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SUMMARY

The research within this thesis was initiated whilst the researcher was enrolled as a part-time doctoral student at Oxford Brookes University, and as such, two of the early studies (York, 1995 and Bath, 1996) were completed during this time. The studies are included as part of the natural progression both in terms of the thesis and the transfer to full-time registration at the University of Surrey.

At the outset, the purpose of this research was to establish a framework that, once in place, could identify and monitor changes in residents' opinions of tourism development in the cities of York, Bath and Chester in England. As well as establishing a framework, it was also anticipated that comparative analysis might well establish a basis for theory development regarding the social impacts of tourism on residents of historic cities in England. As the research developed, it became increasingly apparent that although the studies were providing an interesting benchmark of the social impacts of tourism in historic cities, they said little about residents' opinions regarding the planning actions taken by local government to manage tourism development.

The three social impact studies proved interesting in that similarities and differences were found within and between the resident populations. Their most important contribution however is that they:

1) provided a response to the established need for more extensive longitudinal and comparative urban tourism research;
2) documented residents' opinions of tourism in three historic cities;
3) established a reliable sampling methodology for use in urban environments;
4) contributed a most important basis for the subsequent redirection of this doctoral research in that they led to the recognition that the social impacts of tourism should be investigated at the planning action level and not purely on a general level.

In recognition of this observation, this research sought to develop a second framework that would enable residents to evaluate the specific tourism planning objectives and actions undertaken by local government. In order to achieve this, three further research phases were designed. The objectives of these phases were:

1) to establish the strategic tourism planning objectives and actions of local government in England (research phase II);
2) to develop a conceptual model which established a valid association of distinct planning actions with specific objectives (research phase II);

3) to investigate the commitment of local government to conducting resident tourism surveys (research phase III);

4) to utilise the information attained in the earlier research phases to develop a new methodology which is operationalised through the development of a computer model (research phase IV);

5) to involve the tourism officers in historic cities in the evaluation of this new methodology in terms of its potential to capture residents' opinions and improve the potential for more meaningful public consultation in the tourism environment (research phase IV).

These later research phases are briefly summarised. The research design of phase two contained three distinct stages. Stage one was specifically designed to investigate the strategic objectives of local government councils in the United Kingdom. In May 1997, letters were sent to all local government councils in the United Kingdom requesting them to provide copies of their most recent tourism development strategies/action plans. It was decided to concentrate on the tourism strategies of councils in England due to the low response rate (n = 5/75; 6.6%) from Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. Having analysed the usable returns from councils in England, (n = 58/365; 15.5%), fourteen distinct strategic tourism objectives were identified.

In stage two of this research phase, the sixty participating tourism officers were sent a one page facsimile questionnaire. In response, they were asked to list any actions that they had employed or planned to employ to increase, maintain, or decrease tourism in their locality. From the twenty-two respondents, sixty different policy actions were noted. These actions were then categorised as belonging under one of the fourteen strategic tourism objectives established in stage one. This enabled the construction of a two-tiered objectives/actions model. In order to verify the content validity of the model it was sent, in the form of a briefing document, to those responsible for tourism in the cities of Canterbury, York and Chester. Unfortunately, the city of Bath indicated that they were too busy to be involved in the research. The historic city of Canterbury was approached because of the socio-economic, demographic and historical similarities it bears with the cities of York, Bath and Chester. Canterbury accepted the invitation to be involved, and therefore all references to the cities beyond this point includes them in the place of Bath.
During stage three of this research phase, a series of meetings were held with the tourism officers. The ultimate aim was to agree the placement of each individual action with an appropriate strategic objective. Ultimately, representatives of the City of Chester made the final amendments, as this was the city in which the final survey was to be conducted, and on which the computer model was to be based.

On the basis of the analysis of data from the previous research phases, an updated and city specific questionnaire was developed for deployment in the city of Chester. Each of the research phases and stages were designed in order to develop a research instrument which would enable a tourism officer to ascertain the opinions of the residents of a city and integrate them with the strategies and actions for tourism in that city. The questionnaire was unfortunately delayed which meant that the structure of the process was in place, but dummy data had to entered into the system in order to demonstrate the functions of the model in phase four of the research.

Research phase three sought to investigate the commitment of local government to conducting resident tourism opinion surveys. Each of the fifty-five tourism officers who had provided tourism plans for analysis in stage one were contacted and interviewed using a telephone interview methodology. The response rate was 80% (n=44). Results indicated that a large proportion of local government councils do not conduct resident tourism opinion surveys. Responses to further questions confirmed that local authorities may well be planning for tourism with incomplete knowledge regarding the social impacts of their actions, whatever their stated intentions. The monitoring and evaluation of the social impacts of tourism policies were not found to be a priority of local government councils.

Based on the earlier research phases, phase four involved the development of a computer-based planning model to capture the objectives and actions of tourism officers and integrate resident evaluation based on their opinions about potential or actual policy actions. During this phase, a fourth level was added to the model at the request of Chester City Council. Whilst they agreed with the fourteen strategic objectives for tourism, they utilise six key theme areas. This involved placing the relevant strategies within the most appropriate themed area.

The functionality of the computer model was tested in a series of trials with the tourism officers in the cities of Chester, York and Canterbury. Results from their evaluation of the computer model suggested that...
“The modelling of a computer-based objectives, actions, opinions model does offer the potential to incorporate/integrate, effectively, resident opinion with the objectives and actions of tourism officers thereby improving the consultation process for planning tourism in the historic city of Chester, England?”
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CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Over the past thirty years, the social impacts of tourism on host communities have received increasing interest from the academic community. They have been investigated using a variety of conceptual frameworks such as Social Exchange Theory (Ap, 1992a, 1992b; Perdue et al., 1990) the Destination Life Cycle (Butler, 1980), Molotch’s Growth Machine Theory (Madrigal, 1995), and the Irridex, an index of the varying degrees of irritation which residents perceive with increased levels of tourism (Doxey, 1975). In addition, their measurement and interpretation has come to rely on increasingly sophisticated psychometric techniques (Lindberg & Johnson, 1997).

Each approach has been employed to address such questions as "What are the perceived impacts of tourism by residents?" "Is it possible to predict a person’s opinions according to their socio-economic or demographic profile?" "Under what circumstances will the reported social impacts of tourism change?" And, "What happens if they are ignored?" Other than the rather infrequent reference to the management implications, or the adverse marketing effects associated with resident objections to the tourist industry, there appears to be no particularly strong rationale as to why the social impacts of tourism should be viewed seriously. There is no doubt that the social impacts of tourism are an important concern, the point being made is that the concerns need to be translated into action. Further to this, the tourism literature has documented that urban tourism, within which exists a particular need for social impacts research (Snaith & Haley, 1999), has been broadly neglected as an area of research (Ashworth, 1989) and consequently remains devoid of a developed understanding or research base (Law, 1993; Page, 1995). One of the justifications for this is that the uniqueness of each individual city makes reliable comparisons difficult. The outcome appears, therefore, that a large proportion of the literature centres on individual case studies.

This research sets its propositions from within a philosophical framework, whereby the social impacts of tourism perceived by a resident community are important within the context of the democratic process, within which, each individual is designated an equal right to be involved in the planning and development of their community. Implicit in democratic constitutions is the notion of ‘Rights’ and within the context of rights there exists the concepts of ‘Liberty’, ‘Equality’ and ‘Fraternity’. It is widely understood and accepted that if a government employs these concepts, then each individual has the equal right, as a member of a
greater collectivity, or 'Community' to have their opinions heard (Locke, 1988). This research therefore asks the questions "What are the impacts of tourism on a host community?" "How committed is local government to listening to the opinions of its resident citizens regarding the impacts of tourism?" "How representative are the opinions it hears?" "Is there a more effective method for improving public consultation in the tourism planning process than presently exists?"

The investigation of the perceived social impacts of tourism has, in the past, tended towards the general. Surveys of resident communities have sought to assess where the major impacts are felt, but appear to have missed the opportunity to utilise the information gained from social impact surveys to involve residents in the planning process. The opinions that are related back are in response to general questions such as "Does tourism affect the quality of your life?" "Does tourism have a negative effect on the environment?" "Has tourism's presence reduced your outdoor recreation opportunities?" The research contained within this thesis regards these questions as being too general and that if the principles inherent in the notion of democracy are to be taken seriously, then local government should seek to achieve two objectives. First, develop an effective method of integrating residents' perceptions and opinions of tourism's impacts into the planning consultation process, and second, make sure that this method enables the residents truly to evaluate proposed policies for tourism rather than the general and more peripheral issues. This would have the twofold effect of assuring that the opinions heard reflect, more closely, the feelings of the community, and second, that local government establishes greater accountability for the actions it takes on behalf of its communities.

This study proposes the integration of local government's strategic tourism objectives, the actions taken in pursuance of these, and residents' opinions of the proposed actions and strategies. Further, it seeks to capture all three levels in a computer-based model that provides city planners with a method for improving public consultation in the tourism planning process.

The next section lists the research objectives and associated research questions, and provides an outline of the design underpinning the four main research stages, offering a brief comment on the background, methodology and results of each phase.

1.1 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND QUESTIONS

The final research objective is to develop a computer-based tourism planning model which integrates representative resident opinions as evaluations of
the proposed planning actions of those responsible for tourism in the historic city of Chester in England. In order to arrive at this objective, several contributory objectives must be achieved. Their attainment is assisted through asking a series of research questions.

1.1.1 RESEARCH OBJECTIVE 1 ( PHASE I )

The primary objective of this phase of the research is to conduct comparative social impact studies to establish whether or not the residents of York, Bath and Chester have common perceptions with regards to the impacts of tourism in their respective cities?

Research question 1:
"Are there any underlying dimensions regarding residents' opinions of tourism development in the three city samples?"

Research question 2:
"Do the residents of the cities of York, Bath and Chester have the same level of perceptions regarding the majority of impacts which tourism brings to their cities?"

Research question 3:
"Is it possible to predict residents' opinions of tourism development according to their socio-economic and demographic characteristics, economic reliance and negative and positive perceptions of tourism?"

Research phase I documented the general tourism impacts as perceived by the residents of three historic cities. Having done this it was stated that a more meaningful approach to tourism impact research would be achieved if residents were afforded the opportunity to evaluate the planning objectives/actions of local government.

1.1.2 RESEARCH OBJECTIVE 2 ( PHASE II )

Local government has a legitimate interest in the wellbeing of their communities, including the ways in which they are affected by tourism. With this in mind they have established planning and development mechanisms to achieve community objectives. This includes mechanisms and objectives for tourism.
Research objective two therefore seeks to identify the strategic tourism objectives of local government in England.

Research question 4:

"Are there common strategic tourism objectives which local government throughout England seeks to achieve?"

1.1.3 RESEARCH OBJECTIVE 3

In order to achieve strategic objectives for tourism, local government takes a variety of planning actions. The next stage of the research therefore sought to identify those planning actions which local government uses in order to achieve their stated objectives.

1.1.4 RESEARCH OBJECTIVE 4

The ultimate aim of research objective four was to develop a research instrument that would enable the residents of Chester to evaluate and comment on the planning actions which those responsible for tourism were preparing to employ in pursuit of tourism development objectives. This objective completes the construction of the objectives, actions and opinions model. Unfortunately, at this stage, the historic city of Bath opted not to be involved in the research and therefore the city of Canterbury was approached to act as an alternative consultative voice in the development of the model. Interviews were held with the tourism officers of the historic cities of York, Canterbury and Chester in order to establish the validity and utility of the model.

1.1.5 RESEARCH OBJECTIVE 5 (PHASE III)

The information acquired in research phase II contributes to the development of the conceptual and applied models in research phase IV. Before this is attempted, this interim research phase supports the development of the model. It achieves this by acknowledging the need to understand the commitment of local government in using resident tourism surveys. Without this understanding, the success of this research approach may be undermined through misunderstanding the real world practicalities facing local government tourism officers. The information attained in this phase enables the construction of a methodology that appreciates present practice and is able to accommodate the strengths and weaknesses that are apparent.
Research question 5:
“How committed are local government councils in England towards using resident tourism surveys for collecting residents’ opinions regarding tourism’s impact?”

1.1.6 RESEARCH OBJECTIVE 6
Equally important as the commitment to using resident tourism surveys, are the methodologies utilised to achieve their deployment, collection and analysis. Research objective six seeks therefore to investigate the methodologies used by local government when consulting resident opinion through resident tourism surveys.

Research question 6:
“Do local government councils in England employ reliable, consistent and comparable research methods that enable them to acquire representative resident tourism opinions from their surveys?”

1.1.7 RESEARCH OBJECTIVE 7 (PHASE IV)
The conceptual model established as a result of the earlier research phases becomes an applied model during research phase IV. In this phase, a computer model is developed and evaluated. This computer model captures and integrates all of the information in such a way that it enables those responsible for tourism to involve representative resident opinion in the tourism planning process through a more effective public consultation mechanism.

Research question 7:
“Does the modelling of a computer-based objectives, actions, opinions model offer the potential to incorporate/integrate, effectively, resident opinion with the objectives and actions of tourism officers in order to improve the consultation process for planning tourism in the historic city of Chester, England?”

1.2 STRUCTURE OF STUDY
The structure of this thesis is somewhat non-traditional. There are four distinctly separate and yet related research phases and as such, the research design and its reporting are determined by the requirements of the research emphasis rather than wholly according to traditional methodological debates. Each of the research phases has specific research objectives that are pursued and research
questions, the answers to which are sought. In order to achieve these research objectives, certain methodological choices had to be made regarding the strategies, methods and techniques employed. Robson (1993) supports this approach by pointing out that methodological approaches should be appropriate to the questions that require answering. This view is supported by Denzin and Lincoln (1994) who stated their opinion that choice of research practice should be dependent on the questions asked, questions which themselves depend on their context.

In addition to introductory Chapter one and the concluding Chapter seven, this thesis contains four research phases, within which there exist five chapters. Each of them is treated separately, the majority of which contain a literature review, methodology, results, findings and discussion. Within the discussion of each phase, its contribution to the research as a whole is stated. In this way, the four phases are integrated to form a whole in terms of the overall research design and purpose of the study. In order to assist in the navigation through this thesis, each phase begins with a statement of its purpose. These indicate its link to the previous research phase, its key objectives, the research objectives and questions contained within it, and its contribution to the thesis as a whole. Additionally, Figure 1 provides a model which illustrates the structure, positioning and content of each of the four phases.

The Introduction contains Chapter one, within which a clear and concise description of the research process is established. Chapter one contains:

1) a summary of the entire research process including brief findings;
2) an introduction to the context within which the research is developed;
3) a statement of the research objectives and questions;
4) an outline of the structure of the thesis.

Phase I is entitled "The Social Impacts of Tourism" and contains Chapter two. This chapter contains a review and critique of the literature concerning social impact assessment and residents' perceptions of tourism's impacts, provides an outline of the methodological approach used to collect data in the three cities. Having done this, the results and conclusions of the three comparative studies are reported.

Phase II is entitled "Planning Tourism in England" and contains Chapters three and four. Phase I of the research highlighted the need for future research to attain a greater degree of contextualisation in terms of the nature of the destinations under investigation. In response to this, a primary objective of Chapters three and four is to construct a picture of the historic cities of York, Bath, Canterbury and Chester in terms of their historical socio-economic development. Chapter three is literature based and develops a general conceptual understanding of the emergence
of governance. Within this it is recognised that people living in communities appreciate the need for equality, liberty, fraternity and freedom. Planning is then introduced as the response to the daily issues that arose as a result of people living in close proximity to each other within a civil society. Within this context, the emergence of York, Bath, Chester and Canterbury as historic city destinations is discussed.

Building on the foundations of Chapter three, Chapter four concentrates more specifically on planning within 20th Century England. Particular attention is placed on the emergence of tourism planning and as such, the chapter contains a research investigation into the tourism planning objectives and actions of local government in England.

Phase III is entitled "Public Consultation in Tourism Planning" and contains Chapter five. Having noted and accepted, in Chapter four, the close links between the potential of social impact research and the requirement for local government public consultation, Chapter five establishes the contextual basis of public consultation. It does this by defining the concept of public consultation, discussing the theoretical assumptions and theories inherent within the concept of public consultation, including its purpose, and provides a critical review of the methods employed in order to establish and expand local government consultation. It then goes on to highlight problems encountered in its use, conducts a specific review of the public consultation literature in the field of tourism and concludes with a research investigation of the consultative survey methods adopted by English local government to establish residents' opinions of tourism's impact on their community. The chapter comments on the effectiveness of local government approaches to public consultation and calls for a more rigorous and innovative approach.

Phase IV is entitled "Modelling the Social Impacts of Tourism to Facilitate Representative Public Consultation in the Planning of Tourism in England" and contains Chapter six. Within this chapter, an applied response to the recognised need for innovation in public consultation is introduced. It is suggested that an appropriate technique would be the development of a computer-based tourism planning model that captures and integrates local government tourism objectives, actions and the opinions of citizens regarding these actions. In order that the structure and logic behind this approach can be fully understood, it is necessary to explain the nature of the computer system developed for this purpose. A review of the literature is performed, within which databases are defined and their nature and functions outlined. Next, the development of database-management systems is discussed and an explanation of the architecture of one such type of system, namely,
relational databases are established. Having done this, the construction and evaluation of the ComSmart ("Community Smart") model (ver 1.0.0) is introduced and described. Following this description of research phase IV, the final evaluations are presented in order to answer research question seven.

The conclusions of the research are contained within Chapter seven. This chapter includes the final discussion, provides some conclusions, considers the limitations of the study and makes recommendations concerning how to improve the tourism consultation process further.
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RESEARCH PHASE I: STATEMENT OF PURPOSE
"THE SOCIAL IMPACTS OF TOURISM"

CHAPTER TWO

♦ LINKS TO PREVIOUS RESEARCH PHASE

Chapter two represents the first research phase and as such provides the foundation on which the thesis is built. At the outset, the purpose of this research was to establish a framework that, once in place, could identify and monitor changes in residents' opinions of tourism development in the cities of York, Bath and Chester in England. As well as establishing a framework, it was also anticipated that comparative analysis might well establish a basis for theory development regarding the social impacts of tourism on residents of historic cities in England.

♦ KEY OBJECTIVES

• To conduct a state of the art review of the social impacts of tourism literature.

• To introduce a longitudinal and comparative methodological framework to the measurement of the social impacts of tourism.

• To report the findings of three comparative social impact studies within historic cities in England

• To suggest an alternative and yet complementary approach which focuses the resident survey more acutely on planning issues, rather than general impact statements

♦ RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND QUESTIONS

Research objective 1

The primary objective of this phase of the research is to conduct comparative social impact studies to establish whether or not the residents of York,
Bath and Chester have common perceptions with regards to the impacts of tourism in their respective cities?

Research question 1

"Are there any underlying dimensions regarding residents' opinions of tourism development in the three city samples?"

Research question 2

"Do the residents of the cities of York, Bath and Chester have the same level of perceptions regarding the majority of impacts which tourism brings to their cities?"

Research question 3

"Are residents' socio-economic and demographic characteristics good predictors of whether or not they perceive tourism positively or negatively in the three historic cities?"

CONTRIBUTION TO THE THESIS AS A WHOLE

Research phase I documented the general tourism impacts as perceived by the residents of three historic cities. Having done this it stated that a more meaningful approach to tourism impact research would be achieved if residents were afforded the opportunity to evaluate the planning objectives/actions of local government. A methodology to pursue this recommendation is developed through the integration of the research contained in research phases II, III and IV.
2.0 INTRODUCTION

The original purpose of this study was to examine residents' opinions of tourism development in three historic cities in England. In pursuit of this aim, this chapter contains: a review and critique of the literature concerning social impact assessment and residents' perceptions of tourism's impacts; an outline of the methodological approach to the data collection in the three cities; the results of the three comparative studies; the findings and conclusions which emerge from the analysis.

2.1 LITERATURE REVIEW

This part of the chapter is divided into three distinct yet related sections: social impact assessment; a review and critique of the social impacts of tourism literature 1975 - 1991; a state of the art review of the literature from 1992-1998, with specific reference to research conducted on the social impacts of tourism within the urban environment. The division of the literature review is not due to a particular watershed in the development of the social impacts literature, but rather according to the decision of the researcher to break the rather large and varied literature along the lines of his own learning experience. Having studied the social impacts of tourism during the development and writing of an earlier piece of research (Snaith & Haley, 1994), the second section 1992 - 1998 seeks to observe what if any changes had occurred in response to the critique of the early literature.

Within these sections, there are several sub-sections which address the theoretical and methodological considerations surrounding the investigation of residents' perceptions of the impacts of tourism. Reference is made to several conceptual frameworks which researchers have employed in an attempt to consolidate our understanding of the circumstances which can affect the degree to which social impacts occur as a result of tourism development. These include the notions of social carrying capacity, social exchange theory, causation theory of visitor-resident irritation, and destination life cycle theory.

2.1.1 Social impact assessment

Social impact assessment is defined by Becker (1997:2) as...

"the process of identifying the future consequences of a current or proposed action which are related to individuals, organisations and social macro-systems."
In mentioning that impact assessments utilise three different units of analysis, namely, the individual, organisations and social macro-systems, Becker establishes the need to identify the actors involved. In doing this, Becker is proposing a typology for the components of social impact assessment. The components are then named as Micro (individual), Meso (organisations) and Macro (social macro-systems).

**Figure 2**

*Typology of Social Impact Assessment Projects*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIA PROJECTS ON A MICRO-LEVEL</th>
<th>Analysing impacts on the behaviour of large numbers of individuals, as in demographic impact assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SIA PROJECTS ON A MESO-LEVEL</td>
<td>Analysing impacts on the behaviour of collective actors, such as organisations and social movements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIA PROJECTS ON A MACRO-LEVEL</td>
<td>Analysing impacts on social macro-systems, such as national and international political and legal systems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Becker (1997:18)*

Of the three typologies, a Social Impact Assessment (SIA) of tourism's effect on a resident population fits most comfortably into the first. In practice, an SIA can straddle the boundaries of several typologies. It is therefore important to define the system of interest clearly at the outset. This involves defining the boundaries of the system, its sub-systems and related phenomena outside the system's boundaries. The core of a conceptual model of a social survey should be a survey of actors, their opinions, behaviour, objectives and their action space. In most cases the problem to be mitigated or eliminated and the social system hosting the problem will have a history (Becker, 1997). A critical account of this history is called the baseline analysis, and requires the impact assessor to look back in time in order to reconstruct a picture of the emergent nature of the problem. This is an area of SIA studies in tourism that appears to be under-reported in the literature.

Whilst social impact assessments in tourism position themselves within the geographical and economic context of their system of interest, it is rare for them to be situated within an historical and developmental framework which acknowledges the place of the people (Snaith, 1997). This opinion is echoed by Wall (1997: 1027)
in his review of John Towner's book "An Historical Geography of Recreation and Tourism in the Western World 1540-1940". In it he observes that...

"it is common for authors to stress the recency of mass tourism, the volatile nature of tourism patterns, and the lack of precedents for current or future tourism phenomena. One reason for this is that few authors have placed their studies in an historical context".

No attempt is made at this stage to remedy this shortfall. The studies reported within this chapter are based within the available literature and are attempts to approach other methodological and conceptual issues. This situation is, however, addressed in Chapter three, where socio-economic and historical foundations are laid for each of the four historic cities. This provides a more substantial basis on which to analyse the system of interest. In advance of this, the following is a review of the literature regarding the perceived social impacts associated with tourism development.

2.1.2 The perceived social impacts of tourism: a review and critique of the literature (1975-1991)

The impact of tourism is a topic that has been given extensive treatment in the literature. The reason for this attention is the inevitability that tourism will induce some impacts, both beneficial and adverse. Tourism is seen as an economic tool of development (Gee et al., 1989). Many of the economic benefits associated with tourism can be measured objectively and serve as support for further development (Cohen 1972). However, the social impacts appear to be somewhat more subjective and intangible. It is the intention of this review, to assess the progress made towards a more consolidated view regarding residents' perceptions of the impacts of tourism development.

Historically, most of the research on the topic of residents' perceptions has been atheoretical in nature (Ap, 1990). In addition, the choice of different methodologies in examining residents' perceptions has resulted in a fragmented rather than a coherent view. Consequently there has been little progress in developing a conceptual framework. Researchers from a number of disciplines have also examined this topic. These disciplines include Anthropology (Farrell, 1977; Smith, 1977), Economics (Archer, 1973; Liu, 1979; Peters, 1969), Geography
The perspective developed in this study focuses on residents' experiences of tourism within a particular type of community, namely, the historic city. Several conceptual models are reviewed within this chapter, including Ap's (1992) utilisation of social exchange theory in the context of a tourism system, tourism and social carrying capacity (Mathieson and Wall (1982), Doxey's (1975) causation theory of visitor-resident irritants, Butler's (1980) destination lifecycle theory, and the resident tourism perceptions model of Perdue et al., (1990).

2.1.2.1 Social carrying capacity

According to Martin et al., (1990), the notion of carrying capacity was originally introduced in the field of biology. Although a variety of interpretations exist, the basis of its definition, according to Schneider et al., (1978:17), relates to the...

"maximum population density for a given species in an environment which could be supported without degradation of that environment".

The adoption of social carrying capacity by the field of Recreation Resource Management was a logical extension of the literature according to Graefe et al., (1984). Those in Recreation Resource Management viewed carrying capacity as including not only a biological dimension, but also physical, environmental and social environmental concerns. Lime and Stankey (1971:175) defined recreational carrying capacity as...

"the character of use that can be supported over a specified time by an area developed at a certain level without causing excessive damage to either the physical environment or the experience of the visitor".

This gave rise to the idea that a carrying capacity could be determined for specific activities. Tourism, as a specific recreational activity, differs in character from other recreational activities (Martin et al., 1990). The fundamental difference is the existence, in the majority of cases, of a resident population in the tourism environment. Getz (1983) suggested that interest in carrying capacity within the
field of tourism arose for two reasons. First, the increased concern regarding the negative impacts of tourism; and second, the realisation that destination areas display cycles of popularity and decline. Hovinen (1982) and Mathieson and Wall (1982) were among the first to realise the need for a carrying capacity concept in relation to tourism-related phenomenon. Indeed, Mathieson and Wall's book was probably the most influential of its time in relation to its lessons regarding the impacts of tourism. The central theme of the book focuses on the inevitability of impacts resulting from tourism development and the need to undertake relevant research prior to planning tourist destination areas. Hovinen (1982:567) suggested that carrying capacity might be defined as...

"the maximum number of visitors that can be accommodated without causing excessive environmental deterioration and without leading to a decline in visitor satisfaction".

Similarly, Mathieson and Wall (1982) also recognised the importance of visitors' experiences. Martin et al., (1990:21) suggested that residents' attitudes are equally important to the carrying capacity issue and should not be ignored in tourism studies. They proposed the following definition as a more comprehensive perspective of social carrying capacity...

"the number of visitors that an area can accommodate before negative impacts occur, either to the physical environment, the psychological attitude of the tourists, or the social acceptance of the hosts".

Shelby and Heberlein (1984) suggested that there were two distinct components to carrying capacity, a descriptive one that documents the observable workings of the recreation system (tourism environment), and the evaluative one that deals with the integration of value judgements. The descriptive element looks at site activities, movement patterns of actors, and provides management parameters such as appropriate use levels. The evaluative element, on the other hand, looks at how the tourism system works as a whole, and does not address management concerns. The evaluative element does however, assist the development of standards regarding tolerable (maximum) or desirable (optimum) capacities for each environment.
The Shelby and Heberlein article (1984) examined 20 years of research on the concept of carrying capacity. As a result of this research, they proposed the existence of four types of carrying capacity: Ecological, Physical, Facility and Social. Ecological capacity is concerned with impacts on the ecosystem (e.g. plants, animals, soil, air, and water). Physical capacity refers to the amount of space an area has. Facility capacity involves man-made improvements intended to handle visitor needs (e.g. parking lots, and rest rooms). Social capacity refers to the impacts that impair or alter human experiences (experience parameters).

In conclusion, Shelby and Heberlein (1984) outlined three specific conditions that must be met in order to establish social carrying capacity:

1) there must be a known relationship between management parameters (e.g. use levels) and experience parameters (e.g. resident experiences);
2) there must be agreement among relevant groups about the type of experience to be provided (consultation between city council, residents and businesses);
3) there must be agreement among relevant groups as to the appropriate levels for that experience.

Shelby and Heberlein (1984) introduced to the carrying capacity discussion, the relationship between visitor levels, resident experiences, and the need for consultation between relevant groups. Butler (1980) developed a theory concerning the life cycle of a destination. This theory, while not directly addressing the concept of carrying capacity, assists the discussion because it focuses on visitor levels, and the changing nature of the local community's experiences and involvement in tourism development. According to Martin et al., (1990), the determination of tourism carrying capacity is dependent on the position of the destination area in the life cycle.

2.1.2.2 Destination life cycle theory

Butler's destination life cycle model, based on the product life cycle concept (Levitt, 1965), views a destination's popularity as dynamic and transitory. Accordingly, it passes through stages with particular and recognisable characteristics. Butler (1980) suggested six discernable stages - Exploration, Involvement, Development, Consolidation, Stagnation, and Decline or Rejuvenation. His model suggests that residents will view tourists and tourism differently according to the community's level of tourism development.
Implicit in both carrying capacity and destination life cycle theories, is the idea of change. This suggests that the carrying capacity of an area may well be different according to the stage of the life cycle in which the destination finds itself. In their discussion of the synergistic relationship between the tourism life cycle and carrying capacity, Martin et al., (1990) mention the changing nature of physical and social parameters. Their use of the terms physical and social parameters subscribe to the types of carrying capacity proposed by Shelby and Heberlein (1984). Martin et al., (1990) illustrate the link between carrying capacity and destination life cycle by using the stagnation stage of Butler's model as an example. During this stage, large numbers of tourists can be accommodated, but the host community is showing signs of antagonism towards the tourists. The social parameters have become the limiting factor in the destinations' carrying capacity, whereby the perceived costs outweigh the benefits which tourists bring to the destination.

2.1.2.3 Social exchange theory

There have been many attempts to explain the nature of residents' perceptions towards tourism impacts. A number of theories have been invoked in an attempt to provide a theoretical perspective that encompasses this phenomenon. According to Ap (1990), social exchange theory offers the most plausible explanation for the social impacts that are evident as a result of tourism's presence. In support of this belief, he points to other work that has been unsuccessful in attaining any reasonable degree of clarity in this area. Bystzanowski's (1989a) referred to play theory, compensation theory, and conflict theory, but concluded that none of them were suitable. Pearce (1989) suggested attribution theory but did not discuss its application in detail. Preister (1989) proposed dependency theory, but accepted that its macro-level orientation limited its application at the local community level. In addition, it was unable to account for both positive and negative effects.

