

In August 2008 the Forestry Commission undertook a limited consultation exercise within Bourne Woods to seek the views of woodland users on a number of questions.

A short questionnaire was devised and two sessions were undertaken on site at Bourne Woods. The first took place on Thursday 21st August between 10.30am and 2.30pm. The second session was arranged for Sunday 31st August, again between 10.30am and 2.30pm. A quantity of questionnaires were also made available to the Friends of Bourne Wood, and via the on site leaflet dispensers for 'self-completion' and return by the end of September 2008.

A total of 241 questionnaires were returned.

The questionnaire used is presented in Appendix One.

The basic results are presented in Appendix 2a through to Appendix 2f.

This report is structured in two parts. Firstly a written summary of the results against each question; and secondly a written analysis and discussion of the results.

1.0 SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS.

1.1 Frequency of Visit and Visitor Catchment:

- 52% of the completed questionnaires were completed by visitors living within 5-miles of the wood.
- Over 90% of the returned questionnaires were completed by visitors living within 25 miles of the wood.

1.1.1 Daily visitors: 15% of the questionnaires were completed by daily visitors. Of the daily visitors, 78% live in Bourne Town, with a further 9% living in the outlying villages less than 5-miles away. No daily visitors came from further than Spalding (12 miles).

1.1.2 Weekly visitors: 26% of the questionnaires were completed by people who visited once or twice a week. 62% of the weekly visitors lived in Bourne, with a further 15% drawn from the adjoining villages less than 5-miles away. Several weekly visitors came from Stamford, Spalding and Sleaford (all three between 10 and 15 miles from Bourne).

1.1.3 Monthly visitors: 29% of completed questionnaires were completed by people who visit once or twice a month. 43% of the monthly visitors came from Bourne Town and the adjoining villages. 27% of monthly visitors came from between 5 and 10 miles, with the Deepings being the most common home location in this range. A further 25% of monthly visitors came from between 10 to 25 miles away, with again Spalding being the most common home location in this group at around 12 miles out. A smaller number, 5% came from further than 25 miles away.

1.1.4 Annual visitors: 19% of the completed questionnaires were completed by visitors who visit once or twice a year. 24% of the annual or less frequent visitors live within 5 miles of Bourne Woods. Whereas 54% of the annual or less frequent visitors live between 10 and 25 miles from the wood – with again Spalding (about a third of visitors in this category) and Sleaford being the most common home locations in that range. Interestingly visitors from Peterborough or villages within the Peterborough City area showed up as about 15% of the annual or less frequent visitors, but did not figure in more frequent visits. Two visitors who visited annually or less often travelled

more than 50 miles to visit the site, but both noted that they were travelling through from Norfolk to the Midlands and had stopped for a break.

1.1.5 First Time Visitors: Just 8% of the completed questionnaires were completed by people who were visiting the woods for the first time. One of the first time visitors had come from Bourne. However, 43% had travelled between 10 and 25 miles to visit the wood. Again Sleaford and Spalding accounted for most of these visitors. 43% has also travelled from more than 25 miles to make their first visit – with some from as far as field as Colchester (Essex), Newcastle-Upon-Tyne, and Chester. Although not recorded, it is most likely that these visits from far away were as a result of visiting friends or family rather than decisions to visit the wood per se.

1.2 Overall Visitor Catchment

- 52% of questionnaires were completed by people living in Bourne or the ring of adjoining villages less than 5 miles away.
- 16% of completed questionnaires were completed by those living in the ring 5 to 10 miles away, with the Deepings accounting for about a third of these responses.
- 26% of questionnaires were completed by people living between 10 and 25 miles away, with around half of those from Spalding and a little over 10% each from Sleaford and the villages within Peterborough City area as well as the city itself.
- 6% of questionnaires were completed by people living more than 25 miles away from the wood.

1.3 Reason for Visiting

- Overall 63% of people completing a questionnaire indicated their main reason for visiting was ‘fresh air and exercise’. This was fairly constant across all visit frequencies.
- Dog walking was given as the main reason to visit by 38% of visitors overall. However, this rose to nearly 80% of the daily visitors.
- Those visiting the wood for a family activity represented 23% of respondents. However, ‘family activity’ was only quoted as the main reason to visit by 8% of daily users.
- Overall nearly 12% indicated that their reason to visit was to attend an organised event. This is quite high, but during the course of compiling the results it became apparent that some respondents were counting the actual consultation events as an organised event – which indeed they were. The question was aiming to establish how many people were attending for other group activities such as ‘health walks’ and events run by the Friends of Bourne Wood.
- Under the ‘other’ activities category, responses ranged from ‘ride ponies’ to ‘de-stress’, and included cycling, blackberry picking, athletics training, have a picnic and stretch legs on a long car journey.

1.4 Mode of Transport

- 75% of all respondents to the survey used a car to visit the wood.
- 21% of respondents walked in to the woods.

- Of the others 3% came by bike and 1% by minibus.
- For those who visited daily, 55% came on foot, with 45% coming by car.
- All of the first time visitors came by car.

1.5 Recreation Facilities

1.5.1 Access Road to Car Park:

- Overall 70% of visitors arriving by car or mini-bus, who completed questionnaires, reported the access from the A151 to be good or very good. A small number of comments were received about the junction with the A151 – most saying it was well signed, but one asked for a speed limit on the A151 as vehicles can approach too fast making it dangerous to pull out, and indeed turn in.
- The remaining 30% felt the access was either ‘neither good nor bad’ or in need of improvements. Those that commented here all agreed that the forest road needs to be resurfaced.
- There was very little variation in the responses across the different frequency of visits, ie. those that drove daily to the site were as happy / unhappy with the access road as those who visited once or twice a year.

1.5.2 Toilets:

- Overall 24% of visitors who completed questionnaires reported using the toilets on the day of their visit. This figure showed marked variations according to frequency of visit. Only 5% of daily visitors (2 completed questionnaires) reported using the toilets on the day they completed the questionnaire, whereas 39% of yearly visits and 55% of first time visitors used the toilets on the day they completed the questionnaire.
- Overall 33% of visitors who completed questionnaires had never used the toilets. Similar results were obtained across the visit frequencies – with a range from 44% for first time visitors, dropping to 28% for yearly visitors.
- Overall 21% of visitors felt the toilets were good – perfectly usable. 45% described the toilets were functional. 31% agreed the toilets were poor – unpleasant, with a further 3% stating the toilets were bad – unusable. Comments received ranged from statements along the lines of ‘perfectly okay for what they are / occasional / emergency use’ – to ‘I’d rather go behind a tree than go in those stinky holes’. Several comments noted lack of toilet paper, bags of dog faeces in the toilet bowls and the general graffiti and vandalism.

1.5.3 Waymarked Walks

- Overall 26% of visitors who completed questionnaires reported using one of the waymarked walks on the day they visited.
- 43% of visitors who completed questionnaires reported using one of the waymarked walks at some point in the previous year, but not on the day they visited.

- Overall 30% of visitors who completed questionnaires reported that they had never used the waymarked walks.
- These figures show little variation across the visit frequencies, for example of the daily visitors 21% said they used one of the waymarked walks on the day they visited. With 25% of those that visit once or twice a year saying the same. The only significant difference was with the first time visitors, where half of those making their first visit followed a waymarked walk.
- Of those that had used the waymarked walks:
 - 70% reported them as easy to follow;
 - 31% noted them as well surfaced;
 - 33% noted them as litter free;
 - 40% noted them as interesting and varied.
- Again perceptions of the waymarked walks hardly varied across the visit frequencies. The biggest variation was on litter, where only 29% of daily visitors thought the trails were litter free, yet 34% of yearly and 70% of first time visitors thought the same.

1.5.4 The Sculptures

- Overall 74% of those who completed a questionnaire felt the Sculptures added interest to the wood. This ranged from a low of 66% & 67% for first time and daily visitors to a high of 84% for those who visited once or twice a month.
- Overall 17.5% of respondents agreed the Sculptures were thought provoking.
- Not everyone likes the Sculptures, with about 6% of respondents saying they intruded on the natural wood (11% of daily users), and 2% agreeing the Sculptures should be removed.
- 32% of those who completed a questionnaire agreed that new sculptures should be added to the woods. This ranged from 44% for daily users to just 22% for those who visited just once or twice a year.
- The Sculptures triggered a number of comments. These included a small number of people saying they had never seen any! Several people noted that their children loved finding them, and encouraged their children to explore more. Some comments praised those made of natural materials, but were less supportive of the older concrete ones. A common theme related to vandalism of the Sculptures. One comment from someone concerned about the intrusion on the wood noted that 'if we must have them they should be limited to the car park'.

