<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bowness Temple Roman Bath &amp; Museum</td>
<td>21946</td>
<td>21416</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowness Town Museum</td>
<td>62459</td>
<td>70214</td>
<td>78055</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cawthwaite (Brockhill)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penrith (Castles)</td>
<td>123124</td>
<td>277143</td>
<td>792300</td>
<td>77000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helvellyn</td>
<td>61672</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windermere Yacht Club &amp; Yacht Harbour</td>
<td>58750</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windermere (all)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windermere Lower Bridge</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windermere Lower Bridge (all)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windermere Lower Bridge (48)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windermere Lower Bridge (all)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cark (Car Park)</td>
<td>19087</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>20625</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19897</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19888</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19899</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19900</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19901</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19902</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19903</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19904</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19905</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19906</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19907</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19908</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19909</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19910</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19911</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19912</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19913</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19914</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19915</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19916</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19917</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19918</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19919</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19920</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19921</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19922</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19923</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19924</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19925</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19926</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19927</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19928</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19929</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19930</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19931</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19932</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19933</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19934</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19935</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19936</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19937</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19938</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19939</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19940</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19941</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19942</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19943</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19944</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19945</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19946</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19947</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19948</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19949</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19950</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19951</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19952</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19953</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19954</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19955</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19956</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19957</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19958</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19959</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19960</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19961</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19962</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19963</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19964</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19965</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19966</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19967</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19968</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19969</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19970</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19971</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19972</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19973</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19974</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19975</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19976</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19977</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19978</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19979</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19980</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19981</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19982</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19983</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19984</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19985</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19986</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19987</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19988</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19989</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19990</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19991</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19992</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19993</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19994</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19995</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19996</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19997</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19998</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>19999</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Andrews Church - Heddern-eh-Wall</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talban Town Country Park - Bampurn</td>
<td>120000</td>
<td>7740</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Cathedral</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Gate</td>
<td>177000</td>
<td>39694</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Local Attractions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allama (Arabic)</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Shields Roman Fort / Museum</td>
<td>42451</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Segedunum)</td>
<td>11935</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walaean Heritage Centre &amp; Fort</td>
<td>12700</td>
<td>16377</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum of Antiquities, Newcaste</td>
<td>19900</td>
<td>19898</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.21d</td>
<td>Visitor Numbers - Long Term Range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.7'08</td>
<td>75'92'05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00 00</td>
<td>33'1'00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00'000</td>
<td>00'000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73'4'5</td>
<td>73'4'5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00'000</td>
<td>00'000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123.9'6</td>
<td>123.9'6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00'000</td>
<td>00'000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28'2'5</td>
<td>28'2'5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00'000</td>
<td>00'000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973.5</td>
<td>1973.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00'000</td>
<td>00'000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Castle Castle</th>
<th>Cleeve Head</th>
<th>Voldyman</th>
<th>Houseslands</th>
<th>Cheevers</th>
<th>Conibridge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43'003</td>
<td>53'200</td>
<td>43'700</td>
<td>40'100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00'000</td>
<td>00'000</td>
<td>00'000</td>
<td>00'000</td>
<td>00'000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29'000</td>
<td>25'000</td>
<td>32'000</td>
<td>32'000</td>
<td>25'000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00'000</td>
<td>00'000</td>
<td>00'000</td>
<td>00'000</td>
<td>00'000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112'000</td>
<td>113'000</td>
<td>120'000</td>
<td>117'000</td>
<td>117'000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00'000</td>
<td>00'000</td>
<td>00'000</td>
<td>00'000</td>
<td>00'000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198'000</td>
<td>197'000</td>
<td>198'000</td>
<td>197'000</td>
<td>197'000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00'000</td>
<td>00'000</td>
<td>00'000</td>
<td>00'000</td>
<td>00'000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63'92'</td>
<td>65'0'3'</td>
<td>65'0'3'</td>
<td>63'92'</td>
<td>65'0'3'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table contains visitor numbers for various locations, with columns for different years and ranges. The data is presented in a tabular format with clear distinction between different entries.
Walkers.

Case study: Walkers in Westmorland are used largely by local people for whole or part day outings, and those few who are longer distance walkers have travelled less than 20 miles to reach the lake area. A survey of visitors to the lake area was undertaken by Survey Research Associates Ltd (1987). Over 72% of the day walkers are county residents mostly day and part day walkers are 85% of all walkers.

Tables 4.2.4a, b, c and 4.2.5a are examples of usage of other National Trails. In general the

Table: 4.2.4a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Visitor Numbers</th>
<th>County of Origin</th>
<th>Distance Walked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County visitors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-county</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures include those who did not answer the question on whether or not they visited other National Trails. The figures for Short Distance and Medium Distance Walkers are not comparable.

Survey in England and Wales
Activities

Table A.2a Countrywide Recreation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trail Name</th>
<th>Tables</th>
<th>Est.</th>
<th>Miles</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Trail Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Woods NP</td>
<td>Rondure Holiday</td>
<td>Walker 20% of Day</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>Estimated</td>
<td>5.4 miles</td>
<td>Feeder Path to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Walker 50% of Lane</td>
<td>Estimated</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>Coastal and</td>
<td>19 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Walker 30% of Day</td>
<td>Estimated</td>
<td>2560</td>
<td>Wash Lake</td>
<td>11 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>washer 50% of Lane</td>
<td>2.5 miles</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>Walker 50% of Day</td>
<td>2.5 miles</td>
<td>Heavy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Walker 50% of Lane</td>
<td>2.5 miles</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>Walker 50% of Day</td>
<td>2.5 miles</td>
<td>Heavy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Walker 50% of Lane</td>
<td>2.5 miles</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Walker 50% of Lane</td>
<td>2.5 miles</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Walker 50% of Lane</td>
<td>2.5 miles</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Walker 50% of Lane</td>
<td>2.5 miles</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Walker 50% of Lane</td>
<td>2.5 miles</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Walker 50% of Lane</td>
<td>2.5 miles</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Walker 50% of Lane</td>
<td>2.5 miles</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Walker 50% of Lane</td>
<td>2.5 miles</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Walker 50% of Lane</td>
<td>2.5 miles</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Walker 50% of Lane</td>
<td>2.5 miles</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Walker 50% of Lane</td>
<td>2.5 miles</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Walker 50% of Lane</td>
<td>2.5 miles</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Walker 50% of Lane</td>
<td>2.5 miles</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Walker 50% of Lane</td>
<td>2.5 miles</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Walker 50% of Lane</td>
<td>2.5 miles</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Walker 50% of Lane</td>
<td>2.5 miles</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Walker 50% of Lane</td>
<td>2.5 miles</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Walker 50% of Lane</td>
<td>2.5 miles</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Walker 50% of Lane</td>
<td>2.5 miles</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sources of information see references.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>% of Non-English</th>
<th>Walkers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ulphind Coast</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79 miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Down's Way</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off the Plate Path</td>
<td>166 miles</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166 miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Coast Path</td>
<td>72 miles</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Cliff</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halli</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Allocations**
  - Walkers
  - Overseas
  - Other