Social exchange theory relates to the notion that in a social encounter, something is both given and received. This exchange may occur between the host and the guest at many levels including the physical, psychological, and social. Social exchange theory is concerned with understanding the exchange of resources between individuals and groups in an interaction situation. It is a general sociological theory, the modern proponents of which include Levi-Strauss (1969), Homans (1961), Blau (1964), and Emerson (1972). The first person to apply this theory to tourism with a degree of commitment was Ap (1990). As a theory, it is
now recognised as providing the most logical framework to explain the phenomenon surrounding the interaction of hosts and guests. The most basic premise is that to sustain tourism in a community, certain exchanges must occur. It recognises that the willingness of the community to participate in developing tourism is associated with their drive to improve the social and economic conditions of the area. Social exchange theory, when applied to this area of study, suggests that residents evaluate tourism in terms of expected benefits or costs obtained in return for the services they supply. Residents may choose to involve themselves in the planning, development and operation of tourism attractions in exchange for the benefits obtained from tourism. If however the residents perceive the costs of tourism to be greater than the benefits, then they are likely to be less supportive, even to the extent that they will actively discourage tourism. This assumes however that the residents are given the opportunity to participate in community tourism development.

Tourism's social impact on a community is important not only from a community development viewpoint, but also because when negative impacts are ignored there can be economic and political repercussions. These repercussions imposed by the community may, according to Pearce (1989) include:
1) the loss of support for the organisations and authorities which promote tourism;
2) an unwillingness to work in the tourism industry;
3) a lack of enthusiasm in promoting tourism by word of mouth;
4) distinct hostility to tourists, manifested in overcharging, rudeness, and indifference;
5) delays in the construction of tourism developments because of community protests.

The attitudes of host residents also influences the tourist. Hoffman and Low (1981) found that resident attitudes were the single most important factor determining repeat visitation. Hence, it is important to consider the consequences of tourism upon the host community and involve them in the planning and implementation of tourism development. Information regarding how the community views tourism is recognised as an important factor in the success of future development. This point is most ably voiced by Murphy (1980:356) when he said that...

"to achieve a meaningful dialogue leading to alternatives and trade-off positions among groups living and operating within a
tourism community requires knowledge of each groups perceptions and preferences. This is especially necessary for the residents whose views are largely unknown and whose ability to conceptualise tourism issues and strategies within a planning framework is untested”.

The preceding sections have introduced several of the theoretical attempts to explain residents’ perceptions of tourism development. The following sections review the literature within which these theories were developed and tested. It becomes apparent, when assessing the early literature regarding the social impacts of tourism, that the majority of the research has been conducted in three distinct geographical regions. These will be classified in the following review as 1) North America, 2) Europe, and 3) The United Kingdom. There have been some exceptions to this rule such as Belisle & Hoy’s 1980 study in Santa Marta, Colombia, and Husbands (1989) work in Zambia. The geographical division of this literature is not intended to suggest that the development of research fields can be seen to develop along geographical lines. Such a classification is suggested to be justifiable on the grounds that only in these three regions does there appear to have been a concerted effort to study the issue over an extended period of time. The use of this observation and classification may appear as somewhat arbitrary, however, it was deemed appropriate in the sense that it enabled the structuring of a large amount of literature which might otherwise have proved difficult to interpret.

2.1.3 Residents’ perceptions of tourism development in North America

In the opinion of Fizam (1978), early studies dealing with tourism’s effect on the local community had concentrated solely on economic factors. The following discussion traces the evolution of research on residents’ perceptions of tourism development. This section of the literature looks at research in the North America.

Fizam’s (1978) research was among the first attempts to examine empirically the existence of negative impacts of tourism on tourism destination communities. A sample of 1,636 residents and 212 entrepreneurs were randomly selected in the established tourism destination of Cape Cod, Massachusetts. The findings supported the hypothesis that heavy tourism concentration leads to negative resident attitudes towards tourists and tourism development generally. In addition, the study reported that people who were economically reliant on the tourism industry had more positive perceptions of tourism development than those who were not similarly employed.
Rothman (1978) recognised the need for greater understanding concerning permanent residents' feelings towards tourism development. The author attempted to assess the impact of seasonal visitors on two beach resort communities on the Atlantic coast of southern Delaware. The results of this exploratory study indicated the perceived existence of both positive and negative aspects concerning tourism development. The residents of Rehoboth Beach (population 1,614) and Bethany Beach (population 189) perceived negative aspects as including increased noise, litter, traffic congestion, crime, overcrowding, and tourism-induced price increases. They perceived the positive aspects of development to include such things as increased revenues, improved employment opportunities, an expansion of commercial and municipal services, and the opportunity to see old friends. Similarly, research carried out in the US Virgin Islands by Sethna & Richmond (1978) indicated that residents were aware of the positive economic and environmental impacts (Preservation/Conservation) of tourism, whilst remaining sensitive to its potential to have a negative influence such as increased sexual permissiveness. The findings of Pizam (1978), Rothman (1978), and Sethna & Richmond (1978) were similar in that they each reported a positive/negative duality in the residents’ perceptions of tourism development.

In keeping with the research already outlined, the early interest in residents' perceptions tended to focus on resort areas where the visitors were likely to be staying a long time, or indeed, where they actually owned a second home. Research carried out by Thomason et al., (1979) was no different in this respect, concentrating on residents' perceptions of tourism development on the Gulf Coast of Texas. Twenty-four unstructured personal interviews were conducted with representatives of the resident, entrepreneur and public provider segments of the Corpus Christi area population. Residents, as a group, were found to have a generally positive attitude toward winter visitors. Entrepreneurs, the group most likely to gain economically from the visitors, had the most positive attitude. These findings support those of Rothman (1978), and Pizam (1978) who found that those who favoured tourism development were more likely to be economically dependent on the industry. The increasing interest in residents' perceptions of tourism development led many researchers to look beyond the United States mainland. They focused their attention on smaller resorts and economies which they saw as being more reliant on tourism, and therefore more susceptible to tourism's impact.

Research conducted by Belisle and Hoy (1980) is an example of the shifting emphasis towards destinations outside of the United States. The purpose of their study in a developing tourist destination, the City of Santa Marta, Colombia, was
two fold. First they attempted to build on the exploratory findings of Rothman (1978), Pizam (1978), and Thomason et al., (1979) by identifying the negative and positive aspects of tourism as perceived by the local population. Secondly, they sought to expand the field of residents' perceptions research by determining the influence of selected demographic and socio-economic variables on residents' perceptions of tourism development. The variables included the distance a person resided from the central tourist zone (CTZ), socio-economic status, age, education, and gender. Residents' perceived negative impacts included the increased cost of food (71%), and the increased occurrence of smuggling (73%). Aspects of tourism development which were perceived positively included the development of roads (90%), and the development of the airport (86%). The only variable that was significant as a predictor of residents' perceptions was distance of residence from the CTZ. Those living closer to the CTZ saw tourism more positively. Belisle and Hoy (1980) suggested that the positive attitudes were a function of the 'incipient' or early stage of tourism development.

During the fall of 1982, Liu and Var (1986) mailed 3,000 questionnaires to the residents of the four major counties in the established tourist islands of Hawaii. The purpose of the study was to examine residents' perceptions of tourism development. Although the response rate was only 20% (n=600) results indicated that residents perceived the same positive and negative aspects of tourism development as those communities studied by Pizam (1978), Rothman (1978), Thomason et al., (1979), and Belisle and Hoy (1980). Liu and Var (1986) concluded that the residents of Hawaii viewed environmental protection as being more important than the economic benefits associated with tourism. They were however, unwilling to lower their standard of living to attain these environmental goals. Whereas Belisle and Hoy (1980) found the distance of residence from the central tourist zone to be the only significant predictor of residents' perceptions regarding tourism development, Liu and Var (1986) found the only significant socio-demographic variable to be the length of residence in the community. Those resident for longer periods were less likely to view tourism positively.

In 1988, the results of two studies, both based in Florida, were published. The first was conducted by Milman and Pizam (1988) in the established tourist destination region of central Florida. The purpose of the study was to investigate residents' perceptions of the social consequences and impacts of tourism. A telephone survey of 203 central Florida households revealed that 78% of respondents favoured the presence of tourism. More detailed questions dealing with selected social issues revealed results which were similar to those of earlier studies
Positive perceptions included increased employment opportunities, income, standard of living, and quality of life. Negative perceptions included increased traffic congestion and crime. The second study, conducted by Davis et al., (1988), was also conducted in the state of Florida. This study was designed to assess and segment local residents with respect to their attitudes, interests, and opinions toward tourism. The idea behind the segmentation of residents was to determine whether or not a strong anti-tourism, anti-growth group existed in the state. On the basis of the 415 returned questionnaires (21% response rate), Davis et al., (1988) divided the respondents into five "resident-type" clusters. These clusters were termed "Haters", "Lovers", "Cautious Romantics", "Inbetweeners", and those who "Loved them for a reason". Results indicated that residents' socio-economic characteristics were insignificant as predictors of segment membership. All five segments ranked increased employment as the major benefit of tourism development. Four out of the five segments ranked traffic congestion as the major disadvantage. Other perceived benefits included lower taxes and increased entertainment opportunities. Other negative impacts included increased prices and overcrowding.

The findings of these early studies were similar in terms of the positive and negative perceptions of the resident populations within each community. None of the studies attempted to link the central concepts of their findings to explicit theory. Although these early studies were exploratory and largely descriptive, they could have made use of Doxey's (1975) causation theory of visitor-resident irritants. This theory was an attempt to provide a conceptual framework within which to explain residents' perceptions of tourism development. The model consisted of a four-stage irritation index. The stages suggested potential resident reactions towards tourists and tourism in general. The stages, termed Euphoria, Apathy, Annoyance, and Antagonism, were deemed to be transitional in nature, whereby resident attitudes become more negative as tourism developed.

In addition, these early studies used diverse methodologies (interview, telephone, and mail questionnaire) and failed to be consistent in their reporting of response rates and the validity/reliability of their instruments. This observation is supported by Ap (1990) who conducted a literature review of past studies (Belisle & Hoy, 1980; Liu & Var, 1986; Milman & Pizam, 1988; Pizam, 1978). Discussing their work, he suggested that...
"although the researchers were able to identify the problem and state the objectives of the studies, the central concepts of the study were not linked to some explicit theory" (612-614).

Ap (1990) suggested five possible strategies to improve the measurement of the social impacts of tourism development. These can be summarised as follows:

1) research should be based within a conceptual and theoretical framework;
2) more attention should be given to the significant findings made to date;
3) more emphasis should be placed on longitudinal research;
4) reliability and validity measures should be identified and reported;
5) sampling methodology should be accurately reported and described.

In 1990, the results of research conducted in 16 rural Colorado communities was reported. The authors (Perdue, et al., 1990) attempted to develop a greater conceptual and theoretical understanding of residents' perceptions of tourism's impact on their community. With respect to the strategies proposed by Ap (1990), their efforts were designed to establish a conceptual framework of residents' perceptions of tourism development.

The purpose of their research was to test a model of the relationships among rural residents' perceptions of tourism development, their support for additional development, restrictions on tourism development, and their support for special tourism taxes. Based on their model, four hypotheses were advanced:

1) there will be no relationship between tourism impact perceptions and residents' characteristics;
2) support for additional development would be related to positive and negative perceptions;
3) support for additional development would be negatively related to the perceived future of the community;
4) support for restrictive tourism development policies, special user fees, and additional taxes would be negatively related to the support for additional development.

The instrument was developed from the existing research literature (Allen et al., 1987; Belisle & Hoy, 1980; Murphy, 1981; Sheldon & Var, 1984; Thomason et al., 1979). Between May and June 1987, questionnaires were hand delivered to, and
collected from, 1,346 randomly selected households. Of those contacted, 87% completed the questionnaire. Descriptive analysis of items on the instrument indicated residents' concerns regarding certain negative impacts of tourism development. Concerns over traffic congestion and increased property taxes indicated similarities with the findings of previous research. Positive perceptions were also featured in the results, notably the improvement of the local economy, increased recreational opportunities, and the improvement in the appearance of the area. The emergence of distinct positive and negative perceptions supported the findings of previous research. Perdue et al., (1990) used factor analysis to create factor scores for the positive and negative items. It was in the second phase of their data analysis that they attempted to extend existing research. They offered a model of resident tourism perceptions and attitudes which suggested potential relationships based on previous research findings. Using the factor scores, least squares regressions were conducted. The relationships predicted within the hypotheses were confirmed, suggesting the usefulness of their model and the potential for future investigation. The proposed application of this research focused on the use and design of public relations programmes aimed at building resident support for tourism development.

In the same year, Keogh (1990) published a research article based on residents' perceptions of tourism development at Cap-pele in New Brunswick, Canada. The research took a specific focus on the information needs of residents with respect to proposed tourism development plans. The results obtained from the survey questionnaire (N=246) enabled Keogh (1990) to conclude that through the identification of central issues and the different interest groups, insights can be obtained with respect to the information needs of residents and guidelines prepared for meeting them. In this way, "input from the community becomes meaningful and the public participation process proves to be ultimately more effective" (Keogh, 1990: 464).

To summarise then, the past 20 years of research in North America has examined many different aspects related to residents' perceptions of tourism development. Pizam (1978) suggested that heavy tourism concentration led to the emergence of negative resident attitudes. Rothman (1978) highlighted negative resident perceptions towards increased noise, litter, traffic, crime, over-crowding, and tourism-induced price increases. Research findings also noted the perception of positive aspects of tourism development. These included improvements in local infrastructure (Belisle & Hoy, 1980), increased employment opportunities (Milman & Pizam, 1988; Rothman, 1978), and increased recreational opportunities (Davis et
al., 1988). Other significant findings included the distance of residence from the central tourist zone (Belisle & Hoy, 1980), and the influence of one's length of residence in the community (Liu & Var, 1986).

Ap (1990) pointed to the fragmented nature of residents' perception research and made suggestions aimed at assisting the development of a more coherent view. One of his suggestions was the need to link central concepts to explicit theory. The research conducted by Perdue et al., (1990) was a significant step towards better understanding the relationship between positive and negative perceptions of tourism and support for specific tourism-related policies. The next section of this review examines the contribution of residents' perceptions research in Europe.

2.1.4 Residents' perceptions of tourism development in Europe

Research into residents' perceptions of tourism development in Europe first received attention in the early 1980s. Much of this research relied on the methodologies and procedures established in studies conducted in North America.

During the summers of 1980 and 1981, Var, Kendall, and Tarakcioglu (1985) hand delivered questionnaires to 114 residents of Marmaris, a Turkish resort town. The purpose of their study was the same as those conducted in North America in that they attempted to determine the social impacts of tourism as perceived by the local residents. Based on an 86% response rate, results indicated the existence of several dimensions related to the perceived impact of tourism. These dimensions included socio-economic aspects, negative impacts, traffic congestion and crowding, and tourism as a generator of employment opportunities. Certain negative perceptions were reported, indeed, 70% of the sample agreed that tourism drives up property values and house prices. The generally positive results were contradictory to earlier findings by Pizam (1978) who suggested that high-density tourist areas were prone to more local friction. The authors reported that 84% of the sample indicated a willingness to accept some inconvenience in exchange for tourist money. The authors suggested that this might have been due to cultural expectations.

The positive attitudes of Marmaris' residents concerning the nature of tourism development may in fact point to the stage of that destination in Butler's (1980) tourist destination life cycle model. Tourism development was in an early stage, residents were becoming involved in the industry and the destination was developing in terms of visitor numbers. Doxey's (1975) model of visitor-resident irritants would suggest that, at that early stage of development, residents were
experiencing "Euphoria" and therefore perceived the positive aspects of tourism development in favour of the negative ones.

Kariel (1989) conducted a study of residents' perceptions of tourism development in several resort communities in Austria. Four resorts were chosen; Lech, Neustift, Kaprun, and Schladming. All but Schladming were formerly dependent economically on agriculture, but at the time of the study all were dependent on tourism. The results again indicated positive perceptions such as improved infrastructure, and negative perceptions such as tourism-induced price increases. These first two studies highlight the similarities between early research in North America and the approach adopted in Europe. While registering residents' perceptions regarding the positive and negative impact of tourism development, they offer little conceptually.

In 1983, under the management of the European Coordination Center for Research and Documentation in Social Science (The Vienna Centre), seven European countries combined their resources with the United States of America in order to conduct a cross-cultural study of residents' perceptions of tourism development. The countries involved were Bulgaria, Hungary, The Netherlands, Poland, Spain, the United Kingdom, and Yugoslavia. Their efforts were reported in the report "Tourism as a Factor of Change". The main research question was whether or not tourism was an essential factor of social change within a host community, and if so, what was the character of that change? The following discussion focuses on the findings of the studies carried out in Hungary, Poland, and Yugoslavia.

As part of the Vienna Centre study, Gergely (1989) chose to examine residents' perceptions of tourism development in the Hungarian town of Sarvar, population 15,778. Seen primarily as a quiet health resort and spa town, tourism was not yet a major factor in the economy. Two hundred and fifty-three personal interviews were conducted during August 1985. Results indicated that residents were generally satisfied with the presence of tourists (71%). Only 6% felt annoyed by the presence of the tourism industry. Residents' socio-economic and demographic characteristics were again found to be insignificant as predictors of residents' perceptions of tourism development. This supports the findings of a number of other studies (Milman & Pizam, 1988; Perdue et al., 1990). Respondents highlighted tourism's negative effect on the supply of goods and overcrowding. Positive perceptions included improved employment opportunities (84%), and higher income and standards of living (67%). Again, similar to past research on residents' perceptions, little attention was placed on the nature of the destination.
The Institute of Tourism in Warsaw noticed that although tourism was a common phenomenon, local resident reactions to its development varied according to the intensity of tourist flow, the cultural background of the destination and the level of urbanisation. In an attempt to examine potential differences in resident perceptions according to these distinctions, Bartoszewicz et al., (1989) conducted a study in four tourist resort towns/destinations. The resorts chosen were Ustka (population 17,500), Mikolajki (population 3,000), Bukowina (population 2,500), and Studzienice (five small villages treated as one population 2,900). The fieldwork was carried out in Ustka, Mikolajki and Bukowina during 1984, and then in Studzienice in 1986. The results obtained from the simple random sample of residents indicated that although there was a generally positive attitude towards tourism, there was a greater degree of annoyance in the larger towns of Ustka and Mikolajki than in the small village regions of Bukowina and Studzienice. Although the residents of the larger towns saw tourism in a less favourable way than the small village communities, it was the residents of the towns who indicated a willingness to increase tourist levels. The small villages wished to keep visitor levels the same. While not addressing the concept of carrying capacity, these results indicate a difference in residents' perceptions of tourism development according to the size and nature of the tourist destination.

The study carried out in Yugoslavia (Dragicevic et al., 1989) attempted to focus on the social and cultural milieus of the host and tourist populations and to document the perceived impacts and changes brought about by tourism. This case study was conducted on the small Dalmatian Island of Solta (population 1,470). The site was selected because of its, "present, relatively uniform touristic and industrial under-development, while its future growth will be, according to the present plans and orientations, based on tourism development" (133). This statement, although not making any direct reference to destination life cycle theory, suggested that the island may be in the early stages proposed by Butler's (1980) destination life cycle model.

During June 1985, a random sample of 336 residents from the island of Solta completed an interview questionnaire. This represented a response rate of 98%. Results indicated that 80% of the sample were satisfied with the presence of tourism, as opposed to 4% who expressed annoyance towards its presence. Residents perceived the positive aspects of tourism to include increased employment opportunities (72%), and increased incomes and standard of living (68%). These results were similar to previous studies both in North America (Davis et al., 1988; Milman & Pizam, 1988) and Europe (Gergely, 1989).
The national case studies carried out by the European Coordination Center for Research and Documentation in Social Science (The Vienna Centre) were the result of years of dedicated research. They attempted to analyse the experiences of residents of different nationalities in the hope that the results would contribute to the formation of a general theory of residents' perceptions of tourism development in the future. While highlighting some important perspectives, the studies raised more questions and further impressed the need for comparative methodological approaches. The studies fell short of the recommendation of Ap (1990), that central concepts should be linked to explicit theory. The studies suggested, however, that differences in residents' perceptions of tourism development may be linked to the nature of the destination and its level of involvement in tourism (Bartoszewiez et al., 1989; Gergely, 1989).

Based on the experiences and insights of research in North America, studies conducted in Europe have similarly attempted to examine residents' perceptions of tourism development within small, rural or resort-type communities. In summary then, the results of these studies indicated that residents' perceptions appeared to be generally positive (Bartoszewiez et al., 1989; Dragicevic et al., 1989; Gergely, 1989; Kariel, 1989; Var et al., 1985). Residents' positive perceptions of tourism development included: increased employment opportunities (Var et al., 1985), and expanded infrastructure (Kariel, 1989). Residents' negative perceptions included increased property values and housing prices (Var et al., 1985), tourism-induced price increases for goods (supplies) and services (Gergely, 1989; Kariel, 1989). These results were similar to research results in the United States. No European study was available which had utilised the model proposed by Perdue et al., (1990). Thus it appeared that research on residents' perceptions of tourism development in Europe had yet to advance beyond the exploratory and descriptive stages.

2.1.5 Residents' perceptions of tourism development in the United Kingdom

Given that the original purpose of this study was to examine residents' perceptions of tourism in three historic cities in England, the following discussion represents a review of pertinent research literature related to residents' perceptions of tourism development in the United Kingdom.

Duffield and Long (1981) chose to examine residents' perceptions of tourism development in the highlands and islands of Scotland. Their study questioned the use of tourism as an acceptable tool for regional economic development. Their conclusions supported those of Storey (1979) who also looked at the influence of tourism on peripheral regions in Scotland. The conclusions stressed
that, "it is important to evaluate tourism's role in development in terms of local perceptions of costs and benefits" (427).

During the same year, Brougham and Butler (1981) published the results of their study of residents' perceptions of tourism development on the Isle of Skye in Scotland. Data, including socio-economic and demographic characteristics of residents, were collected between March and June in 1975. It was the contention of the authors that previous research had found no significant relationship between residents' socio-economic and demographic characteristics and their perceptions of tourism's impact because the study populations had been treated as homogeneous groups. It is worth noting that because of these observations, the authors used a population rather than a sample. Through the use of segmentation analysis, the population was divided into smaller more specific categories. By taking a more microscopic view of resident characteristics, they discovered significant differences in residents' perceptions of tourism development according to age, language, length of residence, and degree of tourist exposure. The finding that length of residence was a significant predictor of residents' perceptions of tourism development concurred with the findings of Liu and Var (1986).

Sheldon and Var (1984) chose to examine residents' perceptions of the social, economic, and environmental impacts of tourism on North Wales. Two hundred and fifty households were randomly selected from the telephone directory and a questionnaire was mailed to each. It should be noted that no mention was made by the authors as to the starting point, logic behind the method of sampling or the required number of responses to ensure a representative sample. The survey yielded a response rate of only 54 households (25%). Asked to rank the tourism industry by level of importance to the region, respondents perceived it to be fourth behind agriculture, manufacturing and mining. In reality, tourism ranked second behind agriculture as the most important source of revenue in the community. Traffic congestion was seen by 98% of the respondents as a major negative impact of tourism development. Length of residence was found to be a significant predictor of subjects' perceptions of tourism's impact. The significance which Sheldon and Var (1984) found in the relationship between length of residence and residents' perceptions of tourism development agreed with the findings of Brougham and Butler (1981), and Liu and Var (1986). Sheldon and Var (1984) also found, in contrast to the findings of Pizam (1978), that there was less friction between residents and tourists in high density areas than in low-density areas.

Although Sheldon and Var's (1984) study falls short of the methodological and conceptual recommendations of Ap (1990), the authors did raise some
important points. For example, the authors suggested that the seasonal nature of tourism may be responsible for varying levels of friction between residents and tourists. During the high season, facilities and services are under extreme pressure because of the demand placed on them by residents and tourists alike. Studies have reported that tourism-induced overcrowding and traffic congestion are perceived as an inconvenience by local residents (Davis et al., 1988; Milman & Pizam, 1988; Perdue et al., 1990; Pizam, 1978; Rothman, 1978). This notion tends to support the linkage between residents' perceptions of tourism's impacts and the existence of an acceptable social carrying capacity. In their article "Geography and Tourism", Mitchell and Murphy (1991:61) point out that...

"an important contributor to the carrying capacity problem is the annual peaking of tourism activity during a few hectic weeks or months. This causes a great burden on the physical and social resources of destination areas".

The majority of research into residents' perceptions of tourism development has addressed only small, rural or resort type communities. This has been the focus in the United States (Davis et al., 1988; Liu & Var, 1986; Milman & Pizam, 1988; Perdue et al., 1990; Pizam, 1978; Rothman, 1978; Thomason et al., 1979) in Europe (Dragecevic et al., 1989; Kariel, 1989; Var et al., 1985), and in the United Kingdom (Brougham & Butler, 1981; Duffield & Long, 1981; Sheldon & Var, 1984). Research into residents' perceptions of tourism development in larger urban areas has largely been ignored.

The inner-city urban environment exists as a product which offers a specific environment and possesses a unique spatially concentrated supply of facilities (Jansen-Verbeke, 1986). These facilities include cultural elements such as theatres, concerts, museums, art galleries, special events and festivals, as well as economic elements such as hotels, restaurants, coffee shops, pubs, nightclubs and discotheques. Jansen-Verbeke (1986) has noted that historical cities possess characteristic site features such as monuments, ancient buildings and architectural features that act as attractions. Ashworth (1984) recognized that such attractions are particularly powerful in their ability to attract tourists. The dimensions of the inner-city as an activity place and leisure setting are seen by Jansen-Verbeke (1986) as being dependent on several primary elements, 1) accessibility, 2) inclusive parking facilities, and 3) specific tourist infrastructure (e.g. information bureau, sign-posting, urban walks, and guides). The majority of these primary elements are
free or subsidised, and are provided by the local government in order to encourage the industry's development in the region. The secondary tourism elements include hotels, restaurants and other site-specific facilities, and are owned by the commercial sector.

While the majority of this early research into residents' perceptions of tourism development has focused on smaller, less urban cities, the review of the early literature did reveal three exceptions. Murphy (1981) examined residents' perceptions of tourism development in three urban tourist destinations in England. One existed primarily as a day trip centre (Windsor), the second represented a long stay centre where visitors generally visited for one or two weeks (Torquay), and finally a short stay destination where tourists visited from between one to three days (York). During the spring of 1977, interviews were conducted, and questionnaires mailed to a random sample of residents within each town. A total of 283 usable responses were obtained, 68 from Windsor, 89 from Torquay, and 126 from York. Again one must wonder about the level of representation achieved by so few responses given the size of the respective populations.

It was hypothesised that York residents would have the most positive attitude towards tourism development because of the relatively balanced nature of development in short stay destinations. Murphy (1981) conducted a stepwise discriminant analysis in order to determine whether or not the three tourist centers could be differentiated on the basis of community attitudes towards tourism development. As such, this comparative analysis (Murphy, 1981) did not report attitudes towards particular aspects of tourism as had been the case in other studies outlined in this review. In his book, Tourism: A Community Approach, Murphy (1985) did report the perceived negative impacts identified by the resident survey of York, Torquay, and Windsor. The three most significant concerns of respondents were traffic congestion and parking (36%), increased taxes and inflation of property values (33%), and increased littering and vandalism (24%). These findings, although not distinguishing between the perceptions of residents from each of the three destinations, were similar to the findings reported in studies conducted throughout North America (Davis et al., 1988; Milman & Pizam, 1988; Rothman, 1978), Europe (Gergely, 1989), and other regions of the United Kingdom (Sheldon & Var, 1984). While the respondents from York tended to favour tourism, Murphy (1985) concluded that there was a need to improve community relations through maximising the positive features of tourism development and minimising the problems. Recognising the reservations of local residents concerning the degree of community return from the tourism industry, Murphy (1985) suggested that the
city of York should pay more attention to the education of its residents concerning the benefits of tourism development.

2.1.6 Critique of the early research

Criteria used to compare the studies are categorised under the four major categories of problem statement, data characteristics, data analysis, and conclusions. The criteria used were recommended by Ap (1992b) and were adapted from studies undertaken by Stokes and Miller (1975) and Riddick et al., (1984) in their methodological reviews of research in rural sociology and leisure, respectively.

Due to the diversity of operationalisation and lack of comparability between the studies it is not possible to arrive at a common conclusion concerning the development of a sound body of knowledge about the perceived impacts of tourism and its measurement. However, some observations from these research studies, particularly emanating from a comparative analysis of the studies can be made.

Although the researchers cited so far were able to clearly identify the problem and state the objectives of their studies, the central concepts of the study were not linked to some explicit theory. Only four of the twenty-three studies (Pizam, 1978; Belisle and Hoy, 1980; Perdue et al., 1987, 1990) had identified any hypotheses to guide the studies and provide some evaluation of the rigour of the research endeavour. Kerlinger (1979) stresses the importance of hypothesis formulation and indicates survey (non-experimental or ex post facto) research should be conducted only within a framework of hypothesis testing in order to reduce the likelihood of arriving at improper explanations for various associations. The lack of theoretical integration would restrict cumulative knowledge and contribution of the studies. Hence, it is important for future studies to identify and develop a theoretical base.

The studies also need to be considered within the context of the stage at which the discipline of tourism exists. Moncrief (1970) identified that the early stages of a discipline generally involves identification of the problems, establishment of priorities of need for research enquiry, description of major variables involved, and development of methodologies for conducting research. The reported findings are predominantly descriptive and it could be said that the studies are indicative of a field of study that is still at its early stages of development. The sampling methodology used in the studies varied and the sample sizes also varied considerably. Descriptions provided about the sampling plans were generally limited and the information provided would not allow the reader to make
judgements about the appropriateness and adequacy of the sampling plan. The apparent lack of attention to sampling methodology calls into question the validity of the reported findings and future studies should avoid this problem. The weakest aspect of the data characteristics is that only one study (Sethna and Richmond, 1978) reported any tests of the reliability and validity of the measures used in the survey instrument. Babbie (1986) highlighted the importance of reliable and valid measures to sound research, and more explicit consideration by researchers in the future is needed regarding this matter.

The use of statistical techniques to analyse data varies considerably from study to study and this makes comparisons between them difficult. However, one group of researchers (Kendall, Liu, Sheldon and Var) have used the same statistical techniques over a number of different studies which they have carried out. The “Vienna Centre” studies only sought common descriptive analysis and the use of multivariate analysis of the data was left to the discretion of each national study group. The multivariate techniques most commonly used are Regression Analysis, Analysis of Variance and Factor Analysis. The techniques used in the studies provide useful information about the array of techniques that have been employed and may possibly lead researchers to consider other alternative techniques in the future. Although most studies provided justification for the techniques used, only Belisle and Hoy (1980), Brougham and Butler (1981), Sheldon and Var (1984), and Liu et al., (1987), provided clear and adequate explanations about the techniques used.

Most of the studies did not make reference to the implications of the study findings for practitioners. The fact that the studies were locally or regionally based would seem to provide the researchers with an opportunity to discuss the implications for practitioners and demonstrate the relevance of research in addressing practical problems. Thus, it was disappointing to find only a few studies making reference to their implications for practitioners.