1.5.5 Play Area

- A quarter of the respondents who completed questionnaire had used the play area. This equates well to the overall proportion of children (under 13-years of age) and teenagers who were covered by completed questionnaires - 19% and 5% respectively.
- Children were less likely to visit the woods daily (less than 11% of daily users) and correspondingly only 12.5% of daily visitors used the play area. Conversely 30% of those that visited once or twice a year used the play area, again reflecting the higher proportion of children in this grouping (30.5%).

- Comments about the play area were all positive. Comments such as ‘My grandchildren use it often - good way of getting them to come’ and ‘my children love it, good place to stop and rest’ were typical. No negative comments were received about the play area, but several observations about the limited range of play furniture were noted. One verbal comment noted that the fenced off open space within the play area was great for her youngsters to play on the ground without fear of getting covered in dog poo.

1.6 Navigation around the Woods.

- Overall 60% of those that completed a questionnaire reported that they found the wood easy to navigate around because they knew the wood well. This fell slightly to 57% for daily users, but rose to a massive 84% for those that visited once or twice a week. Those that visited once or twice a year were less likely to know their way around with only 26% finding their way easily because they know the wood well.
- 27% of those that responded to the questionnaire found the wood easy to navigate around because it was well signed. This rose to 38% for daily and yearly visitors, and 60% for first time visitors.
- Overall nearly 10% of visitors who completed questionnaires found navigation around the woods hard, but did not get lost. This included 4% of daily visitors. Nearly a fifth of yearly and first time visitors also fell into this category.
- 3% of all those who completed questionnaires reported that they had got lost. This only affected first time visitors, 2%, and yearly visitors, 12%.
- Overall 22% of those that completed a questionnaire had used the map leaflet to navigate around the woods. This figure was not affected by visit frequency, except for first time visits, as no map leaflets have been available since early summer.

1.7 Information

- 1.7.1 Nearly 82% of those who completed questionnaires indicated that they would like more information about the wood’s history, wildlife and / or management operations. This was marginally higher (87%) for daily users, and lowest for first time visitors (78%).
- 1.7.2 Just over half of those who had completed questionnaires had also read the ‘WOODS’ Newsletter in the previous year. This was much higher for daily and weekly visitors to the wood 82% and 74% respectively.
- 1.7.3 Of those who had read ‘WOODS’ three-quarters agreed that it was useful and relevant, and a sixth agreed that whilst it was interesting it was irrelevant. Two people responded by saying that it was both uninteresting and irrelevant.

1.8 Options for Future Developments and Charging

1.8.1 Community Room

- Overall 15% of all respondents new of a community group that might be interested in using a community room. This was highest for daily visitors (20%).

1.8.2 Café

- 58% of people who completed questionnaires said that they would use a café if one was provided, whereas 35% indicated that they would not use one. The remaining 7% did not respond to the question.
- For daily users the majority, 64.7% indicated that they would not use a café, compared to 32.4% who would. Only 3% of daily users did not answer the question.
- For weekly visitors, 47.6% would use a café, compared to 46% who would not use one. Again nearly 7% of weekly visitors did not answer the question.
- Of those who visit once or twice a month 56.2% would use a café, against 32.9% who said they would not. 11% gave no answer.
- For those who visit the woods once or twice a year 81% would use a café, against 15% who would not. This is echoed by first time visitors, with 78% likely to use a café against 6% who would not.

1.8.3 Car Park Charging:

- Overall 21.2% of people who completed questionnaires stated a preference to have free parking with no other recreation facilities provided (55 people). Nearly twice as many people stated the opposite (99 people). However about a third of respondents did not answer the question.
- Overall 50% of people who completed questionnaires stated a preference to pay a car parking charge to cover the costs of maintaining the waymarked walks, play area and toilets. This represented 122 people. 34% of people stated the opposite, ie, 82 people. Only a sixth of respondents did not answer the question.
- For daily visitors, 23.5% stated a preference to have free parking with no other recreation facilities provided (8 people). 13 people stated the opposite.
- Overall 32% of people who visited daily stated a preference to pay a car parking charge to cover the costs of maintaining the waymarked walks, play area and toilets. This represented 11 people. 47% of people stated the opposite, 16 people.
- 27% of weekly visitors who completed questionnaires who wanted free parking and no facilities (representing 17 people), against 42% of weekly visitors (27 people) who disagreed.
- 33 weekly visitors (55%) indicated that they would prefer to pay a car parking charge and retain the existing facilities, compared to 21 people (33%) who disagreed.
- The results for those who visited once or twice a month were more evenly matched with 20 people (27%) preferring free parking and no facilities, with only 23 people (31%) stating the opposite.

- When it came to paying for parking, the monthly visitors were equally matched with 31 (42%) willing to pay, and 31 (42%) opposed.
- Of those who visit yearly or less often, only 2 people (4%) wanted free parking and no facilities, compared to 26 (49%) who disagreed.
- 40 yearly or less frequent visitors (75.5%) expressed a willingness to pay for parking, against 7 (13%) who disagreed.

1.9 Volunteering:

1.9.1 Overall 18% of respondents indicated an interest in volunteering in Bourne Woods.

1.10 Statistical Monitoring

1.10.1 The statistical monitoring questions do not form part of the questionnaire, but gives useful information on group sizes as well as information on how representative of the wider the community the sample was.

1.10.2 Key points from the statistical monitoring:

- The 241 returned questionnaires reflected the views of over 525 individuals;
- Of these 24% were senior citizens; 51% were adults; 5% were teenagers and 20% were children under the age of 13;
- 21% of questionnaires were completed by individuals;
- 34% of the questionnaires were completed on behalf of two people.
- 18% of the questionnaires were completed on behalf of groups of three people.
- 15% of the questionnaires were completed on behalf of groups of four people.
- 10% of the questionnaires were completed on behalf of groups of five or more people.
- 21% of senior citizens and 20% of adults who completed questionnaires visited the wood alone;
- Daily visitors were most likely to be visiting as individuals; whereas less frequent visitors (monthly and yearly) were more likely to visit as part of a group.
- 7% of teenagers who completed questionnaires visited the wood alone. Teenagers were most likely to visit the wood as part of a family group of 3 or more people.
- 31% of senior citizens and 19% of adults who completed questionnaires visited the wood with one other person;
- 19% of children visited the wood with one other person; whereas 11% of children visited in a group of 3 people and 23% in a group of 4 people. No children under the age of 13 visited the woods alone;
- 9% of visitors were registered disabled
- 95.5% of those that filled in the data were 'white British'.

2.0 ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

2.1 Frequency of Visit and Visitor Catchment

- 2.1.1 From the questionnaires, it is possible to deduce that just over half of the visitors to Bourne Woods come from the town of Bourne and the ring of villages that lie within a mile or so of the wood. This emphasises the importance of the wood as a local resource for the local community.
- 2.1.2 Very few visitors come from over 25 miles away. Of those that did, most fell into one of two categories – those that visited the wood whilst staying locally with friends or relatives; and those that used the wood as a stop off to break-up a long journey. This strongly suggests that the wood is not seen as a regional resource, but is a local or sub-regional facility. If it had been a regional facility far more people would have been recorded as travelling further than 25-miles to get to the woods.
- 2.1.3 The ‘localness’ of visitors is underlined by the high proportion of daily and weekly visitors. People who visit very regularly, i.e. once a week or more often completed a third of the completed questionnaires. Of those more than two-thirds came from Bourne or the immediate ring of villages. This is evidence of a much valued, often used facility that has become a very important part of many people’s daily / weekly lives. However, very few people are willing to drive more than 16-miles to get to the wood once a week, or more frequently with no-one doing so picked up in the survey. The furthest people seem to travel on a very regular basis is from / to the town of Sleaford (15 miles), although several people seem to make the 12-mile journey from the town of Spalding each week.
- 2.1.4 A small number of those who visit once or twice a month were prepared to drive up to 25 miles to visit the wood. Most of these visits (just under half) came from Bourne and the immediate ring of villages. A quarter of the monthly visitors came from between 5 and 10 miles out – with visitors from the ‘Deepings’ being most numerous. A further quarter came from the ring 11 to 25-miles, with Spalding being the most common home location in this category. These figures again show the importance of the wood to the people of Bourne and surrounding villages. However, they also start to bring out the importance of the wood to those living across the Lincolnshire fens, with visitors from Spalding, Sleaford and the Deepings being significant.
- 2.1.5 A little under a fifth of the visitors to Bourne Woods visited no more than once or twice a year. Half of the people who fell into this group lived between 10 and 25 miles from the wood – with Spalding again being the home location of about a third. Interestingly visitors from Peterborough or villages within the Peterborough City area showed up as about a sixth of the annual or less frequent visitors, but did not figure in more frequent visits. This suggests that the wood is not deemed to be a relevant destination for people from Peterborough. However, it is clear again that the wood has significance for those living across rural Lincolnshire, notably Spalding and Sleaford.
- 2.1.6 It can be argued that the woodland recreation facilities therefore need to be taken forward in a way that reflects the two main user groups. The first of these groups is the regular or very regular visitors from Bourne and the immediate ring of villages. The second is the group of less frequent visitors who are likely to drive from up to 25-miles away, and most likely to be coming from the towns and villages of the Deepings, Spalding and Sleaford.