- **Walkers**
  - No of Day Walkers
  - Walkers in Total
  - Character
  - Length
  - Fall
not typical long distance walking terrain to the nature of the route, part of which is open to all vehicles, and therefore
interweaved with day walkers. The unusual characteristic was probably the
walkers' in the Ridgeway survey (1989) amongst these quartiles of those
and Penrhyne Way (A5H 1990) more than half were doing only part day
walkers. In addition out of total day walkers on the West Highland Way
surveys that there was an almost equal split between long distance and day
West Highland Way (A5H 1990) and Penrhyne Uplands Way (A5H 1990).
Long distance walkers. It is notable that in the Penrhyne Way (A5H 1990),
Table 4.3b breaks down walkers interviewed in the various surveys along
intend to walk the whole route but do so a day at a time.
walkers. Day walkers may include „day at a time“ walkers, people who
and divided into these distinctive groups – „day at a time“ walkers, „day at a
to walk the whole route but do not complete it. Day walkers may be
complete a section of the route but may also include those who set
who complete sections of the route. The latter group are usually people who set
and those who
Long distance walkers can be
divided into two major categories, Long
Visitor Characteristics
route.

Most likely mode of transport is cycling and walking; time spent on the
route is usually less than 20 minutes.
The walker will also usually be a car or the
public transportation user; the age of the user will be between 30 and 44 years old and is in a
long distance path.

The table below highlights key characteristics of long distance path walkers. It

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Whole Day Walkers</th>
<th>Whole Way Special Days</th>
<th>Walkers</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Days Walkers</th>
<th>Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lane 1 (1999)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 2 (1998)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 3 (1998)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 4 (1998)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 5 (1998)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 6 (1998)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 7 (1998)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 8 (1998)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Except where a walker's home area and route coincide, proximity seems to play an important role.

Walkers use buses more often than cars, and this is not just the destination and origin of a National Trail which encourages use, but other factors such as publicity and promotion must also be influential. The percentage of walkers using buses was 20% in the Pennine Way, 22% in the Cleveland Way, and 26% in the West Highland Way. The Lower Teesdale Trail was used by 56% of walkers.

The individual surveys also highlighted other important characteristics of walkers:

The quality of a trail has an important influence on the attractiveness of the route.

The table below illustrates the home areas of long distance walkers surveyed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trail</th>
<th>Home Area</th>
<th>Car / Bus</th>
<th>Car / Cycle</th>
<th>Cars / Bus</th>
<th>25-44</th>
<th>25-44</th>
<th>67%</th>
<th>67%</th>
<th>25-44</th>
<th>25-44</th>
<th>38%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pennine Way</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Highland Way</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Way</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Teesdale Trail</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2.3c illustrates the home areas of long distance walkers surveyed.
Distance Routes

Looking for a route that is popular for passing through towns and villages and has some appeal as an attractive to walkers, the Great Glen Way is unlikely to be an attractive to day walkers especially during the summer months. The most popular walk, the Great Glen Way, may not even be attractive to the average walker who is looking for an alternative to these walks. The Great Glen Way offers some of the best views with small sections in upland and urban settings.

The proposed Hadrian’s Wall National Trail passes mostly through rural Scotland. The most important element of the route is the provision of a way to experience the beauty of Scotland. The table below provides a review of the elements which long distance walkers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>1984</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reel of World</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reel of Europe</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of England</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Anglia</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North of England</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2.3: Home Area of Walkers
The accessibility of the eastern and western sections of the proposed route to centres of populations will be significant factors in the decisions made by people to use the new trail. In addition, the novelty of a new National Trail will be attractive to many walkers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Renfrew-Renfrew</th>
<th>West Highland</th>
<th>Southern Highland</th>
<th>Rideau Trail</th>
<th>Wallaceland</th>
<th>Potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- H: High importance
- M: Medium importance
- L: Low importance
Role of Public Transport

Public transport access to the Hadrian’s Wall National Trail was reviewed in a recent report (January 1992) prepared by Transport for Leisure on behalf of the Countryside Commission. Amongst its conclusions relevant to this study are the following:

- The Hadrian’s Wall Trail will be extremely well served by Inter-City and Regional Rail services to both Carlisle and to Newcastle as well as National Express Coach Services. An important Regional Railways network, the areas within Tyne and Wear (which in fact are largely urban), Northumberland and Cumbria through which the proposed Wall National Trail passes, are in the main well served by public transport by UK rural

- Tyne Valley Railway and a Hadrian’s Wall Coach Service sponsored jointly by the Northumberland National Park Authority, Tynedale District Council and the Countryside Commission, forms a key part of the transport network along the proposed Hadrian’s Wall National Corridor.

- The service has been running since 1991, between 20 July and 1 September, the service carried 2,693 people over 43 days of operation. This represents a 23.5% increase in traffic over 1989, which was itself a 29% increase over 1988.

Summary of Visitor Distribution

A summary of known distribution characteristics follows:

- The most popular facility is Housesteads, 132,246 (1990), visitors to Housesteads Museum. The figure in 1973 was 175,300;

- There is considerable variation in the numbers of visitors to each of the sites which records visitor numbers and these numbers have altered quite sharply in the time since visits have been recorded. For example since 1970 visitors to Corbridge have decreased from 55,034 to 21,118 (1990) but visitors to Vindolanda have increased from 5,760 to 7,920;

- A large percentage of the recorded visitors to popular attractions on the Wall probably do not walk along the line of the Hadrian’s Wall Trail;

- An estimated 10,000 people already walk a section of the Hadrian’s Wall Trail as long-distance walkers on the Pennine Way and therefore will spend at least one day on the Hadrian’s Wall Trail;
For the purpose of this report the central sector is defined as being from the Western edge of the town.