In conclusion, this review of studies on host residents’ perceptions of the impacts of tourism reveal that the findings are predominantly descriptive. This is indicative of an area of investigation which exists at the early phases of its development. Some of the common problems revealed by this review were associated with a lack of theoretical integration, failure to report on the reliability and validity of measures, inadequate reporting of the sampling methodology (sampling frame, sampling design, and response rate), and failure to discuss the implications for the practitioners. It is considered that if such problems are adequately addressed in future studies, the likely success of making a significant contribution, especially of an explanatory nature, would be enhanced.
According to Ap and Crompton (1994), the elusiveness and difficulty in attempting to measure the impacts of tourism provides a formidable challenge for researchers. They suggest that in mounting this challenge, the following actions will assist:

1) develop a conceptual and theoretical orientation;
2) develop reliable and valid impact measures;
3) focus more research on the significant findings of research carried out to date, for example, the cultural and economic distance between host and tourist, the intensity of tourism development and growth, and the influence of economic dependency on tourism and attitudes toward tourism;
4) establish longitudinal research of resident perceptions especially over the various development phases of a destination area;
5) investigate the extent to which perceptions translate into belief and result in action;
6) acknowledge the inherent weaknesses of survey research and adopt other research designs (for example, quasi-experiments);
7) report sampling methodology more clearly.

2.1.7 Summary of the literature (1975-1991)

Research conducted on residents' perceptions of the impacts of tourism during this period has provided a knowledge base which is primarily of a descriptive nature (Allen et al., 1988; Belisle and Hoy, 1980; Boissevain, 1979; Brougham and Butler, 1981; Liu and Var, 1986; Liu et al., 1987; Milman and Pizam, 1988; Perdue et al., 1990; Pizam, 1978; Rothman, 1978; Sethna and Richmond, 1978; Sethna, 1980; Sheldon and Var, 1984; Tyrrell and Spaulding, 1984; Thomason et al., 1979; Var et al., 1985).

In economic terms, the perceived impacts include an improvement in the local economy (Bystrzanowski, 1989a; Perdue et al., 1990; Tyrrell and Spaulding, 1984), increasing employment opportunities (Belisle and Hoy, 1980; Liu and Var, 1986; Milman and Pizam, 1988; Rothman, 1978; Sheldon and Var, 1984; Tyrrell and Spaulding, 1984); improved investment, development, and infrastructure spending in the economy (Belisle and Hoy, 1980; Liu and Var, 1986; Milman and Pizam, 1988; Sheldon and Var, 1984); increased tax revenues (Brougham and Butler, 1981; Milman and Pizam, 1988; Rothman, 1978; Tyrrell and Spaulding, 1984); improved public utilities infrastructure (Rothman, 1978; Sethna and
improved transport infrastructure (Belisle and Hoy, 1980); and increased opportunities for shopping (Liu and Var, 1986).

The positive and negative impacts are generally well recognised. They include: the increased price or shortage of goods and services (Belisle and Hoy, 1980; Brougham and Butler, 1981; Husbands, 1989; Liu and Var, 1986; Liu et al., 1987; Pizam, 1978); the increased price of land and housing (Bystrzanowski, 1989a; Perdue et al., 1990; Pizam, 1978; Var et al., 1985); and increased cost of living/property taxes (Liu and Var, 1986; Perdue et al., 1990).

The perceived positive environmental effects which are attributed to tourism include: preservation of the natural environment/does not cause ecological decline (Belisle and Hoy, 1980; Liu and Var, 1986; Liu et al., 1987; Sethna and Richmond, 1978); preservation of historic buildings and monuments (Liu et al., 1987; Sethna and Richmond, 1978; Sheldon and Var, 1984); and improvement of the appearance of the area (Bystrzanowski, 1989a; Perdue et al., 1990).

The most commonly perceived negative environmental impacts of tourism are: increased traffic congestion (Brougham and Butler, 1981; Liu et al., 1987; Perdue et al., 1990; Pizam, 1978; Rothman, 1978; Sheldon and Var, 1984; Tyrrell and Spaulding, 1984; Var et al., 1985); overcrowding, particularly of outdoor recreation areas (Brougham and Butler, 1981; Pizam, 1978; Rothman, 1978; Thomason et al., 1979; Var et al., 1985). Other perceived negative environmental impacts include increased noise pollution and increased litter (Pizam, 1978; Rothman, 1978). The perceived social and cultural impacts are considered next and these constitute the greatest number of observed impacts resulting from tourism.

The positive social impacts which have been found are that it: improves the quality of life (Bystrzanowski, 1989a; Milman and Pizam, 1988; Perdue et al., 1990; Pizam, 1978); increases the availability of recreation facilities and opportunities (Belisle and Hoy, 1980; Liu and Var, 1986; Liu et al., 1987; Pizam, 1978; Perdue et al., 1987; Sheldon and Var, 1984); increases the availability of entertainment (Belisle and Hoy, 1980; Liu and Var, 1986; Liu et al., 1987; Sheldon and Var, 1984); improves the quality of fire protection (Milman and Pizam, 1988; Pizam, 1978); and improves the quality of police protection (Pizam, 1978). Of the above-mentioned social impacts, Bystrzanowski (1989a) found that tourism did not increase the availability of recreation facilities/opportunities, a finding which ran contrary to those found in other studies. Milman and Pizam (1988) in their study of central Florida residents, found that they did not perceive tourism as a contributor to increasing the virtues of morality, honesty, politeness and manners, mutual confidence, and attitude to work.
The positive cultural impacts of tourism that have been identified are that it: improves understanding and image of different communities or cultures (Liu and Var, 1986; Liu et al., 1987; Milman and Pizam, 1988; Pizam, 1978; Sheldon and Var, 1984); promotes cultural exchange (Belisle and Hoy, 1980; Brougham and Butler, 1981; Liu and Var, 1986; Liu et al., 1987; Sheldon and Var, 1984); enables meeting visitors which is a valuable educational experience (Liu and Var, 1986; Liu et al., 1987; Sheldon and Var, 1984); encourages variety of cultural activities by locals (Liu and Var, 1986; Liu et al., 1987; Sheldon and Var, 1984); preserves the cultural identity of the host population (Liu and Var, 1986); and increases demand for historical and cultural exhibits (Liu and Var, 1986).

The perceived negative social and cultural impacts of tourism, which were highlighted consistently by residents, were: increased prostitution (Belisle and Hoy, 1980; Liu and Var, 1986; Liu et al., 1987); increased alcoholism (Milman and Pizam, 1988; Pizam, 1978); and increased smuggling (Belisle and Hoy, 1980; Milman and Pizam, 1988). Other negative social impacts which have been perceived by residents are feelings of heightened tension (Rothman, 1978) contribution to a hectic community and personal life (Rothman, 1978) and creation of a phoney folk culture (Brougham and Butler, 1981). Furthermore, there were some negative impacts with which residents expressed disagreement, such as: increased exploitation of local natives (Liu and Var, 1986; Liu et al., 1987; Sheldon and Var, 1984); caused one to avoid shopping in tourism areas (Liu and Var, 1986; Liu et al., 1987; Sheldon and Var, 1984); and increased sexual permissiveness (Milman and Pizam, 1988; Sethna and Richmond, 1978).

Social impacts, which showed contradictory findings, were related to the impacts on crime and vandalism, drug use and addiction, and family/social structure. Some studies found that tourism was perceived as contributing to increased crime and vandalism (Belisle and Hoy, 1980; Perdue et al., 1987; Rothman, 1978; Sheldon and Var, 1984), whilst other studies did not (Bystrzanowski, 1989a; Liu and Var, 1986; Milman and Pizam, 1988). This ambivalence is also found in other literature dealing with the relationship between tourism and crime where some found that it did exist (Chesney-lind and Lind, 1986; Jud, 1975; Walmsley et al., 1983), whilst others did not (Lin and Loeb, 1977, Pizam, 1982).

This response probably reflects the issue raised by Noronha (1979) that some tourism impacts have indirect effects upon society and some changes cannot be attributed solely to tourism. The extent to which these effects can be attributed to
either tourism or modernisation is largely unknown and is an area requiring future research (Ap and Crompton, 1994).

With respect to drug use and addiction, two studies found that an increase is attributed to tourism (Belisle and Hoy, 1980; Pizam, 1978) and two studies did not (Liu and Var, 1986; Milman and Pizam, 1988). Tourism was found to have no adverse effect on social/family structure within the sample of Turkish residents investigated as part of Liu et al.'s, (1986) cross-national study. Church attendance in the U.S Virgin Islands was also not seen as being adversely affected by tourism (Sethna and Richmond, 1978). On the other hand, adverse effects were perceived by the residents of Southern Delaware, USA who noted that tourism led to a decline in the amount of time spent with the family (Rothman, 1978).

Husbands (1989) has challenged the notion that socio-economic or sociodemographic variables are not meaningful in developing an understanding of the perceived impacts of tourism. He argued that the interpretation of residents' perception of tourism requires consideration of the social structure of the region and that differences in residents' perceptions of tourism are associated with social status and social class cleavages. His study found that the level of educational attainment and the respondent's age to be the most important variables associated with tourism's impact in Livingstone, Zambia. The more highly educated managerial/professional workers in the 30-39 age category were more favourably disposed to tourism than the secondary level educated service and manual/production workers. Although Husband's argument is supported with empirical data, it is closely related to the education policies of colonial and independent Zambia. Whilst his findings are applicable in the context of the developing country of Zambia, they may not be generalisable elsewhere.

The identification of the major impacts and variables involved, the development of methodologies, and the identification of problems of research needs have been established. However, determining the impacts of tourism is a complex problem and attempts to measure perceptions of tourism's impacts have not been encouraging. There is also little theoretical understanding as to why residents respond to the impacts of tourism positively or negatively. This underdeveloped theoretical orientation of the subject is being addressed and a number of theoretical frameworks have been suggested (Ap, 1990b; Butler, 1980; Doxey, 1975; Nash, 1989; Pearce, 1989; Perdue et al., 1990; Preister, 1989).

Another problem concerns measurement. Perdue et al. (1990) indicated there is a need to develop better measures of perceived impacts of tourism in order to advance knowledge. Ap (1990a) also found that reliability and validity measures
of the survey instruments used in existing studies typically have not been reported, the exception being Sethna (1980). Up until 1991, a reliable and valid tourism impact scale had not been developed. Until a scale is developed it will be difficult to advance our understanding of tourism's impacts. This aspect is dealt with in the next section.

The importance in obtaining information about residents' perceptions of tourism and consideration of residents in the planning of tourism is well recognised (Butler, 1974; Cheng, 1980; Kendall and Var, 1984; Knox, 1977; Liu et al., 1987; Loukissas, 1983; Moulin, 1980; Murphy, 1980). Murphy (1980:356), for example, indicated that...

"to achieve a meaningful dialogue leading to alternatives and trade-off positions among groups living and operating within a tourism community requires knowledge of each group's perceptions and preferences. This is especially necessary for the residents whose views are largely unknown and whose ability to conceptualise tourism issues and strategies within a planning framework is untested."

The following section takes a look at the most recent efforts to remedy the deficiencies acknowledged in the earlier literature. Given the research objectives of this doctoral research, an emphasis is placed on the efforts to understand residents' perceptions of tourism development within the urban environment.

2.1.8 Current state of research with an emphasis on urban environments (1992-1998)

Since 1991, researchers within this field of study have adopted a variety of approaches in order to gain a greater understanding of residents' perceptions of tourism development. These approaches include:

1) several case studies in the urban environment (Bastias-Perez & Var, 1996; Faulkner & Tideswell, 1997; Gilbert & Curtis, 1997; Glasson et al., 1992; Lawson et al., 1998; Madrigal, 1995; Madrigal et al., 1993; Ross, 1992; Snaith & Haley, 1994, 1999; Snaith et al., In progress; Teo, 1994);
2) additional case studies in rural locations (Allen, Hafer, Long & Perdue, 1993; Burns, 1996; Crofts & Holland, 1993; Johnson et al., 1994; Ryan et al., 1998);
3) a variety of case studies on islands (Akis et al., 1996; Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996);
4) attempts to extend theoretical understanding (Ap, 1992; Hinch, 1996; Jyrowskic et al., 1997);
5) development of analytical models (Lindberg & Johnson, 1997; Jyrowskic et al., 1997);
6) the testing of tourism impact scales (Ap & Crompton, 1998; Lankford & Howard, 1994; Preglau, 1994; Snaith et al., In progress);
7) the development of longitudinal approaches and comparative research designs (Getz, 1994; Snaith & Haley, 1999).

In addition to these major research efforts, other studies have adopted a more specialist stance, choosing to look at one distinct part of the phenomenon. These include; linguistic competence and residents' perceptions of tourists (Prentice & Hudson, 1993), residents employed in tourism and their perception of tourists by nationality (Harlak, 1993), residents' perceptions of tourism in the pre-tourism phase (Hernandez et al., 1996), tourist endearment through their interaction with locals (Prentice et al., 1994), a comparative study of the perceptions of residents employed in tourism in developed and undeveloped countries (Pizam et al., 1994), residents' perceptions on the impact of the America's Cup (Souter & Mcleod, 1993), and resident attitudes towards specific tourism related activities such as gambling (Kang et al., 1996).

The following review of the recent literature concentrates on studies which were conducted within the urban context, or dealt specifically with the development of a tourism impact scale.

Within the tourism literature, it has been widely documented that urban tourism has been continually neglected as an area of research (Ashworth, 1989) and consequently remains devoid of a developed understanding or research base (Law, 1993; Page, 1995). One of the explanations for this is that the uniqueness of each individual city makes reliable comparisons difficult. The outcome appears therefore to be a large proportion of the literature centring on individual case studies.

An original purpose of this research, whilst adding to the list of case studies, was a response to the call for the development of valid and reliable frameworks supported by longitudinal and comparative data collection techniques. As such, it establishes a framework designed to monitor residents' opinions of tourism development in the cities of York, Bath, and Chester in England. It was felt
that without an approach of this nature, any proposed understanding would merely add to the fragmented picture of urban tourism research. Indeed, Page (1995:9) notes the important observations of Ashworth (1992a: 5) who stated that...

"Urban tourism requires the development of a coherent body of theories, concepts, techniques and methods of analysis which allow comparable studies to contribute toward some common goal of understanding of either the particular role of cities within tourism or the place of tourism within the form and function of cities".

What follows is a review of current research regarding the perceived social, economic and physical impacts of tourism on the urban environment. Studies outside of the urban context, whilst being recognised for their contribution to the exploration of determinate factors, will not be referred to in this review. This is due to the proposition that findings from outside of the urban environment may be misleading due to the potentially different opinions of residents from small, rural and resort-type destinations when compared with the opinions of those living in large cities.

There has been much emphasis placed on what Jansen-Verbeke (1995) calls "Artefacts" in the historical environment, for example, changing land use, and the adaptation of infrastructures for touristic purposes. Alternatively, she notes that there are only a limited number of empirical studies dealing with the interaction of touristic activities - people and place. A significant component of such studies should, it is suggested, include an investigation into the "Mentifacts", or attitudes and behaviour patterns of the hosting community. These attitudes frame their understanding of place and are likely to guide their behaviour with regards to the level of support they afford tourism in their city. There is a real need therefore for an extensive and thorough analysis of resident opinions regarding the perceived impacts of tourism in the urban environment.

Based on a study of residents' attitudes towards tourism, conducted during the spring of 1977, Murphy (1981) recommended that the city of York in England needed to improve community relations. This suggestion was born out of the concern that residents reported with regards to the degree of community return from hosting tourism in their city. Similarly, in his 1991 study of residents' perceptions of tourism in Cairns, Australia, Ross (1992) discovered that the impacts of tourism were felt, by the residents, to affect them more on the community rather
than an individual level. More specifically, positive perceptions regarded the increased opportunities for leisure and entertainment as well as financial gain. Alternatively, negative perceptions regarded escalating living costs (land and house prices, and accommodation), and an increase in crime due to the presence of tourism in their city.

As part of the Oxford visitor study (Glasson et al., 1992; Glasson, 1994), an additional survey of 400 local residents was conducted to provide a picture of local views of the impacts of tourism. A principal finding was that the perceptions of advantages were more favourably seen by those who worked or had a family member working in tourism-related jobs. An additional significant finding was that only those residents living in the city centre felt that the problems which visitors create outweighed the benefits.

Research conducted in the city of Darwin, Australia by Bastias-Perez and Var (1996) further highlighted the importance of assessing resident attitudes and perceptions towards tourism development in an urban environment. Their finding that middle-aged residents were more inclined to appreciate the positive economic benefits derived from tourism activity suggests that age may indeed be a useful socio-demographic indicator of attitudes.

In a recent exploratory study, Gilbert and Curtis (1997) found that nearly three quarters of the study sample from the city of Canterbury in England responded positively with regards to the notion that tourism had created greater employment opportunities within the city. They did not however feel that tourism had increased their standard of living as a whole since the resulting tourism employment opportunities were not valued. Further, residents did not perceive that property prices had increased as a result of tourism.

Two recent studies of residents' perceptions of tourism's impact on the city of York were conducted by Madrigal (1995) and Snaith and Haley (1994). Madrigal investigated Molotch's (1976) belief, that communities are comprised of smaller (nested) communities, each competing with each other to maximise their particular vision of land-use potential. Molotch observed coalitions, or at least groups that readily formed and developed around specific interests. Madrigal did indeed identify three nested clusters of residents whose perceptions of tourism enabled the naming of them as "Realists", "Haters", and "Lovers". The observation therefore, that some perceptions are shared and may contribute to behaviour, should serve to reinforce our desire to seek a greater understanding of the opinions of distinct groups towards tourism development.
The city of Canterbury conducted a resident tourism survey during January and February 1995 (Canterbury City Centre Initiative, 1996). As the questionnaire was published in the local paper, the results should be interpreted with the understanding that the self-selection by those residents who chose to complete the survey was likely to draw a biased response. It does however provide some indication of the strength of opinion regarding the impact of tourism on the city. The impacts mentioned in this survey include economic and physical impacts, and as such suggests a confusion amongst researchers as to whether they are conducting a purely social impact study, or a broader survey which seeks the answers to wider perceptions amongst the resident population. Local opinion was divided over whether or not the benefits associated with tourism outweighed the costs. Some 45.1% felt the benefits did outweigh the costs, 44.8% disagreed, whilst 10.1% remained neutral. Similar questions were asked of a sample (n=750) of residents of the city of Cambridge (Fordham Research Services, 1998). The results were “grossed-up” to reflect the 42,300 households. This resulted in the estimate that 16.3% of residents felt the costs of tourism outweighed the benefits, 53.4% were of the opinion that the benefits outweighed the costs, 13.4% were noted as being neutral, with the remaining 16.9% stating that they didn’t know. In summarising their results, Fordham Research Services (1998:11) noted that “The younger age groups and to some extent those who have most recently moved to Cambridge were more likely to state that tourism is important to life in Cambridge”. Snaith and Haley (1994) asked the same question in their study of York in 1991. Of the residents sampled (n=315), 49% felt that the benefits of tourism outweighed the costs, 25% felt the opposite was true, whilst 26% remained neutral.

This question of whether the benefits of tourism outweigh the costs, was the only item which each city asked in a way which enabled comparative analysis. Whilst each piece of research was concerned with issues regarding quality of life, visitor management and the provision of services, survey questions were phrased in such a way so as to render residents responses as non-comparable across cities.

Further analysis of the York data (Snaith and Haley, 1994) indicated several significant differences in the opinions of residents according to their socio-economic profile. First, and in agreement with the findings of Glasson et al. (1992) in Oxford, those respondents who were employed in the tourism industry were more likely to report positive perceptions towards tourism development. This was also the case for those who felt that tourism was important to their occupation. As such, economic reliance, or perceived reliance on the tourism industry proved successful in predicting positive perceptions. Secondly, as the respondents' age
increased, so too did the likelihood of them supporting a local tax levy to support tourism development. Whilst not relating to the same development issue, age, as in the case of Bastias-Perez and Var's (1996) study in Darwin, Australia, proved to be an important indicator of differing perceptions within the population.

It has been suggested that behaviour depends to a great extent on how the person perceives the world around them (Vincent & Fazio, 1992). If this is the case, then the successful management of tourism might be well served in developing place/people specific internal marketing plans (Snaith, 1997). These would be inherent acknowledgements of the opinions of the local community, and therefore serve to assist in the anticipation of likely resident reactions in advance of future policy decisions (Snaith et al., 1998).

In an attempt to develop a more functional insight into management processes, Jansen-Verbeke (1986) recommended the viewing of urban areas as leisure products. These, it was suggested, could be seen to comprise "Primary", "Secondary" and "Additional" elements. Within the primary and possibly the most important elements exists the concept of a "Leisure setting", essential components of which are the socio-cultural characteristics which give a city a distinct image and "sense of place" for visitors.

This view again serves to highlight the important contribution that the resident population could make to the image and therefore marketing of the city's tourism product. Residents' opinions of tourism are particularly important given the suggestion (Pearce, 1994; Snaith & Haley, 1994) that a happy host is more likely to welcome the tourist and in so doing generate an atmosphere which is conducive for both increased return visits and positive word-of-mouth marketing.

Whilst these urban studies are generating interesting and useful information regarding residents' perceptions of tourism, another, some might say, more important process is taking place. Several groups of researchers are developing and testing tourism impacts scales in order that the measurement of the impacts can be conducted with greater confidence. This is a response to the call for the establishment of standardised instrumentation in tourism research (Crompton, 1990; Tyrrell & Spaulding, 1994). In the Columbia River Gorge of Oregon and Washington, Lankford and Howard (1994) have been testing a multiple item tourism impact attitude scale (TIAS). The 27 item, two-dimensional scale proved reliable, but they accepted that in order to validate the scale, it needed to be tested on other populations. In their review of the approaches to instrument construction, Ap and Crompton (1998:7) noted that...
"respondents usually have been asked to rate their level of agreement with a positively or negatively worded statement about tourism".

This they suggest is a dangerous approach as responses may be biased. Indeed, Kim’s (1992) measurement of residents’ perceptions of tourism development had also obtained a two-factor structure indicating positive and negative dimensions. These two factor structures were again evident in the findings of Madrigal (1993). The similarity in aspects of the results of these early studies may be due to the fact that they utilised very similar scales, scales which were adopted from the impact items used and reported by Perdue et al., (1990).

To counter the potential confounding of results through ambiguity in the wording of questions, Ap and Crompton (1998) developed an index of tourism impacts. This development was guided by the Fishbein attitude model (Fishbein, 1963:237) in which he reported that...

"a significantly better estimate of attitude is found by taking both the belief and evaluative aspects of an object into account".

In utilising this approach, in three populations in Texas, Ap and Crompton (1998) verified the existence of the three domains, which are evident in the tourism literature (economic, social/cultural, and physical/environmental). In addition, four other domains emerged; crowding and congestion, services, taxes, and community attitude. This approach has since been tested in the city of York (Snaith et al., in progress) where the dimensions were again confirmed. Preliminary analysis of data collected by Ap in two comparative studies in Singapore and Hong Kong, again confirm the existence of these dimensions. The consistency of results that emerged across such diverse populations suggests that the instrument is likely to be applicable across a broad spectrum of communities that are impacted by tourists.

2.1.9 Conclusions regarding the state of social impacts research in the urban environment

This review of the literature regarding residents’ perceptions of tourism in the urban context has highlighted several important points:

1) the studies reviewed utilised a variety of methodologies, instruments and were conducted by academics, practitioners and consultants. The different
approaches of these individuals, groups and institutions serve to highlight that there still exists the need for a more integrated, longitudinal and comparative approach to the understanding of residents' perceptions of tourism's impact within the urban context;

2) that there has been some success in developing instruments which are both reliable and valid;

3) that an interest still exists in the nature of the social impacts of tourism as perceived by host populations;

4) that this is the case because the perceptions and attitudes of residents toward the impacts of tourism will be an important planning and policy consideration for the successful development, operation, and survival of tourism programmes and projects.

For tourism to succeed and survive in a destination area it should be viewed favourably by its residents. In addition, any unavoidable adverse impacts must be minimised. Butler (1975: 89) noted this problem and stated that...

"unless the often unforeseen and thus unplanned effects of tourism development can be controlled, or at least recognised and predicted, then opposition to the development of tourism, particularly in less well developed parts of the world, is likely to increase. Such a situation would be extremely unfortunate and could result in the loss of potentially valuable economic benefits to many areas".

Information about the consequences and impacts of tourism from host residents' perspectives is thus an important factor that needs to be considered in planning for tourism. Irrespective of how tourism is introduced and developed in a community, residents are important players who can influence the success or failure of the local tourism industry. Residents may contribute to the well being of the community through their participation (in varying degrees) in the planning, development, and operation of tourist attractions, and by extending their hospitality to tourists in exchange for the benefits obtained from tourism. On the other hand, residents may be instrumental in discouraging tourism by opposing it or exhibiting hostile behaviour toward tourism advocates and or tourists (Crompton & Ap, 1994).

The needs of the visitor have to be satisfied because providing quality experiences for the visitor by the host community will increase the desire for further
interaction between them (Hudman and Hawkins, 1989). The encounter between resident and visitor may also lead to negative experiences. Knox (1982:77) commented that...

"the tourist may have his vacation spoiled or enhanced by the resident. The resident may have his daily life enriched or degraded by the unending flow of tourists".

In developing and attracting tourism to a community, the goal is to achieve outcomes that obtain the best balance of benefits and costs for all the key players involved, that is, residents, tourists and the tourism industry. The longitudinal and comparative type of research design adopted within this study may prove to be important in terms of informing visitor management strategies in historic cities, particularly if residents report a finer balance between what they will and will not live with in terms of tourism development. The totality of these opinions deserves investigation and documentation along with associated resident profile characteristics in order to gain a fuller understanding of this essential component of the supply side of the tourism product.

2.2 METHODOLOGY

2.2.1 Introduction

The methodological choices made throughout this research follow a logical order in which they seek to:

1) measure the social impacts of tourism in three historic cities in England (research phase I);
2) find out what strategic tourism objectives and actions are employed by local authorities in England (research phase II);
3) discover the level of commitment of local authorities in their use of surveys to assess the social impacts of tourism and their tourism strategies in their resident communities, and the methods used to assess them (research phase III);
4) assimilate the knowledge gained in the previous three research phases in order to develop a functional social impacts/public consultation model which utilises a rigorous methodological approach, asks residents specific planning-related questions rather than general ones, and captures, analyses and provides information to assist in improving present consultation procedures (research phase IV).
The next section outlines the methodological procedures adopted in order to fulfil the research objectives within research phase I.

2.2.2 Research phase I

The chosen methodological approach for research phase I was quantitative in nature, namely a mailed questionnaire to a random sample of the residents of three historic cities in England. It is widely recognised within the research literature that the advantages of using a quantitative approach is that it is possible to measure the reactions of a great number of people to a limited set of questions, which facilitates comparison and statistical aggregation of the data (Bell, 1992; Preece, 1994; Robson, 1993; Veal, 1993). As this phase of the research sought to understand the opinions of a representative sample of three large populations, the mail survey provides the most suitable mechanism. The additional aim of this research was to compare the findings with those studies already reported in the literature and whilst not all of them used mail surveys, this was clearly the preferred method within the field. The mail survey is also recognised as being a relatively quick and low-cost way of collecting information. This was an important consideration given the required sample sizes within the selected cities. There are however drawbacks with this method, these include the fact that the interviewer is not present and therefore the potential for misinterpretation or confusion exists. This was minimised through the use of a short and simplified questionnaire consisting of items which had been pre-tested by other researchers (Madrigal, 1995; Perdue et al., 1990).

Another potential problem identified in the literature is that of low response rates. In order to increase the response rates in research phase I, several strategies were adopted. Within their meta-analysis of questionnaire design and associated response rates, Fox et al. (1988) found that the use of coloured questionnaire paper increased response rates. Three different colours were adopted for the studies, light green (York, 1995), light blue (Bath, 1996) and light yellow (Chester, 1998). Dillman’s Total Design Method (1978) was also adopted. This is a three wave mailing strategy which is discussed in more detail within this chapter. Preparation and planning of the mail questionnaire is of the greatest importance since once it has left the researchers hands, it must be self explanatory to the intended respondent (Oppenheim, 1992). For this reason, cover letters were designed, drafted and piloted following the recommendations of Babbie (1992). In light of the sample response rate in York (303/600; 50.5%), sample sizes were increased in Bath and Chester (n=800) to allow for the non-response experiences in the first study.
2.2.3 The sampling frames

The historic cities of York, Bath and Chester are surrounded by remnants of fortified walls, and therefore physically demarcated from their suburbs. In order to ensure that each household within the York, Bath and Chester areas possessed an equal chance of being selected to participate in the respective studies, circles, each with a radius of four miles, were placed on the Ordnance survey maps of each city and its respective surrounding areas (See figures 3, 4 and 5). The location and size of the circle was selected following discussions in 1991 with the Chief Executive of the York Visitor and Convention Bureau. A circle of this size captured the city centre, the suburbs, and out-lying villages. Following the success in achieving a closely representative sample (Snaith & Haley, 1994), the same approach was employed for the three studies presently under discussion. When selecting a sampling frame, there are many alternatives regarding the parameterisation of the chosen population, each of which, it could be argued contain methodological challenges when applied across different populations. Therefore, although the method proved successful in the city of York, it may not necessarily be suited to the other historic cities. However, whilst accepting this potential issue, it was deemed the best option because of its success in York. As such its implementation is a continuing test of its applicability across city samples.

Each grid-referenced square on the map, which lay on the peripheral boundary of the circle(s), was included if at least 50% of its total area fell within the outer boundary. Each grid square that fulfilled this criterion was enumerated. With this completed, the total sample area was seen to consist of 131 grid squares. From this sample area, a random number was selected between 1 and 131. This was achieved using the random number generator facility within the Microsoft Excel software package and resulted in the number 10 being randomly selected as the number of grid squares to be included in the sampling frame. In each study sample, the grid squares were not found to group in one particular area and included participant households from both within the city itself and outside it. The sampling frame consisted of all residential addresses within the 10 chosen grid squares. The completion of this task was facilitated by the use of the Royal Mails' Postal Address File on compact disc. The computer performed a grid search that produced a list of all the streets and residential addresses, including their postal codes, contained within those areas. A database was then compiled from this information which consisted of 10,539 residential addresses (York, 1995), 7,602 (Chester, 1998) and 8,431 (Bath, 1996). Each address was subsequently numbered.
According to Di Grino (1986), the required number of responses to achieve a representative sample from a population of 25,000 or more individuals is 348. This figure allows for 95% confidence within +/- 2.5% margin of error. The study conducted previously in York in 1991 had achieved a response rate of 58% (n=315). In an attempt to allow for non-response (42%) based on this previous experience, six hundred questionnaires were mailed to residents of York and its surrounding area during September 1995.

Figure 3
Map of the city of York indicating the sample area and the grid squares from which the study sample were randomly selected

The questionnaires were sent to households selected at random from the residential address file. In order to personalise the survey, the letters were completed with household names. This information was obtained from the electoral registers held by the Office of National Statistics (ONS) in Titchfield, Hampshire, England.
Figure 5
Map of the city of Chester indicating the sample area and the grid squares from which the study sample were randomly selected.