2.2 Reason for Visiting

- 2.2.1 In woods with very high numbers of very regular visitors it is usual to see 'dog walking' as the most frequently cited reason to visit the woods. At Bourne, however it was only cited by a little over a third of visitors as a reason to visit. The most cited, cited by two-thirds of the visitors who completed questionnaires was 'fresh air and exercise'.
- 2.2.2 For daily visitors, dog walking did remain the most cited reason to visit, with over three-quarters of daily visitors stating they had come to walk the dog.
- 2.2.3 Perhaps influenced by the survey taking place during the school summer holidays, nearly a quarter of all the respondents cited 'family activity' as the reason to visit. This is quite high for a site that has such a high proportion of local users.
- 2.2.4 Other activities that came up in the questionnaire responses included horse riding, cycling and picking black-berries. 'De-stressing' and 'un-winding' were also cited as reasons to visit the woods.
- 2.2.5 Other than the much higher proportion of daily dog walkers, there was no significant differences in reason to visit across the different visit frequencies.
- 2.2.6 In many ways it is pleasing to see that the majority of visitors are choosing to visit the woods for a positive reason, rather than as a default location to take the dog for a walk. The importance of the wood to the local community for fresh air and exercise is recognised. The opportunity to see wildlife was also valued by many respondents.
- 2.2.7 Some comments received specifically asked for some activities to be restricted – a small number of people wanted horse-riding to be restricted or banned; and a similar number wanted cycling restricted or banned.

2.3 Mode of Transport.

- 2.3.1 Three-quarters of the respondents to the survey used a car to visit the wood, and hence arrived first at the main car park. The questionnaires show that for the less frequent and first time visitors, the car park is the primary arrival point.
- 2.3.2 A fifth of respondents walked into the woods. This is fairly high, but reflects the location of the wood alongside the town. Good public rights of way give direct access from / to outlying villages. Although the question was not asked, it can be deduced that for the majority of those that walked in, the arrival point will have been the Beech Avenue access point.
- 2.3.3 A very small number of people arrived by bike.
- 2.3.4 The car park is used by some larger vehicles, although not many were picked up in the survey. These included minibuses, horse-boxes, motor-homes and delivery vans. The later seem to use the car park as a quiet place for a lunch / rest stop. A number of community groups use the wood, arriving by mini-bus.
- 2.3.5 The car park is the main reception area for the majority of visitors to the woods, and it seems almost all of the infrequent visitors who may benefit from more information on what they can do and where they can go in the woods. For those who walk in, the main

reception point is the Beech Avenue entrance, but with many more public rights of way accessing the woods at other locations this can not be relied upon as the only access for regular pedestrian visitors.

2.4 Recreation Facilities

2.4.1 Access Road to the Car Park:

Over two-thirds of visitors to the woods who used the car park reported the access from the A151 to be good or very good. Most people were happy with the junction with the A151, but a couple of people observed that the speed of traffic on the A151 could be a problem when both turning in and trying to get out again. The signage at the access is good with traditional Forestry Commission signs supplemented by standard highways 'brown tourist' signs.

A little less than a third of those who completed questionnaires noted that the the access road was 'neither good nor bad' or that 'improvements were needed'.

The car park access road is approximately ½ mile long and shared with timber lorries that need to access the wood. The road is two-lanes wide at both ends, but narrows to a single track road with passing bays as it passes over a narrow, raised causeway that crosses a hollow. This causeway is around 200 yards long with steep sides. A private car has previously slid off of the causeway and down the embankment. Following that incident, around 4-years ago, wooden timber works were erected to more clearly indicate the steepness of the drop and keep vehicles to single track. The causeway has previously suffered from subsidence, and this was last addressed 4-years ago. The road is showing signs of renewed slippage and remedial work will be required in the next year.

The main run of the road has been tarmaced in the past, however the last 100 yards or so into the car park was left as a loose bound surface. The top dressing has work away and the larger sub-surface course has come through which gives a very rough ride to vehicles entering the car park – especially those that come off the smooth tarmac stretch too fast. This does have the beneficial effect of slowing most vehicles right down as they enter the car park proper.

2.4.2 Toilets:

Overall a quarter of those who completed questionnaires reported using the toilets on the day of their visit. These figures showed marked variations according to visit frequency, with only 2 people who used the woods on a daily basis using the toilets. Whereas, over a third of those who used the woods once or twice a year used the toilets when they visited.

A third of the visitors to the wood had never used the toilets.

Of those who used the toilets within the past year a fifth thought the toilets were good and perfectly useable. Just under a half thought the toilets were functional. And a third thought the toilets were poor and unpleasant, or bad and unusable. The range of comments received ranged from 'perfectly okay for what they are'....'for emergency use' to 'I'd rather go behind a tree than go in those stinky holes'. Written and verbal comments received included experiences of no toilet paper, broken locks, bags of dog faeces blocking the bowls, and splashing in unknown liquids on the floor.

Many people who have known that the future of the toilets was bleak made comments about the toilets being essential for community groups, including local schools.

The toilets are currently closed and will not re-open in their current sub-standard form. The toilets drain into a soak away system that can not cope and does not meet current standards. Since the toilets closed we have had 6 letters of complaint, all from individuals. The Friends of Bourne Wood have objected to the closure.

The importance of the toilets to the quality of people's visit is difficult to ascertain. Relatively few woods benefit from toilets, and increasingly these are being limited to 'day visitor sites' where parking charges apply and other facilities such as a café and visitor centre exist. This is because toilets are very expensive to build and maintain. They invariably attract vandalism and require regular cleaning and almost daily servicing to keep supplied with toilet paper. This makes them prohibitively expensive at sites where there is no full time FC staff presence. Does the lack of a toilet block restrict the use of sites by schools and other community groups? The answer to this is we just don't know. Yes there is a logic that if no toilets are provided then school groups particularly will seek an alternative visit location. However, we do know that schools do visit woods where no toilets are provided – for example before the recent round of developments at Top Lodge no public toilets were provided at Top Lodge, yet many schools still visited the woods. Likewise Southey Woods near Peterborough was a very popular wood for community groups to visit – and is a wood that never benefited from having toilets. Does the lack of toilets deter other woodland visitors – again it is hard to say. It is likely that the closure of the toilets at Bourne Woods will put off some people visiting – but again Southey Woods is an example of a wood that in the past had higher numbers of visitors than Bourne, and never had toilets. Maulden Woods and Rowney Warren Woods in Bedfordshire, also managed by the Northants Forest District have no visitor facilities beyond the car park, but also benefit from visitor numbers that are estimated to be equivalent to those at Bourne.

That said, if a quarter of all the visitors to the wood each day used the toilets, as the survey suggests, that would constitute a significant demand for toilets to be provided.

2.4.3 Waymarked Walks

A quarter of those who completed a questionnaire reported using one of the two waymarked walks on the day they visited. This rose to half of all the first time visitors, and slightly lower, a fifth of daily visitors.

Around two-fifths of those who completed questionnaires reported using a waymarked walk in the previous year, but not on the day they were questioned.

The remaining third of visitors reported never having used the waymarked walks.

An all-ability trail was first installed around 15- years ago, and before that various nature trails, waymarked walks have come and gone. The all-ability trail was extended about 5- years ago and renamed as the Larch Walk. At the same time a new longer unsurfaced walk, the Nightingale Trail was introduced.

Given the very regular nature of many of the visitors to the woods, it is moderately surprising that so many had indeed used the waymarked trails on the day of the interviews. However, some of the comments made suggest that some respondents were including the public rights of way as waymarked trails – which was not the intention of the question.

The views of the users of the waymarked walks are quite interesting, and somewhat disappointing.