Parking facilities on the route. It is assumed that, even with an improvement
distance travelled is likely to remain at current levels and
as discussed in Section 4.2 and identified in Table 4.2 car parks on long
journeys will be used.

Camphill capacity of existing car parks

Section 4.2

Parking facilities are made within a range which includes a worst case
by long distance walkers is discussed in Section 4.4. Due to the vagaries of
an assessment of the range of the likely demand for the use of the new rail
line currently walk in the central sector.

It is conceivable that the development of circular walks away from the
increase pressure on existing access points.

For long distance and day walkers:
the creation of a new rail will add a major demand for the use of that rail

The establishment of a long distance Heathersden's rail should have two
exits from car parks and to the central levels of use.
their capacity of car parks and to the central levels of use.
the increased number of vehicles. Consideration is therefore given to the
consultation that growth in the capacity of existing car parks to accept
traffic is restricted and the lack of further expansion. A major

The following section reviews the predicted changes which are likely to

Visitor distribution, predicted changes

4.3

Heddon’s Wall Coach service and events to encourage use of the area.
there are specific publications including circular walk guides, a

Known Wall related features:
park across with part of the Pennine Way and which have well
most recorded visitors to the Wall visit a central section (i),
between Lances in the west and Heddon in the east
2 of the 21 Wall related features identified in promotional literature are
already walk sections of the Wall.
in addition a number of the 15,000 day visitors to the Pennine Way
Including that at certain times during the day the car park may be close to its
during 1990. At peak periods, in summer Sundays, observations of use
shows that 12,000 visitors (approximately) visit Household Museum
visitors are in each car? The maximum capacity of Households is 320
which surveys have been established that on average between 3 and 4
assumes that 4 people travel in each car (from other
cars and 5 coaches). Assuming that 4 people travel in each car (from
Households has the largest capacity with an estimated 130
The car park at Households has the largest capacity with an estimated 130
will actually park at these sites at any one time.
These estimates are maximum numbers and it is probable that fewer cars
\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
Car Park Name & Coach Spaces & Circular Walk
\hline
Bournemouth (260) & 10 & 10
\hline
Canford Castle & 60 & 60
\hline
Broadstairs Household & 50 & 50
\hline
Vineyard & 130 & 130
\hline
Shiel Biggs & 30 & 30
\hline
Once Breach & 80 & 80
\hline
Cow Bay & 70 & 70
\hline
Willow Bay & 60 & 60
\hline
Cliffords Chine & 15 & 15
\hline
Philbeach & 20 & 20
\hline
Bank Tunnel & 12 & 12
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}
Table 4.3.24: Car Parks Closely Identified with the Use of Hadrian’s Wall

- Public areas are also used as starting points for people joining published circular
- Table 4.3.24 identifies each of the car parks which are closely identified with
- Service cars will continue to provide the principal mode of access.
- Public areas are also used as starting points for people joining published circular
- Table 4.3.24 identifies each of the car parks which are closely identified with
- Service cars will continue to provide the principal mode of access.
Pressing to the central section

Attracting more walkers to sections where a walk could be combined with a
parking section of the route is likely to increase distribution factors.

The level of publicity and marketing of the walk will have a large influence

on the number of walkers attracted to the route and to which sections they

are likely to visit. National and international marketing of the whole route is likely
to having the highest reach in the first of the three phases of the campaign.
The book is produced at which stage of the walk is established that an authoritative guide

will be.

Even internationally as most national needs attract some walkers from

provision and availability of publicity materials locally, nationally and

overseas?

Influenced for example by:
The pattern of visitor distribution along the Wall Trail will be

permanent. Programme on Scottish walkers devoted to the walking of the Wall.

Research and marketing associates that one reason for the increased

number of visitors to the route. It was felt by the tour operators centre for leisure

by 17%. It was felt by the tour operators centre for leisure

between 1986 and 1991. The tour operators centre for leisure

and businesses.

Table 4.2 shows the heavy numbers of visitors by many walkers on Guide

Impact of Publicity and Marketing on Visitor Distribution

By the Hadrian's Wall Coach Service between July and September 1991.

The total physical maximum capacity of car parks along the Wall

on the number of car parks along the Wall.

I think that a reduction in the number of car parks along the Wall

should have a marked effect

addition of a large number of visitors attracted to the new rail links are likely to

increase capacity. Any additional visitors wishing to gain access to the rail

parcels of land. The number of car parks along the Wall

in addition to the walking of the Wall.

50% of the total.

Any visitors wishing to gain access to the rail
of 50,000 day walks are undertaken.

Trail When total numbers of walkers are multiplied by day walks a figure

long distance walkers will take at least 5 days to complete the Hatton's Wall Trail. It is assumed that

distance walkers will wish to use the Hatton's Wall Trail. It is assumed that at least 10,000 long

In addition to the 10,000 walkers currently using the Penine Way and

Hatton's Wall Trail

10,000 long distance walkers already spend one day on the proposed

common to the Penine Way. It is assumed therefore that an estimated

also walked that section of the proposed Hatton's Wall Trail which is

the full length of the Penine Way in 1989. All of these walkers will have

Table 4.2.4 indicates that an estimated 10,000 long distance walkers walked

Long Distance Walkers

and also by being popular with families and less energetic long distance

walkers and also by being popular with families and less energetic long distance

hikers. It will gain others through the encouragement received by the outline

and also walked that section of the proposed Hatton’s Wall Trail which is

the full length of the Penine Way in 1989. Of these walkers will have

Table 4.2.4 indicates that an estimated 10,000 long distance walkers walked

Reasons for the assumption are that although the Penine Way is longer

Although the Penine Way is longer

commonly walk the Penine Way.