2.2.4 Data collection method
Dillman's (1978) Total Design Method was adopted in an attempt to increase the effectiveness of data collection. Dillman recommended the use of three separate mailings (waves). The first includes a letter of introduction (Appendix A), the research instrument (Appendix B) and a stamped self-addressed envelope for the return of the instrument. The second takes the form of a postcard reminder, and the third is a follow-up letter to non-respondents (Appendix A) with a replacement questionnaire and stamped self-addressed envelope.
A total of 303 usable questionnaires were returned from the York sample, giving a final response rate of 50.5% and whilst this represents a high response rate for a self-completion postal survey, it did not achieve the required 348 which Di Grino (1986) suggested was required from a population the size of York's. The results should therefore be viewed within this understanding. In light of these findings, 800 questionnaires were mailed to both the Bath and Chester study samples during the summers of 1996, and 1998 respectively. The response rate from Bath was 46.4%, with a total of 368 usable questionnaires. This exceeds the recommended 348 returns required from a population the size of Bath's (DiGrino, 1986). Given the success achieved from the mailing of 800 questionnaires in Bath, the same procedure was repeated in Chester. The response rate was 31%, with 248 total usable questionnaires. The smaller response rate achieved in Chester may have been due in part to it being mailed out too close to the Christmas holidays. Under different circumstances, and where time and cost were not as restrictive, it would have been possible to return to Chester and conduct a further mailing. Unfortunately the process requires access to and the use of the Royal Mail's Postal Address file on compact disc as well as additional funding to generate the mail survey. In terms of achieving this, access to the York City Royal Mail headquarters as well as additional funding were both limited.

2.2.5 The survey instrument

The survey instrument used in this study was comprised of a subset of items developed by Perdue et al., (1990). The original instrument was developed for use in rural communities in Colorado and therefore underwent slight amendment before being used in the historic cities. These amendments were therefore more contextual than conceptual as the original items were specifically designed to enable hypothesis testing and the confirmation of their model. The instrument consisted of two sections that were retained in the historic cities instrument. The first section included 23 closed-style items (York, 1995) and 24 closed-style items (Bath, 1996; Chester, 1998) and required respondents to rate their level of agreement with each item, through indicating their response on a five point Likert scale which ranged from Strongly disagree (1) to Strongly agree (5). Each of the items was related to general aspects of tourism development. Several of them shared an interest in a particular issue, therefore enabling the creation of sub-scales. The additional questionnaire item on the Bath and Chester instruments related to whether or not residents were positive about tourism when they spoke to each other about its presence in the city.
The second section sought socio-economic and demographic information in order to verify as far as possible the similarity of the study samples to the actual populations of the respective cities. This information was also incorporated in order to investigate whether socio-economic and demographic characteristics were significant in their ability to indicate differing resident opinions towards tourism development. Additional questions were added to section two of the Bath and Chester surveys in order to identify the number of times residents were entering the cities to shop, recreate, work, and the average duration of those visits. In addition, residents were asked to report whether or not they had an ancestral history of residence in the area.

2.3 RESULTS

2.3.1 The study samples

2.3.1.1 The York study (1995)

The profile of respondents reflected closely the actual socio-demographics of the population. The majority of respondents (78%) were between the ages of 30 and 74. There was a slight bias in the responses with a tendency for under-representation of those aged 16-29 (-9.1%), and 75+ (-.7%) when compared to the 1991 census data (OPCS, 1993a) for the Greater York area. Nearly 49% of the sample were born in York, with 77% reporting owning their own home. The gender breakdown of respondents (female, 56%; and males, 44%) was similarly representative of the actual breakdown of the population, which is reported at the time of the last population census as 52.3% female, and 47.7% male.

A large proportion of respondents (67.6%) had lived in the York area for over 30 years, indicating a fairly stable population. Fifty seven per cent of the sample had an annual household income of under £14,999. Seven percent of respondents reported that a member of their family was currently employed in the tourism industry. In addition, 9.6% felt that the tourism industry was either 'important' or 'very important' to their occupation.

2.3.1.2 The Bath study (1996)

The breakdown of the sample by age groups again closely reflected the actual socio-demographics of the sample area (OPCS, 1993b). The mean age of the sample was 41 years of age, with the majority (79.6%) under the age of sixty. A larger proportion of respondents fell into the 16-29 category, indicating a slight over-sampling when compared to the census data. Only 25% of the sample reported having been born in Bath, 67% owned their own home, and the gender breakdown
was 56.2% female, and 43.8% males. The mean for the length of residence was 24.6 years, with 30.4% of respondents indicating that their family had a history of habitation in the Bath area. The length of ancestral residence was reported as 112.8 years (n=107). In terms of household income, 44.8% of the sample earned less than £14,999, with the largest category being 27% who earned less than £9,999. The proportion of people who declared that they were employed in the tourism industry was 7.6%, closely mirroring the results from the York study. In addition, 8.7% of respondents felt that tourism was either “important” or “very important” to their employment.

2.3.1.3 Chester study (1998)

The breakdown of the sample by age groups again closely reflected the actual demographics of the sample area (OPCS, 1993c). The mean age of the sample was 51 years of age, indicating an older sample than in the two previous studies in York and Bath. Respondents falling within the 45 - 74 age category equalled 55.1% with 44% of the sample reporting having been born in Chester, this indicates a stable population which is comparable to York in this sense. Seventy six per cent owned their own home, and the gender breakdown was 47% female, and 53% males. The mean for the length of residence was 31.4 years, with 45% of respondents indicating that their family had a history of habitation in the Chester area. The length of ancestral residence was reported as 112.7 years (n=98), almost identical to the residents of the city of Bath. In terms of household income, 47.1% of the sample earned less than £14,999, with the largest category being 25.9% who earned less than £9,999. Once again, these sample results are extremely similar to the two other studies. The proportion of people who declared that they were employed in the tourism industry was 5.1%, this being a slightly lower percentage than reported by the York and Bath samples. In addition, 13.2% of respondents felt that tourism was either “important” or “very important” to their employment.

2.3.2 Research phase 1: the analysis

The following analytical procedures were chosen and conducted in order to test the research findings and conclusions of previous researchers. The results will be presented in three sections.
2.3.2.1 Section 1: Principal Components Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation
(Research question 1)

Principal components factor analysis with Varimax rotation was conducted on each sample and then on the aggregate sample in order to test research question 1. The conventional criteria for factor analysis is that there should be a minimum of 5 cases per item (Tinsley and Tinsley, 1987). In this case, with a 24-item questionnaire, that would mean 120 respondents. This has been achieved in each of the three samples.

Research question 1

"Are there any underlying dimensions regarding residents' opinions of tourism development in the three city samples?"

Null Hypothesis (Ho)

No underlying dimensions will emerge from the analysis of resident responses to tourism development issues within the three city samples.

Following the initial factor extraction process, a Varimax rotation was conducted in order to make the results more easily interpretable. This resulted in a two-factor solution being specified (see Table 1). This solution was accepted in line with the recommendations of Green et al., (1997:352)) who state that "Eigenvalues are helpful in deciding how many factors should be used in the analysis". They recommend two accepted practices, first, retain all factors that have eigenvalues greater than 1, or secondly, retain all factors with eigenvalues in the sharp descent part of the Scree plot. The second, it is suggested, yields more accurate results (see Figures 6, 7 & 8).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>York Sample (n=303)</th>
<th>Bath Sample (n=368)</th>
<th>Chester Sample (n=248)</th>
<th>Aggregate Sample (n=919)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Benefits outweigh negative consequences</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tourism improves appearance of the city</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increasing tourist no's improves economy</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tourism increases recreational opportunities</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Should become more of a tourist destination</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improves the quality of life</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The city should try to attract more tourists</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long term planning controls negative impacts</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tourism provides good jobs for residents</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tourism should play a vital role in the future</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support local tax for tourism</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I can personally influence tourism decisions</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When I talk to fellow residents I am positive</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Tourism businesses too influential politically</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local government should restrict tourism</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local government should control tourism</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tourism has a negative effect on environment</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tourism increases the council tax</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tourism leads to more litter on the streets</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tourists should pay more for attractions</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tourism unfairly increases property prices</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduces quality of my outdoor recreation</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tourism increases the amount of crime</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tourism increases the traffic in the city</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Having specified the two-factor solution, results indicate that the two domains within the sample data signified residents' positive and negative opinions of tourism development. The items loading saliently (communalities of .40 or greater; Ap and Crompton, 1998) on the positive domain differed marginally across samples. The two factors accounted for 40% of variance in the Bath data set, with all items loading on the two domains. In the York data however, whilst the two factors...
accounted for 36% of variance, five of the twenty one items failed to load on the anticipated domains. In the Chester data, three items did not load on the anticipated domains, however, the two factors again accounted for 42% of variance. The amount of variance explained in each of the samples is fairly low and therefore it must be recognised that the factors are not particularly strong. In addition, it is worth noting that three of the items did not load on the two domains in any of the samples. These were: “I feel that I can personally influence the decision-making process associated with tourism development in ...” “I would support local tax levies for tourism development” and an additional question which was included in the Bath and Chester surveys, “When I talk to fellow residents of ...concerning tourism in the city, I am generally very positive”. These items are reported in the coefficient’s alpha tables with the indication that they are not included in the scales.

Figure 6
Scree plot of eigenvalues for the York study
Figure 7
Scree plot of eigenvalues for the Bath study

Figure 8
Scree plot of eigenvalues for the Chester study
Figure 9
Scree plot of eigenvalues for the aggregate sample

Having established the existence of these two domains, it remains to test for internal consistency among each of the items within each of the domains. This was accomplished by computing Cronbach's coefficient alpha's which indicate the degree of item-total correlation. Again, these procedures were conducted on each sample independently and then on the aggregated sample (Table 2). This is an important stage as the results will establish whether or not it is acceptable to use the two domains as variables in later stages of the analysis.

Table 2
Summary of Cronbach's alpha results measuring the internal consistency of each of the domains on the three independent samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>York (9)</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bath (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chester (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>York (7)</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bath (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chester (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The values were sufficiently consistent across the samples, and items in each domain possessed item-total correlations ranging from .41 to .73 (Positive), and .40 to .68 (Negative). The data confirmed that the items did belong to the domains to which they were assigned, and that the scales were internally consistent. These results indicate the existence of two underlying dimensions regarding residents' opinions of tourism development in the three city samples. In answering research question 1, the null hypothesis is rejected, establishing that two underlying dimensions emerge from the analysis of resident responses to tourism development issues within the three city samples. These dimensions relate to the residents' positive and negative opinions of tourism.

2.3.2.2 Section 2: t-tests for independent samples (Research question 2)

Having ascertained the reliability of the items within their associated domains, Tables 3 and 4 report the mean scores for each scale item in each of the cities. The secondary objective of the analysis was to run a series of t-tests for independent samples to see whether or not the reported differences in opinions are actually significant, and therefore whether the residents of these three cities perceive the same level of impact from tourism’s development. This procedure was conducted in order to test research question 2.

Research question 2

“Do the residents of the cities of York, Bath and Chester have the same opinions regarding the majority of impacts which tourism brings to their cities?"

Null Hypothesis (Ho)

The residents of the three historic cities have different opinions regarding the impacts which tourism development has on their respective cities.
Table 3
Comparison of the means and 2-tailed t-scores (Independent samples) for each of the perceived positive tourism impact statements by city

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive tourism impact statements</th>
<th>YORK (n=303)</th>
<th>Mean scores</th>
<th>CHESTER (n=248)</th>
<th>YORK/BATH</th>
<th>YORK/CHESTER</th>
<th>CHESTER/BATH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More tourism improves the economy</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.00***</td>
<td>.00***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The benefits of tourism outweigh its negative impacts</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.00***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism should play a vital role in the future</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism provides good jobs for residents</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The city should not try to attract more tourists</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.00***</td>
<td>.00***</td>
<td>.00***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism improves the appearance of the city</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>.01**</td>
<td>.00***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism increases recreational opportunities</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.00***</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.00***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The city should become more of a tourist destination</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.00***</td>
<td>.00***</td>
<td>.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism development increases the quality of life</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.00***</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>.00***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I talk to fellow residents I am positive</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would support a local tax levy for tourism</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can personally influence tourism decisions</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.00***</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.00***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean for the scale</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.00***</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.00***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* 1=Strongly disagree  5=Strongly agree

b Reverse coded item

c Not included in scale

*** P<.001    ** P<.01

* P<.05
2.3.2.2.1 York residents' positive tourism impact opinions compared with those of Bath's residents

Table 3 contains two sets of results. First, it presents the mean scores for each positive questionnaire item for each of the three cities. In doing this, any differences are easily identifiable to the eye. Secondly, it highlights (in bold) and asterixes (level of significance) those questions wherein the responses of each respective cities' residents differed significantly. Keeping in mind that the questions required respondents to answer on a Likert scale (ranging from 1= Strongly disagree through to 5= Strongly agree), it is evident that the residents of Bath, whilst agreeing with the majority of positive tourism impact statements, viewed the benefits associated with tourism less favourably than the residents of York. This is confirmed in the overall scale mean which is significantly lower than York (p<.001).

2.3.2.2.2 York residents' negative tourism impact opinions compared with those of Bath's residents

Table 4 follows the same format as Table 3 however this time, it is the negative tourism impact opinions which are compared. It is important to point out that not all of the items that loaded saliently on the negative scale dimension for one city did so for the others. For this reason, they are denoted by the superscript letter b. The residents of York were more likely, than the residents of Bath, to perceive that tourism development would “increase the council tax (p<.001)” and “property prices (p<.01)”. The residents of Bath on the other hand were more acutely aware of “tourism’s effect on the environment (p<.01)” and the need for “local government control of tourism (p<.01)” when compared with the residents of York.

2.3.2.2.3 York residents’ positive tourism impact opinions compared with those of Chester’s residents

The residents of Chester were generally more positive in terms of their appreciation that tourism improves the local economy (p<.001), their recognition that "tourism should play a vital role in the future" (p<.05), their desire that the city "should try to attract more tourists" (p<.001), and their belief that "tourism improves the quality of life" (p<.05). The York residents however, were more agreeable to the suggestion that their city "should become more of a tourist destination" (p<.001). Overall, the scale mean showed no significant difference between Chester and York resident's positive opinions (Table 3).
2.3.2.2.4 York residents' negative tourism impact opinions compared with those of Chester's residents

Seven significant differences were established between the residents' negative opinions of tourism in the two cities. In each of these cases, the residents of York were more aware of the negative impacts of tourism, something which is confirmed in the overall difference in scale means (p < .001; Table 4).

2.3.2.2.5 Chester residents' positive tourism impact opinions compared with those of Bath's residents

Results indicated that in nine of the eleven items, the residents of Chester were significantly more positive than the residents of Bath. The only exception was in regard to the question of whether the city should become more of a tourist destination. As was the case with the Chester/York comparison, the residents of Chester were less agreeable to this suggestion than the residents of Bath (p < .05). In confirmation of the Chester residents' more positive outlook, the overall mean scale score was significantly more positive than the residents of Bath (p < .001; Table 3).

2.3.2.2.6 Chester residents' negative tourism impact opinions compared with those of Bath's residents

Nine of the eleven items indicated a significantly greater awareness among the Bath residents of the potentially negative impacts of tourism development. The other two items, whilst not showing significant differences, indicate that the residents of Chester are more concerned about the potential negative influence of tourism on their council tax and the price of property (see Table 4). The overall mean score for the scale reflects the more negative opinions of Bath's residents (p < .001).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative tourism impact statements</th>
<th>YORK (n=303)</th>
<th>Mean scores*</th>
<th>CHESTER (n=248)</th>
<th>2-tailed t-scores</th>
<th>YORK/BATH</th>
<th>YORK/CHESTER</th>
<th>CHESTER/BATH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tourism increases traffic</td>
<td>3.99 b</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.00***</td>
<td>.00***</td>
<td>.00***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism leads to more litter</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.00***</td>
<td>.00***</td>
<td>.00***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism development increases council tax</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.00***</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism unfairly increases property prices</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.01**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism businesses are too influential politically</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.01**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism increases the amount of crime</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.00***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism negatively affects the environment</td>
<td>3.03 b</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.01**</td>
<td>.01**</td>
<td>.00***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism reduces quality of outdoor recreation</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.01**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government should control tourism</td>
<td>3.52 b</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.40 b</td>
<td>.01**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government should restrict tourism</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>3.01 b</td>
<td>2.67 b</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourists should pay more for attractions</td>
<td>3.54 b</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>2.88 b</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.00***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean for the scale</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.00***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean for all items</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1 = Strongly disagree - 5 = Strongly agree
* * P < .01
* * * P < .001

Table 4
Comparison of the means and 2-tailed t-scores (independent samples) for each of the perceived negative tourism impact statements by city
2.3.2.2.7 Summary of findings

In seeking an answer to research question 2, it becomes evident from the results, that it is not possible to reject the null hypothesis. It must therefore be recognised that whilst the residents share similar perceptions regarding some tourism issues, their responses to the majority of issues indicates different perceptions of the degree to which tourism impacts on their respective cities.

To summarise, the residents of Chester are more positive than the residents of York and Bath, but are less likely to support more tourism development. The residents of York are more positive than the residents of Bath who are the least positive regarding the influence of tourism's impact on their city. Whilst each of the three city samples are aware of the negative impacts of tourism, Bath residents are the most sensitive to the negative pressures, next are the York residents, and then the residents of Chester.

2.3.2.3 Section 3: Hierarchical Regression Analysis (Research question 3)

The next stage of analysis investigates whether or not residents’ socio-economic and demographic characteristics, economic reliance and positive and negative perceptions of tourism are useful predictors of their opinions regarding tourism development issues. In order to achieve this, the socio-economic and demographic profiles of the respondents were entered as independent variables in a series of hierarchical regression equations. This procedure was conducted in order to test research question 3.

Research question 3

"Is it possible to predict residents’ opinions of tourism development according to their socio-economic and demographic characteristics, economic reliance and negative and positive opinions of tourism?"

Null Hypothesis (Ho)

No it is not possible to predict residents’ opinions of tourism development according to their socio-economic and demographic characteristics, economic reliance and negative and positive perceptions of tourism.

A series of seven hierarchical regression equations were computed for each city. The dependent variables were specifically selected to assess:
1) whether residents' socio-economic and demographic characteristics, economic reliance and positive and negative opinions are good predictors of community support for tourism “...should become more of a tourist destination” “...should try to attract more tourists” “tourism should play a vital part in the future of the city” (Tables 5, 6 and 7);

2) whether residents' socio-economic and demographic characteristics, economic reliance and positive and negative opinions are good predictors of community opposition to tourism “local government should restrict tourism development” (Table 8);

3) whether residents' socio-economic and demographic characteristics, economic reliance and positive and negative opinions are good predictors of the degree to which people feel that they are involved in the decisions made regarding tourism development in their city “I feel that I can personally influence the decision-making process associated with tourism development in...” (Table 9);

4) whether residents' socio-economic and demographic characteristics, economic reliance and positive and negative opinions are good predictors of either their positive, or negative opinions of tourism (Tables 10 and 11).
Table 5
Hierarchical regression of “The city should become more of a tourist destination” on resident characteristics, economic reliance, and positive and negative opinions of tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blocks of Independent variables</th>
<th>York</th>
<th>Bath</th>
<th>Chester</th>
<th>York</th>
<th>Bath</th>
<th>Chester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Resident characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of residence</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance of residence from</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Tourist Zone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in city a</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home ownership b</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year round residence</td>
<td>.09**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.07+</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Economic reliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of tourism to occupation</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed in the tourism industry c</td>
<td>.14***</td>
<td>.07***</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Positive</td>
<td>.69***</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td>.61***</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Negative</td>
<td>.69***</td>
<td>.60***</td>
<td>.61***</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant F
+ P<.10
* P<.05
** P<.01
*** P<.001

a Born in York: Yes=1, No=0
b Home ownership: Own=1, Rent=0
c Employed in the tourism industry: Yes=1, No=0

d Adjusted R square

Whilst interpreting multiple regression equations of the type presented here, it is important to note the recommendations of Bryman and Cramer (1997), that when utilising independent variables which rely on different units of measurement, no significance should be attributed to individual variables unless there regression coefficients have been standardised. This has not been conducted within these multiple regression equations and whilst it is possible to indicate the contribution of each variable to its group of variables, e.g. "Resident Characteristics", no significance can be attached to them singularly. As such, those that are worthy of mention remain in bold highlight, but are not given a significance rating. The results of the first hierarchical regression analysis (Table 5) indicated that the
equation contained a valid set of explanatory variables. The explanation of total variance in the model (adjusted $R^2$) reached 60, 69 and 61 percent. The following results report the significance of resident characteristics, economic reliance and positive and negative opinions on predicting resident opinions regarding specific tourism related issues.

In York, resident characteristics proved significant ($R^2=.09; p<.01$) in their ability to predict support for the city becoming more of a tourist destination. Whilst not indicating a significant contribution, it is worth noting that of all the resident characteristics entered into the equation, it was those on lower incomes ($\beta=-.11$) which were the most likely to support this suggestion. Additionally, economic reliance proved significant ($R^2=.14; p<.001$) in its ability to predict resident support. The most influential item was that related to whether or not residents were employed in the tourism industry ($\beta=.10$). Up to this point, the two groups of independent variables account for only 14% of the variance. The positive scale however, increases the explanation of variance to 69% ($p<.001$). Finally, the negative scale fails to add any explanation of the variance, suggesting that the positive opinions of York's residents are the most effective in predicting their support for York becoming more of a tourist destination.

In Bath, results indicated that resident characteristics are not predictive of residents' opinions on this issue, whilst economic reliance is ($R^2=.07; p<.001$). Again, the positive scale offers the greatest contribution to the explanation of variance ($R^2=.57; p<.001$), whilst the negative scale also offers a significant degree of explanation ($R^2$ change=.03; $p<.001$). These results suggest that as residents' positive opinions increase and their negative ones decrease, they are more supportive of Bath becoming more of a tourist destination.

In Chester, the results indicated that resident characteristics were insignificant as predictors of opinions, whilst economic reliance was ($R^2=.11; p<.05$). The positive opinions scale contributed the greatest explanation of variance ($R^2=.61; p<.001$), with the negative opinions scale proving insignificant in its ability to predict residents' opinions. This set of results indicates that those with positive opinions and who perceive themselves to be reliant on tourism are more likely to support Chester becoming more of a tourist destination.

The second hierarchical regression (Table 6) again sought to investigate an aspect of resident support for tourism. This time, it was the question of whether or not their respective cities should try to attract more tourists. Again the regression equations achieved reasonable levels of explanation, these being 47, 51 and 48 percent of adjusted $R^2$. 
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In York, resident characteristics \( (R^2=.09; \ p<.001) \) were significant predictors of support for the city trying to attract more tourists. Within the variable set, age appears, from looking at the regression coefficients, to provide the strongest indication. As age decreases \( (\text{beta}=-.16) \), the support for attracting more tourists increases. The \( R^2 \) change through the addition of economic reliance is insignificant, whilst the positive scale again contributes the largest explanation of the variance in the equation \( (R^2=.50; \ p<.001) \). The negative scale makes a significant contribution \( (R^2 \text{ change}=.01; \ p<.05) \).

In Bath, resident characteristics are insignificant as a group, economic reliance is significant \( (R^2=.04; \ p<.05) \), the positive scale makes the largest contribution \( (R^2=.41; \ p<.001) \), with the negative opinions scale accounting for additional explanation of variance \( (R^2 \text{ change}=.06; \ p<.001) \).

In Chester, resident characteristics are again insignificant, economic reliance is only significant at the \( p<.10 \) level, Positive opinions are the most significant contributor \( (R^2=.39; \ p<.001) \), whilst the negative opinions scale makes another significant contribution \( (R^2 \text{ change}=.09; \ p<.001) \).
Table 6
Hierarchical regression of "The city should try to attract more tourists" on resident characteristics, economic reliance, and positive and negative opinions of tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blocks of Independent variables</th>
<th>York (R²d)</th>
<th>Bath (Beta)</th>
<th>Chester (Beta)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Resident characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of residence</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance of residence from</td>
<td>.10⁺</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Tourist Zone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in city a</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.16⁺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home ownership b</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.09⁺</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year round residence</td>
<td>.09***</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Economic reliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of tourism to occupation</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed in the tourism industry c</td>
<td>.09***</td>
<td>.04⁺</td>
<td>.04⁺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Positive</td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.38***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Negative</td>
<td>.51***</td>
<td>.47***</td>
<td>.48***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant F
⁺ P<.10
* P<.05
** P<.01
*** P<.001

a Born in York: Yes=1, No=0
b Home ownership: Own=1, Rent=0
c Employed in the tourism industry: Yes=1, No=0
d Adjusted R square
The third series of hierarchical regressions (Table 7) were designed to investigate whether or not resident characteristics, economic reliance and positive and negative opinions could indicate resident support for tourism playing a vital part in the future of each of the respective cities. These independent variables accounted for 58, 65 and 54 percent of variance within the equations. Again, support was evident from within the resident communities.
In York, resident characteristics were insignificant, economic reliance was significant ($R^2=.05; p<.05$), the positive opinions scale was significant ($R^2=.57; p<.001$) and the negative opinions scale was insignificant ($R^2$ change=.01).

In Bath, resident characteristics were again insignificant, economic reliance was significant ($R^2=.09; p<.001$), the positive opinions scale was significant ($R^2=.65; p<.001$), and the negative opinions scale was insignificant in its contribution to the explanation of variance.

In Chester, resident characteristics were again insignificant, economic reliance was significant ($R^2=.10; p<.01$), the positive opinions scale was significant ($R^2=.54; p<.001$) and the negative opinions scale was insignificant in its contribution.

The fourth set of hierarchical regressions (Table 8) sought to investigate resident support for local government restrictions on tourism development. The equations accounted for 44, 53 and 54 percent of variance.

In all three samples, resident characteristics were again insignificant. Economic reliance was insignificant in York, but significant in Bath ($R^2=.06; p<.01$), and Chester ($R^2=.10; p<.01$). The results for the positive opinions scale were significant in all three samples, indicating that as positive opinions decreased, the support for local government restrictions on tourism development increased. In support of this, the opposite was true of the negative opinions, where as they increased, so too did the support for local government restrictions.
### Table 8

Hierarchical regression of “Local government should restrict tourism development” on resident characteristics, economic reliance, and positive and negative opinions of tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blocks of Independent variables</th>
<th>York (R² d)</th>
<th>Bath (R² d)</th>
<th>Chester (R² d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Resident characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of residence</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance of residence from</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Tourist Zone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in city a</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home ownership b</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.09*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year round residence</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Economic reliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of tourism to</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed in the tourism</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06**</td>
<td>.10**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>industry c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Positive</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>.32***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Negative</td>
<td>.53***</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.54***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant F:
+ P<.10
* P<.05
** P<.01
*** P<.001

a Born in York: Yes=1, No=0
b Home ownership: Own=1, Rent=0
c Employed in the tourism industry: Yes=1, No=0
d Adjusted R square

The fifth hierarchical regressions (Table 9) related to the extent to which residents felt that they could personally influence decisions associated with tourism development in their respective cities. The independent variables performed poorly, accounting for only 5, 8 and 10 percent of the total variance.

With this in mind, results indicated that resident characteristics were insignificant in York, but significant in Bath (R²=.04; p<.05), with those living a greater distance away from the centre reporting a greater sense of influence over the decision-making process. Resident characteristics were again significant in the city of Chester (R²=.06; p<.05), with those on lower incomes reporting a sense of more influence on the decision-making process.
Economic reliance was a significant contributor to the explanation of variance in all three city samples, although most notably in York ($R^2=.10; p<.01$). The positive scale was only significant in the Bath sample ($R^2$ change=.03; $p<.01$), whilst the negative scale was insignificant in its ability to predict residents' opinions of the degree to which they felt that they could influence the decision-making process.

**Table 9**
Hierarchical regression of “I feel I can personally influence the decision making process associated with tourism in the city” on resident characteristics, economic reliance, and positive and negative opinions of tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blocks of Independent variables</th>
<th>York (R²)</th>
<th>Bath (R²)</th>
<th>Chester (R²)</th>
<th>York (Beta)</th>
<th>Bath (Beta)</th>
<th>Chester (Beta)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Resident characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of residence</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance of residence from</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Tourist Zone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in city a</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home ownership b</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.13+</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year round residence</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.06*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Economic reliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of tourism to occupation</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed in the tourism industry</td>
<td>.05**</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Positive</td>
<td>.05**</td>
<td>.08***</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Negative</td>
<td>.05**</td>
<td>.08***</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant $F$  
+ $P<.10$  
* $P<.05$  
** $P<.01$  
***$P<.001$  

*a Born in York: Yes=1, No=0  
*b Home ownership: Own=1, Rent=0  
*c Employed in the tourism industry: Yes=1, No=0  
*d Adjusted R square
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blocks of Independent variables</th>
<th>York</th>
<th>Bath</th>
<th>Chester</th>
<th>York</th>
<th>Bath</th>
<th>Chester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(R^2)</td>
<td>(\beta)</td>
<td>(R^2)</td>
<td>(\beta)</td>
<td>(R^2)</td>
<td>(\beta)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Resident characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of residence</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance of residence from</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Tourist Zone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in city (a)</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home ownership (b)</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year round residence</td>
<td>.07**</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.04+</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Economic reliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of tourism to</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed in the tourism</td>
<td>.10***</td>
<td>.11***</td>
<td>.21***</td>
<td>.10***</td>
<td>.11***</td>
<td>.21***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>industry (c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Negative</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>-.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The underlying positive and negative opinion dimensions appeared to be effective in predicting residents' support or otherwise for tourism development. With this in mind, two additional hierarchical regression equations (Tables 10 and 11) were conducted to investigate whether or not positive or negative opinions were stronger within distinct sections of the populations. The regression equation in Table 10 explained 38, 40 and 45 percent of the variance in each of the cities respectively.

Resident characteristics proved to be significant, in varying degrees, in their ability to explain the variance in residents' positive opinions within the city samples. In York (\(R^2=.07; p<.01\)), the shorter the length of residence (\(\beta=-.15\)) and home ownership (\(\beta=-.13\)) appeared to be the greatest contributors in terms of the size of
their regression coefficients. In Bath \((R^2=.04; p<.05)\), the shorter the length of residence was again the greatest contributor to the overall explanation of variance. In Chester \((R^2=.04; p<.10)\), year round residents were more positive.

Economic reliance was significant in its predictive contribution in all three city samples. In York \((R^2=.10; p<.001)\) it was the most important contribution to the explanation of variance was from those employed in the tourism industry \((\beta=.13)\). In Bath \((R^2=.11; p<.001)\), it was the importance which people perceived tourism had to their occupation which was the greatest contributor \((\beta=.12)\). In Chester \((R^2=.21; p<.001)\), it was again those people employed in tourism who appeared to be the most positive \((\beta=.20)\).

The inclusion of the negative opinion’s scale was intended to act as a check on the data responses of residents. It would make sense that their positive responses would be diametrically opposed to their negative responses. This is apparent in Table 10, where residents' negative opinions are significant in their ability to predict positive opinions. In all of the city samples, its contribution is significant \((p<.001)\). The direction of the regression coefficients shows that as negative opinions decrease, positive opinions increase.