Of those who did use the waymarked trails, over two thirds reported them as easy to follow. However, this suggests that a little less than a third found them hard to follow – which is not good. The maintenance regime on the trails has been reduced slightly with fewer cuts of the vegetation – this coupled with a warm wet summer has meant that the vegetation has grown and in some cases obscured the waymarking posts. One respondent claimed that the use of coloured bands was nonsense and coloured arrows should be used. The coloured band system is the standard system used in the Forestry Commission in England, with arrows only being used at complex junctions. One comment asked for a long loop rather than ‘there and back again’ routes. Both waymarked walks provided are looped walks, whereas of course the public rights of way are all ‘there and back again’, so it is not clear which route this person was following. Several people noted that they could not find the start of the walks, and also people could not find the car park on completion of their walk. This suggests that using the point known as ‘5-ways’ in the woods as the starting point for the walks with the map and noticeboards may be a mistake, as although it is only a hundred yards or so from the car park, a band of trees does visually separate it.

Less than a third of the users of the waymarked trails agreed that they were well surfaced. This is not surprising as the Nightingale Trail is an un-surfaced trail which has become very muddy. Likewise the Larch Walk, although surfaced, the running width has decreased as years of leaf fall and cut grass has encroach on the surfaced width. In addition comments were received about mud and blocked drains and culverts on sections of the public rights of way both within the wood and on the approaches to the wood.

A third of users reported the waymarked walks as litter free – again this suggests that the majority perceive the routes as littered. Some comments referred specifically to dog faeces and bags of dog faeces. Dog faeces on the all-ability trail is a particular problem as it gets on to and clogs the wheels of wheelchairs and push chairs. However, the biggest eye sore is the increasingly common, and entirely unacceptable and anti-social habit of some dog owners of picking their pets faeces up, bagging it, and then throwing the bag into the bushes. Turning an unpleasant, but bio-degradable product into an un-pleasant, long-lived and non bio-degradable product.

2.4.4 The Sculptures

The sculpture trail has been a feature of the wood for around 20-years. Overall three-quarters of those who completed a questionnaire agreed that the sculptures add interest to the wood. This ranged from two-thirds of daily visitors to over four-fifths for those who visit just once or twice a month. Several comments received noted the way the sculptures have encouraged many young people to explore the woods – looking for them. One person commented that she had enjoyed hunting for them when they first went in and now brings her children who love finding them as well, although she did note that there seemed to be fewer of them these days.

The sculptures are not universally liked with around a tenth of the daily users stating that they intruded on the natural woodland. However only a very small number of respondents thought that the sculptures should be removed. One respondent noted that ‘if we must have them they should be limited to the car park’.

A third of those who completed the questionnaire agreed that new sculptures should be added. This rose to just short of half of those that used the woods daily.

Many of the comments received about the sculptures concerned vandalism. Vandalism has been a problem in the past, and in a small way continues to be a threat to the sculptures. However, some of the comments suggested that more of the sculptures had been lost due to vandalism than in fact has been the case. Many of the original sculptures were designed to decay back into the natural woodland. Some were of a size and scale that to allow them to rot in their original places would have posed an unacceptable health and safety risk – so over the years some have been moved or been removed completely. Other newer sculptures have been commissioned that were created or located to be robust against vandalism.

Some comments noted a clear preference for natural materials to be used for any new commissions.

There is little doubt that the sculptures are now part of the fabric of the wood, and that if possible new, appropriate, sculptures should be commissioned for the wood.

There is a perception that art, and particular Sculpture, in the landscape has been overdone over the last two decades and that some of the artistic rationale for commissioning and placing pieces has been lost or watered down. A growing movement in the art world currently is a focus on process art – discovery of / hands on involvement of the creation of a piece of art that is then right for time and place. This does not mean that new Sculptures should not be commissioned for Bourne Woods – but is a reminder that those commissioning new pieces should have a clear artistic rationale for commissioning the piece that should be more than ‘it has been two year’s since the last one’. As in the past that approach has too readily lead to pieces of art that don’t fit with the context of the wood. This may mean it is time to move away from Sculpture to other artistic mediums – such as performance art, or poetry for example.

2.4.5 The Play Area

A quarter of the respondents who completed the questionnaire had used the play area. This equates well to the overall proportion of children (under 13-years of age) and teenagers who were covered by completed questionnaires - 19% and 5% respectively.

The correlation between respondents who had used the play area on the day they visited, and the number of respondents that had children in their party held for all visit frequencies. For example, of those who visited once or twice a year, a third had children in the group, and a third had used the play area. This close correlation is very positive, showing that the play area is valued by visitors with children.

The comments about the play area were all positive. Comments such as ‘My grandchildren use it often - good way of getting them to come’ and ‘my children love it, good place to stop and rest’ were typical. No negative comments were received about the play area, but several observations about the limited range of play furniture were noted. One verbal comment noted that the fenced off open space within the play area was great for her youngsters to play on the ground without fear of getting covered in dog poo.

2.5 Navigation around the Woods.

- 2.5.1 Well over half of those who completed the questionnaire reported that they found the wood easy to navigate around because they knew the wood well. This ranged from a massive four-fifths of regular (weekly) visitors to just a quarter of those who visited once or twice a year. This again emphasises the importance of the wood to the local community who generally know their local wood very well.
- 2.5.2 A quarter of those who responded to the questionnaire found the wood easy to navigate around because it is well signed. This rose to well over half for first time visitors.
- 2.5.3 Nearly a tenth of the visitors to the wood found navigation hard, but did not get lost. This included a small number of people who visit the wood each day; and a fifth of those who visit once or twice a year or who were on their first visit to the woods. A small number of people got lost – this included a tenth of those who visit once or twice a year. With one group complaining that all the signs had been removed since their last visit.
- 2.5.4 Around a fifth of all visitors had used the map leaflet in the past to help navigate around the woods. The map leaflet is currently out of print, but had carried the same map as is on the map-board at '5-ways'.
- 2.5.5 Navigation around the woods is an interesting subject. Some people seem to have an in-built ability to navigate around unfamiliar surroundings, sufficiently observant to be able to retrace their steps back to the car park without undue difficulty. Whereas some others are less able to do so. The woods can be confusing places with each 'ride' or trackway looking similar to another and with few obvious landmarks.
- 2.5.6 Several years ago the four main forest track junctions were signed with large finger posts that directed people to just three locations – the car park, Beech Avenue and the Ponds. These signs proved to be useful for visitors who either did not wish to follow the waymarked walks (or had got lost part way round), as well as to give re-assurance to those who were fairly confident about finding their own way. The finger posts have been vandalised and repaired several times, but remain in place. Contrary to a handful of comments, none of the signage has been removed in the last year – but a reduction in vegetation cutting, plus a warm wet summer has exacerbated vegetation growth so some of the smaller waymarker posts had become less obvious.
- 2.5.7 The relatively few people who got lost is re-assuring, but indicative that improvements do need to be made so that first time, and infrequent visitors are not discouraged from returning to the woods.

2.6 Information

- 2.6.1 The questionnaires showed a very large demand for more information on the wood's history, ecology and silvicultural operations to be shared with visitors through on site notices. This can be delivered through temporary notices, guided walks and semi-permanent interpretation boards. Temporary notices are 'cheapest' but can look tatty after a relatively short period and are only of use to impart short messages. Guided walks are best for imparting information, and have the benefit of allowing two-way exchanges. However, by their nature they have a large call upon staff time both to run and arrange. Permanent interpretation boards are very expensive, and get out of date relatively quickly.

Our research also tells us that ‘regular’ visitors are less likely to stop and read permanent interpretation boards.

2.6.2 The WOODS newsletter, which is produced annually, was read by around half of those who completed questionnaires. Over three-quarters of the very regular visitors (weekly and daily) had also read the WOODS newsletter. Of those who had read WOODS, most found it to be interesting and relevant. However a sixth thought it interesting, but irrelevant. Just two respondents thought it to be both uninteresting and irrelevant. One comment received made the point that they thought it misleading as it told only good news stories.

2.7 Options for Future Developments and Charging

2.7.1 Community Space: One of the common observations we receive is that for groups visiting the wood, from school groups to adult learning and youth groups, there is no wet weather shelter or specific place to meet. A handful of woods around the country have ‘woodland classrooms’ – which range from old portacabins, such as the one at Sherwood Pines Forest Park, to state of the art timber buildings such as the new Forestry Commission education centre on Cannock Chase. Locally we have been looking at options to provide flexible spaces – referred to as ‘Community Spaces’ that can be booked by visiting groups. The question was asked in the questionnaire about whether people knew of groups that may be interested in using such a facility. A sixth of all the respondents relied that they did know such a group. The groups named in the questionnaire ranged from local schools, through wildlife groups to athletics groups. This suggests that there would be strong demand for such a space if one were to be provided.