Trail When the above assumption that the numbers will be similar to those who

the new Hatton’s Wall Trail to a survey of a sample of walkers who may use

For the purposes of predicting the number of walkers who may use

assessments of current visitor trends showed the length of

The creation of new public rights of way may lead to a redistribution of

-day walks by people who will seek a short walk

-day walks by people who will enjoy part day walks

-day walks by people who will wish to spend the day walking

Long distance walks:

This is likely to lead to an increase in the following activities:

An expansion of existing demand for the use of a long distance trail and

As reviewed in Section 4.2.1 once the new trail is established there is likely to

Assessment of Predicted Visitor Distribution
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The opening of a new trail will greatly increase the estimated total visitor day walkls predicted following the opening of a new trail. The new trail will generate an estimated 3,000 visitor day walks along the Pennine Way.

Day Visits - short walks

- 1,000 visitors per day walk along the Pennine Way, 800,000 in total.
- The largest group of walkers on the Pennine Way, 800,000 in total.
- Day visitors - part day walkers

Use the new Hadrian's Wall Trail to open one year.

scan data to calculate the increase in number of Hadrian's Wall Trail day walkers will also use the new Hadrian's Wall Trail. It is assumed that at least 55,000 all day walkers and an estimated 25,000 walkers use the Pennine Way for full day walks and

Day Visits - full day walkers

The expected number of people who use or could use the new Hadrian's Wall Trail is estimated at 3,000 per day walk along the Pennine Way.

Day Visits - part day walkers

The opening of a new trail will greatly increase the estimated total visitor day walks predicted following the opening of a new trail. The new trail will generate an estimated 3,000 visitor day walks along the Pennine Way.

Day Visits - short walks

- 1,000 visitors per day walk along the Pennine Way, 800,000 in total.
- The largest group of walkers on the Pennine Way, 800,000 in total.
- Day visitors - part day walkers

Use the new Hadrian's Wall Trail to open one year.

scan data to calculate the increase in number of Hadrian's Wall Trail day walkers will also use the new Hadrian's Wall Trail. It is assumed that at least 55,000 all day walkers and an estimated 25,000 walkers use the Pennine Way for full day walks and

Day Visits - full day walkers

The expected number of people who use or could use the new Hadrian's Wall Trail is estimated at 3,000 per day walk along the Pennine Way.

Day Visits - short walks

- 1,000 visitors per day walk along the Pennine Way, 800,000 in total.
- The largest group of walkers on the Pennine Way, 800,000 in total.
- Day visitors - part day walkers

Use the new Hadrian's Wall Trail to open one year.

scan data to calculate the increase in number of Hadrian's Wall Trail day walkers will also use the new Hadrian's Wall Trail. It is assumed that at least 55,000 all day walkers and an estimated 25,000 walkers use the Pennine Way for full day walks and

Day Visits - full day walkers

The expected number of people who use or could use the new Hadrian's Wall Trail is estimated at 3,000 per day walk along the Pennine Way.

Day Visits - short walks

- 1,000 visitors per day walk along the Pennine Way, 800,000 in total.
- The largest group of walkers on the Pennine Way, 800,000 in total.
- Day visitors - part day walkers

Use the new Hadrian's Wall Trail to open one year.

scan data to calculate the increase in number of Hadrian's Wall Trail day walkers will also use the new Hadrian's Wall Trail. It is assumed that at least 55,000 all day walkers and an estimated 25,000 walkers use the Pennine Way for full day walks and

Day Visits - full day walkers

The expected number of people who use or could use the new Hadrian's Wall Trail is estimated at 3,000 per day walk along the Pennine Way.

Day Visits - short walks

- 1,000 visitors per day walk along the Pennine Way, 800,000 in total.
- The largest group of walkers on the Pennine Way, 800,000 in total.
- Day visitors - part day walkers

Use the new Hadrian's Wall Trail to open one year.

scan data to calculate the increase in number of Hadrian's Wall Trail day walkers will also use the new Hadrian's Wall Trail. It is assumed that at least 55,000 all day walkers and an estimated 25,000 walkers use the Pennine Way for full day walks and

Day Visits - full day walkers

The expected number of people who use or could use the new Hadrian's Wall Trail is estimated at 3,000 per day walk along the Pennine Way.

Day Visits - short walks

- 1,000 visitors per day walk along the Pennine Way, 800,000 in total.
- The largest group of walkers on the Pennine Way, 800,000 in total.
- Day visitors - part day walkers

Use the new Hadrian's Wall Trail to open one year.

scan data to calculate the increase in number of Hadrian's Wall Trail day walkers will also use the new Hadrian's Wall Trail. It is assumed that at least 55,000 all day walkers and an estimated 25,000 walkers use the Pennine Way for full day walks and

Day Visits - full day walkers

The expected number of people who use or could use the new Hadrian's Wall Trail is estimated at 3,000 per day walk along the Pennine Way.

Day Visits - short walks

- 1,000 visitors per day walk along the Pennine Way, 800,000 in total.
- The largest group of walkers on the Pennine Way, 800,000 in total.
- Day visitors - part day walkers

Use the new Hadrian's Wall Trail to open one year.

scan data to calculate the increase in number of Hadrian's Wall Trail day walkers will also use the new Hadrian's Wall Trail. It is assumed that at least 55,000 all day walkers and an estimated 25,000 walkers use the Pennine Way for full day walks and

Day Visits - full day walkers

The expected number of people who use or could use the new Hadrian's Wall Trail is estimated at 3,000 per day walk along the Pennine Way.

Day Visits - short walks

- 1,000 visitors per day walk along the Pennine Way, 800,000 in total.
- The largest group of walkers on the Pennine Way, 800,000 in total.
- Day visitors - part day walkers

Use the new Hadrian's Wall Trail to open one year.

scan data to calculate the increase in number of Hadrian's Wall Trail day walkers will also use the new Hadrian's Wall Trail. It is assumed that at least 55,000 all day walkers and an estimated 25,000 walkers use the Pennine Way for full day walks and

Day Visits - full day walkers

The expected number of people who use or could use the new Hadrian's Wall Trail is estimated at 3,000 per day walk along the Pennine Way.

Day Visits - short walks

- 1,000 visitors per day walk along the Pennine Way, 800,000 in total.
- The largest group of walkers on the Pennine Way, 800,000 in total.
- Day visitors - part day walkers

Use the new Hadrian's Wall Trail to open one year.

scan data to calculate the increase in number of Hadrian's Wall Trail day walkers will also use the new Hadrian's Wall Trail. It is assumed that at least 55,000 all day walkers and an estimated 25,000 walkers use the Pennine Way for full day walks and

Day Visits - full day walkers

The expected number of people who use or could use the new Hadrian's Wall Trail is estimated at 3,000 per day walk along the Pennine Way.

