Park limited to x number of dates as in American national parks
 Local people given free parking permits in local towns
 More cycling facilities
 More promotion brings more traffic and we have to live with it
 Low cost car parks

Housing

Does it matter how houses look?

Yes	97%
No	2%
No opinion	1%

Should new housing be for the local community or open to all?

Local communities	68%
Anyone	30%
No opinion	2%

Where should houses be built?

Bakewell	9%
Larger settlements	37%
Any village	45%
Other	14%
No reply	7%

'Other' suggestions included:

Only if the owner is working in the area
 In filling in larger settlements
 But with sympathetic building materials to the landscape
 Where the need is for local people
 None
 Convert farm buildings
 Anywhere with strict planning application
 For local poorly paid people
 A mixture of all three but in the context of the local buildings
 Only in keeping with the area

Old buildings that are derelict should be made habitable
 Any villages with a proven need or else small settlements will die
 As little as possible
 Limited to larger populations in the Park
 Where there is local need
 Not for second homes
 Not sure
 A few here and there I would suggest but then I don't know the situation that you are dealing with
 Where needed but not as housing estates for greedy associations plus society outcasts
 Expand towns
 Initially those settlements which have existing infrastructure - schools, shops etc.
 Then work with declining communities to determine appropriate development
 Within limits
 Not in small villages
 Low cost for locals
 Has to be done on a case by case basis
 Brown field sites in existing village
 Recycled Land
 Balanced to demand
 Scattered to blend in
 Where it blends in
 Not in green belt
 Locals should have priority
 Anywhere with the least detrimental impact
 For locals in villages
 Provided they are in keeping
 Where least visual impact
 Not in park (London)
 Affordable to locals
 On brown field sites
 Respond to need
 Anywhere if well designed
 Controlled areas
 Redundant buildings
 Only if there is local work
 Barn conversion
 Starter homes in all villages to enable the schools to be kept viable
 Wherever it's needed
 Small addition onto existing building
 In moderation
 Subject to control

Should holiday/second homes be permitted if this reduces numbers of permanent homes?

Yes	19%
No	72%
No opinion	8%
No reply	1%

Other Comments

"Some additional quality homes in villages would enhance the whole village."

"Need to encourage and help equestrian establishments - no need to be anti equestrian."

"Holiday homes bring in tourists which increases the area's economy. Second homes can be empty for most of the year contributing to nothing in the area."

"This survey has biased questioning and is too small to really get a true picture."

"How well do you rate general quality of the public facilities? Extremely variable e.g. toilets at Wetton and Alstonefield good but Milldale poor. Holiday homes - nothing is allowed now for local or holiday homes - so what is to change?"

"Locals hate paying to park in their own environment: we already pay very high rates."

"Too many farm yard buildings are allowed to run down with negative effect. Much could be learnt from USA national state parks although there is an economic factor.
Entry fee to Park - Unworkable. We are totally different to national parks in the US which mostly have minimal residential population."

"I have no problem paying for car parks provided they are kept in good order, free of broken glass and have litter bins and are reasonably secure for people who wish to park in them."

"House builders should consider a local person first as it is these people who may well be priced out by city / town people. Housing / holiday homes for second homeowners and visitors should be kept to an absolute minimum as a big majority of people only visit the park in the summer months anyway. If the facilities at most caravan sites were better then more people would consider this as a good way to holiday."

"Environmental management is going too far - (Does it matter how houses look?) But common sense should prevail. In some cases Peak Park go over the top."

"The landscape has been changed for centuries - is intensification the only option?"

"Local income tax which did not give concession to second homes would be a start."

"Disgraceful facilities in Buxton and excessive parking costs."

"Why if a redundant farm building was granted a change of use for a dwelling would it have more chance of being passed for planning if it was for tourism rather than someone who had lived in the area all their life?"

"We don't want a dead park i.e. no jobs - quarries are attractive in many ways."

"Too much public money is spent on unused public transport. This ought to be directed to areas of greater need. Traffic calming is very important in rural villages, more ought to be done."

"Visitor information - more languages are needed e.g. French and German. Car parking for local people is expensive. Annual permit should be available then anyone can buy. Young people cannot afford to stay and live here, therefore becoming an aged population."

"Entry fee to Park - definitely not - there are far better ways of generating revenue indirectly which positively contributes to the economy of the area without placing an inhibitor on the surrounding hinterland."

"Transport - willing to pay parking fees if reasonable."

"Housing - only build housing for people who live there."

"Transport - entry fee to National Park absolutely unacceptable."

"This questionnaire appears to be loaded with possible answers that I suspect the Peak Authority want to hear. It's limited and I truly hope that the answers are not used to make any major decisions."

"Transport - Entry fee only acceptable if money goes towards the upkeep of the National Park."

Housing - New housing available only when its in keeping with the countryside and enables young locals a start in their own village at a reasonable price."

"Transport - I come by public transport!"

"Transport - Public Transport spending on locals and visitors as with housing."

"Village life - We need a good mix of ages, talents and locals and new blood."

"Not all houses should be detached, local people should be considered."

"Traffic Calming - not bumps."

"Acceptable use for a quarry - landfill."

"Entry fee - Focus should be on charging ramblers / hikers who currently can receive considerable benefit without expense."

"We think holiday homes can contribute to villages as when we book self-catering accommodation we eat out at the local pub every night and also shop at the local store - usually a spar shop."

"Local community housing should be built and a small amount in each village would be better than a large amount in a few."

"Public transport spending should be spent on both visitors and locals."

"Housing - A fixed percentage of all new builds to locals."

"Does it matter how houses look? - but that doesn't mean everyone has to be a chocolate box cottage. Innovations can be good."

Please note comments raised by members of the public completing the survey are not necessarily the views of the Peak District National Park Authority. All comments will be fed into the consultation process.