2.7.2 Café: The suggestion of a woodland café caused the strongest response in the questionnaires with very clear statements – both for and against. One daily made the unequivocal comment that ‘NO ONE WANTS ONE’ – whilst another daily user responded ‘Yes please - DEFINITELY’. The question was deliberately phrased to ask respondents whether they would use a café or not. Because of the contentious nature of this question it is worth re-stating the summarised responses:

- 58% of people who completed questionnaires said that they would use a café if one was provided, whereas 35% indicated that they would not use one. The remaining 7% did not respond to the question.
- For daily users the majority, 64.7% indicated that they would not use a café, compared to 32.4% who would. Only 3% of daily users did not answer the question.
- For weekly visitors, 47.6% would use a café, compared to 46% who would not use one. Again nearly 7% of weekly visitors did not answer the question.
- Of those who visit once or twice a month 56.2% would use a café, against 32.9% who said they would not. 11% gave no answer.
- For those who visit the woods once or twice a year 81% would use a café, against 15% who would not. This is echoed by first time visitors, with 78% likely to use a café against 6% who would not.

So overall a small majority of people would use a café if one were to be provided. For daily visitors two-thirds would not use such a café, but one-third would. Weekly visitors were evenly split. But for those who use the wood once or twice a month – or less frequently the

majority stated that they would use a café. This trend is not unsurprising with less frequent visitors more likely to be travelling further, and thus more likely staying in the wood for longer, and thus more likely to be looking for refreshments.

It is also worth exploring the comments made against the notion of a café. These included concerns about financial viability – some comments noted that if the mobile catering vans could not make the pitch pay then how can a café? Financial viability is evidently a key question that any private investor will need to examine in detail. Other comments included the risk of increased littering and vandalism. Yes these are potential problems, but can be managed with proper building design and lease / management arrangements.

- 2.7.3 **Car Park Charging:** Charging was not as contentious as the café proposal, which in itself is interesting. The question was paired with two separate questions requiring a yes or no answer. The first question was would you prefer the wood to be free with no waymarked walks, play area or toilets? And the second was would you prefer to pay a car parking charge to cover the costs of waymarked walks, play area and toilet maintenance?

Overall a fifth of those who completed the questionnaire stated a preference for free parking with no other facilities provided. However nearly two-fifths of those who responded stated the opposite. This equated to 55 questionnaires supporting free parking, no facilities and 99 completed questionnaires giving a no to this option.

Overall half of those who completed the questionnaire stated a preference to pay a car parking charge to cover the costs of maintaining the waymarked walks, play area and toilets. This represented 122 completed questionnaires. However, 82 questionnaires gave the opposite view.

Almost a quarter of daily visitors showed a preference for free parking and no facilities – which virtually mirrored the overall result. Not surprisingly daily visitors were less supportive of a parking charge, with only a third saying yes to car park charges and facilities. This presumably is reflective of the potential cost for those who visit daily – which would be mitigated by the availability of annual parking permits if charges are introduced.

Responses from those who visit once or twice a week were not dissimilar to the daily visitors, except that there was an apparent greater willingness to pay a charge (over half of respondents).

For those who visit infrequently there was a very clear majority in favour of car park charges and retaining facilities.

This shows clear support for the retention of recreation facilities beyond just a car park at Bourne Woods. The results also show support for, or if not support than an acknowledgement of the need for pay and display charging to cover the cost of maintaining the facilities.

2.8 **Volunteering:**

- 2.8.1 There is already a good network of volunteers contributing to the management of Bourne Woods –either directly through the Forestry Commission's volunteer ranger scheme or indirectly through the work of the Friends of Bourne Woods. Hence it was pleasing to see nearly a fifth of respondents to the questionnaire indicate a positive interest in volunteering.

2.9 Statistical Monitoring:

- 2.9.1 The statistical monitoring was not part of the questionnaire, but gives useful information on group sizes as well as information on how representative of the wider community the sample was.
- 2.9.2 241 questionnaires were completed which is a good sample size. Of these all age ranges were represented, but there was a marked dearth of teenagers included in the sample. This is quite typical of questionnaires of this nature.
- 2.9.3 A fifth of the questionnaires were completed by people who normally visit on their own. A third were completed by visitors who normally visit with one other person – be it their partner, a friend or a relative. A tenth of the questionnaires were completed by groups of 5 or more people.
- 2.9.4 Daily visitors were most likely to visit on their own; whereas less frequent visitors were more likely to visit as part of a group.
- 2.9.5 A fifth of the children under 13-years of age visited the woods with one other person. Nearly a quarter of the children visited in a group of four people. No children visited the wood alone.
- 2.9.6 Nearly a tenth of the questionnaires completed included the views of people who were registered disabled.
- 2.9.7 95.5% of those that completed the ethnic minority data were 'white British'. This corresponds closely to the published census data which indicates that the survey was broadly representative of the community resident in South Kesteven.

3.0 Overall Summary of Key Points

- 3.1 In broad terms this questionnaire has confirmed that a very large proportion of the users of Bourne Wood come from the town of Bourne or the immediate ring of villages. With a very large number knowing the wood well.
- 3.2 The questionnaire has revealed that those who travel to visit Bourne Woods, a large proportion drive to the wood from the fenland towns and villages of Sleaford, Spalding and the Deepings. Visitors from the City of Peterborough, and the district centre at Grantham do not figure significantly in the survey despite the size of those communities.
- 3.3 The questionnaire confirmed that the wood has a relatively small catchment – with relatively few people travelling further than 25 miles on a regular basis to visit the wood.
- 3.4 The majority of the visitors to the wood are familiar with the wood and are able to navigate around the wood easily by themselves. However, a small but significant number of first time visitors and less frequent visitors visit the wood and still require help to navigate around.
- 3.5 The survey confirmed that a significant number of people, around a quarter of those surveyed, walk to the woods. Those who walk in are most likely to enter via the Beech Avenue entrance – but could walk in via any of the other public right of ways. The majority

of visitors who come to the woods do so by car. Those that arrive by car all park in the main car park.

- 3.6 The toilets, waymarked walks and play areas are all well used and valued to varying degrees. However each has its own problems linked to perceptions of poor design and poor maintenance.
- 3.7 The questionnaire has suggested that there is a clear preference to introduce charging to pay for recreation facilities rather than withdraw facilities and maintain free parking. This suggests that if introduction of charges is linked to clear investment in the recreation facilities the majority of users would be quietly supportive.
- 3.8 The questionnaire also shows that whilst a majority of people would use a café, the provision of a café would be controversial and will generate the strongest feelings.

As a result of this questionnaire, and soundings taken from other individuals and organisations a series of development proposals have been prepared and are presented in the document titled – The Way Forward?

Kevin G Stannard
Forestry Commission
November 2008

Appendix One: The Questionnaire

Bourne Woods Survey - Summer 2008

Q1	How often do you visit Bourne Woods?	Daily Once or twice a week Once or twice a month Once or twice a year Less often This is my 1st visit	
Q2	What is the main reason for your visit? Please use this space to specify other	Fresh air & exercise walk the dog family activity wildlife watching attend organised event Other - specify	
Q3	Where have you come from today? (please give name of town or village - or provide post code)		
Q4	How did you arrive today?	On foot By bike On horse-back By car By coach / mini-bus	
Q5	If you arrived by car, coach or mini-bus how did you rate the car park and access road in terms of ease of use and signing? Please use this space for comments	Very good Good Neither good nor bad Improvements needed	
Q6	A toilet block is provided in the car park, have you...	used the toilets today? used in the last year? used more than a year ago? never used the toilets?	
Q7	If you have used the toilets today or in the last year would rate them as..... Please use this space for comments	good - perfectly usable functional poor - unpleasant bad - unuseable	
Q8	Waymarked walks are provided, have you..... followed either of the waymarked walks today? followed either of the waymarked walks in the past year? never used the waymarked walks?		
Q9	If you have used the waymarked walks today or in the past year, how did you find them? Please use this space for comments	easy to follow? well surfaced? litter free? interesting and varied?	
Q10	Sculptures are dotted around the woods, do you think that the Sculptures..... Please use this space for comments	add interest to the wood? are thought provoking? intrude on the natural wood? should be removed? added to with new ones?	
Q11	Have you used the play area today or in the last year?	Yes	