Day Visits - short walks

- 1,000 visitors per day walk along the Pennine Way, 800,000 in total.
- The largest group of walkers on the Pennine Way, 800,000 in total.
- Day visitors - part day walkers
The Existing Pattern of Visitor Distribution is Concentrated on This Section of the Trail Between Lanes of the Headon Where There are Already Existing Car Parking Spaces. In This Region There is a Large Increase in the Number of Visitors Who Travel to the Headon, and the Increase in Visitor Numbers is Predominantly at Peak Periods.

*Table A.3: Descriptive Annual Visitor Numbers at Select Sites (Based on 6 Hour Periods)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Peak Periods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The predicted figures of 212,000 in peak seasons are similar to the predicted figures of 100,000 per annum of existing footpaths and trails in the area of Steel Rige. However,游客s visiting this area are likely to be in the peak season, and visitor numbers on this section of the trail are likely to be in the peak period. Therefore, the predicted figures should only be assumed to be a guide figure. However, if the predicted figures were extended to people of other groups, the increase in visitation would be greater.
The scale which has been used is shown in Table D.6 and repeated below.

- Proposed new facilities including new circular walks.
- Existing circular walks.
- Existing public rights of way.
- Areas, such as archaeological remains and museums.
- Predicted numbers of new users of the National Trail.
- Current visitor numbers and trends.

Into a broad range scale which is dependent on visitor numbers along any particular stretch of the trail, there have been simplified as outlined in Section 3.6 for the purposes of the modelling process predicted:

**OVERVIEW OF PREDICTED VISITOR DISTRIBUTION ALONG THE TRAIL**

- Sections which are already busy will become busier.
- Although experience at least a doubling of current use. Therefore between Lancaster and Heddon where most of the car parks exist these sections of the walk which are accessible and in particular walkers can access the trail.
- Activity however will be continued to those locations where.
- Even access to the trail.
- The walk.
- It is assumed that most will continue to use cars to gain access to gain access to the trail at existing car parks or along approaches.
- Visitor numbers in the trail will increase only where visitor numbers can parks to undertake parts of the trail.
- A large proportion of walkers will require access to existing car.
- Existing visitor facilities will become busier for the following reasons:
  - Annually.
  - Estimated 2000 people will wish to walk the full length of the trail there will be visits in areas where there is currently no trail - and:
  - Expected in the early 1990s.
  - Growth in the total number of visits since the lowest numbers were
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low</th>
<th>50,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>50,000 - 100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>&gt; 100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The predicted distribution of visitors along the trail as well as major attractions and car parks have been marked on a 1:250,000 map lodged with the Countryside Commission.

Table 3.6b
Increasing erosion problems were so great that the supply of the stones
until 1969 there had been unrestricted public access to the stones but

(maximum).

and now GJ-1 in 1960 (with a site of relatively small area (400 m²)
extracted large visitor numbers (4.96/7258), visions in 1986 and 1977/295 in 1984
At stonehenge more extreme wear and heat damage was linked with

effective

areas. This included blurring central areas with gravel which had provided very
was a number of maintenence staff on site who dealt with problems as they
the area that visitors are dispersed over a fairly wide area and also that these
and 12466 in 1986, was recorded as "premature. This was felt to be due to

and wear and tear at Housesteads, where vision numbers were 111.954 in 1987

Wear and tear at Housesteads, where vision numbers were 111.954 in 1987

Research at Stonehenge

and wear and tear at Stonehenge in Wilshire

and wear and tear at Stonehenge in Wilshire

and wear and tear of the study concentrated on the much more extreme problems of wear
part of the study concentrated on the much more extreme problems of wear
Durnsteinhöll Castle and Housesteads in North East England but the main
around the site of Durnsteinhöll Castle and Housesteads in North East England but the main

These are apparent mainly because of the publication of research on other the impact of

Section

Introduction

VISIONS PRESSURE: RESEARCH AT OTHER ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES

National Trails (Section 5.2), where archaeological sites (Section 5.2) as well as the impact of visitors on other

architectural sites. However, the major studies are reviewed briefly in this

archeological sites of the management of visions at the impact of

This section outlines and assesses the potential impacts on the monument

INTRODUCTION

ASSSESSMENT OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS OF THE NATIONAL TRAIL ON

WADRAM'S WALL
cover has developed which has already reduced the rate of erosion. Where these problems were established and within 72 years a mixed pasture grass experiment was constructed, a short term period on the bank and experimental earthwork which was constructed on Gorton Down (well observations at an experimental grass cover is the best land use management for the grass) was successfully established. Grass cover in other arable situations has indicated that research elsewhere in Britain at other arable situations has indicated that

Other Research

Fertiliser applications. Fertiliser applications are greatest with higher rates of application. The short term grass experiments have shown that the use of nitrogen encourages growth of the grass and also heavy fertiliser treatment because grasses other suggest management techniques reduce regular grass cutting in order to help control the deep erosion is essential after heavy use. In addition to areas of heavy use, composition is a key problem and this management this will be more frequent in periods of wet weather. Heavy neuronal should be given periods of rest to allow adequate growth Intensive management require involving regular mowing season, fertilizer application of urine and also some strategies with commercial

Expansible plots of uru and also some strategies with commercial

Grass maintenance

c defer might be sustainable with proper repair, dietion management and intensive. The results of a mowing programme indicated that grass achieved by vigorous pruning and the preservation of surface drainage. While a 1990 Wilmot has shown that the cut down was readily

The aim of the recent research at Shornclay were to monitor wear in the absence of effective grounds maintenance. By the absence of effective grounds maintenance.
Strategies of other National Trusts
in their designation of special sites may also be from published material
indication of what these interests might be from visitor opinion expressed
by other National Trusts. The major source of information which gave an
idea of published material on the impact of visitors on

Introduction

Review of Impacts of Visitors on Other National Trusts

Heritage Sites, but many of the papers relate to the impact of visitors on

An ICOMOS (1) convention in 1990 reviewed tourist pressure at World

some sites.

management work in relation to visitor pressure has been carried out at

Highlights any further published work although it appears that

Discussions with English Heritage, Cadw and Historic Scotland did not

point out that an archaeological advice to users of the land is a key component

environmental issues such as the needs of nature conservation. Darnell

plans to extend archaeological sites integrated with those for wider

However, the review is a variety of situations where management

inception and successful management of the archaeological resource is not

Darnell (1998) in a review of archaeological resource management strategies

isms.

in the boundary zone and creating multi-disciplinary zones around

in the planning of the planning of new and modification to the monuments

Some conservation policies may be appropriate in addition to further management

areas within which are at present under debate and evaluation changes

Darnell also order to reduce the threat of erosion on those (Darnell 1997). Darnell also

and improvements to change the established land-use pattern to preserve in

There have been many management agreements between English Heritage

monitored for their success.

