

## 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 (Bakewell, Matlock, Buxton and Ashbourne)	4%

### 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.**