Please use this space for comments		No	
		PLEASE TURN OVER	
Q12	How easy did you find your way around the wood? easy - the wood is well signed not easy - but I did not get lost Please use this space for comments	easy - I know the wood well hard - I got lost	
Q13	Would you appreciate more information signs explaining the woods history, wildlife and / or management operations?	Yes No	
Q14	Have you read the WOODS leaflet in the last year	Yes No	
Q15	If yes - did you find the information....	useful and relevant interesting, but irrelevant uninteresting and irrelevant	
Q16	Have you ever used the map leaflet to navigate round this wood?	Yes No	
Q17	If a community room was provided in the wood, do you know a group that would use it? Please name the group. Please use this space for comments	Yes	
Q18	If a café was provided in the wood - would you use it? Please use this space for comments	Yes No	
Q19	Would you prefer the wood to be free with no waymarked walks, play area or toilets? OR	Yes No	
	Would you prefer to pay a car parking charge to cover the costs of waymarked walks, play area and toilet maintenance?	Yes No	
Q20	Are you interested in volunteering to help maintain Bourne Woods? If yes, please give your name and address for our Community Ranger to contact you later - or otherwise contact her direct at the forest office on 01780 444920	Yes No	
Thank you for completing this survey			
STATISTICAL MONITORING QUESTIONS			
SM1	How many people in your group today were:	Senior citizens Adults Teenagers Children (under 13)	
SM2	How many people in your group today were:	registered disabled	
SM3	How many people in your group today were:	White	
	<i>White British</i> <i>White Irish</i> <i>White Traveller of Irish Heritage</i> <i>Gypsy / Roma</i> <i>Other White Background</i> Mixed <i>White and Black Carribean</i>		
		<i>White and Black African</i> <i>White and Asian</i> <i>Any other Mixed Background</i> Asian or Asian British	

	<i>Indian</i>	
	<i>Pakistani</i>	
	<i>Bangladeshi</i>	
	<i>Any other Asian Background</i>	
	Black or Black British	
	<i>Caribbean</i>	
	<i>African</i>	
	<i>Any other Black background</i>	
Any other ethnic background		

Appendix 2a – Overall Results

Bourne Woods Survey - Summer 2008			241	
			%	
Q1	How often do you visit Bourne Woods?	Daily	34	14.1
		Once or twice a week	63	26.1
		Once or twice a month	73	30.3
		Once or twice a year	45	18.7
		Less often	8	3.3
		This is my 1st visit	18	7.5
Q2	What is the main reason for your visit? Please use this space to specify other	Fresh air & exercise	155	64.3
		walk the dog	92	38.2
		family activity	57	23.7
		wildlife watching	57	23.7
		attend organised event	28	11.6
		Other - specify	15	6.2
Q3	Where have you come from today? (please give name of town or village - or provide post code)			
Q4	How did you arrive today?	On foot	52	21.6
		By bike	7	2.4
		On horse-back	0	0.0
		By car	179	74.3
		By coach / mini-bus	3	0.8
Q5	If you arrived by car, coach or mini-bus how did you rate the car park and access road in terms of ease of use and signing? Please use this space for comments	Very good	52	28.9
		Good	75	41.7
		Neither good nor bad	15	8.3
		Improvements needed	38	21.1
Q6	A toilet block is provided in the car park, have you...	used the toilets today?	58	23.7
		used in the last year?	82	33.5
		used more than a year ago?	24	9.8
		never used the toilets?	81	33.1
Q7	If you have used the toilets today or in the last year would rate them as..... Please use this space for comments	good - perfectly usable	32	20.6
		functional	70	45.2
		poor - unpleasant	48	31.0
		bad - unuseable	5	3.2
Q8	Waymarked walks are provided, have you.....			
	followed either of the waymarked walks today?		64	26.4
	followed either of the waymarked walks in the past year?		104	43.0
	never used the waymarked walks?		74	30.6
Q9	If you have used the waymarked walks today or in the past year, how did you find them? Please use this space for comments	easy to follow?	119	40.3
		well surfaced?	52	17.6
		litter free?	56	19.0
		interesting and varied?	68	23.1
Q10	Sculptures are dotted around the woods, do you think that the Sculptures..... Please use this space for comments	add interest to the wood?	180	56.3
		are thought provoking?	42	13.1
		intrude on the natural wood?	14	10.0

		should be removed?	5	1.6
		added to with new ones?	79	24.5
Q1 1	Have you used the play area today or in the last year?	Yes	58	24.4
	Please use this space for comments	No	180	75.6
		PLEASE TURN OVER		
Q1 2	How easy did you find your way around the wood?	easy - I know the wood well	150	60.5
		easy - the wood is well signed	67	27.0
		not easy - but I did not get lost	24	9.7
	Please use this space for comments	hard - I got lost	7	2.8
Q1 3	Would you appreciate more information signs explaining the woods history, wildlife and / or management operations?	Yes	184	81.8
		No	41	18.2
Q1 4	Have you read the WOODS leaflet in the last year	Yes	133	54.5
		No	111	45.5
Q1 5	If yes - did you find the information....	useful and relevant	99	74.4
		interesting, but irrelevant	19	14.3
		uninteresting and irrelevant	2	1.5
Q1 6	Have you ever used the map leaflet to navigate round this wood?	Yes	51	22.2
		No	179	77.8
Q1 7	If a community room was provided in the wood, do you know a group that would use it? Please name the group.	Yes	37	
	Please use this space for comments			
Q1 8	If a café was provided in the wood - would you use it?	Yes	139	62.3
	Please use this space for comments	No	84	37.7
Q1 9	Would you prefer the wood to be free with no waymarked walks, play area or toilets? OR	Yes	51	34.0
		No	99	66.0
	Would you prefer to pay a car parking charge to cover the costs of waymarked walks, play area and toilet maintenance?	Yes	122	59.8
		No	82	40.2
Q2 0	Are you interested in volunteering to help maintain Bourne Woods?	Yes	33	17.9
	If yes, please give your name and address for our Community Ranger to contact you later - or otherwise contact her direct at the forest office on 01780 444920	No	151	82.1
	Thank you for completing this survey			
	STATISTICAL MONITORING QUESTIONS			
SM 1	How many people in your group today were:	Senior citizens	126	24.0

		Adults	269	51.2
		Teenagers	26	5.0
		Children (under 13)	104	19.8
SM 2	How many people in your group today were:	registered disabled	45	8.6
SM 3	How many people in your group today were:	White		
		<i>White British</i>	485	95.5
		<i>White Irish</i>	9	1.8
		<i>White Traveller of Irish Heritage</i>	0	
		<i>Gypsy / Roma</i>	0	
		<i>Other White Background</i>	6	1.2
		Mixed	2	0.4
		<i>White and Black Carribean</i>	1	0.2
		<i>White and Black African</i>	2	0.4
		<i>White and Asian</i>	0	
		<i>Any other Mixed Background</i>	0	
		Asian or Asian British		
		<i>Indian</i>	0	
		<i>Pakistani</i>	0	
		<i>Bangladeshi</i>	0	
		<i>Any other Asian Background</i>	0	
		Black or Black British		
		<i>Caribbean</i>	0	
		<i>African</i>	0	
		<i>Any other Black background</i>	3	0.6
		Any other ethnic background	0	

Appendix 2b Results for Daily Visitors

Bourne Woods Survey - Summer 2008			
Q1	How often do you visit Bourne Woods?	Daily	34 14.1
		Once or twice a week	
		Once or twice a month	
		Once or twice a year	
		Less often	
		This is my 1st visit	
Q2	What is the main reason for your visit? Please use this space to specify other	Fresh air & exercise	21 61.8
		walk the dog	27 79.4
		family activity	3 8.8
		wildlife watching	10 29.4
		attend organised event	3 8.8
		Other - specify	1 2.9
Q3	Where have you come from today? (please give name of town or village - or provide post code)		
Q4	How did you arrive today?	On foot	19 55.9
		By bike	0.0
		On horse-back	0.0
		By car	15 44.1
		By coach / mini-bus	0.0
Q5	If you arrived by car, coach or mini-bus how did you rate the car park and access road in terms of ease of use and signing? Please use this space for comments	Very good	5 33.3
		Good	7 46.7
		Neither good nor bad	0.0
		Improvements needed	3 20.0
Q6	A toilet block is provided in the car park, have you...	used the toilets today?	2 5.7
		used in the last year?	18 51.4
		used more than a year ago?	2 5.7
		never used the toilets?	13 37.1
Q7	If you have used the toilets today or in the last year would rate them as..... Please use this space for comments	good - perfectly usable	6 28.6
		functional	13 61.9
		poor - unpleasent	2 9.5
		bad - unuseable	0.0
Q8	Waymarked walks are provided, have you.....		
	followed either of the waymarked walks today?		7 21.2
	followed either of the waymarked walks in the past year?		17 51.5
	never used the waymarked walks?		9 27.3
Q9	If you have used the waymarked walks today or in the past year, how did you find them? Please use this space for comments	easy to follow?	17 41.5
		well surfaced?	6 14.6
		litter free?	7 17.1
		interesting and varied?	11 26.8
Q10	Sculptures are dotted around the woods, do you think that the	add interest to the wood?	23 46.0