Types of preservation policies to reduce visitor pressure on

in order to re-emphasise a stable, grass cover for the earthworks. Different

careful positioning have been tested by learning of earlier, re-reading

Areas subject to soil erosion from visitor pressure and also as a result of

Culdaff, 1995) by English Heritage in conjunction with the National Trust

Dorset (Haddaway 1995) and Wiltshire, Dorset (Wiltshire and

Major conservation programmes have been initiated at Badbury Rings.
found to show evidence of damage by vegetation activity. Damage from
bridge piers accounts for 12.5% of the Cleveland Way of which 3.7% was
had been little active management.

be made a number of walkers. Furthermore, these sections were over beat and the
1990) found that 22% of the sub and mountain sections were classified as

The baseline survey of the Cleveland Way (Cleveland Management Strategy)
arranged to check whether public, should not be made easier. Proposed to make the
but near the walkhead you should not be made easier. Proposed to make the

% 1
% 2
% 4
% 8

Too many people
There
Poor path erosion

Day walkers

Long distance walkers

However, the main problems were
walkers and 33% of long distance walkers had no dislike of the route.

The Pennine Way Visitor Survey in 1988 (Ash 1990) found that 63% of day
walkers were more annoyed by other (30%),

% 2
% 4
% 8

of groups found that erosion is a problem and 8% said it would improve it. On the

and avoided day walkers more often than long distance walkers and 70% of day walkers

The Southern Upland Way Survey in 1989 (Ash 1990) found that for 47% of

(14%) and 30% of respondents were asked to identify things which might

In the West Highland Way Survey (Centre for Leisure Research / MacKay

3.2

Impacts of Visits on Other National Trails
The amount of erosion in each example section does seem to increase.

Encouraged more people to take a walk.

Reduced the ability of vegetation to recover from walker pressure.

The two dry years between surveys will have:

400 between 1988 and 1990.

Probable increased erosion, as the Hoofprints have increased.

Visitor numbers on the Hoofprints have increased by

deteriorated. There are several possible reasons for this.

The overall condition of the three sections chosen as examples of the path in


increased in the section examined. The path also showed evidence of braking

created an area of erosion in the path condition that coincided with some

between the two strata being

conditioning route: In the intermediate period between the two surveys being

between Real Grasses and Hoofprints, the most heavily walked area of the

The results of the two baseline surveys was also compared for a section of the 1989,

surveys with one part showing signs of braking which was not apparent in

addition to the condition of these sections this worsened between the two

were both more severe condition than in the previous section. In

remained the case. The path surface in this example has fewer areas of light

covered in the 1988 survey showed some ware and tear and has

covered in the 1989 survey was examined in the vicinity of

medium ware.

path surface has remained fairly with occasional section showing signs of

joined in the path condition. Generally the effects of wear and tear on the

a section of path east of Coverton was examined and little change was

the path condition in the two years between surveys.

information from the surveys to give an indication of deterioration, if any, in

face of Coverton. These areas of the joint route were compared with the

east of Coverton. These areas of the joint route were compared with the

NATIONAL TRAIL, combed for a 12 km stretch west of Hoofprints and

October 1991. The proposed Hadrian’s Wall National Trail and the Penrith

Hadrian’s Wall Baseline Condition Survey was conducted in September -

The Penrith Way Baseline Condition Survey was carried out in 1989; the

Baseline Survey

Comparison between the Penrith Way Baseline Survey and the Hadrian’s Wall

vehicles (was found on 16.5% of the route.

Four wheel drive vehicles and motor cycles (mostly from farm / forestry
In conclusion, it must be noted that the period between the two baseline surveys is not directly comparable. Only general trends in path condition can be obtained from examining the two sets of data.

Summary

The major impact of visitors on the trail is erosion to its surface. In addition, litter left behind by visitors also forms a major impact on the trail. The visitors themselves by walking the route may also form a visual impact on the surrounding countryside.

POTENTIAL IMPACTS OF THE NATIONAL TRAIL ON THE MONUMENT

5.4

5.4.1 Introduction

Impacts arising from the development of a National Trail may be numerous but in this survey only those which have some relevance to the archaeology of Hadrian's Wall are considered.

5.4.2 Potential Impacts

Section 5.4.2 lists such potential impacts which might occur as a result of the proposed National Trail. Experience from other National Trails and other archaeological sites are taken into account (see Section 5.2 and 5.3). The impacts are assessed in Section 5.4.3.

Potential Impacts

- The creation of a new trail will stimulate demand for the use of that trail for long distance walks.
- Increased trampling from increased numbers of walkers on existing footpaths. This may lead to:
  - wear and tear on grass and other vegetation;
  - soil compaction which will contribute to problems of grass regeneration and drainage;
  - increased erosion around signboards, pinch-points etc.
- Increased erosion on grass banks where boundaries cut off access paths from the footpath.
- Increased erosion on banks where access to fields is from footpaths.

The potential impacts largely stem from the relatively high traffic flows on the long-distance routes. The length of the route is an important factor influencing the impact on the archaeological remains. It is appropriate to consider in turn the impact of walking and cycling on the proposed trail.
Opportunities of English Heritage.