The regression equation in Table 11 explained 31, 36 and 40 percent of the variance in each of the city samples.
Table 11
Hierarchical regression of negative opinions of tourism on resident characteristics, economic reliance on the industry and their positive opinions of tourism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blocks of Independent variables</th>
<th>York (R²)</th>
<th>Bath (Beta)</th>
<th>Chester (R²)</th>
<th>York (Beta)</th>
<th>Bath (Beta)</th>
<th>Chester (Beta)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Resident characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of residence</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance of residence from</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Tourist Zone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in city</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home ownership</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year round residence</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Economic reliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of tourism to occupation</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed in the tourism industry</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.08***</td>
<td>.14***</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.11+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Positive</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>-.59</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>-.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant F
+ P<.10
* P<.05
** P<.01
*** P<.001

Residents' characteristics were insignificant, in predicting negative opinions, in York (R²=-.01) and Chester (R²=.01), but were significant in Chester (R²=.03; <.05) with those born in the city indicating the greatest contribution (beta=.12).

Economic reliance made no contribution to understanding residents' negative opinions of tourism in York (R²=.00). In Bath (R² change=.05; p<.001) and Chester (R² change=.13; p<.001) however, it did.

Residents' positive opinions are significant in their ability to predict negative opinions. In all of the city samples, its contribution is significant (p<.001). The direction of the regression coefficients shows that as positive opinions decrease, negative opinions increase.
In answering research question 3, the results of the seven hierarchical regressions enable the rejection of the null hypothesis since residents' socio-economic and demographic characteristics, economic reliance and negative and positive opinions of tourism were found to indicate differing levels of support and opposition to tourism development. These results indicate the potential for predicting residents' opinions of tourism development in historic cities according to certain resident characteristics.

2.4 FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

As was stated in the introduction to this section, the original purpose of this research was to examine residents' opinions of tourism development in three historic cities in England. Having set the context for these studies, research was conducted using the same methodological approach and instrument. The primary aim was the establishment of a research framework that would enable longitudinal and comparative analysis of residents' opinions, acting as a type of benchmark study. The subsequent analysis of the results enabled the answering of the three research questions and provides a sound foundation for recommendations regarding a way forward in social impact assessment studies. The discussion adopts the same structure as the results section, falling into the three logical sections, each relating to one of the research questions.

2.4.1 Are there any underlying dimensions regarding residents' opinions of tourism development in the three city samples?

The first research question concerned whether or not there were any underlying dimensions regarding residents' opinions of tourism development in the three city samples. It had been suggested (Kim, 1992; Madrigal, 1993; Perdue et al., 1990; Snaith & Haley, 1994) that a two-factor structure existed which indicated positive and negative dimensions. Results from this research confirm these observations with two-factor structures apparent in all three samples. This enables the rejection of the null hypothesis and establishes consistency in the use of this research approach. There has, however, been criticism of this approach (Ap & Crompton, 1998; Snaith et al., in progress) supported by the discovery of another four potential dimensions: Crowding and congestion, Services, Taxes and Community attitude. Whilst this new approach is welcomed, the continual development of new instrumentation carries with it, an important implication. Increasing the understanding of the underlying dimensions is an important step
forward, but it must be remembered that consistent historical data also serves a purpose.

In order to trace the changing nature of residents' opinions and compare them alongside developments in tourism and its planning within a destination, some degree of continuity must exist which acts as a baseline for reference. It is suggested that there is a place for several different approaches that either possess the potential for comparative analysis or seek to drive more specific understanding.

2.4.2 Do the residents of the cities of York, Bath and Chester have the same level of perceptions regarding the majority of impacts which tourism brings to their city?

The second research question sought to discover whether or not the residents of the three historic cities possessed similar opinions regarding the nature and impact of tourism in their community. At first sight, the mean scores for each city appear to indicate differences between the study sample responses across all questions. The overall mean scores for the positive tourism impact statements show that Chester residents are the most positive (x=3.44), next are the residents of York (x=3.38) and then Bath (x=3.19). This indicates that the residents of each of the cities do recognise the positive benefits of tourism. The lowest scoring item for all three samples was "I feel that I can personally influence the decision-making process for tourism". This supports the findings of Murphy (1981) who suggested that the city of York should concentrate more effort on educating residents about tourism and involving them in the planning. This finding is common in social impacts research and may indeed be reflected in the fact that the most consistent finding is that those employed and therefore involved in the tourism industry see it more positively.

The significance of the differences in mean scores were tested using the 2 tailed t-test for independent samples procedure. The results of the t-tests indicated that the null hypothesis could not be rejected and that the residents of the cities were found to have sufficiently differing opinions regarding the impacts of tourism. The results in Tables 3 and 4 illustrate the degree to which these opinions differed. Perhaps the most important observation is that there are fewer differences between the residents of York and Bath, suggesting that as destinations, they may be more similar in terms of the nature of their development and the residents' experiences of tourism.
Each of the cities are more fully discussed in chapter three, and whilst this research did not set out to suggest why the residents may feel similarly about tourism, there are many contributory factors which deserve further research attention. These include: number of tourist arrivals, size of the central tourist zone, the structure of the social space, degree of resident-tourist interaction, the length of time tourism has been present in the destination, tourist-type, management techniques, extent of public consultation, the number employed in tourism, and the perceived opportunity cost of developing tourism compared with other industries. The point being made is that there remains a great number of potential contributory factors which could influence the opinions of residents and which are not presently accounted for in any measurable way.

The story so far suggests that within this research, two distinct dimensions exist within the opinions of residents of the cities. These are either positive or negative. In addition, the residents perceive the majority of impacts differently between samples. There are however, fewer differences reported by York and Bath residents than by York and Chester and Bath and Chester. This suggests that the resident experience of tourism in York and Bath are more similar. Additionally, it is worth pointing out that Chester residents are more positive and less negative, indicating that they are more supportive of Chester's tourism industry, whilst not necessarily supporting further growth.

2.4.3 Do residents' opinions of tourism development differ according to their socio-economic and demographic characteristics?

Much of the early literature debated the potential for using socio-economic and demographic variables as indicators of differing opinions and perceptions of tourism (Pizam, 1978; Rothman, 1978). This debate has continued throughout the last twenty years with a great deal of disagreement. The reason for this may well lie in the limited attempts by the research groups, to define the type of destination, utilise the same methodology and develop models which are broad enough to contain all of the potentially contributory variables. In this way there is little confidence in establishing whether or not socio-economic and demographic variables are significant indicators of distinct opinions regarding tourism. It would be most useful for tourism planners if it were that simple since they could hypothesise regarding the likely reactions of the resident population to future planning actions. As things are, there is not a sufficient enough body of longitudinal and comparative research in specific destinations to enable those general predictions.
This research was conducted with the explicit intention that the study samples would receive the same questionnaire, it would be deployed using the same methodology and that the samples would each be randomly selected from a specific type of destination. Research question three sought to ask whether socio-economic and demographic characteristics act as useful predictors of residents’ opinions within urban historic cities in England. Results enabled the rejection of the null hypothesis, suggesting that some of the variables may indeed provide the basis for a general understanding of which people are more susceptible to perceiving certain impacts of tourism. A total of seven hierarchical regressions were conducted. These are discussed under a series of subheadings.

2.4.3.1 Community support for tourism

The results from the first three hierarchical regression equations indicated that residents’ positive opinions were consistently predictive of their support for tourism \((p<.001)\) across all three city samples. Their negative opinions were not as reliable, suggesting that residents are more likely to support tourism development if they are sold a positive image, rather than trying to reduce the perceived negative impacts. In York, results suggested that younger people might be more supportive of attracting more tourists, a finding which supports the observations of Husbands (1989) who said that age was one of the most important variables affecting residents’ perceptions of tourism. In each of the three cities it was found that as income level fell, the residents were more likely to support more tourism. Those on lower incomes were more likely to accept their city becoming more of a tourist destination. In support of this, those on lower incomes also believed that tourism should play a vital role in the future of York. This is further established by the finding that those employed in the tourism industry were more supportive of their city becoming more of a tourist destination.

The group of variables associated with economic reliance proved consistently predictive of support for tourism development. In Chester, those on higher incomes were more supportive of attracting more tourists, the opposite to that found in the York sample. These findings may be related to the respondents’ recognition of the economic opportunities and benefits afforded by tourism development. They certainly support the consistent research finding that those who perceive that they may, or actually do, benefit economically from tourism are more supportive of further tourism development (Perdue et al., 1990).
2.4.3.2 Support for local government restrictions on tourism development

The fourth hierarchical regression sought to investigate whether residents wanted local government to restrict tourism development. A consistent finding across all three city samples was that as positive perceptions went down and negative ones went up, the support for restrictions went up. Only one socio-economic and demographic profile variable indicated potential support for restrictions on tourism development. This was found in the Bath sample that has already been noted as being the least positive of the three samples. In this case, it was found that those people living closer to the CTZ appeared more supportive of restrictions. Belisle and Hoy (1980) first observed the distance of residence from the CTZ as a significant variable. In their study of Santa Marta in Colombia, the opposite was found, that those living closer to the CTZ were more positive and supportive than those living further away. This was seen as being due to the incipient stage of development present at that time. It may well be therefore, that later on in the life cycle of the destination, that those living closer to the main CTZ become increasingly impacted by the pressure of increasing numbers of tourists on the local infrastructure.

2.4.3.3 Residents' perceived level of influence on the decision-making process

This item did not load on any of the dimensions in the earlier stages of the research, and again here, the adjusted R² was weak in all three city samples, ranging between 5 and 10%. This indicates that it was either a poorly worded question, the respondents misunderstood it, or that there is no association between their perceptions of tourism and their ability to be involved in the decision-making process. This would be a potentially damning explanation and if it were the case, it would support the notion that the consultation process must become more transparent and accessible before sustainable community tourism can ever become a reality.

Interestingly enough, given the weak overall strength of the equations, it was found in all three city samples, that those on lower incomes were more likely to feel that they could influence the decision-making process. Perhaps this indicates the influence of older people who have the time in retirement to involve themselves in local issues, or perhaps indicates a degree of unemployment amongst the younger age groups and a similar ability to become involved. Either way, this was a concern of Keogh (1990) and remains an interesting area of research to develop since it may offer an insight into the motivations and ability of individuals to involve themselves in local issues and the planning of their communities.
2.4.3.4 Residents' positive opinions of tourism

Given that the only truly consistent variable was the scale variable relating to residents' positive opinions of tourism development, the fifth hierarchical regression equation investigated whether or not it was possible to predict positive perceptions using residents' profile variables. In each of the three samples, the shorter the length of residence, the more positive the perceptions of tourism appeared. This agrees with the findings of Liu and Var (1986) in their study of the residents of Hawaii, and again by Fordham Research Services (1998) in the city of Cambridge. This suggests that irrespective of the destination type, a point is reached in the minds of the residents when the continued presence or development of tourism reaches a threshold, or exceeds the capacity which they are willing to accept. In York, it was also found that homeowners were more positive than those that rented, suggesting perhaps a greater association or sense of place/ownership and therefore attachment to the city and its reliance on tourism. It was also found that those employed in the tourism industry in York were more positive. This acts to support the findings of earlier research (Pizam, 1978; Rothman, 1978). In Bath, those who perceived tourism as being important to their occupation were more likely to see the positive side of tourism, a finding that was repeated in the Chester sample. These results indicate further support for developing an understanding of the influence of resident characteristics and economic reliance on residents' acceptance of tourism as a positive element within a community.

2.4.3.5 Residents' negative opinions of tourism

The only consistent finding across all three city samples, was that as positive opinions went down, negative ones went up (p<.001). This supports the finding that two distinct dimensions emerge with the use of this instrument, within which the inter-item validity and reliability appear sound. In the Bath sample, those people who were born in the city appeared more likely to notice the negative impacts of tourism. This supports the previous finding that the shorter the lengths of residence, the more positively residents see the impacts of tourism. In Bath and Chester it was found that as residents' perceived economic reliance decreased, their negative opinions increased, a finding which supports earlier research and establishes economic reliance as an effective contributor to understanding residents' opinions of tourism. This finding supports the utility of social exchange theory (Ap, 1992b) which suggests that people are more accepting when an exchange is seen to be reciprocal.
2.4.3.6 Summary

It was suggested in the introduction to this section that the field of SIA studies was somewhat fragmented and in need of a degree of consolidation. Ap (1990) made several recommendations as to how this could be done, including the utilisation and reporting of more reliable measurement techniques. To this, this research adds the suggestion that previous research may have jumped too quickly from the description to the modelling and then explanation of social impacts, and that there is not enough comparative work. The concern here therefore would be that tourism professionals might well be basing their planning decisions on generalisations and explanations grounded in an underdeveloped area of understanding. In addition to this concern regarding the rapid development of explanations based on incomplete knowledge, a secondary concern fuelled the primary direction of this research. This concern is outlined.

When developing the questionnaire and conducting the research for the studies in York during 1995, Bath in 1996 and Chester in 1998 it became apparent that the research instruments under consideration (Ap, 1992; Madrigal, 1995; Perdue et al., 1990; Snaith & Haley, 1994) concentrated on issues which were predominantly general in nature. By this, it is meant that they sought responses with regard to general concepts such as whether tourism had affected the respondents’ quality of life, whether there should be more or less local government control of tourism, and whether tourism had affected the environment. None was directly concerned with the management and planning of tourism, especially at the community level. Such questions as “How are we doing?” and “What do you think of our policies and actions on your behalf?” had never been asked of residents.

Hence it was decided that if a true evaluation of residents’ opinions towards tourism development and particularly about future planning and management were to be conducted, then the questions should be more specific and reflect more closely, the tourism experiences of that destination. In response to this, the focus of the next research phase was to integrate the strategic objectives and actions of tourism officers with the opinions of the local community toward those objectives and actions. Indeed, Page and Thorn (1997) in agreement with Pearce (1995) suggested that an integrated approach to tourism planning is essential.

In brief, this research aims to link together the opinions of the residents with the strategies of the policy makers in a way which can provide a basis for policies to be more securely rooted in the needs of the residents. Without this type of research, the successful development and maintenance of tourism in towns and cities could be jeopardised. Before pursuing this research objective, it is important to
remember the earlier observation, that to conduct a useful SIA, it is important to develop an understanding of the place in which you are to conduct it (Becker, 1997). This was also reflected in Wall's (1997) review of John Towner's Book within which it was noted that much of the impact of tourism was studied without reference to its historical context. In order to address this issue, the next chapter considers the emergence and growth of human settlements, particularly that of the historic cities of York, Bath, Chester and Canterbury.
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RESEARCH PHASE II: STATEMENT OF PURPOSE
"PLANNING TOURISM IN THE UK"

CHAPTER THREE

♦ LINKS TO PREVIOUS RESEARCH PHASE

Research phase I highlighted the state of the art regarding the measurement of the social impacts of tourism. Two main conclusions were posited. First, that social impact of tourism studies rarely contain a sound contextual basis in terms of describing the environment in which the social impacts are witnessed. This observation is addressed in chapter three where the nature and development of four historic tourist cities in England. Secondly, it was noted that social impact studies tended toward the general rather than investigating the perceived impacts of planning actions. This second observation is addressed in chapter four.

♦ KEY OBJECTIVES

- To highlight the emergence of governance and planning as a result of communities recognising the need for a democratic basis to support equitable growth and development.

- To introduce a picture of four historic cities in England, their socio-economic development and emergence as historic tourist cities.

♦ RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND QUESTIONS

None of the primary research questions contained within this study are dealt with in this chapter.

♦ CONTRIBUTION TO THE THESIS AS A WHOLE

This chapter provides a broader foundation to the study of the social impacts of tourism in historic cities. It does this by outlining the nature of the places and their inhabitants, thereby establishing a more secure point of reference on which to discuss research findings.
3.0 INTRODUCTION

Within Chapter two, the observations of Wall (1997) were noted, when he, in his review of John Towner's book "An Historical Geography of Recreation and Tourism in the Western World 1540-1940" observed that few authors had placed their studies in an historical context. This point is significant to the development of a context within which this present study wishes to place itself. This study is built, in the first instance, around the growth and nature of four historic cities in England.

In order to anchor the research it is essential to trace their development as popular places to both live and work in on the one hand, and visit on the other. This is achieved through establishing, within Chapter three, a general conceptual understanding of:

1) the emergence of governance as a reaction to a developing recognition by the people living in these communities of the need for equality, liberty, fraternity and freedom within a civil society;
2) the emergence of planning as a response to the daily issues that emerged as a result of people living in close proximity to each other.

With this completed, Chapter four will take up the story of planning within 20th century England, developing an historical commentary regarding the significant planning responses of the government to the issues of that time. Within research phase II particular attention is placed on the emergence of tourism as a significant industry that required specific planning responses. Within this background, the emergence of the four historic cities of York, Bath, Chester and Canterbury as tourism destinations will be established. Each city will be treated as an individual case study in order to give a description of its emergence and development as an historic tourist city.

3.1 LITERATURE REVIEW
3.1.1 Rights theory and the emergence of governance

So much has been written about planning that it would be very tempting to approach this literature head on and provide a thorough review of changing approaches, case studies, and the state of the art practices. In keeping with the approach taken thus far in this research, our departure point will be much earlier. In order to understand the concept of planning, it is essential first to create a conceptual foundation.
Given that one of the aims of this research work is to develop a model for public consultation within the tourism planning process, which is both practical, and enables representative input, we should ask the question, what are the origins of the concept of representation? Whilst searching the philosophical literature, Locke’s Second Treatise on Government was found to organise the principles of political organisation clearly and therefore provided a useful framework. In Lloyd Thomas’s (1995) translation of the Second Treatise, he outlines five principles which, whilst not stated by Locke, were felt to be evident in his work. These were:

1) the citizens of a state, no matter what differences might exist between them in social status, authority, or wealth, are basically equal in political standing;
2) each citizen is equal to all the others in that each possesses certain individual rights which limit what any citizen may do to another;
3) these rights also limit what the state may do to any of its citizens;
4) those who hold authority in the system of government, or in any other political institutions, are to be regarded as doing so not for their own gain, advantage or prestige, but in order to further the good of their fellow citizens;
5) government is instituted to ensure that the rights of all citizens are respected, and to promote the good of the citizens. Governments are therefore instituted for the benefit of the citizens, if the citizens no longer consent to how they are being governed and wish to be rid of their governors, the government ceases to have any moral right to be in power.

Many of the philosophers who were writing in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries wrote on subjects such as human understanding and the nature of being and time. Within their discussions, they often mention a ‘state of nature’. This ‘state of nature’ is a condition in which none of the institutions of the state exist and hence there is no requirements of ‘positive law’, in other words, those made by men for men. In Lockean terms, people stand in a relationship of equality to one another under a state of natural law, and that only after the construction of civil society and the positive laws of state, do people come to hold unequal positions.

Indeed, Locke’s account of how a legitimate state is possible depends on this conception of ‘natural law’ and ‘natural right’. Natural laws are seen as normative laws, laws in accordance with which human conduct ought to occur. Stemming from an acknowledgement of natural laws, is the notion of natural rights conferred upon persons by the laws of nature. These natural rights can be seen as rights of
control people have over themselves, the rights of self ownership in that...“every man has a property in his own person” (Locke, 1988: II.27).

Locke suggested that in terms of political organisation, people can be in one of only two stable conditions; the state of nature or civil society. In order to show how the state can be legitimate, it must be possible to show how a person or society can move from the state of nature to civil society in a morally sound way.

In the state of nature, all persons are free, equal and independent. Persons are ‘owners’ of their executive power of the law of nature. That is, they have:

1) the right to judge for themselves what actions are and are not in accordance with the law of nature;
2) the right to restrain attempts to violate the law of nature;
3) the right to judge what is appropriate punishment and to attempt to impose that punishment.

There is no way in which these powers can end up in other hands except by each person consenting to such a transfer. For this to happen, each person makes a compact with every other by which they agree to surrender their executive power of the law of nature to all those entering that compact (as a collectivity). This agreement to relinquish control over their executive power is exchanged for an equal share in the joint control of everyone’s pooled executive power.

This new entity which Locke (1988: II.87, 95, 96, 99, 130) calls the ‘community’ is the body through which the people express their will. Their will therefore lies in the ‘community’. There is, in the end, nothing to hold the community together but its common resolve to establish civil society. On its own, the formation of the community leaves things incomplete since the original aim of the compact was to seek a remedy for the inconveniences of the state of nature. They need a common, agreed interpretation of the law of nature that will be impartially enforced by a formally constituted authority which will be referred to as the ‘government’. This ‘government’ rests on the consent of the majority of people, to the continuance of that trust. The community has therefore entrusted its executive power to a system of government, for it to exercise on the community’s behalf so long as the trust continues. The state then vests this power in the appropriate institutions, the legislature, the executive and the judiciary, and a political order, properly speaking, now exists.

Thus far, the discussion has focused on the state of the law of nature and civil society. Implicit in both states, is the notion of an individual's or group's rights over their executive power. The notion of ‘rights’ has therefore only been explored on a general level. Freedon (1991) however, emphasises the importance of ‘rights’,
pointing out that modern political theory locates the notion of rights at the centre of its debates on the promotion of Equality, Democracy and Liberty. Rights are increasingly recognised by the liberal state and constitutional theory as the fundamental building blocks of social order. Philosophical treatises enrich our understanding of the roles rights play in the construction of political-belief systems and in the world-view of those who employ them. This is an important point to note as this study will return to it when it seeks to interpret the actions and non-actions of the present government with regards its commitment to public consultation and the democratic process of involving representative resident opinions when planning for tourism.

So what are ‘rights’? Freedon (1991:6) offers probably the clearest explanation when he suggests that...

“a human right is a conceptual device, expressed in linguistic form, that assigns priority to certain human or social attributes regarded as essential to the adequate functioning of a human being; that is intended to serve as a protective capsule for those attributes; and that appeals for deliberative action to ensure such protection”.

In his article “Rights, Goods and Democracy”, Lemos (1986) suggests that three major classes of rights exist. These, he suggests, are Natural, Conventional and Divine. Within ‘Conventional’ rights it is stated that there are again, three major classes of rights; first, civil, legal or political rights, which are conferred, granted or conceded by a government. Secondly, social rights which are similarly granted, conferred or conceded to the human being or group by some society or group from within that same said society independently of its being required. These social rights tend to arise out of the...

“gradual development of various customs or habits independently of the occurrence of explicit acts of conferral”. Lemos (1986:21)

Finally, there exists what are termed as contractual or promissory rights. In the former, the rights and obligations of each party who have chosen to associate are laid down either in written or verbal form. The rights termed promissory, are those acquired as a consequence of some promise that is made. Conventional rights appear then, to be those which man confers upon himself through his need for
patternning and predictability (Civil, Legal, and Political). They also arise out of the awareness of a certain level of due or respect which should be offered to one another (Social).

The etymology of ‘Natural’ right, by contrast to ‘Conventional’ rights, suggests that it refers to the rights a person possesses by virtue of his/her nature. This becomes a value-laden area, as there is disagreement as to the origin of man, and therefore the rights s/he possesses by his/her nature. If man, as the supporters of Darwinism believe, evolved from some other species, then the rights s/he possesses by his nature would be those s/he carried with him/her and those which s/he conferred implicitly on him/herself (Social rights) in conjunction with other conventional rights which developed out of his/her social nature. On the other hand, there is vast support for the notion that man was created by a God (in the image of himself) and that all natural rights are conferred upon man by this superior being. If this is the case, then the argument could be established that all natural rights exist within and grow out of those ‘Divine’ rights which are conferred on us by that God.

What is certain, is that in accepting that human beings or groups have rights, we are maintaining that these rights have vital attributes that need to be expressed and safeguarded. We also affirm that they are unusually important objects and that the world we know would be inconceivable if their promotion was not ensured and encouraged. Indeed, theories of basic rights attempt to meet rational and logical standards (philosophical dimension), are couched in terms that are emotionally and culturally attractive (ideological dimension), and must be translatable into codes of enforceable action (legal dimension). One way of ensuring the legal dimension is to encode rights as civil and political rights. Acceptance of the rights of each person as having equal value, is a premise on which civil society is founded. It is important to keep this in mind when observing and discussing the methods and manner in which governance is carried out on behalf of the people who have pooled their executive power (Community power) in a governing body.

3.1.2 The emergence of planning

As societies became larger, more complex and the interaction of people and place more obvious, there emerged the need to establish greater order whilst maintaining the notion of equality of opportunity. This was attempted through ‘planning’, which Hall (1994:22) suggests is...
“the making of an orderly sequence of action that will lead to the achievement of a stated goal or goals”.

The notion of planning as an instrument of government can be seen therefore to be an attempt to improve the situation of the people. Further to Hall’s general definition, it is suggested by McCulloch (1965:1), that planning is built on the social ideal of democracy, being...

"the instructed vision of men working, co-operatively, according to rules of their own choosing, to enjoy in peace the civilised advantages of plenty".

With the introduction of new ideas and methods there are inevitable questions and debates regarding their functioning. Ideas and ways of working are either rejected or accepted according to the debates of that time. Those that are accepted as being useful become formalised. That planning, as a function of government, became accepted is due to its recognition as serving a purpose. According to Reissman (1970), the eventual establishment of The Town Planning Movement was successful, in that it possessed:

1) plans that contained sets of propositions that could unify belief;
2) a history, its point of origin being the general protest against the effects of industrialism;
3) a following, mainly of intellectuals who recognised the discrepancies between what was promised and what was attained by industrialism;
4) an organising myth, the function of which was to condense a complicated intellectual message into shorthand which could be translated into action.

Modern planning has been described as possessing three key characteristics (Rydin, 1993). First it is a future oriented activity, wherein strategies are devised which aim to lead to desired end states. Secondly, whilst acknowledging the importance of decision-making in the private sector, planning is seen as primarily a public sector activity. Finally, is the recognition that planning, whilst having a focus (e.g. physical, economic or social environment), is complex and crosses boundaries in its influence. It was due in part, to this complexity, that those involved in planning, either theoretically or in an applied sense, sought to classify some of the parameters/dimensions that contributed to decision-making processes in planning. Of particular importance was the nature of the community, two of its most obvious
dimensions were those of size and function. These then formed the basis for the first attempts at introducing some form of patterning and predictability to the planning process. With this achieved, it must have been hoped that a basis for the equitable distribution of resources within and between communities would be achievable. With this objective in mind, debates evolved regarding how best to classify settlements.

3.1.3 Classification of cities

According to Robson and Regan (1972), men have lived in towns for thousands of years. It became evident, however, in the census of 1851, that the urban population of the United Kingdom comprised more than 50% of the whole. This compares with the first national census in 1801 when it was reported as constituting about 33%. This figure is presently estimated to have risen, with 80% of the population of the UK living in either a city, town or village (DOE, 1996). With the shift from a more isolated rural lifestyle to a more communal urban existence, the needs of categorisation within the census led to places being designated town status:

1) if their population exceeded 2,000 inhabitants;
2) if their lives were regulated by authorities of some type.

There was no specific criteria other than this, and often towns were designated their status following consultation with the town clerks. As such, it is apparent that there was no definite rule that drew a line of separation between hamlet, village and town other than the density of population. It was not until the 1872 Public Health Act that census enumerators were provided with a more consistent statistical codification. This was the 'urban sanitary' district, whereby the concentration of people was deemed to require certain sanitary regulations without which urban living could not be sustained.

The main distinction among Victorian historians when categorising and grouping towns was the quantity of population. For this reason, the historical grouping of towns is somewhat incoherent. A proper town was deemed to possess over 10,000 people and a large town over 50,000. Ignoring the formal means by which a town became a city - by royal charter or by being the seat of a bishopric - a proper city would have over 100,000 inhabitants and a great city over 200,000 inhabitants (Waller, 1983).

There is therefore, imprecision in the defining characteristics of cities and the need therefore to establish other criteria that will better establish the hallmarks of different urban types. On the one hand, Mumford (1961) asserted that all
Victorian cities were really the same, simply the city at one stage of evolution of form. This was rejected by Briggs (1963) who suggested that the first perceivable effect of industrialisation was to differentiate English communities rather than to standardise them. Whilst Briggs's philosophy suggests that we have no monotony of appearance and characteristics in towns, any more than we have a sameness among townspeople, it can discern similar entities, common functions and shared problems amid the singular histories of the cities. Towns are administrative, legal, political social and economic constructs and consequently sociologists, geographers, economists, political scientists and philosophers have contributed to our understanding of city forms and city life. It is in the area of inter-disciplinary collaboration perhaps where the typological debate regarding classification of urban centres has led to confusion and disagreement. One point which we should remember, made clear by Rosier, is that "classifying urban agglomerations, by whatever method, is arbitrary, but it is nonetheless informing" (Rosier, 1953 cited in Anderson, 1960).

Exceptional growth was achieved in the late nineteenth century chiefly by three types of community. One was the residential suburb or satellite, another set of growth points consisted of the nodal points of the changing industrial economy; new iron and steel producing centres and lastly were the seaside and pleasure resorts. In terms of the historic cities which are the focus of this research, the city of Canterbury achieved its growth through agriculture and its importance as an ecclesiastical centre. York emerged as a focal point for the developing railway network which, when combined with its ecclesiastical significance and agriculture, led to considerable growth. In this way, these emerging cities provided urban services, a market, and additional specific industrial and technical facilities for their dependent rural areas. Bath grew out of its continuing recognition as a spa town, and Chester due to its locational advantages in terms of river facilities and its prominence as a shopping and commercial centre. Indeed, it still possesses rows of 12th Century shops in the city centre of which there are over 700 listed buildings today (Chester Action Programme, 1993).

All of this type of information is important in order to be able to develop an understanding of the urban outlines of these cities as they grew. Throughout chapters three and four, the four cities will be described in increasing detail and from a variety of perspectives. Only through doing this, will a clearer picture emerge as to their present form and function that results from their historical development.
The difficulty in achieving this kind of comparative and developmental urban analysis is highlighted by the efforts of Reissman (1970:33) to organise a "rather large and varied literature" in urban studies. In an attempt to develop a functional method of classification, he created a typology which possessed two dimensions. One dimension related to the kind of problem studied, the second to the kind of data used. The problems were classified as either 'applied', which considers a situation in terms of the action needed to improve it, or 'theoretical' problems which only have meaning within a scientific context.

In accepting this two-dimensional view, this research accepts that initially, the question of how to classify a 'city' is a theoretical problem, the solution of which would not directly affect the urban environment. In terms of the second dimension, the methods and data used to solve a problem, much of the research adopts a quantitative approach since available information tends towards; the size of populations, scale of industrial development, economic returns from tourism, numbers of tourist arrivals, and the stock of local resources. However, in terms of the classification of the four 'historic cities', the aim of this research is not to develop extensive all-encompassing empirically based indices. Rather, the intention is to draw a picture of similarities in order to see if it is possible to identify a degree of comparability in terms of their situation with regard tourism planning issues.

3.1.4 The rationale for classification

Classification according to Reissman (1970) is probably the simplest technique, especially in social science, to reduce some subject matter to workable and practical limits. Classification has been attempted using many indicators. These include size, which acts as a convenient index because it is measurable. It does not however in itself, portray a sense of the quality or character of the city. Impression or feel of a city on the other hand possesses aspects which are more abstract but are difficult to operationalise as measures.