	Sculptures.....	are thought provoking?	7	14.0
	Please use this space for comments	intrude on the natural wood?	4	14.8
		should be removed?	1	2.0
		added to with new ones?	15	31.3
Q1	Have you used the play area today or in the last year?	Yes	4	12.5
1	Please use this space for comments	No	28	87.5
		PLEASE TURN OVER		
Q1	How easy did you find your way around the wood?	easy - I know the wood well	28	57.1
2		easy - the wood is well signed	19	38.8
		not easy - but I did not get lost	2	4.1
	Please use this space for comments	hard - I got lost		0.0
Q1	Would you appreciate more information signs explaining the	Yes	27	87.1
3	woods history, wildlife and / or management operations?	No	4	12.9
Q1	Have you read the WOODS leaflet in the last year	Yes	28	82.4
4		No	6	17.6
Q1	If yes - did you find the information....	useful and relevant	20	71.4
5		interesting, but irrelevant	7	25.0
		uninteresting and irrelevant		0.0
Q1	Have you ever used the map leaflet to navigate round this	Yes	8	23.5
6	wood?	No	26	76.5
Q1	If a community room was provided in the wood, do you know a	Yes	7	
7	group that would use it? Please name the group.			
	Please use this space for comments			
Q1	If a café was provided in the wood - would you use it?	Yes	11	33.3
8	Please use this space for comments	No	22	66.7
Q1	Would you prefer the wood to be free with no waymarked	Yes	8	38.1
9	walks,	No	13	61.9
	play area or toilets? OR	Yes	11	40.7
	Would you prefer to pay a car parking charge to cover the	No	16	59.3
	costs			
	of waymarked walks, play area and toilet maintenance?			
Q2	Are you interested in volunteering to help maintain Bourne	Yes	6	24.0
0	Woods?	No	19	76.0
	If yes, please give your name and address for our Community			
	Ranger to contact you later - or otherwise contact her direct at			
	the forest office on 01780 444920			

Thank you for completing this survey			
STATISTICAL MONITORING QUESTIONS			
SM 1	How many people in your group today were:	Senior citizens	13 27.7
		Adults	28 59.6
		Teenagers	1 2.1
		Children (under 13)	5 10.6
SM 2	How many people in your group today were:	registered disabled	5
SM 3	How many people in your group today were:	White	
		<i>White British</i>	44
		<i>White Irish</i>	
		<i>White Traveller of Irish Heritage</i>	
		<i>Gypsy / Roma</i>	
		<i>Other White Background</i>	
		Mixed	
		<i>White and Black Carribean</i>	
		<i>White and Black African</i>	
		<i>White and Asian</i>	
		<i>Any other Mixed Background</i>	
		Asian or Asian British	
		<i>Indian</i>	
		<i>Pakistani</i>	
		<i>Bangladeshi</i>	
		<i>Any other Asian Background</i>	
		Black or Black British	
		<i>Caribbean</i>	
		<i>African</i>	
		<i>Any other Black background</i>	
		Any other ethnic background	

Appendix 2c – Weekly Visitors

Bourne Woods Survey - Summer 2008			
Q1	How often do you visit Bourne Woods?	Daily	
		Once or twice a week	63 26.1
		Once or twice a month	
		Once or twice a year	
		Less often	
		This is my 1st visit	
Q2	What is the main reason for your visit? Please use this space to specify other	Fresh air & exercise	44 69.8
		walk the dog	27 42.9
		family activity	9 14.3
		wildlife watching	16 25.4
		attend organised event	6 9.5
		Other - specify	3 4.8
Q3	Where have you come from today? (please give name of town or village - or provide post code)		
Q4	How did you arrive today?	On foot	22 35.5
		By bike	2 2.8
		On horse-back	0.0
		By car	38 61.3
		By coach / mini-bus	0.0
Q5	If you arrived by car, coach or mini-bus how did you rate the car park and access road in terms of ease of use and signing? Please use this space for comments	Very good	9 23.7
		Good	16 42.1
		Neither good nor bad	6 15.8
		Improvements needed	7 18.4
Q6	A toilet block is provided in the car park, have you...	used the toilets today?	12 18.8
		used in the last year?	25 39.1
		used more than a year ago?	8 12.5
		never used the toilets?	19 29.7
Q7	If you have used the toilets today or in the last year would rate them as..... Please use this space for comments	good - perfectly usable	12 29.3
		functional	18 43.9
		poor - unpleasant	10 24.4
		bad - unuseable	1 2.4
Q8	Waymarked walks are provided, have you.....		
	followed either of the waymarked walks today?		16 25.4
	followed either of the waymarked walks in the past year?		28 44.4
	never used the waymarked walks?		19 30.2
Q9	If you have used the waymarked walks today or in the past year, how did you find them? Please use this space for comments	easy to follow?	32 37.6
		well surfaced?	14 16.5
		litter free?	17 20.0
		interesting and varied?	22 25.9
Q10	Sculptures are dotted around the woods, do you think that the	add interest to the wood?	46 51.7

		Children (under 13)	23	
SM2	How many people in your group today were:	registered disabled	6	
SM3	How many people in your group today were:	White		
		<i>White British</i>	96	
		<i>White Irish</i>	2	
		<i>White Traveller of Irish Heritage</i>		
		<i>Gypsy / Roma</i>		
		<i>Other White Background</i>	1	
		Mixed	2	
		<i>White and Black Caribbean</i>		
		<i>White and Black African</i>		
		<i>White and Asian</i>		
		<i>Any other Mixed Background</i>		
		Asian or Asian British		
		<i>Indian</i>		
		<i>Pakistani</i>		
		<i>Bangladeshi</i>		
		<i>Any other Asian Background</i>		
		Black or Black British		
		<i>Caribbean</i>		
		<i>African</i>		
		<i>Any other Black background</i>		
		Any other ethnic background		

Appendix 2d – Monthly Visitors

Bourne Woods Survey - Summer 2008			
Q1	How often do you visit Bourne Woods?	Daily	
		Once or twice a week	
		Once or twice a month	73 30.3
		Once or twice a year	
		Less often	
		This is my 1st visit	
Q2	What is the main reason for your visit?	Fresh air & exercise	50 68.5
	Please use this space to specify other	walk the dog	24 32.9
		family activity	18 24.7
		wildlife watching	21 28.8
		attend organised event	12 16.4
		Other - specify	2 2.7
Q3	Where have you come from today? (please give name of town or village - or provide post code)		
Q4	How did you arrive today?	On foot	8 10.8
		By bike	4 4.4
		On horse-back	0.0
		By car	59 79.7
		By coach / mini-bus	3 2.4
Q5	If you arrived by car, coach or mini-bus how did you rate the car park and access road in terms of ease of use and signing?	Very good	17 27.9
	Please use this space for comments	Good	21 34.4
		Neither good nor bad	5 8.2
		Improvements needed	18 29.5
Q6	A toilet block is provided in the car park, have you...	used the toilets today?	12 16.7
		used in the last year?	26 36.1
		used more than a year ago?	9 12.5
		never used the toilets?	25 34.7
Q7	If you have used the toilets today or in the last year would rate them as.....	good - perfectly usable	8 17.4
	Please use this space for comments	functional	20 43.5
	W	poor - unpleasent	16 34.8
		bad - unuseable	2 4.3
Q8	Waymarked walks are provided, have you.....		
	followed either of the waymarked walks today?		17 23.3
	followed either of the waymarked walks in the past year?		41 56.2
	never used the waymarked walks?		15 20.5
Q9	If you have used the waymarked walks today or in the past year, how did you find them?	easy to follow?	43 47.8
	Please use this space for comments	well surfaced?	16 17.8
		litter free?	14 15.6
		interesting and varied?	17 18.9
Q10	Sculptures are dotted around the woods, do you think that the	add interest to the wood?	61 62.9