Ancient monument and World Heritage Site (one of the more accessible and thus education in an extremely significant
perception of the Wall as a complex of human monument
public access to larger stretches of the Wall which will allow

The creation of a new continuous linear footpath will allow:

- archaeological features
- strengthening of existing control patterns
- stability of some archaeological features
- improved management of existing footpaths may increase the
- existing problem areas will be dealt with

and new footpaths:

Increased resources will be made available for the upkeep of existing
value
consolidation thus deriving from the existing archaeological
the necessary for increased maintenance of features such as
acts of vandalism

or erosion of stabilising vegetation around them:
instability of some features from people climbing on the features
erosion and even destruction of sensitive earthwork features;

Damage to archaeological features. This could include:

- associated erosion problems
- increased numbers of sightseers and other intruders with

Intensive visitor usage:
the creation of new honey pots and associated problems of
other facilities could lead to:
New infrastructure to improve access to the Wall such as car parks and

The Wall
Increase pressure on existing access points in order to gain access to
these above
New footpaths where none existed before with associated problems of

as the internal supply of the surrounding features is defined a combination of its own intrinsic vulnerability as well
features is defined a combination of its own intrinsic vulnerability as well
as indicated in the model process the vulnerability of any archaeological
Eventually a lack of vegetation may lead to soil erosion as a result of increased rainfall and physical disturbance in areas where vegetation is sparse. This process can lead to soil compaction and the resultant damage to the underlying geology. Different soils and vegetation types have been highlighted by the (unpublished) research of section (g). However, plant growth is often slow, and long periods of dry weather can significantly reduce vegetation growth. A need for detailed research into vegetation and soil sensitivity is therefore identified. Although a need for detailed research into vegetation and soil sensitivity is identified, some increased impacts from increased visitation numbers are also inevitable in some areas which have previously not been visited. The creation of a new trail involves sections where no previous public right of way existed or where the creation of new public right of way would lead to significant impact on some features of the National Trail. Thus, the potential success of proposed management interventions is likely to be directly related to:

- The potential success of proposed management interventions is likely to be directly related to:
- The health of the archaeological features affected,
- Visitor numbers and predicted visitor numbers outlined in section (g),
- The number of walkers using the trail (as defined by current visitor numbers),
- The magnitude of the impacts of the National Trail will be directly related to:
  - Increased visitor numbers may:
    - Increase litter and other obstructions in the vicinity of the wall,
    - Detract from the wilderness setting of the Wall,
    - Increase visitor numbers at some viewpoints,
    - Creation of circular walks may:
      - Problems with increased visitor numbers (see above),
      - More public awareness of a national monument;
    - In turn, and cumulatively will allow:
      - The positive effects on recreation and economy in the vicinity of the wall.
Organic soil on the proposed route near Turley Park west of Peoria. Over
baseline Condition Survey for Peoria's Will has identified only 0.2 miles of
consecutively between habitat types.
although such properties vary from species to species (B.C.N. 1983) and
weir resistant species predominately to ramping increases (Cole 1981).

path within increased with slope (Bayfield 1973)

especially when walking downhill (Bayfield 1973)

effect on vegetation is greater on steeper slopes (Cole et al. 1980)

vegetation and the number of species (Laddie 1975)

persistent ramping results in decrease in both the height of
low levels of ramping increase vegetation cover (Laddie 1975)

The main conclusions from research are:

The impacts of vegetation increase significantly with increased ramping.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Use</th>
<th>Soil Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light use</td>
<td>Light use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very light use</td>
<td>Very light use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate use</td>
<td>Moderate use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy use</td>
<td>Heavy use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4.34: Impacts of Increasing Use on Soil and Vegetation

Reduced and solids compaction occurs more rapidly.

Vegetation and soils. Under wet conditions, resistance to wear is generally

Communication highlights the impacts of increasing visitor pressure on

Table 5.4.34 is the accumulated data report for the community.

Addition of physical abrasion as well as climatic influences. An increase in

In areas of the Peoria area between 1971 and 1983 (Bayfield 1985),

wetlands that resulted in a two-fold increase in the bare and ramped widths.
In summary, significant increased wear and rear damage is most likely in the central section of the tail and particularly on poorly drained or steep

observation. Increases in visitor numbers would accentuate these effects.

compaction (such as near the North Gate) easy of Housesteads for

many increase, any poorly drained areas will be subject to increased soil

extraction. Any decrease in visitor pressure in combination with steep slopes has led to

extraction. Any decrease in visitor pressure in combination with steep slopes has led to

increase the severe section of the tail. An increase in visitor numbers to steep sections

is severely impacted by the present raveling and will limit the number of

The intensity of compaction impacts will be directly correlated to the number

management

stand very well to pressure particularly in the absence of much other

over 2m is less than 5. Despite these steep gradients and heavy visitor

that only 12% of the proposed route has a gradient of over 10 and

where the steepest gradients as well as the most intense visitor pressure are

greater on steep slopes (Quinn et al. 1986) and is in the central section

the impact of compaction impacts on vegetation and the resulting erosion is

Housesteads and just west of Steel Rigg.

was Blake’s. These areas were covered in the central section between

extensive extraction and 4.5m with heavy erosion where extensive

Al pressure the baseline condition survey records 0.23 miles of the route with

et al. and there were many small sections crossing streams, wet patches in fields

72 miles is recorded as mineral soil much of which is well drained (only

and ingress to the National Trust). In addition erosion by rainwater (such as those in parts

Survey path deterioration external to Ruts) 0.1m 1990. On Hadrian’s Wall the baseline

Erosion is generally more marked at pinch-points such as view points and

steep sections.

Figure 8 shows a comparison with

80 miles)
not be diminished.

The very positive effects of resource availability and management strategies are expected to be less significant if policed by human wardens.

damage to the unmanaged use of mountain bike tracks which might be very expensive than it is at present. The trail will not be a gateway for much of its use. Where areas of vandalism cannot be fixed, the task is expected to be no

further reduce these risks.

However, suitable mitigation measures outlined in Section 5 are not expected to show signs of pressure from visitors. Some resource measures have already been adopted and in the absence of access to which will be most at risk. Generally, the only stop on for the visitor, the problem should be addressed and undertaken for

The challenge of walking on the wall or on parts of the wall is very likely to

arise where pressure exists. Vandalism or expected to be at least as significant as the archaeo-

decay. The BCRA (1998) suggested for example an understanding of the philosophy of the park. Despite these remarks, we are not optimistic about the potential for movement in this particular case. Wherever would this be extremely significant to an already fragile system. Furthermore, the impact of this situation is dramatic. The immediate transition of the area would mean much of the historic monument and also the removal of sections of the trail and at pinch points elsewhere. Low predicted visitor numbers will reduce effects away from the horticultural areas.