Ultimately it depends on the motivations which drive us to seek commonality and difference. Good city indexes, according to Reissman (1970), possess certain requirements. They should:

1) be measurable and objective, that its application is reliable and does not depend on idiosyncrasies of different users;

2) be relatively fixed and constant. In other words, it finds utility over time without requiring adjustment;

3) have functional relevance—must be applicable to some area of concern, and ideally be underpinned by a theoretical framework i.e. variables should be
functionally related within urban society in a way that makes sense. Therefore to what and how the index is relevant should be specified; 4) include as many important characteristics as are necessary, therefore proving of maximum utility.

Popular characteristics have included population size and urban characteristics such as family organisation (Duncan and Reiss 1956), economic function (Kneedler, 1945; Harris, 1951), occupational distribution (Gillen, 1951), moral integration (Angell, 1951), and social area analysis (Bell, 1959). Distinctions along these lines indicate a recognition that it would be useful to develop city classifications. The basis for such a general examination of city classification is the idea that cities are changing in all manner of ways, and whilst each evolves in an individual manner, there may be enough similarity between the social and economic development contexts of some of England's historic cities to enable the development of a somewhat generic model which attaches itself to their planning needs for tourism. This includes the search for potential commonality in the social impacts of tourism on local residents.

In the case of this study, the intention is to assess whether or not similarities exist in the social and economic histories of four historic cities. If this is achieved, then it becomes more likely that some observations can be made regarding the likely effect of tourism on the lives of their communities as it emerges as a primary source of economic wealth over and above all other industrial and economic entities in the local economy. This will then provide the foundation to a study that seeks both to measure and incorporate the opinions of the community into tourism planning and development. As Anderson (1960:21) states...

"Evolution concerns... on the one hand, the artefacts which are sometimes called the material side of culture, and on the other hand, the ways of life in communities".

3.1.5 Defining historic cities

The concept of 'city' is "notoriously difficult to define" (Childe, 1950:6). Numerous scholars have attempted to develop typologies that draw both similarities and dissimilarities between cities. Generally, these comparisons are made on the basis of the function of the city, including its relationship with its hinterlands and to other cities, or on their technological level.
One of the most commonly accepted of the early city typologies was that advanced by Sjoberg (1960) the basic assumption of which was that the character of basic modes of production has profound ramifications on human social relations. He classified cities as being either Pre-industrial, or Industrial. Pre-industrial cities were seen as having their base in agricultural hinterlands and therefore rely on human and animal labour to produce surpluses to feed the urban population. The centre of Pre-industrial cities are usually occupied by central religious and public buildings. Alternatively, industrial cities relied on machine technology and inanimate sources of energy to absorb many of the tasks previously performed by hand.

Sjoberg's (1960) division of cities has received similar criticisms as others, the basic foundation for such criticism revolves around whether there really are any substantial number of ways in which cities can be classified and seen as homogenous phenomena. Rosier (1953) suggested that cities need to be classified by different approaches. They could potentially, in his view, be grouped in terms of their founding (created or natural), evolution (fast/slow/declining or shape of growth), legal status (by statute or otherwise), or predominant activity. The list of activities is diverse, with Rosier suggesting that cities may fall into one or more of the following categories:

1) cities of consumption (residential or resort places);
2) cities of production (mainly manufacturing);
3) mixed activity cities (consumption and production);
4) cities of storage and distribution (wholesaling);
5) river and seaport cities;
6) receiving and forwarding cities (free ports where goods are transferred, or cities like Le Havre that are ports for larger cities);
7) cities of finance and credit;
8) cities of working men or artisans (residential);
9) military cities;
10) thermal or bath cities;
11) climatic cities;
12) museum cities;
13) university cities;
14) cities which are religious centres;
15) pilgrimage cities;
16) mining cities;
17) oil cities.
It may be that an 18\textsuperscript{th} classification could be the historic tourist-city. Indeed, a truly functional classification of such urban historic destinations may be long overdue. Historically, the literature appears to have overlooked the importance of the urban destination. This observation is readily accepted within the tourism literature where it has been adequately documented that urban tourism has been continually neglected as an area of research, and consequently remains devoid of a developed understanding or research base (Ashworth, 1989; Law, 1993; Page, 1995). Suggestions have been offered as to why such a paucity exists in the theoretically based research literature on urban tourism. The primary explanation involves the recognition of the diverse and heterogeneous nature of tourism in cities as causing difficulty regarding evaluation and analysis (Page, 1995; Shaw & Williams, 1994). The uniqueness of each individual city makes reliable comparisons difficult and may partially explain why a large proportion of literature centres on individual case studies. Indeed, it is worth acknowledging the work of Ashworth (1992a), as stated in Chapter two, that urban tourism requires the development of a more coherent body of theories and methods of analysis before it can contribute towards an improved understanding of the particular role of cities.

It is widely accepted (Gunn, 1994; Inskeep, 1991) that tourism environments can best be understood through taking a systems approach. This is well described by Inskeep (1991:22) who observes that:

“Although complicated, cutting across sectoral categories, and fragmented, tourism is and should be viewed as a single system comprised of interrelated parts. As a system, it can be defined, analysed, planned, and managed in an integrated manner”.

Within the urban tourism environment (system of interest), there are many different contributory elements. Figure 10 below provides an indication of the way in which these elements can be seen to interrelate.
The purpose of the systems approach is to rationalise through a simplified model, the complexity of the real world (Page, 1995). Burtenshaw, Bateman and Ashworth (1991) made the point that considerations of tourism demand (customer) and supply (product), are a necessary preliminary to the development of urban planning strategies specifically designed for managing the urban tourism function. The classification of the urban tourist destination from a supply perspective is therefore an important and yet somewhat elusive pursuit.

Urban tourism appears to be gaining greater recognition during the 1990’s and there are now several research groups within Europe who are particularly intent on investigating ‘historic tourism cities’. This increasing emphasis is due to the need for an integrated approach to urban regeneration and the role of tourism (Jansen-Verbeke & Lievois, 1999). A variety of research approaches have been adopted which look at these historic tourism cities in terms of their:
1) evolution in form and function (Ashworth & Tunbridge, 1990; Ashworth & Dietvorst, 1995; Jansen-Verbeke & Lievois, 1999; Pearce, 1991; Pearce, 1998; Van der Borg, Costa & Manente, 1993);
2) economic resources and prosperity (Ashworth & Voogd, 1992; Cottie et al., 1993; Davidson & Maitland, 1997; Jansen-Verbeke, 1994; Law, 1992);
3) marketing and management (Costa & Van der Borg, 1991; Jansen-Verbeke, 1997; Law, 1993; Page, 1995; Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996; Van der Borg & Costa, 1993);
4) environmental impacts (Cheng, 1990; Mossetto, 1991; 1992; both cited in Ashworth, 1993);
5) demand patterns (Ashworth & Voogd, 1990a; Hall, 1992a; Van der Borg et al., 1993);
6) activity patterns (Horne, 1984, cited in Ashworth, 1993; Murphy, 1992)
7) residents and the social impacts of tourism (Glasson et al., 1992; Snaith & Haley, 1994, 1999).

Urban tourism can be seen therefore to be a complex phenomenon, one that is mainly viewed from a demand perspective. Indeed, Ashworth (1992a: 15) noted that...

"the dominant paradigm for approaching tourism in both academic study and tourism practice is the 'industry approach' (see Sinclair & Stabler, 1992) i.e. the assumption that tourism is analogous to a commercial production process designed to satisfy consumer product demands through a market system".

The main issue that remains however, is the lack of a satisfactory definition of the urban tourism product. The approach to-date appears, as is the case in many developing research areas, to be the triangulation of many views that attempt to add another piece to the whole picture. This however does not help to solve the issue since that which cannot easily be defined cannot be subject to investigation Ashworth (1992a).

In an earlier section of this chapter, the evolution of human settlements, their classification, the rationale for such classification, and the problems inherent in such an approach were discussed. The 'urban tourism' debate suffers from the same difficulties, namely, the potential for defining and classifying similar and yet in many ways, extremely diverse cities. At even the most general level, Ashworth (1992a) states that urban tourism is essentially urban. He reminds us of this
apparently obvious observation because of the recognition that whilst the tourist activity itself is urban related, motivated by and distinctive in cities, much analysis of urban tourism has ignored this simple assertion and proceeds to analyse urban tourism as if it were merely occurring by chance in cities.

In a recent draft paper “Urban Tourism for the Sustainable Development of European Towns and Cities: the PREPARe Approach”, Bruce (1999) notes that the term ‘urban tourism’ has been used in at least two different ways. First, Law (1993:2), followed by Richards (1996) uses the term to mean tourism in ‘large cities’, “metropolitan areas that have a population of over 1 million. However much...is applicable to smaller cities...perhaps some of even a quarter a million”. Page (1995:16-17) on the other hand, identifies eleven categories “capital cities..., metropolitan [which he apparently uses in the ecclesiastical sense] centre and walled historic cities (e.g. Canterbury and York) and small fortress towns, large historic cities..., inner city areas..., revitalised waterfront areas..., industrial cities, seaside resorts and winter sports resorts..., purpose-built integrated tourist resorts, tourist entertainment complexes..., specialised tourist service centres..., and cultural/arts cities”.

These attempts to classify the urban tourism product do so through reference to size of population, the nature of its form in terms of that which has been built in the past, its spatial relations, its past function, or present in touristic terms, its cultural collections in terms of that which has been bequeathed and stored from the past, and finally, in terms of more recent tourism development. The definitional malaise is complicated further, through the additional confused use of the terms ‘historic’, ‘cultural’, and ‘heritage’ tourism, in combination with the notion of an urban scenario.

Perhaps the context of the visit, namely, the city itself, is the most important determinant of the nature of the tourism witnessed at the site. In this way, the city and the way in which it is managed should come under scrutiny in order to classify its nature as a tourist resource. It may well be that the complexity and diversity of even the most apparently similar cities are such that a functional classification is rendered impossible. However, as cities look to develop their ‘heritage’ resources and explore their value as alternative or supplementary industries, they have at their disposal, an increasingly extensive library of management paradigms and principles replete with ‘best practice’ and ‘best theory’. This appears to be a useful and attractive proposition that can only assist in the development of strategies to manage the impacts associated with tourism in historic cities. In terms of this research however, it is suggested that cities with similar historical characteristics may
ultimately become defined as ‘historic tourist cities’ more as a result of their management and development than their historical diversity or comparability. This raises the question of ‘how pervasive are development practices in moulding an homogenous tourism entity?’ In addition, several commentators (Ashworth, 1992a; Meethan, 1996) talk of the additional and contributory effects of the commodification of the past and its transformations into the heritage tourism product, noting that this process may well be to blame for gross selectivity, simplification leading to distortion and bowdlerisation of what is regarded as authentic truth. This leads, in the opinion of Ashworth (1992a) to the conversion of Europe’s rich and varied cultural heritage into Horne’s (1984) “Great Museum”. Recent field studies (Jansen-Verbeke & Levois, 1999:103) confirm this...

“the development of heritage tourism in historic cites initiates an irreversible process of touristification in forms and in functions”.

This research acknowledges the difficulties with defining and classifying places in terms of their form, function, nature and consumption. It involves the choice of words and meanings from different perspectives, none of which can be argued as having more relevance, until that is, an over-riding all-inclusive, integrated and operationally meaningful definition is accepted. It also becomes evident in the following section that the socio-economic and demographic data relating both to the population and the tourism industry is collected and presented in many forms. As such, some of the cities possess more detailed information than the others. The position adopted here therefore is one of an amateur historian who seeks to define the context of his research in terms of the cities under investigation. Rather than abstracting this research, it is the intention to place its contribution within the urban tourism literature in order that it might assist in building the basis for future understanding.

The most appropriate defining aspect of each of the cities is that York, Bath, Canterbury and Chester possess the remnants of roman walls that demarcate the inner city from its suburbs. As such, they fall within Page’s (1995) category of “walled historic cities” in which tourism has become a vital part of the local economy. The final section of this chapter seeks to outline the nature of these cities.

3.1.7 The historic cities of Canterbury, York, Chester and Bath

Whilst the ultimate aim of this research is to develop a generic tourism planning and consultation model which can be applied within any destination, the
present research focuses on developing a model that has meaning in historic cities, and specifically, the city of Chester. If it is worthwhile attempting to develop a planning tool which, whilst broad in its inception, actually specifies certain cities as its main place of utility, and if extensive periods of time are to be spent developing the model, then similar effort should be attached to understanding the nature of the places where it will be applied. Each of the cities will be described in terms of its:

1) socio-economic historical perspective;
2) tourism product;
3) approach to planning tourism;
4) present tourism strategy.

3.2 THE CITY OF CANTERBURY

According to Waller (1983), history indicates that towns have origins in five causes; from reasons of trade, recreation, defence, religion and administration. In addition, their physical symbols are market, fair, castle, church, and chamber. Canterbury's economic base showed little diversification and relied mainly on the hop trade and its existence as a military station. In the census of 1891, Canterbury, as a shire capital, became deemed a cathedral city with a population of between 20,000 and 50,000. Due to both its location in North East Kent and its ecclesiastical significance, Canterbury has a long history of visitation from home and abroad. As such, tourism in the city has its origins in mediaeval times (Canterbury City Council, 1996).

3.2.1 The Canterbury tourism product

Canterbury District has a broad range of tourist attractions. There are 80 conservation areas, a wealth of timber-framed buildings and over 3,600 listed buildings (Canterbury District Local Plan, 1998). Canterbury contains one of Britain's World Heritage Sites: the Cathedral and Cathedral Close, which together with St. Augustine's Abbey and St. Martin's Church help to attract over 2 million visitors a year. Indeed, the Tourism Unit reports that since 1976, Canterbury's tourist economy has grown by over 125%; Given its increasing importance to the local economy, tourism is seen as presenting a way of financing conservation and boosting the local economy. Canterbury is the most popular tourist destination in Kent, but tourism is apparently dominated by day tourists (Canterbury City Council, 1996).
3.2.2 Planning tourism in Canterbury

Given the above, the planning of tourism should be a significant feature of the Canterbury City Local Plan. The 1985 District Plan is presently being updated and amended. The draft plan has undergone public consultation, been revised, deposited for objections (Spring, 1994), undergone an inquiry (Mar-Sept, 1996) and been assessed and reported on by an inspector (June-Sept, 1997). Following a response from the City Council, modifications will be proposed, the plan will be finalised, a notice of disposition to adopt will be circulated and then the plan will be adopted.

There are four principles which are stated as underlying the plan. These are:

1) caring for the environment - to safeguard the quality of the district's man made and natural environment for present and future generations;
2) conservation and restraint - to ensure that the unique character and heritage of Canterbury, Whitstable, Herne Bay and the countryside are not jeopardised;
3) economic development - to provide a greater diversity of business and employment opportunities;
4) enhancement - to make the most of the whole district, and to ensure new development and other changes employ the highest possible standards of design and materials.

This philosophy is echoed in Government Guidance, where it is generally given the label 'sustainable development'. Planning Policy Guideline (PPG) 12 states that "the sum total of planning decisions should not deny future generations the best of today's environment". These four principles apply to broader topics, namely; Conservation, Economic Development (of which tourism forms a part), Housing, Recreation and Leisure, Transportation and Infrastructure.

3.2.3 The Canterbury tourism strategy

The strategy aims to:

1) look at ways in which a district-wide tourism consultative framework could be introduced, drawing on the expertise of all interested local groups and individuals;
2) draw up an agreed action plan aimed at viable and sustainable long term tourism development, balancing the interests of residents, local businesses and visitors, and establishing a way of monitoring progress;
3) give continued support to the city centre initiative and a visitor management strategy;
4) encourage the development and upgrading of accommodation and examine the potential for more touring caravans and camping;
5) promote public transport, in particular rail links, and environmental good practice in the local tourism industry;
6) review visitor information services and support accessibility programmes;
7) investigate the options for a district-wide events strategy and the development of town and country attractions;
8) ensure that tourism continues to be considered in the local plan and assist with research into the carrying capacity of the city centre;
9) raise the international profile of Canterbury and the district;
10) maximise the economic potential of tourism;
11) review and implement the annual Tourism Marketing Communications Plan.

3.3 THE CITY OF YORK

The City of York in England is the leading city tourism destination outside of London (Touche Ross, 1994) Indeed, in the opinion of Lichfield and Proudlove (1976:11) "the visual wealth of York is in the secular city itself, one of the richest and most complex townscape in the world". For over a quarter of York's more than 1,900 year existence this townscape has featured and supported a bustling tourism industry. According to Meethan (1996), the emergence of York as a historic tourist-city can be seen to be comprised of three phases. In the Post war period up until the 1960's, the scale of tourism was small with approximately 500,000 visitors to the city during 1965 (Aldous, 1976). Between then and the mid-1980's, conservation policies were a priority as it was found that visitors valued York's historic character most (ETB, 1972). During this period, part of the city centre (Stonegate) was pedestrianised, the National Railway Museum was opened and the first signs of an anti-tourist sentiment were reflected in the local papers (Yorkshire Evening Press, 1976).

From the mid-1980's the city entered what has been seen as a third phase of development. This is characterised by a heritage-enterprise couplet (Corner & Harvey, 1991). The Jorvik Viking centre was opened, in 1984, and with it came the emergence of a new form of consumption within the city. Many other museums followed suit in an attempt to duplicate its success and the city council encouraged buskers and street entertainment in order to create a living experience within the
city centre. The city had moved from its reliance on the railway network and its two confectioners (Terry's and Rowntree's) as its primary source of employment to include tourism as one of its major defining employers.

3.3.1 The York tourism product

Given this deep history, York has a wide variety of historic visitor attractions, two of the most popular being the York Minster and the Jorvik Viking Centre. In 1993, four million visitors to York spent £257 million, of which £103 million went into local incomes, creating 10,581 jobs (Touche Ross, 1994). These figures indicate a high level of touristic activity, the majority of which occurs during the summer months of July through to September (York City Council, 1995).

With the ever increasing numbers of visitors, there has been a corresponding rise in retail outlets dealing with comparison goods (Meethan, 1996). The relative decline of the non-tourism or service-related sector can be seen by the current floor space occupation in the city centre, with approximately 80,000 square metres for comparison goods, compared with under 10,000 square metres for convenience goods (City of York, 1994). The importance of this change in retail function can be gauged by the fact that an estimated £25 million per annum, not including food or drink, is spent by visitors, whether daytrippers (47%) or staying visitors (53%). In addition it is estimated that retail distribution, hotels and restaurants account for 21.2% of the city's workforce (City of York, 1994).

3.3.2 Planning tourism in York

Within the City of York Local Plan Deposit Draft (November, 1997), tourism receives significant attention in two chapters. These are Chapter 6, entitled "Transport Objectives", in which the intention is stated:

1) to implement land-use and transportation strategies which facilitate the implementation of the land-use objectives of the local plan whilst minimising travel and traffic generation;

2) to achieve development patterns which give people the choice of using more environmentally friendly means of transport than the car;

3) to minimise new road construction;

4) to reduce pollution, noise and the physical impact of traffic, by restraining growth in the use of motor vehicles...

and again in Chapter 12 entitled "Visitor Objectives" in which the intentions are voiced to...
5) maximise economic and other benefits brought by visitors, whilst minimising any adverse impact on residents and businesses in the city;

6) promote improvements in the range and quality of visitor and leisure attractions in the city for the benefit of local residents and visitors.

Results from the 1996 Residents' Opinion Survey indicated that two of the most important issues facing York residents and their families are congestion (mentioned by 35%) and lack of parking (mentioned by 13%). The planning reaction has been to increase the pedestrianisation of certain zones of the city during peak hours. In addition, the city council maintains and extends the cycle and pedestrian network, employs a park and ride scheme, encourages the use of public transport for both passengers and freight, is seeking to develop a park and sail scheme which utilises the rivers Foss and Ouse, supports resident parking schemes and assesses the impacts on the city of highway improvement schemes. Under section 6.67, it is suggested that "Adverse environmental effects resulting from negative development can often be minimised by careful design and location, and by providing other improvements and facilities". Developers are required to carry out a transport impact assessment (TIA). They are not, however, required to conduct a social impact assessment (SIA).

3.3.3 The York tourism strategy

The following therefore are the strategic goals of York City Council (Tourism Strategy Group, 1999) within which they hope to create, through partnership between the public and private sectors, a tourism industry where:

1) economic and employment benefits are maximised;

2) the city is recognised as a high quality tourism destination that is continually enhancing its visitor experience, thereby encouraging people to want to come here and return;

3) a wide range of quality jobs are available - with training and career opportunities - so that people will want to work in the industry;

4) tourism is managed so that the quality of life for residents and the enjoyment of York by visitors are enhanced;

5) residents can appreciate the benefits of tourism in York and therefore give it their support;

6) those engaged in the industry in York possess the means to understand and respond to national and international trends in their business, understand who their customers are and have the ability to respond to their needs.
3.4 THE CITY OF CHESTER

Present day Chester stands on the site of an ancient Roman Fortress, built in AD 79 as a base for military operations against the Welsh. The Romans built the fortress on a sandstone plateau in a bend of the river Dee, hence its Roman name "Deva". The inhabitants of this time relied on local produce and materials - salt from Cheshire, minerals from North Wales and Anglesey - so Chester undoubtedly became a trading centre (The Pitkin Guide, 1997). It has a rich and full history from that date, indicating that its site was not only one of continued strategic importance, but also that it was successful in sustaining itself and its people. Chester's rich history has not been wasted by developments, indeed it was the first British city to appoint a conservation officer and in 1975, the Chester Heritage Centre was opened - the first Architectural Heritage Centre.

As well as being one of the country's top tourist attractions, present day Chester is also a major commercial centre, registering among the UK's top five retailing areas (Chester Action Programme Partnership, 1993). Chester escaped the large industrial developments in neighbouring areas and has retained its historic features making it a popular tourist destination.

3.4.1 The Chester tourism product

The city of Chester declares that it attracts around six million UK and overseas visitors each year. This would set it as the leading city destination outside of London. This raises an issue regarding the collection of tourism statistics which is not dealt with here, but which points to the different measurement parameters used by each city. It is more likely, that this is the figure for the region or locality and not wholly the urban centre. Even given this concern over the true estimate of tourist numbers, it does establish Chester as a major city destination. These visitors provide an estimated revenue of £320 million per year and support directly and indirectly 30% of the jobs in the district (Chester City Council, 1998). The whole of Chester city centre has been designated as an Outstanding Conservation Area, an area which contains the famous rows, the city walls and the Cathedral. Additional and more recent attractions include the Chester Heritage Centre, The Cheshire Military Museum, The Chester Toy and Doll Museum and the Chester Zoo.

3.4.2 Planning tourism in Chester

Given Chester's standing as a major tourist attraction, with millions of visitors arriving every year, it was decided that not enough was known about tourism's impact in the city. In 1984, the Research Services Branch of the English
Tourist Board prepared the Chester Tourism Study (ETB, 1984). At the same time, the Chester Marketing Bureau was established (1983). The main outcome of the study was to note the pressure exerted by a combination of tourist arrivals and local workers on the city's infrastructure. The main problem was lack of car parking, and litter in the streets. All in all, the problems facing Chester are similar to those of the other historic cities, in that they possess a small central tourist zone with narrow streets and poor access.

3.4.3 The Chester tourism strategy

The draft tourism strategy aims to make Chester increasingly competitive in the worldwide tourism market through sustainable policies. The delivery of the strategy is based on several core beliefs or guiding principles, the primary one of which is that the strategy should be guided by the city council's mission to make Chester a better place for people to live, work and visit. The tourism strategy is set out according to six key theme areas.

The six key theme areas are:

1) the visitor experience - This covers each element of the experience received by visitors including accommodation, visitor facilities, the natural and built environment, and transport and information;

2) visitor management - Visitor management is the central theme to this tourism strategy that has the mission of setting down a process through which the economic and environmental impacts of tourism on Chester will be optimised. The establishment of a positive visitor experience is the key to visitor management as is the need for reliable tourism research information;

3) research and information - Accurate research information is essential for tourism in Chester to be effectively managed and developed. Information on the numbers of visitors, their activity and their spending; their profiles and perceptions; when they come, where they go and how long they stay; where they come from and where non-visitors went instead of Chester; how visitors came to choose Chester, the effectiveness of the city's marketing. Information on the economic and environmental impact of visitors and on the performance of the industry year-on-year, month-on-month and in comparison with competitor areas;

4) marketing and product development - Chester must be able to respond efficiently to enquiries from each market segment whilst being pro active in
seeking to increase its business share from those markets which bring it greatest benefit;

5) people - For any industry to be successful, the people who work in it must be properly trained and motivated;

6) organisation - Chester's tourism potential will be achieved or it will fail according to the extent to which it is embraced by its anticipated partners.

3.5 THE CITY OF BATH

Bath was the thriving centre of the spa business as long ago as Roman times. It became a popular tourist centre during the 17th and 18th Centuries, during which time it was included in the social round, complementing Tunbridge as their seasons did not clash. Bath was still very much a medieval town, enclosed by its wall, and possessing narrow streets (Havins, 1976). Bath became more of a 'classical' city during the late 18th Century due to the influence of Richard Nash and Ralph Allen who set out to rebuild the city and provide amenities for those living in it.

During her travels, Celia Fiennes commented on the behaviour of the local people in Bath, saying that the bath attendants were, from her point of view, pleasantly servile - but it was the servility of any body of people who relied upon the largesse of the wealthy for their livelihood. Some might say that she might equally have been commenting on the service staff in modern day tourist centres. Nash became the 'Beau', and as master of ceremonies became the arbiter of Bath society. During this period, Bath was elevated to the position of most fashionable city in England.

These men, John Wood included, were heavily influenced in their architectural designs for Bath, by the Greeks and Romans. Indeed, Wood's realisation of Bath as a Roman city on English soil is his greatest claim to fame. Although much of the plan was never realised, his work laid the foundation of Bath the Georgian city. Bath became England's off-duty capital and the model for other spa resort towns. Interestingly, Havins (1976) speculates that it was no more than a series of historical accidents that led to Bath becoming the chosen site. Although Bath was accepted as London-in-the-West, it possessed little on the lines of the monumental other than the Abbey. Bath was in no better state than many other English towns of that time, and the conditions were becoming aggravated by the growing annual inflow of visitors. The town was still fairly prosperous as a result of its connection with the wool-trade, although this too was in decline. Indeed, it was
its developing recognition as a spa resort, that fashioned its development and which underpins its acceptance today as a notable tourist attraction.

The modern day Bath has a total resident population of 85,100, the three biggest employers are the Ministry of Defence (MOD), the Health Authority and Bath and North East Somerset Council. The male and female population split is 48% to 52% in favour of the female population. In terms of age structure, the 1991 census indicated that 16-24 year olds represented 12% of the Bath and North East Somerset population, 25-34 similarly accounted for 12%, 35-44 year olds equalled 11%, 45-pensionable age represented 20%, pensioners under 75 totalled 12%, and pensioners over 75 represented 6% of the total population (Bath Chamber of Commerce, 1996).

There has been an increase in the number of people working in the service sector (+ 26%, 1981-1991 NOMIS/Census of employment) with approximately 40% of the working population now working in ‘Other services’.

3.5.1 The Bath tourism product

The Bath Tourism Bureau recognises the value of tourism (as a Service Industry) as an increasingly important element of local economic activity. In 1990 the estimate of the value of tourism to the city was £120 million, that has since been adjusted to an estimate of over £200 million (Bath Tourism Bureau, 1995). This figure is similar to the estimated spend in the city of York (£257 million, Touche Ross, 1994).

Bath possesses several historic attractions, most notably, the Roman Baths, and the Georgian architecture (most evident at the Royal Crescent). These attractions contributed to Bath becoming designated a World Heritage Site by UNESCO. Present figures indicate that 2.2 million visitors arrive each year.

3.5.2 Planning tourism in Bath

It is estimated that tourists contribute to around 60% of the retail sector’s turnover in Bath (Bath Tourism Bureau, 1995). It is also estimated that the city council owns approximately 60% of the freeholds in the city centre, many of which are empty at present (Newnham, 1994). In order to encourage residents and tourist to visit the city centre, a Bath City Centre Management Scheme was established in 1993. This is a more generic approach to regenerating the city of Bath, within which many of the principles for tourism development co-exist. The tourism strategy however is a separate document.
3.5.3 The Bath tourism strategy

The following are the principles and strategic objectives of the Bath tourism strategy:

1) Target Markets and Market Segmentation
   It is clear that the dynamics of the tourism industry on a global basis require constant monitoring in order to accurately apply scarce marketing resources in an effective targeted way;

2) Customer Care
   The private sector have placed great emphasis on the treatment and welcome given to the visitors arriving in the city. This is becoming an increasingly important aspect of the Bath product and is a vital element in the visitor's perception of value for money;

3) The Environment of the City
   The whole city of Bath is a world heritage site and the bureau will be ever mindful of the responsibilities of the city to manage the physical fabric of Bath in a responsible manner, consistent with World Heritage status and International standards of good practice;

4) Product Development
   No marketing strategy of the city could ever ignore the unique aspects, however, new ideas and images are constantly required. The re-imaging or re-packaging of the Bath product will be achieved whilst maintaining the unique historical characteristics of the city at its core;

5) Image definition
   Follows on from Product Development and concerns the "softer sell" approach. This is usually a long term issue with a message or image being constantly drip-fed to the marketplace;

6) Events Programme
   The events programme is year round, varied and wide-ranging in subject. The programme needs to be developed and co-ordinated in order to increase its value in an external marketing sense;

7) Business Tourism
   The Bath Conference Bureau has been established in order to maximise the city's potential to attract conferences, meetings, seminars, business incentive travel, product launches and corporate events;

8) Monitoring and Performance
   All marketing and public relations activity will in the future be monitored for performance against original objectives;
9) Major New Projects
The Bath Tourism Bureau will advise and assist the Director of Leisure, Tourism and Economic Development in realising the development of new projects e.g. The Spa project, the Avon Street site, and The Abbey Chambers project;

10) Maintain Local Support
The Bureau will, through pro-active local public relations, establish a closer dialogue with the media and the public at large concerning its work, current issues and new developments.

3.6 SUMMARY
Within Chapter two, the recommendations of Becker (1997) were acknowledged. He recommended that social impact assessments should contain a baseline referent point for the area under investigation. This involves a general version which provides a global overview of the place under study, and a focused version which deals with the variables which are closely connected to the current or future action whose consequences are being analysed. In the case of this research, chapter three provides such baseline information.

In terms of the general overview, chapter three discusses the emergence of governance and the associated rights of the people living in civil society; the development of planning as a means of managing growth in a planned and equitable way such that all residents benefited; the associated mechanisms which emerged to assist in classifying places, the rationale behind this and the difficulties defining historic cities in order to assist in planning tourism development.

As for the focused view, each city is taken individually and discussed in terms of a brief socio-economic historical perspective, their tourism product, their approach to planning tourism, and their present tourism strategy. In doing this, the intention was to develop a view of the development of historic cities in England and to assess whether or not they can be classified as such. If it were found that there were similarities in their growth and development, and indeed, in the way in which they plan and manage tourism, then it would add strength to the supposition that research specific to their strategic tourism objectives which assists in the measurement of tourism's impacts on their communities is a useful contribution.