		Children (under 13)	31	
SM 2	How many people in your group today were:	registered disabled	30	
SM 3	How many people in your group today were:	White		
		<i>White British</i>	175	
		<i>White Irish</i>		
		<i>White Traveller of Irish Heritage</i>		
		<i>Gypsy / Roma</i>		
		<i>Other White Background</i>		
		Mixed		
		<i>White and Black Carribean</i>	1	
		<i>White and Black African</i>	2	
		<i>White and Asian</i>		
		<i>Any other Mixed Background</i>		
		Asian or Asian British		
		<i>Indian</i>		
		<i>Pakistani</i>		
		<i>Bangladeshi</i>		
		<i>Any other Asian Background</i>		
		Black or Black British		
		<i>Caribbean</i>		
		<i>African</i>		
		<i>Any other Black background</i>	3	
		Any other ethnic background		

Appendix 2e – Annual and less Frequent Visitors

Bourne Woods Survey - Summer 2008			
Q1	How often do you visit Bourne Woods?	Daily	
		Once or twice a week	
		Once or twice a month	
		Once or twice a year	45 18.7
		Less often	8 3.3
		This is my 1st visit	
Q2	What is the main reason for your visit?	Fresh air & exercise	32 60.4
	Please use this space to specify other	walk the dog	9 17.0
		family activity	21 39.6
		wildlife watching	10 18.9
		attend organised event	7 13.2
		Other - specify	5 9.4
Q3	Where have you come from today? (please give name of town or village - or provide post code)		
Q4	How did you arrive today?	On foot	3 5.7
		By bike	1 1.9
		On horse-back	0.0
		By car	49 92.5
		By coach / mini-bus	0.0
Q5	If you arrived by car, coach or mini-bus how did you rate the car park and access road in terms of ease of use and signing?	Very good	12 25.0
	Please use this space for comments	Good	23 47.9
		Neither good nor bad	4 8.3
		Improvements needed	9 18.8
Q6	A toilet block is provided in the car park, have you...	used the toilets today?	22 39.3
		used in the last year?	13 23.2
		used more than a year ago?	5 8.9
		never used the toilets?	16 28.6
Q7	If you have used the toilets today or in the last year would rate them as.....	good - perfectly usable	3 8.1
	Please use this space for comments	functional	17 45.9
		poor - unpleasant	15 40.5
		bad - unuseable	2 5.4
Q8	Waymarked walks are provided, have you.....		
	followed either of the waymarked walks today?		14 25.5
	followed either of the waymarked walks in the past year?		18 32.7
	never used the waymarked walks?		23 41.8
Q9	If you have used the waymarked walks today or in the past year, how did you find them?	easy to follow?	20 36.4
	Please use this space for comments	well surfaced?	11 20.0
		litter free?	11 20.0
		interesting and varied?	13 23.6
Q10	Sculptures are dotted around the woods, do you think that the Sculptures.....	add interest to the wood?	38 56.7
		are thought provoking?	10 14.9

SM3	How many people in your group today were:	White		
	<i>White British</i>		126	
	<i>White Irish</i>		5	
	<i>White Traveller of Irish Heritage</i>			
	<i>Gypsy / Roma</i>			
	<i>Other White Background</i>		3	
	Mixed			
	<i>White and Black Caribbean</i>			
	<i>White and Black African</i>			
	<i>White and Asian</i>			
	<i>Any other Mixed Background</i>			
	Asian or Asian British			
	<i>Indian</i>			
	<i>Pakistani</i>			
	<i>Bangladeshi</i>			
	<i>Any other Asian Background</i>			
	Black or Black British			
	<i>Caribbean</i>			
	<i>African</i>			
	<i>Any other Black background</i>			
	Any other ethnic background			

Appendix 2f – First Time Visitors

Bourne Woods Survey - Summer 2008			
			%
Q1	How often do you visit Bourne Woods?	Daily	
		Once or twice a week	
		Once or twice a month	
		Once or twice a year	
		Less often	
	This is my 1st visit	18	7.5
Q2	What is the main reason for your visit? Please use this space to specify other	Fresh air & exercise	8 44.4
		walk the dog	5 27.8
		family activity	6 33.3
		wildlife watching	0.0
		attend organised event	0.0
		Other - specify	4 22.2
Q3	Where have you come from today? (please give name of town or village - or provide post code)		
Q4	How did you arrive today?	On foot	0.0
		By bike	0.0
		On horse-back	0.0
		By car	18 100.0
		By coach / mini-bus	0.0
Q5	If you arrived by car, coach or mini-bus how did you rate the car park and access road in terms of ease of use and signing? Please use this space for comments	Very good	9 50.0
		Good	8 44.4
		Neither good nor bad	0.0
		Improvements needed	1 5.6
Q6	A toilet block is provided in the car park, have you...	used the toilets today?	10 55.6
		used in the last year?	0.0
		used more than a year ago?	0.0
		never used the toilets?	8 44.4
Q7	If you have used the toilets today or in the last year would rate them as..... Please use this space for comments	good - perfectly usable	3 30.0
		functional	2 20.0
		poor - unpleasant	5 50.0
		bad - unuseable	0.0
Q8	Waymarked walks are provided, have you.....	followed either of the waymarked walks today?	10 55.6
		followed either of the waymarked walks in the past year?	0.0
		never used the waymarked walks?	8 44.4
Q9	If you have used the waymarked walks today or in the past year, how did you find them? Please use this space for comments	easy to follow?	7 29.2
		well surfaced?	5 20.8
		litter free?	7 29.2
		interesting and varied?	5 20.8
Q10	Sculptures are dotted around the woods, do you think that the	add interest to the wood?	12 70.6

	Sculptures.....	are thought provoking?	1	5.9
	Please use this space for comments	intrude on the natural wood?	1	20.0
		should be removed?		0.0
		added to with new ones?	3	14.3
Q11	Have you used the play area today or in the last year?	Yes	1	5.6
	Please use this space for comments	No	17	94.4
		PLEASE TURN OVER		
Q12	How easy did you find your way around the wood?	easy - I know the wood well	2	13.3
		easy - the wood is well signed	9	60.0
		not easy - but I did not get lost	3	20.0
	Please use this space for comments	hard - I got lost	1	6.7
Q13	Would you appreciate more information signs explaining the woods history, wildlife and / or management operations?	Yes	11	78.6
		No	3	21.4
Q14	Have you read the WOODS leaflet in the last year	Yes	1	5.9
		No	16	94.1
Q15	If yes - did you find the information....	useful and relevant	1	100.0
		interesting, but irrelevant	0	0.0
		uninteresting and irrelevant	0	0.0
Q16	Have you ever used the map leaflet to navigate round this wood?	Yes	1	6.3
		No	15	93.8
Q17	If a community room was provided in the wood, do you know a group that would use it? Please name the group.	Yes	1	
	Please use this space for comments			
Q18	If a café was provided in the wood - would you use it?	Yes	14	93.3
	Please use this space for comments	No	1	6.7
Q19	Would you prefer the wood to be free with no waymarked walks, play area or toilets? OR	Yes	4	28.6
		No	10	71.4
	Would you prefer to pay a car parking charge to cover the costs of waymarked walks, play area and toilet maintenance?	Yes	7	50.0
		No	7	50.0
Q20	Are you interested in volunteering to help maintain Bourne Woods?	Yes	1	7.1
	If yes, please give your name and address for our Community Ranger to contact you later - or otherwise contact her direct at the forest office on 01780 444920	No	13	92.9
	Thank you for completing this survey			
	STATISTICAL MONITORING QUESTIONS			
SM1	How many people in your group today were:	Senior citizens	6	

		Adults	26	
		Teenagers	8	
		Children (under 13)	5	
SM2	How many people in your group today were:	registered disabled	3	
SM3	How many people in your group today were:	White		
		<i>White British</i>	44	
		<i>White Irish</i>	2	
		<i>White Traveller of Irish Heritage</i>		
		<i>Gypsy / Roma</i>		
		<i>Other White Background</i>	2	
		Mixed		
		<i>White and Black Caribbean</i>		
		<i>White and Black African</i>		
		<i>White and Asian</i>		
		<i>Any other Mixed Background</i>		
		Asian or Asian British		
		<i>Indian</i>		
		<i>Pakistani</i>		
		<i>Bangladeshi</i>		
		<i>Any other Asian Background</i>		
		Black or Black British		
		<i>Caribbean</i>		
		<i>African</i>		
		<i>Any other Black background</i>		
		Any other ethnic background		