The opportunity of creating circular walks linking with the National Trail would not be diminished.
Model Results

The detailed results from all stages of the model are contained within Annex C. The final three tables (Table 5 - 7) group the archaeological features according to their sensitivity indices. This index defines the inherent stability of any archaeological feature in terms of the expected sensitivity to the visitor numbers which are predicted in the vicinity of that feature.

The model has shown that from 1814 archaeological features defined on the trail 3, 14 (17%) are identified as having a high sensitivity index (and therefore very vulnerable to visitor pressure); 220 (12%) a medium sensitivity index and 1280 (71%) a low sensitivity index. The results are discussed in more detail in Section 3.8.

Suitable management techniques to safeguard those features which may be most at risk from the trail are outlined in Section 6.
The management plan process is outlined in Section 6.3 of the report. The environment for the presentation of the archaeological remains is given in Chapter 1 of this report.

The Community Commission believes that the most appropriate surface in such a landscape setting to be a "monumental Creative Path" managed with a policy be sustainable.

be preeminent in its management and estate

not impact upon the archaeology.

Possible solutions:

The belief for this project specifies that the walking surface of the site.

The site is a World Cultural Heritage Site (ICOMOS, 1990). The site includes elements of cultural heritage that are listed on the UNESCO World Heritage List.

Potential problems can be minimised by preeminent and into one

These features that the risk of unmitigated damage is greatest.


do damage that the information potential is undifferentiated. It is part of the architectural and urban structure, sometimes called or "hidden" and are not in historical context. However, it is where the stone and buildings receive attention to some extent with information potential has already been removed to some extent. These parts of the monument which are most readily accessible to the public on its own initiative pass unobserved and undifferentiated. The information potential of any management proposal must be

Archaeological heritage is a non-renewable and irreplaceable resource.

The impact of the National Trail on the archaeological features of the Wall...
It has been suggested by archaeologists we have consulted that wherever the presence of any significant archaeological remains under Phra Pathom Chedi is of particular concern, any excavation should be conducted using a physical inventory index. In any case, if the remains are found at Flora Yoth, excavation should be allowed unless the remains are in a physical inventory index.

### Table 6.24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proximity</th>
<th>Physical Form</th>
<th>Physical Form</th>
<th>Physical Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Close</td>
<td>Under Phra Pathom Chedi</td>
<td>Under Phra Pathom Chedi</td>
<td>Under Phra Pathom Chedi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close</td>
<td>Under Phra Pathom Chedi</td>
<td>Under Phra Pathom Chedi</td>
<td>Under Phra Pathom Chedi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close</td>
<td>Under Phra Pathom Chedi</td>
<td>Under Phra Pathom Chedi</td>
<td>Under Phra Pathom Chedi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close</td>
<td>Under Phra Pathom Chedi</td>
<td>Under Phra Pathom Chedi</td>
<td>Under Phra Pathom Chedi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close</td>
<td>Under Phra Pathom Chedi</td>
<td>Under Phra Pathom Chedi</td>
<td>Under Phra Pathom Chedi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key Archaeological Considerations

1. To retain the rich diversity of archaeological remains that is known to exist
2. To make the archaeological heritage satisfy the demands made upon it by society as a whole
3. To reconcile conflict and competition, for the use of land containing ancient monuments.

DARWIN (1962) lists 3 main objectives of effective archaeological resource management.
Where erosion patterns have already been recorded on an earthwork or stone
structure (in, e.g., the physical form or sub-weathering of archaeological data), the
path of the feature,
over trenches that the most appropriate action would be to re-route the
or other features which are only now found as negative features such as
will cross visual traces of earthwork features in archaeology on earthwork
specialists of the monument but detailed discussions with archaeologists who
would suggest that archaeological remains with high visibility indices
be identified. It is inevitable that the route will have to cross or pass along
should be given particular attention when the final route is planned on the
would suggest that archaeological features with high visibility indices
the detailed route direction on the ground, information from the model
Of fundamental importance to the preservation of the monument must be

6.3.2
Route Alignment

Monumental conservation by English Heritage
work on the monument would have to be given special and urgent
prescriptions for the monument. It must be noted that any management
(see Annex C), the following sections outline the suggested management
as well as the information on the preservation of the monument plan (see Sections 6.1 and 6.2). In mind
With the key aims of the management plan (see Sections 6.1 and 6.2) in mind

Introduction

6.3
MANAGEMENT PLANS TO SECURE AND THE MONUMENT

Prescriptions

a line on a map and thus difficult to demarcate for management
shades off into its hierarchy in a way which may be difficult to define with
does not have a single lateral, the conditioned sense, but the route does
it is essential to remember that because of the lower elements the monument
problem in that the archaeological might cross a complex series of earthworks.
Caution - consolodated wall in accordance with the suggested management
necessity. For example, any enclosure for archaeological features on the part should be
wherever an alternative route is proposed to avoid a sensitive feature carefully
been identified.

6.3.1

 preschool survival (should always be avoided, rather than preemptive
action taken).
Victory of the alternative route. Their sensitivity indices are shown below.

A few more anthropological features occur along the alternative route (Table 6.2a). In the second chosen example (see Table 6.2b) there are

It is shown to the phonetic route of friendly any damage in the early stages.

Table 6.2a shows that the rail is actually on feet west of the rail.

A detailed comparison of the results in Annex C, repeated in Table 6.2a also

Highly sensitive features in the vicinity of the public right of way

Even tough many anthropological features occur along the alternative route,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>%76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>%58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>%42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The alternative route which is the direct line for walkers at present exists.

Two examples are given below:

Lower landform index indicating higher potential stability of the terrain

A number of alternative routes have been outlined for the rail in the

Feature is already at high risk and again the route should be repositioned at
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Alternative Route</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this example, the proportion of features with low sensitivity indices (and therefore less sensitive to visitor pressure) is much greater in the vicinity of the alternative route. A detailed comparison of the data (see Table 6.4.2b) shows the alternative route passes or touches 7 features existing as vestigial remains whereas the proposed route passes only 1 which is in addition protected by a control boundary. In addition, the table indicates that the alternative route follows the Turf Wall feature of rarity value (see Section 3.3.1). Thus, the alternative route is more sensitive to visitor pressure than the chosen one and the trail should follow the original plan.