Historically, the cities all possess a rich and deep past. The sites on which they emerged and grew were successful because of the presence of natural resources, trade access, and their defensive qualities. Because of these qualities, they survived and evolved, being peopled at some time by Romans, Vikings, Anglo-
Saxons, and Normans. It seems quite apt therefore that the people presently residing in the cities are supported to a certain extent by a tourist invasion, many of whom arrive from overseas. In terms of population, York (101,000), Bath (78,689), and Chester (75,458) each possess similar size populations.

Economically, the cities report that tourists spend between £200-320 million per year, and that tourism related employment supports between 14% and 30% of the local populations. In terms of their tourism product, each possesses historic attractions that relate to the same periods in history, most notably, the Roman experience. As ecclesiastical centres, each possesses a Cathedral or Abbey, and because of the development of core historic centres based in the old town areas, they each state that transport congestion is the greatest problem facing them and their community. Because of the impacts of tourism, their tourism strategies talk about the need to:

1) monitor the economic, environmental and social impacts of tourism;
2) implement a visitor management strategy;
3) develop and upgrade accommodation;
4) improve public transport;
5) review and improve visitor information services;
6) maximise the employment and economic benefits of tourism;
7) improve the standards of service through training people to work in tourism-related jobs;
8) assist those organisations working in the industry understand and respond to national and international trends;
9) market and re-brand the tourist experience in order to maintain a competitive edge over similar destinations.

The emergence of the cities of York, Bath, Chester and Canterbury appear therefore to be somewhat similar. Their present day economies are reliant to a great extent on the same industry, an industry which brings millions of tourists to their doors each year, the impacts of which are more evident economically and environmentally than they are socially in terms of the host's reality of living with tourism.

Chapter four focuses on governmental planning responses to the growth and changes in society witnessed during the 20th Century. Tourism, as an emerging key economic industry, receives particular attention, including a piece of research that investigates the strategic objectives and planning actions of local government tourism departments.
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CHAPTER FOUR

♦ LINKS TO PREVIOUS RESEARCH PHASE

Chapter four addresses the observation made in chapter two, that social impacts studies to date have failed to investigate the specific impacts of planning actions, tending instead, toward the general. In order to accomplish this effectively, it is important to lay a solid foundation. The review of the literature focuses on the planning responses of central government throughout the 20th century, and specifically notes its attempts to manage the emergent tourism industry. Having done this, research phase II concludes by conducting a piece of research which enables the analysis of the strategic tourism objectives and actions presently employed by local government in England.

♦ KEY OBJECTIVES

- To review the planning responses of central and local government, in England, to the social, economic and environmental developments witnessed during the 20th century.

- To highlight the specific planning responses of the government of that time to the emergence of tourism as a significant industry.

- To determine the present strategic tourism objectives and planning actions implemented by local government in England.

- To develop a conceptual model which links the strategic tourism objectives with their associated planning actions.

- To test the agreement of the local government tourism officers in the historic cities as to the validity of the model in terms of its logic and usefulness.
RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND QUESTIONS

Research objective 2

To ascertain the strategic tourism objectives of local authorities in the United Kingdom.

Research question 4

"Are there a common group of strategic tourism objectives which local government councils throughout the United Kingdom seek to achieve?"

Research objective 3

To assemble a list of tourism planning actions that are employed by local government councils for tourism development.

Research objective 4

The ultimate aim of research objective four was to develop a research instrument that would enable the residents of Chester to evaluate and comment on the planning actions which those responsible for tourism were preparing to employ in pursuit of tourism development objectives. In order to achieve this, research objective four was designed to incorporate the agreement of tourism officers working in the historic cities. This was operationalised through an extensive series of interviews and consultations with those individuals.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE THESIS AS A WHOLE

This chapter establishes the historical planning context within which tourism emerged. It then indicates the present day tourism objectives and actions of local government in England. This research work provided the opportunity to complete the conceptual basis of the objectives, actions and opinions model. Having achieved this, research objective four sought to develop a resident tourism survey designed to enable the evaluation of local government tourism objectives and actions in Chester (research phase IV).
4.0 INTRODUCTION

Chapter three established a commentary regarding the:

1) emergence of governance and planning as a result of communities recognising the need for a democratic basis to support equitable growth and development;

2) practice of classification of settlements and the attempts of early planners to objectify their work through developing functional patterns regarding the nature of places, particularly cities. The aim of this movement was to render planning more equitable, manageable, and understandable along objective guidelines;

3) notion of what constitutes an historic city and whether or not a functional classification system could be established which defined their particular form and function;

4) emergence of the four historic cities of York, Bath, Chester and Canterbury as tourism destinations. Each city is treated as an individual case study in order to give a description of its emergence, development and present situation as an historic tourist city.

Having developed this particular conceptual basis, Chapter four focuses more acutely on:

1) planning within twentieth century England, developing an historical commentary regarding the significant planning responses of the government to the issues of the time. Particular attention is placed on the planning responses to tourism and its development as a significant industry;

2) the results of two pieces of research which sought to identify the strategic tourism objectives of local authorities in England, and the planning actions employed by them in order to achieve these objectives;

3) developing a conceptual model, in conjunction with the tourism officers in the historic cities, which links their objectives, actions and the opinions of residents to these.

4.1 LITERATURE REVIEW

4.1.1 Planning in 20th century England

This section traces the functioning of the planning system during the 20th century. As a result of the growing influence of the planning movement, the 19th century had seen many changes, including the adoption of notions of social welfare which were added to the planning portfolio which previously had only concerned itself with aspects such as National Defence and Public Order. By the 20th century,
additional responsibilities included Public Health, Education, Housing and protection against unemployment.

Before proceeding, it is important to take a view as to the way in which planning itself has developed in England. Planning in England represents a response to the environmental problems of the first industrialising nation. It was shaped by two particular political ideologies. First a commitment to a “Welfare State” and secondly, the impact of “Thatcherism” and the move towards a more mixed market economy. Additionally, there are significant cross-cultural dimensions to British planning. Many of the concepts were borrowed or adapted. Many examples exist which are evidence of the influence of Prussian land policy and urban design on British land use planning. In the same way, other practices such as Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) have been adopted from the United States of America.

The emphasis of this chapter is placed on the changing planning approaches in 20th century England. The major focus taken will concentrate on the attention afforded tourism during this period as planning responded to the scale of, and problems arising from economic growth and decline. A logical starting point would seem to be a brief, basic structural outline of the British government structure.

The British government structure involves three main institutions at the national level: the Cabinet, which formulates government policy; Parliament, which is the legislature and passes binding policy in the form of acts; and the Executive in the form of the government and the civil service which provides non-partisan advice to ministers and organises the implementation of policy. It is the civil service that is most involved in the day-to-day running of the planning system.

4.1.2 Central government

It is not the purpose of this section to enter into a lengthy exploration of the role of central government in the planning system in England. The intention is to portray the context within which planning, particularly tourism planning, and its concomitant strategies emerge. In order to do this effectively, it is necessary to gain an outline appreciation of the institutional arrangements within the planning framework (Structure), of the nature of policies and policy-making alternatives within the planning framework (Function), and a view as to the types of strategies behind policy-making (Nature).

According to Held (1989), the state is an exceedingly complex structure which eludes precise definition. Nevertheless, Davis et al., (1993) suggest that it is of crucial importance in understanding the contours of public policy because the
state translates values, interests and resources into objectives and policies. To this end then, the state has been recognised as serving four key functions (Hall, 1994). These are:

1) the maintenance of internal order;
2) military concerns;
3) maintenance of communication infrastructures;
4) economic redistribution.

It is the arena of economic redistribution that the tourism policy combatants are primarily found. As Hall (1994) observes, the crucial question is not whether the government plays a role in tourism development, but what kind of role does it play? It has been suggested (IUOTO, 1974; Mill & Morrison, 1985) that five main areas of public sector involvement exist. These include the roles of:

1) communication;
2) planning;
3) legislation and regulation;
4) entrepreneurship;
5) stimulation.

To this list, Hall (1994) suggests the inclusion of a social tourism role and interest protection. These classifications of public sector involvement are very general, and behind them lies the complexity of planning and policy processes.

The theories of liberal political economy present an image of the state as a unified set of public sector organisations who approach their business from a rational-decision making perspective. In practice, the state may not be unified, nor the sole arena for the policy process. With regards to institutional arrangements, there are four types of organisation which together constitute the public sector where planning is involved (Rydin, 1993). These are central government, local government, quangos and international organisations, particularly the European Commission. This research, whilst accepting the influence of the later two, concentrates on the operation of the planning system by central and local government. These organisations interact in a series of complex dynamics, where there is, within each organisation...

“a different balance between the influence of politicians, administrators, and professionals, each with their own approach to policy issues...and who are subject to influence, pressure and claims from the public, exerted through pressure groups, political parties and general public opinion.” (Rydin, 1993:181)
Figure 11 illustrates this complexity and enables the observation of the contributory factors which have an influence on the tourism policy-making process.

Figure 11
Elements in the tourism policy-making process
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At central government level, the main institution responsible for the planning system in England is the Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions (DETR). Originally created in 1972, as the Department of the Environment, it combined the former ministries of Housing and Local Government, Public Building and Works, and Transport and was therefore charged with the responsibility for the whole range of functions which affect people’s living environment. In order to manage this effectively, much of the responsibility for implementation of planning policy is delegated to regional or local level institutions. These may include local offices of central government departments or ministries, or more autonomous institutions such as local government or quasi-governmental organisations.

Tourism has become more than just an industry and an economic activity. In 1995 there was a world wide total of 567 million international tourist arrivals (WTO, 1996). Governments had become involved in tourism mainly therefore because of its economic importance. However, because of its scale and widening
influence, tourism is increasingly being seen to have profound social impacts on the resident communities. Because governments have the power to provide political stability, security and the legal and financial framework to manage industries such as tourism, they are in the best position to monitor and control any adverse or unforeseen impacts. Within their role, there are seen to be several important principles. These according to Elliott (1997) reflect their duties in terms of: 1) public interest, 2) public service, 3) effectiveness, 4) efficiency, and 5) accountability. These principles are not always achievable together, in some cases there may be the need to compromise. The principles which are compromised may differ according to the level at which the decision is made. At the Central government level, it may well be decided that it is in the public interest to promote tourism for employment purposes. At the local level however, it may well create impacts which require more concern for accountability.

4.1.3 Local government

Local authorities in Britain...

"play a vital role in helping to promote and develop tourism in their areas...besides their marketing and information activities, they provide many facilities and amenities enjoyed by visitors and residents alike. Their role in the land-use planning process gives them an important influence over tourism development. They play a major part in supporting the work of local Tourist Boards. (Dept of Employment, 1992)

Local government is found to some degree in all political systems and is seen as necessary to enable local people to appoint representatives to administer on their behalf. Byrne (1986:6) describes local government as "a form of self-government providing for local initiative and freedom". According to Elliott (1997), managers at the local level should see public interest as their first priority. Local government responsibilities include legal and economic affairs, welfare of the poor and needy, the morale of the citizens, good visitor relations, cultural matters and the conservation of the natural and built environment.

Given all of these responsibilities, it is the duty of these elected representatives to speak for the people through establishing policy priorities. It does this within the framework established by central government. Local government
has, at times, a somewhat uneasy relationship with central government as both can claim authority by virtue of their elected nature. It is central government, however, which has the greater power, and is able to employ financial and administrative mechanisms to limit the actions of local government. An example of this, relevant to tourism development, is that development control decisions are subject to appeal to the Secretary of State. This then is the fundamental structure of the government system in Britain.

The next section observes the way in which the government system responded to the challenges it faced during a century of change unlike any other known before it. The 20th century bore witness to an intense period of industrialisation, two world wars and the acceleration of technology into an "Information Age" which saw the decline of many traditional manufacturing industries. Such rapid change brought about on such a scale required careful planning, a challenge which, if measured in terms of the pure number of planning actions, was met with equal ebullience on the part of the government and the 20th century planners that it employed. The historical commentaries that follow rely, for their natural structure, on the two distinct and yet connected issues of central and local government planning responses to tourism in the 20th Century.

4.1.4 Tourism planning (1900-1919)

At the turn of the century, the trend towards urbanisation in Britain began to accelerate. The populations of cities increased, spreading out further from the centre. The development of cheap and efficient transport systems meant that people could now live further away than the three mile walking distance to work which appeared to characterise the typical settlement patterns of the time (Hall, 1997). Industries were still present in rural areas, where they had been situated in order to be close to the source of their required raw materials (e.g. coal), but more and more, industries were developing in the cities that grew as a result of advantageous location. In this it is meant that they either existed within easy reach of a coalfield or, as in the case of older established towns and cities such as York, Chester Canterbury and Bath, they were near enough to coalfields, navigable waters, or became railway junctions.

At this time, tourism was considered to be of little economic significance and therefore not worthy of national government attention (Young, 1973). In the view of Pimlott (1947) 19th Century tourism in Britain was a minority pastime enjoyed by an elite few and its economic impact was limited to a small number of fashionable resorts. This was to change as a result of the urban growth and the
demands of the people who moved to the cities who sought holidays by the sea or in the countryside. It was, according to Heeley (1981), a combination of rising per capita incomes and railway technology that enabled the latent demand for holidays to be systematically exploited. And so it was, that “the foundations of a significant new economic activity had been laid” (Heeley, 1981:62). The potential for commercial and economic gain was first recognised by the local authorities in the resort towns who took a lead role in developing infrastructure and facilities for tourists, as well as establishing a precedent for resort promotion (Kendall and McVey, 1986). Local government is recognised therefore as having a much longer history of involvement in tourism development than central government (Richards & Wilkes, 1990). With an absence of an explicit national tourism policy, local authorities adopted a wide variety of approaches and attitudes towards tourism development. These attitudes were noted by Heeley (1986) as ranging from “tourist conscious”, “indifferent” to “openly antagonistic” towards tourism development. At this time statutory town planning was a new concept and would have limited influence on tourism development.

4.1.5 Tourism planning (1920-1939)

Between the wars, the whole process of suburban growth and decentralisation began to speed up. The world depression which lasted between 1929 and 1934 meant that labour and building materials were cheap, whilst at the same time, social changes were becoming evident as a result of economic forces. More workers were becoming white-collar employees with regular salaries and the associated security which enabled them to borrow money on credit (Hall, 1997). Further developments in transport technology once more extended the effective commuting distance to work and therefore urban expansion followed. By the mid-1930’s this new mobility opened up previously remote destinations (Dougill, 1935). The pressure on certain areas became exaggerated by the growth in the so-called tertiary industries – service occupations within inner urban locations. The majority of this growth occurred in city centres where people were increasingly employed in offices and shops. As a result, traffic congestion in the cities began to grow, imposing an increasing burden on the inhabitants.

This period of growth was limited to certain economic areas, whilst there also emerged a growing recognition of a ‘Regional problem’ wherein, certain areas were suffering disproportionate economic problems, as evident in the indices such as high unemployment and low incomes. This led central government, in 1934, to designate special status for ‘special areas’. This however was not seen as adequate
and so due to increasing pressure, the government appointed a Royal Commission on the Geographical Distribution of the Industrial Population. The outcome was the Barlow Commission, named after the chairman Sir Anderson Montague-Barlow. This report was significant for two main reasons. First, it found that the lack of economic growth in some areas was due to a 'structural effect' in that their basic industries were declining, and secondly, its commissioning started a chain reaction of events which were to create the whole complex post-war planning machine.

These changes had a significant influence on the way in which people lived, worked and played, changes that were to influence the development of tourism. Whereas tourism development had previously been seen as a local issue, central government interest in tourism was stimulated. This was further encouraged by the 'Come to Britain Movement' (CBM) which was founded in 1926 (Richards, 1995). Operating as a pressure group to raise central government's awareness of tourism, it also aimed to attract more visitors to Britain. From this point in time on, central government would come to have a more direct influence on the tourism industry. Initially, government support was more by way of encouragement than financial support. By April 1929, the Travel Association of Great Britain and Ireland had been established under License of the Board of Trade (Hewett et al., 1970). In 1930, the Board of Trade contributed £5,000 towards the funding of the association. This is significant in that it can be seen as the first step in the development of state intervention in and support of tourism. Whilst early support was patchy, appeals made to the government had the desired effect, with funding growing from 17% of the Travel Association budget in 1937 to 32% in 1939 (Richards, 1995). During this period, the concept of tourism as an industry was established.

4.1.6 Tourism planning (1940-1970)

The period from 1940-1947 was dominated by an intense period of committee work and report writing. Many reports were commissioned, each charged with making recommendations on specialised aspects of planning. The Scott report pointed to the need to preserve agricultural land from development. Lord Justice Uthwatt's Expert Committee on Compensation and Betterment suggested that the only logical step was to nationalise all non-developed land. The Abercrombie report recommended the decentralisation of London to reduce congestion through resettlement in 'New Towns'. Two reports concerning the planning and development of these towns were produced by Lord Reith. This surge of report writing ended with Dower's report on National Parks in 1945, and the
Hobhouse Committee Report on National Parks Administration in 1947. If it were not already clear, the Town and Country Planning Act of 1947 established the intent of the government. In this short period of time, the outline had been drafted of a potentially powerful planning system. Many of the recommendations of these reports were put into practice in a burst of legislation between 1945 and 1952. First came the 1945 Distribution of Industry Act that provided the government with greater control over the distribution of Industry. During this time of radical change, the Travel Association continued to push for tourism’s recognition as a ‘special case’, setting out its objectives in a government requested memorandum ‘Government and the Tourist Industry’ (Finney, 1945). The Finney Memorandum based its claims for the special status of tourism on the needs of post war reconstruction. During the period, the British Tourist and Holidays Board was established (1947), as were the Scottish Tourist Board (1945) and the Northern Ireland Tourist Board (1948).

At the local level, official support for tourism remained negligible. Tourism did not benefit from the system of grants and incentives that the government had introduced to assist economically depressed areas. The thrust of government efforts had been directed at the regional problem, with the concentration of efforts to reduce unemployment in the conurbations. This according to Heeley (1981) gave regional policy a built-in urban bias. Further to this, tourism was still seen as serving a secondary and lesser purpose than the options provided by light and heavy industry. The third point which Heeley suggests created this indifference is the fact that central government viewed tourism’s contribution as being to balance of payments rather than regional development objectives. This is evidenced by the merging of the Travel Association and the Tourism and Holidays Board in 1950 to form the British Travel and Holidays Association, and the subsequent growth in financial support for the newly formed body which reached £800,000 by 1959.

The 1950’s saw central government planning concerned with housing and the development of expanded towns (Town Development Act, 1952) in an attempt to redistribute the population away from overcrowded urban areas. This emphasis was further confirmed by the 1959 New Towns Act. Meanwhile, at the regional level, one of the major concerns was industrial development and employment. This is evidenced by the passing of the 1960 Employment Act, the 1966 Industrial Development Act, the emergence of Special Development Areas in 1967, and the definition of Intermediate Areas in 1969. At the national level, government grants to the British Travel Association grew from £1 million in 1960 to almost £3 million in 1969 (BTA, 1969). The growing importance of tourism was recognised in the form of the 1969 Development of Tourism Act which was to provide a statutory
framework for tourism administration in Britain. It created, alongside the previously established Northern Ireland Tourist Board (1948), four statutory boards, namely the English, Wales, and Scottish Tourist Boards, and the British Tourist Authority (Hughes, 1994). These were set up primarily for balance of payment reasons (Heeley, 1981) in that their main functions were marketing and promotion. Given that the task of governance is enormous, the UK employed a system to decentralise its administration (Byrne, 1994) in the field of tourism. This it did, first by establishing Non-statutory Regional Tourist Boards to advise on planning and management, and secondly by deploying further responsibility for tourism planning down to the local government level. Although local authorities were effectively given the opportunity to pursue more active tourism policies, they were not obliged to do so, particularly as there was still no national tourism policy.

Elsewhere, and in recognition of the diversity and heterogeneous development issues across regions, the Location of Offices Bureau was established (1963). Intended to supervise the decentralisation of commercial activities, it was consolidated by the Control of Offices and Industrial Development Act (1965) which required developers to obtain an Office Development Permit before undertaking any major commercial development.

This whole approach placed planning within a framework of indicative planning documents. In 1965, planning councils and boards were established for the eight planning regions in England. These provided a mechanism for preparing regional plans (e.g. The Strategic Plan for the South East, 1970). Regional plans were assembled as anchoring points to which lower level planning could refer for guidance. The development plans of the land use planning system were to be the lowest tier in the developing hierarchy of strategic planning. Whilst tourism remained somewhat on the sidelines, some changes began to appear. In 1965, the Highlands and Islands Development Board was appointed, heralding the advent of a degree of government interest in tourism’s potential role in assisting rural development. This move was followed in 1968 by the introduction of the Development Commission’s Tourism Loan Scheme which set up a system whereby small-scale tourist enterprises could acquire advances from the Government’s Development Fund.

The 1960’s saw significant changes due to the recognition that urban and rural development was outpacing the inflexible development plans established under the 1947 Town and Country Planning Act. In 1964, the Planning Advisory Group reported on “The Future of Development Plans”. They recommended the creation of a two-tier system of development plans, and so it was, in 1968, that the
Town and Country Planning Act introduced the structure plan to provide a broad framework, and more detailed local plans.

Structure plans consisted of a written statement and a key diagram, supported by explanatory memorandum and a statement of public participation and other consultations (Rydin, 1993). These plans were to be reviewed continuously rather than on a five-year basis. This ongoing survey was intended to look, not just at physical land use matters, but also to take account of social and economic forces. Local plans consisted of a written statement, maps and other descriptive matter as relevant. Three types of local plan were proposed: 1) District plans, 2) Subject or topic plans, and 3) Action plans. Within the changing planning approach, development control became more obvious. Additionally, and coming out of the Scheffington Report of 1969 was a call for more public involvement in planning. The report “People and Plans” encouraged local authorities to involve communities in plan making at every stage (Gyford, 1991:72-79).

The protection of urban heritage remained a popular government objective and indeed received greater attention and support with a wider range of interest in architectural periods. This is most evident in the formation of the Victorian Society in 1958 and the Civic Amenities Act of 1967. This in particular was pivotal in introducing conservation areas, a notion which can be seen to be implicitly tied to the modern concept of sustainability. Along with the 1962 Local Authorities (Historic Buildings) Act, the 1968 Clean Air Act heralded the return of pollution control onto the planning agenda. Charged with the controlling of emissions, it became part of a major re-examination of environmental issues during the 1960’s and early 1970’s. These other issues included discharge into rivers (Rivers Act, 1961), household refuse disposal (Key Committee, 1961), noise pollution (Wilson Committee, 1963), sewage disposal (Jager Committee, 1970), transport (The Buchanan Report, “Traffic in Towns” 1963; Transport Act, 1968). All of these issues had a bearing on tourism development in that increased numbers of people staying in a region, and the associated increase in the use of local resources placed a greater strain on the natural environment and its inhabitants.

4.1.7 Tourism planning during the 1970’s

This decade saw the peak and collapse of the post war economic boom. The sub-urbanisation of the 1960’s had turned into a flight from the cities and by the end of the decade, the urban-rural shift in British society was well established. Given these changes, several themes changed in the approach to planning. The new
towns programme was wound down as was regional planning, with a greater emphasis on inner city problems within regions.

The planning system now appeared to fall into several categories; land use planning and conservation, countryside policy, environmental planning, and urban policy and transport. There was also a shift away from development planning to development control. The Dobry Committee published its final report on “The Review of the Development Control System” in 1975. Although their recommendations were not taken up by central government, it became widely recognised that efficient and effective development control was linked to speedy development plan preparation, thereby ensuring up-to-date strategic guidance. Particular concern was voiced about the development of structure plans which consumed large amounts of local authority planning resources.

The one ever-present theme was that of environmental planning which was extended and significantly developed in this period, particularly with regard to pollution control. The major policy initiatives of the 1970’s, though, revolved around the inner city problem. The Department of the Environment (DoE) dominated, in a period when the 1978 Inner Areas Act was passed. This essentially gave local authorities the power to support the creation of employment opportunities and improve the environment of industrial areas by designating industrial improvement areas. Indeed, central government did begin to encourage local authorities to consider a redeployment of resources towards tourism development (Department of the Environment circular, 13/79, 1979).

Thirty years after the end of the war, it had become evident that planning had not been able to fulfil its promise of balancing growth across the country and spreading its benefits widely within society. There was a pressing need for a re-examination by professional planners of their activities and for a renewed intellectual justification for planning. One strand turned to organisation theory to explain the problems facing the planning system in terms of its internal limitations. In this way, planning was seen from the point of view of policy formulation and implementation. The problems of implementation became the focus for attention (Barrett & Fudge, 1981; Child, 1977; Pollit et al., 1979).

The second strand of planning theory during the 1970’s was termed the liberal political economy approach. This drew on welfare economics to derive concepts of market failure applicable to urban and environmental problems (Baumol & Oates, 1975; Evans, 1973; Harrison, 1977). This approach suggested a number of justifications for public sector activity to redress market failure and achieve more efficient and equitable market outcomes. Using a variety of economic
techniques (e.g. cost-benefit analysis) planners could act as expert assessors of the impact of environmental change.

This approach involved them more obviously in resource allocation that involves a political dimension. The second radical strand of political economy tackled this issue head on and explored the ways in which the state influenced the flow of capital within the economy. The generation of inequitable outcomes was thus central to an understanding of the planning process. Planners were seen as urban gatekeepers (Pahl, 1975). Intellectual support for the planning profession was fragmenting and turning instead to an exposure of planning’s weaknesses and inadequacies (Rydin, 1993). For tourism, this meant a review of its development legislation, a process conducted by the conservative government in 1970. The review recommended that tourism should be utilised to redress the regional differences which had developed between areas in the country. The Tourist Projects Scheme was allocated £1 million between 1970-1971. It was administered by the statutory Tourist Boards and was available to those who sought to develop tourist facilities in the Development areas. This was later expanded, in 1978, to include the intermediate areas of England, Wales and Scotland.

In 1974, the newly elected Labour government commissioned another review of tourism development legislation. The Shore review recommended that tourism development should be shifted away from traditional resort areas into areas of the country suffering economic decline (Richard and Wilkes, 1990). The resulting action was to see the establishment of ‘Tourism Growth Points’, three of which were established in 1977 in Scarborough, the High Pennines and Wadebridge (Wanhill, 1988). There appeared to be a significant shift towards understanding the nature and potential role of tourism as an agent for the positive redistribution of regional equity. At the same time however, disagreement emerged over the role of government in tourism. Sir Alfred Sherman, a conservative councillor and the director of the right wing Centre For Policy Studies criticised the over-bureaucratic structure of the Tourist Boards, which he saw as unfit for a ‘modern market economy’ (Heeley, 1989). Unemployment began to increase towards the end of the 1970’s and so government policy focused more acutely on employment creation, particularly in the expanding service industries, of which tourism formed a significant part.

4.1.8 Tourism planning during the 1980’s

The effects of a cyclical recession were reinforced by the introduction of new technology based on computer microprocessors. As a result of recession and
Restructuring, industrial employment fell. However, industrial output was also falling as the longer-term trend away from manufacturing towards service industries had an even greater impact. The dominant theme within the shifting ideological framework was the emergence of a New Right philosophy emphasising the advantages of market processes, the role of the private sector in generating wealth and the moral and economic dangers of both a large public sector and other forms of collective action such as trades unionism.

To assist in the more flexible and responsive approach to tourism development, amongst other planning developments, certain aspects of the planning system which had been in decline were now killed off. Regional Economic Planning Councils were a prime example. Within land use planning, development planning and development control were restructured in line with a more market oriented approach. Government advice made it clear that as far as development control was concerned, a more “positive” approach to planning was to be adopted. In line with this, the requirements for survey work and public participation was reduced. These procedural changes were summarised in DoE circulars 23/81 and 22/84. The net result of these was that structure plans became shorter, indeed, the Inner Areas Act of 1978 had allowed for local plans to be prepared and adopted in advance of structure plans in specified inner city areas. This was extended to all areas by the Local Government Planning and Land Act of 1980.

Throughout the 1980’s central government established its grip on the planning system and whilst its ultimate aim was to devolve responsibility down to the regions, the first movement was towards central government control and away from the notion of a partnership. Indeed, a number of strategies have been used to engineer this shift: legislation, minimal consultation, targeted funding, bypassing local government procedures, and reorganisation and reform of local government (Stoker, 1991:153-7). Along with these changes, Stewart and Stoker (1989) identified a number of key themes: the fragmentation of responsibilities, with service delivery, regulation and strategic planning shared with other institutions and agencies; local authority competition with private sector bodies, and a commitment to a more ‘business-like’ management.

These changes were made in an attempt to reduce the development time and bureaucracy surrounding developments without compromising the established principles of the planning system. Implicit in the resulting planning actions was a sense of environmental determinism, whereby it was thought that by changing the physical environment it would alter peoples’ nature, behaviour and by association, their quality of life.
Tourism planning, as a result, become more devolved, with the more conspicuous incorporation of private sector influence and politics. Pressure was increased within the tourism-planning domain, pressures for change that were accentuated through the publication of a series of reports. The link between tourism and employment was consolidated by the publication of Lord Young's report 'Pleasure, Leisure and Jobs (Department of Employment, 1985). Outlining the importance of tourism as a potential employer, it led to the subsequent relocation of ministerial responsibility from the Department of Trade to the Department of Employment. This established the wider recognition of tourism's wider economic role. At the national level, the English Tourist Board stated its objective to maximise tourism's contribution to the economy through the creation of wealth and jobs. At the local level there was increasing pressure on local authorities to develop positive attitudes towards tourism. In 1982, the Association of District Councils (ADC) produced a review of the benefits of tourism development for local authorities. This was followed up by two further reports in 1983 and 1984, within which they emphasised the job creation and economic benefits of tourism development. The Confederation of British Industry joined in with a report on “Paying Guests” (CBI, 1985) in which they emphasised the need for local authority encouragement for private enterprise. The efforts of government at all levels had certainly raised the profile of tourism and its development throughout the 1980's. A survey by the ADC (1988) revealed that district council investment in tourism had risen by £521 million between 1984 and 1987.

4.1.9 Tourism planning during the 1990's

The first substantive move came with the creation of the Department of National Heritage (DNH) in 1992. Renamed in 1997 to the Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS), one of its primary functions was to give tourism a higher profile and to create links between the United Kingdom's tourism appeal, culture and heritage. In March 1995, the Department of National Heritage published “Tourism: Competing with the Best” which set out a number of policy initiatives for all sectors of the industry. Following the white paper “Creating the Enterprise Centre for Europe” (DNH, 1996a), the document “Success Through Partnership” (DNH, 1997) put forward what was to be a comprehensive strategy for tourism, in which local authorities were seen to have a “vital role” to play.

Along with this wider recognition of local government's growing involvement in tourism, came the issuing of central governments' first ever guidance to local authorities. The report entitled “Guidance to Local Authorities on
Tourism” (DNH, 1996b) pointed out the benefits that can result for those authorities that promote and develop tourism in their areas. In 1998, the National Planning Forum released a report entitled "Planning for Tourism”. Aimed primarily at local planning authorities and the commercial sector, it declared that it had four main purposes which were to:

1) raise awareness among planners and other decision-makers of the economic importance and potential for employment generation of tourism;
2) improve the commercial sector’s understanding of how the planning system operates and the various roles performed by the local authority;
3) discuss perceived problems in the operation of the planning system which have been raised by the commercial sector and identify measures for resolving them;
4) recommend how planning for tourism can be further underpinned by the principles of sustainable development and to draw on best available practice in this area.

The report made some more specific observations, stating that local authorities play many important roles in that they co-ordinate development applications, regulate that development, develop in their own right or in partnership with other agencies and provide information to all involved. Perhaps the most important point made in the report, in terms of this research, was the one that...

"an increasing number of local authorities are now preparing tourism and leisure strategies for their areas. However, there is no doubt that the level of coverage could and should be improved”.

(National Planning Forum, 1998:18)

It was further noted, that some tourism strategies were well developed, whilst others were at the formative stage, suggesting that further work in developing good practice in this area was needed.

On 26 February 1999, the Government launched its new tourism strategy "Tomorrow's Tourism". The strategy contains the following fifteen action points:

1) a blueprint for the sustainable development of tourism;
2) initiatives to widen access to tourism;
3) more money for a more focused and aggressive overseas promotion programme;
4) new internet systems to deliver more world wide tourist bookings for Britain;
5) new computerised booking and information systems;
6) a major careers festival and image campaign;
7) a hospitality industry programme to sign up 500 employers to work
towards Investors in People Standard;
8) a new strategic national body for England;
9) a new grading scheme for all hotels and guest houses;
10) new targets for hotel development in London and a further £4.5 million for
marketing;
11) more integrated promotion of our cultural, heritage and countryside
attractions;
12) the development of innovative niche markets;
13) encouraging the regeneration of traditional resorts;
14) more central government support for the regions;
15) a high profile annual tourism summit.

This new strategy indicates an increasing recognition of the importance of
tourism to Britain, not just in economic terms such as employment generation (1.75
million people in 125,000 businesses) and its contribution to the GDP (£53 Billion;
4-5%), but also in the recognition that tourism has both positive and negative social,
cultural and environmental impacts.

Having outlined the changing approach to tourism planning and
development throughout the 20th century, the question remains “How does local
government respond to the challenge to develop tourism in their authority?” The
following section reports on a research investigation aimed at highlighting present
local authority tourism strategies.

4.2 METHODOLOGY

Research phase II contains three distinct stages, each of which was designed
to elicit particular information. They are treated separately in terms of their
methodologies and results, but jointly in the discussion section.

4.2.1 Research phase II: stage 1

This phase of the research was designed to find out what strategic tourism
objectives and actions are employed by local government in England. Whilst
assessing the most appropriate methodological approach, it became increasingly
obvious that the local authority officers were extremely busy (NB: Bath City
Councils' decision not to be involved in the research). The decision was made, that
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the method adopted would have more chance of success if it involved a limited amount of input in terms of the time required to respond. For this reason, interviews of a qualitative nature were ruled out. This approach would also have been unfeasible given the potential number of respondents \((n=471; \text{Municipal Yearbook, 1997})\) and their geographical dispersion. A questionnaire approach was also ruled out, not only because it would be time consuming on the part of the respondent, but also more importantly, it was decided that an independent and external interpretation of their strategies would offer a more objective view.

For these reasons, a letter was sent to each of the local authorities in the United Kingdom asking them to post a copy of their most recent tourism strategy to the researcher at his office. The details of the analytical procedure are discussed below in the research methodology section.

The following section outlines the research procedures which were adopted in order to pursue research objective 2. Having done this, research question 4 is answered.

Research objective 2

To ascertain the strategic tourism objectives of local authorities in the United Kingdom.

Research question 4

"Are there a common group of strategic tourism objectives which local government councils throughout the United Kingdom seek to achieve?"

4.2.1.1 The research methodology

Of the 471 local authority councils in the United Kingdom (Municipal Yearbook, 1997) 430 local councils possessed either a specified tourism officer/department \((n=230)\) (Appendix D), or include responsibility for tourism in the job specification of someone employed in a similar role \((n=200)\) (Appendix E). With this number of people employed to manage tourism at the local level, the question had occurred, "What are their strategic objectives with regards the planning and development of tourism?"

The letters sent to the local authority councils included the specific direction that they should be passed to the person charged with the responsibility for tourism functions.

On initial treatment of the returned strategy documents, it was decided to concentrate on the tourism strategies of local authority councils in England. This
was due primarily to the limited number of returns (n=9/75; 6.6%) from Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland and the potential concomitant loss of validity in generalising from limited information. Having analysed the usable returns from councils in England, (Appendix F: n=88/388, 15.5%), fourteen distinct strategic tourism objectives were identified.

The documents were analysed according to the recommendations of Strauss (1991) who proposed a method of coding written data of this nature. Within this method, the researcher takes notes of significant words, phrases and concepts and codes them. Effectively writing themselves a memo, researchers can return to the coded portions and confirm associations between like-marked sections. In order to determine that local government tourism strategies were essentially emerging from the response to localised priorities, it was deemed necessary to discount the potential intervention of national and regional strategy guidelines which might have served to create falsely generic strategies. The following provides evidence that no such guidelines existed at the time the research was conducted.

The British Association of Tourism Managers indicated that they had not developed any guidelines, organised any lectures or conferences, or written any working papers with regards advice to tourism officers in developing tourism strategies. The then Association of District Councils (ADC) reported similarly, indicating that they provided no guidelines for tourism officers. The Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions (DETR) reported that they had not developed guidelines, as did the newly formed Department of Culture, Media and Sport (ex. Department of National Heritage) who said that there was nothing in their archives at the central office. The British Tourist Authority and the English Tourist board similarly, had no documented guidelines regarding assistance with developing tourism strategies, but stated that they would advise tourism officers if requested.

If there are no guidelines widely available to tourism managers at the local government level, then it may be suggested that the emergent strategies are a combination of the needs of the tourism industry and the specific requests of those stakeholders who are able to be heard. These needs are set within the present social, political and economic environment, reflect emergent local issues, are somewhat based on the training of the managers themselves, and may include the influence of a certain amount of informal/formal networking and agreement between tourism officers as to what the present issues are.

The important feature remains, that the fourteen policy objectives emerging from the analysis of strategy documents are evident across all levels of local
government, albeit with differing emphasis. They appear therefore not to be due to prescribed or inducted principles/guidelines.

4.2.1.2 The results

Table 12 contains each of the fourteen strategic tourism objectives that emerged from the analysis of the local authority tourism strategy documents. Included within the table are the definitions that were developed through the amalgamation of information from within the fifty-five strategy documents. These definitions underwent a confirmatory process which is discussed in detail in research stage 3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Objective</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Product enhancement</td>
<td>The aim of this objective is to enhance the tourism product through, for example, the development of excellent tourist information centres, encouraging old attractions to improve and new ones to emerge, and by improving the image and identity of the destination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>The aim of this objective is, through promoting and advertising, to increase demand, target and protect specific markets, and to gather market intelligence to assist the aforementioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social issues:</td>
<td>The aim of this objective is to encourage community involvement, develop plans that benefit both tourists and residents alike, raise awareness of the benefits of tourism, improve the quality of life, encourage the locals to use facilities and educate and familiarise them with the nature of tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality assurance:</td>
<td>The aim of this objective is to promote the theme of visitor enjoyment through raising professional industry standards in service, training, signposting and accommodation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership:</td>
<td>The aim of this objective is to encourage joint working initiatives with local industry and neighbouring tourism offices, and to encourage inward investment and international links.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure issues:</td>
<td>The aim of this objective is to improve and extend appropriate forms of access to the destination (includes Transport, Disability and Social Access).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental protection:</td>
<td>The aim of this objective is to improve and protect the built as well as the natural environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend season:</td>
<td>The aim of this objective is to develop strategies which serve to extend the tourist season, working to encourage tourism during specific quiet periods during the day, week, shoulder periods and all year round.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment generation:</td>
<td>The aim of this objective is to increase the potential for employment in the area through tourism (more of a general policy, with most tourism initiatives expected to gain some rewards in terms of employment opportunities for the region).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management issues:</td>
<td>The aim of this objective is to improve management information, to co-ordinate and develop more effective monitoring and evaluation of the tourism industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic issues:</td>
<td>The aim of this objective is to optimise the economic value of tourism to the local economy. This objective is closely related to those of employment generation and the development of new attractions and facilities since any action in these areas is assumed to be one of improving the economy through employment and inward investment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural/Heritage issues:</td>
<td>The aim of this objective is to conserve/preserve the cultural and historic environment of the destination in order to maintain and promote a sense of place and local distinctiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New attractions and facilities:</td>
<td>The aim of this objective is to encourage the development of new facilities, attractions and events such as festivals and conferences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation:</td>
<td>The aim of this objective is to increase the number of bed spaces to either match demand or satisfy the requirements of a specific target market.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Following the analysis of the apparent strategic objectives, it was decided to investigate which of the objectives received the highest priority in terms of the frequency with which they were mentioned in the documents of the responding councils. These are reported in Table 13 below. The results were originally intended to be segmented by type of authority (County, City, District, Borough, Metropolitan District), unfortunately, the number of responses from City (n=7), County (n=2) and Metropolitan District councils (n=1) rendered analysis on this level as meaningless. The results were therefore combined to reflect a general view of local government's strategic priorities for tourism.

Table 13
Local government strategic objectives for tourism and their prioritisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Objective</th>
<th>Frequency of its appearance in local government strategy documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Product enhancement</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social issues</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality assurance</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental protection</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic issues</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New attractions and facilities</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend season</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure issues</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment generation</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural/Heritage issues</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management issues</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Table 13 indicate the prioritisation of tourism strategy by local government in England. The most frequent reference was made to product enhancement, whilst management issues were stated least frequently. For a full definition of each of these strategic objectives, see Table 12.

4.2.2 Research phase II: stage 2

This part of the research was specifically designed to investigate the tourism planning actions employed by local government in the United Kingdom. The
following section outlines the research procedures that were adopted in order to pursue research objective 3.

Research objective 3

To assemble a list of tourism planning actions that are employed by local government councils for tourism development.

4.2.2.1 The research methodology

The fifty-five tourism officers who had responded to the request for their strategy documents were sent a one page facsimile questionnaire (Appendix G). The questionnaire contained only two questions in order that it was not seen as too time consuming. The first question asked what they believed were their residents' main concerns regarding the impact of tourism. This question was asked as an introductory question, designed to focus the respondent in the area of social impacts of tourism. The second, and most important question, asked them to either list, or fax a copy of any planning actions which they had employed or planned to employ to increase, maintain or decrease tourism in their authority.

4.2.2.2 The results

Twenty-two officers responded, and 60 different planning actions were noted. These are as listed in Table 14 over the page. These results are not analysed in any way, they merely add to the data requirements of the briefing document, and ultimately to the construction of the Consultation model. This is not to say that they do not contribute interesting information, rather, that the decision was made that an in-depth analysis of their content was inappropriate to the objectives of this research. The reported planning actions were reviewed, adopted in part, and linked to the 14 strategic objectives by the tourism officers of the three historic cities. Through this process, the conceptual model (Figure 12) was further validated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open a Tourist Information Centre.</td>
<td>Assist attractions with lottery bids.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make further investment in the Tourist Information Centre (TIC).</td>
<td>Develop closer working relationship with local trade through quarterly newsletter/meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve services provided by the TIC (Extend opening times).</td>
<td>Develop projects, which aim to enhance the town centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide business advice to new and existing tourism related companies.</td>
<td>Introduce new environmental projects (e.g. mobile rangers, reclaimed parkland).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish and distribute official guidebooks (Attractions and Accommodation), promotional videos and leaflets.</td>
<td>Participate in the S.T.E.A.M. model (Scarborough Tourism Economic Assessment Model).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update marketing publications regularly.</td>
<td>Include specific tourism section in the local plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design marketing campaigns to target overseas markets (N. Europe, USA).</td>
<td>Increase staffing (e.g. two officers for tourism).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design marketing campaigns to target domestic markets (exhibitions, direct mail, and national advertising).</td>
<td>Integrate tourism with Business &amp; Economic Development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design marketing campaigns to target special interest tourists (Archaeology, themed trails, events and itineraries).</td>
<td>Conduct market research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market to the travel trade (Exhibition/Trade fair attendance, familiarisation trips and direct mailing).</td>
<td>Establish a tourism unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in joint marketing initiatives with neighbouring councils.</td>
<td>Appoint a full-time tourism officer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribute information through the TIC's, shops, post offices, and direct mailing.</td>
<td>Encourage private sector investment (e.g. refurbishment, redevelopment, expansion, resettlement and rebuilding of offices, hotels, shops, restaurants, tour buses/boats, shopping arcades and sports venues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce and distribute newsletters to local businesses.</td>
<td>Invest in interpretation initiatives (e.g. cyber-life).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undertake market research to assist the council and local traders.</td>
<td>Establish new museums/heritage centres/visitor centres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deploy new brown attraction signs on strategic road networks.</td>
<td>Establish new arts centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase media attention.</td>
<td>Develop lottery bids to fund said projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree planning permission for a new bus station.</td>
<td>Refurbish museums/art centres/historic buildings/ships e.t.c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiate improved/extended rail provision.</td>
<td>Promote the historic and cultural through festivals and events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce park and ride scheme.</td>
<td>Develop a calendar of events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve public consultation methods.</td>
<td>Establish annual festivals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce residents first weekends (free entry to attractions).</td>
<td>Give planning permission for new developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build attractions and stage events which create employment opportunities.</td>
<td>Run conference promotion campaigns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish tourism forum to encourage liaison between private and public sector.</td>
<td>Build new centres for conferencing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work in partnership with regional tourism bureau.</td>
<td>Encourage the refurbishment and expansion of hotels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursue partnership activities to encourage public transport.</td>
<td>Encourage the establishment of new accommodation through tax holidays/incentives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form partnership agreements with national/international carriers.</td>
<td>Establish a tourism forum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disseminate market research to all tourism-related businesses.</td>
<td>Build large all year round leisure/entertainment complexes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support regional tourism initiatives.</td>
<td>Encourage school parties to visit all year round.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Join Regional Tourist Boards/Associations.</td>
<td>Introduce seasonal festivals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish tourism conferences to inform-develop relations with tourism-related businesses.</td>
<td>Develop/Implement a tourism strategy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.3 Research phase II: stage 3

In general terms the third stage of this research was concerned with bringing together, in one model, the three key elements that link the planners' objectives and actions with the opinions of the residents. In other words the model endeavours to link the sorts of issues identified earlier (Chapter 2) related to the social impacts of tourism with the sorts of work being carried out by those who create and potentially control those issues. This model is set out in diagrammatic form in Figure 12. More precisely, the ultimate aim of the third stage was to consolidate the conceptual model into an applied model. In order to achieve this, those people who were likely to use it and who were already working in the field, would be the most suitable people to assist in its development and confirmation. The objectives and actions provided the basis for a briefing document which was used to introduce the conceptual model for use in the development of the ComSmart computer model. The conceptual model was a three level model which suggested that it was logical and valid to link the actions taken with the objectives they were intended to achieve. Similarly, it was then viewed as equally valid to link resident survey questions that were evaluative of these actions and objectives as a third level. In this way, the resident would answer a question which relates to an actual or planned action, which is then associated with an intended objective.

This stage in the research was a major exercise and involved a complex series of consultations with the tourism officers in the historic cities of York, Canterbury and Chester.

4.2.3.1 The research methodology

4.2.3.1.1 Construction of the briefing document

In order to verify the objectives, actions and opinions (OAO) model, it was necessary to seek the validation of its logic from the tourism officers working in the historic cities. It has already been noted in earlier research phases that the officers are extremely busy. With this in mind, it was more likely that they could be of assistance if the approach made to them was structured, logical and self explanatory, enabling them to comment without having to spend too much time trying to translate and understand the complexity of the research.

The analysis of tourism strategy documents in research stages I and II led to the establishment of 14 strategic objectives, definitions for each of them, and actions which are implemented to achieve them. Using this information, a briefing document was constructed which provided the tourism officers with a clear picture of the conceptual model. This briefing document (Appendix H) contained three
sections, each of which required the officers to complete a number of simple tasks. All of the tasks required the use of agree/disagree boxes and provided space for additional comments. The briefing document outlining this process was sent, for initial feedback to the tourism officers at Surrey County Council, "Discover Islington" and Melton Mowbray District Council. The document was sent to these people as they were easily accessible to the researcher. The pilot study indicated that the completion of these tasks took between 45 and 60 minutes. The tourism officers in the historic cities welcomed this information, as they were then able to set aside time rather than being faced with a task of unspecified length.

Having established that the rationale and logic of this document made sense to people working in the tourism industry, it was sent to York, Canterbury and Chester City Councils. The briefing document, as the name suggests, was intended to act as a preparatory catalyst for the meetings that would follow. Once again, it soon became evident that time was at a premium for the tourism officers. Having sent the briefing document out in January 1998, the initial round of meetings was not completed until June 1998.

During these meetings, the objectives, definitions, choice of actions and the potential resident survey questions were discussed. Changes that were significant at this stage included Chester's addition of a further 14 planning actions that related directly to their authority. These are included in the computer model but are not stated here. They also recommended a significant change to the conceptual model and the way in which it related to tourism planning in Chester. As can be seen in Figure 12, The city of Chester, whilst agreeing with the 14 strategic objectives, stated that they spoke of these objectives within six key theme areas. As such, a fourth level was added to the model which enabled it to be utilised in a manner which reflected the way in which Chester operated. Throughout the development of this approach, the researcher consulted the literature regarding research design, held discussions with academics and others working in the field, noted potential methodological weaknesses in present practice, and listened to the requests of local government tourism officers. Through this process, it became evident that whilst surveys attempt to acquire residents' opinions on issues as well as some socio-economic and demographic information, they do not generally seek to understand how important the respondent thinks the issue is, or how knowledgeable they are on the subject. This research opted to include these ideas since it was decided that if the information were to be used to segment a consultative audience, then this information would be extremely important.
4.2.3.1.2 Construction of the research instrument

The final series of meetings were held with the city of Chester. The conceptual model had been amended and agreed, which meant that the next step would be to begin developing the questionnaire items that would be sent to the residents of Chester. As the model stood, it was felt that 17 pages of questions, one for the actions related to each of the 14 objectives, and one each for the importance, knowledge and resident profile information would be too large an undertaking to expect residents to fulfil. During this stage of the development (January 1998 - March 1999) discussions centred around how to reduce the size of the questionnaire as well as making it more user friendly in terms of the technical language being used.

The first step in addressing these issues was developed by the researcher with his supervisors. Each of the strategic tourism objectives was taken individually, its purpose discussed, and a phrase or term developed which was felt to have more meaning to the lay person. The original strategic tourism objectives and their associated lay phrases are displayed together in Table 15 below.

Table 15

Strategic tourism objectives and their associated lay phrase developed for the resident survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC TOURISM OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>ASSOCIATED LAY PHRASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Product enhancement</td>
<td>CHESTER AS A PLACE FOR TOURISTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>PROMOTING CHESTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social issues</td>
<td>TOURISM AND THE QUALITY OF LIFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality assurance</td>
<td>VISITOR ENJOYMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>WORKING TOGETHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure issues</td>
<td>GETTING ABOUT IN CHESTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental protection</td>
<td>PROTECTING CHESTER'S ENVIRONMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend season</td>
<td>WELCOMING TOURISTS ALL YEAR ROUND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment generation</td>
<td>WORKING IN TOURISM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management issues</td>
<td>MONITORING TOURISM IN CHESTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic issues</td>
<td>TOURISM AND LOCAL PROSPERITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural/Heritage issues</td>
<td>LOOKING AFTER CHESTER'S HERITAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New attractions and facilities</td>
<td>NEW ATTRACTIONS FOR CHESTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>STAYING IN CHESTER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The amendments were sent to Chester for validation and comment. Having completed this step to the satisfaction of all involved, the next step was the issue of reducing the number of items on the questionnaire to a more manageable number whilst retaining the purpose of the survey. This was successfully completed during a series of meetings with the tourism officer in Chester. As the survey was to be used in the city of Chester, it was most logical that they prioritised the issues that were of most concern to them and their community. The 17 page briefing document which had formed the basis for the research instrument was now reduced to six pages which contained four sections. The first included 41 opinion questions, the answers to which were deemed of the highest priority to Chester City Council. The second and third sections contained questions requiring the respondent to rate their level of knowledge for each of the objective areas, as well as their rating of the importance of those objectives. Finally, the fourth section required the respondent to provide some profile information regarding their socio-economic and demographic background. The final version of the research instrument can be found in Appendix I. An additional point to note here, was the concern that none of the questions were seen to be duplicating research efforts in other departments of the council. In order to attain consent to continue, the document and the related questionnaire were sent to a meeting of the Chester City Council Cross-department Research Board for clearance.

The final questionnaire was now ready for deployment. Unfortunately, the pressure of work on the tourism officers during the summer season has meant that the questionnaire has not yet been deployed. Delays encountered whilst working with the city council reiterate the findings of earlier research in this thesis, that resident tourism surveys hold a position of low priority when compared to the short term economic priorities of local government tourism departments.

Figure 12
The conceptual model structure of the objectives, actions and opinions model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHESTER'S SIX KEY THEME AREAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOURTEEN STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEVENTY-FOUR PLANNING ACTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDENT RESPONSE AND PROFILE INFORMATION (THE SURVEY)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The conceptual model highlights the connections between the stages of the research. It indicates the priority placed on the specific requirements that the model should utilise the frameworks adopted by tourism planners in Chester. The second level makes the association between the 14 strategic objectives derived from the national search of tourism strategy documents and the Chester framework. The planning actions are related to each of the strategic objectives and then by association, with the Chester framework. The resident response and profile information relates to the survey questions which enable the residents to evaluate the actions which are designed to achieve the objectives which in turn are related to the planning themes in Chester.

4.3 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Research stages one to three within research phase two indicate that local government does indeed attempt to achieve specific tourism objectives. This research established the existence of 14 strategic tourism objectives. They also employ many different actions to achieve these objectives, and the tourism officers of the historic tourist cities agree that the four level conceptual model identified by this research is indeed an appropriate association of information.

Up to this point then, it has been suggested by this research, that studies of the social impacts of tourism have some way to go before any theories can be reliably asserted. Secondly, the suggestion was made that social impact studies should relate more closely to the specific impacts of local government tourism objectives and the associated actions employed to develop tourism. In addition, it is suggested that social impact assessments could be effectively integrated as part of an improved consultation process. Before exploring this suggestion, it is important to investigate the present commitment, via surveys, of local government, to consulting local residents regarding the social impacts of tourism. This is an important stage since it is necessary to appreciate the factors which contribute to the state of public consultation in tourism planning in England.
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RESEARCH PHASE III: STATEMENT OF PURPOSE
"PUBLIC CONSULTATION IN TOURISM PLANNING"

CHAPTER FIVE

♦ LINKS TO PREVIOUS RESEARCH PHASE

Research phase II documented the intentions of local government in England with regards to their strategic objectives and associated planning actions. Research phase III acknowledges the potential for a closer link to be established between social impacts research and public consultation in tourism planning. One of the main components of this process is the methodologies adopted by local government to acquire representative resident opinions. Chapter five focuses on the public consultation literature and then reports the findings of a research investigation regarding the mail survey as a methodological technique employed by local government to generate representative opinion.

♦ KEY OBJECTIVES

• To review the public consultation literature.

• To discuss the rationale underpinning public consultation.

• To review the tourism related public consultation literature.

• To establish a view concerning the reliability and validity of consultative survey methodologies presently used by local government tourism officers in England.
RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND QUESTIONS

Research objective 5

To understand the commitment of local government in using resident tourism surveys as a form of tourism planning consultation.

Research question 5

“How committed are the local government councils in England towards using resident tourism surveys for collecting residents’ opinions regarding tourism’s impact?”

Research objective 6

To investigate the methodologies used by local government when consulting resident opinion through resident tourism surveys.

Research question 6

“Do local government councils in England employ reliable, consistent and comparable research methods that enable them to acquire representative resident tourism opinions from their surveys?”

CONTRIBUTION TO THE THESIS AS A WHOLE

By critically reviewing the survey methodologies employed by local government tourism officers in England, chapter five presents a second dimension in which improvements can be made in the process of acquiring representative resident opinion. As such, the research up to this point has highlighted a conceptual issue in that the resident tourism survey should first consider more tourism planning related issues, and secondly, look to employ longitudinal and comparative methodological techniques in a reliable, valid and therefore consistent manner.
5.0 INTRODUCTION

Chapter four dealt with the development of the English planning system during the 20th century. With an emphasis on central and local government involvement in the planning and development of the tourism industry, observations were made regarding one distinct element that was acknowledged as important to the process of democratic government. This most important element was the need to retain the involvement of the citizens in the planning process. Both in reports (Scheffington, 1969) and Acts of Parliament (Town and Country Planning Acts and amendments, 1947, 1968, 1970, 1971, 1990), those involved in local planning were reminded of and directed towards the importance of ongoing public consultation.

Chapter five expands on the notion of public consultation. Its structured approach involves:

1) defining the concept of public consultation;
2) discussing the theoretical assumptions and theories inherent within the concept of public consultation, including its purpose;
3) a critical review of the methods employed in order to establish and expand local government consultation;
4) highlighting problems encountered in its use;
5) a specific review of the public consultation literature in the field of tourism;
6) a research investigation of the survey methods adopted by English local authorities to establish residents’ consultative opinions of tourism’s impact on their community;
7) concluding comments regarding the effectiveness of local authority approaches to public consultation and the call for new innovative approaches from central government.

5.1 LITERATURE REVIEW

At its most simple, public consultation concerns...

“the different ways in which the organisation responsible for an activity – for example a local authority – can involve participants – in this case their citizens”.

(New Economics Foundation, 1998:2)
In order to understand the concept of public consultation it becomes necessary to highlight the purposes that underpin its use(s). The adoption of public consultation signifies an intent by those employing it. For this reason, public consultation is inherently value-based. There are many techniques, each with a slightly different emphasis. They do however share the general value of equality which means making special efforts to include people who are often excluded.

The following is an exposition of those values and principles that have been stated as the basis, purpose and therefore contribution of public consultation. Public consultation is seen to fulfil several important roles, namely:

1) the need of an organisation to be more responsible for its actions to the community. This, according to Armstrong (1997) relates to the need for local government to be more open and accountable;

2) to minimise the perceived/actual negative impacts of the intended action (Snaith et al., 1998);

3) the need for consensus – both within the planning requirements and in terms of developing a sense of shared vision (Ritchie, 1993);

4) to eliminate the remoteness effect. Through the adoption of community assets for consumer use a sense of remoteness can be created when the community is not involved (Keogh, 1990). This has also been recognised by May (1997) who talked about consultation to reduce alienation and indifference;

5) it fosters community self-growth. Uncontrolled development can lead to increased dependency on outside agencies (Font, 1995) which can lead to conflict between those that benefit and those that do not (Getz, 1983a). This issue is taken further by Chanan (1997) who talks about working positively, using tourism to target and strengthen areas of the local economy;

6) it authenticates the tourist experience by putting the local citizens at the nucleus of the tourism product (Simmons, 1994; Snaith, 1997);

7) to encourage sustainability – involving the residents from the early stages of development is more likely to ensure sustainability (Barlow, 1995; Gilbert, 1993; Jones, 1993; Keogh, 1990; Murphy, 1985);

8) to provide feedback, not only in terms of return on investment, but also social issues transmitted by all elements from within a community;

9) because education and information exchange are closely linked to feedback, indeed, Jowell (1975) classified them together under the heading of communication;
10) support building within the community (New Economics Foundation, 1997);
11) representative input from the key stakeholders;
12) it provides a decision-making supplement which enables the joint development of policies and priorities and therefore joint ownership in the planning process (Getz & Jamal, 1994);
13) the sharing of power, giving people a more direct hold of local governance (Bassam & Stoker, 1997). This was also spoken of in terms of the principles of devolution and delegation (Jowell, 1975) and empowerment (May, 1997);
14) it enables access to knowledgeable and informed views of significant others, views which might offer additional insight into both simple and complex issues;
15) it strengthens local democracy (Chanan, 1997);
16) it strengthens voluntary activity, civic pride and citizenship (Chanan, 1997) also called activation (Jowell, 1975);
17) to strengthen social cohesion and prevent the breakdown of community networks (Chanan, 1997);
18) the exploration of needs which might otherwise have remained hidden or assumed (Steele & Seargeant, 1997);
19) enables the assessment of service provision (Steele & Seargeant, 1997);
20) it reduces the likelihood of objections to individual planning applications (Smith et al., 1986).

The above indicates a variety of roles for which public consultation can be used. The Policy Studies Institute (Steele & Seargeant, 1997) suggests that in a general sense, three reasons exist for consulting the public. These are:
1) specific reasons – exploration of needs, development of policies, plans and strategies, setting of priorities for services and the assessment of service performance;
2) contextual reasons – to do with culture, and attitudes, most likely to be utilised when there is a belief in empowerment;
3) instrumental reasons – more to do with going through the motions, in instances where there is a requirement to consult, or where those employing consultation are attempting to put off difficult decisions.

There is considerable debate regarding the form and function of public consultation within the social science literature. The following discussion
concentrates initially on the debate in terms of the experiences in local government and urban regeneration, before finally concentrating on public consultation in tourism planning.

In England, the structure plan frames the future distribution of new development between local authorities (Barlow & Duncan, 1992, 1994). At this plan formation level, the plans are subject to public scrutiny and anybody who makes a formal objection has the right to be heard by an independent planning inspector at a public local enquiry. In a similar way, local authorities are obliged to draw up local plans which are also subject to public scrutiny. There is therefore a requirement for publicity but not necessarily consultation, and while local authorities will engage in public consultation when deciding on an application, there are no third party rights of protest for those with an indirect interest (Barlow, 1995).

During the 1960's, a 'techno-rational' approach was popular, whereby experts defined the issues and interests. Whilst this 'normal' approach had adopted a somewhat semi-judicial process, the 1970's and 1980's saw a move towards a more market-led approach. This according to Thornley (1991) signalled a growing trend towards 'authoritarian decentralism' in which central government pushed planning decision-making lower down to the local government scale while maintaining firm and ultimate control over planning decisions. More recently, the planning framework can be seen to have shifted back towards a more 'normal' 'semi-judicial' approach although elements of market rationality remain. Indeed, the Planning and Compensation Act of 1991 re-emphasised the use of simplified planning zones by local authorities.

The degree of public consultation at the plan formation level reflects great variation in local authority practices (Barlow, 1995). There is no generally agreed upon practice and therefore the approaches appear fragmented with some providing the statutory minimum level of publicity for plans, whilst others conduct major consultation exercises. As mentioned previously, in England, the development control decisions and processes occur on the basis of matters contained in the local plan. Since July 1992, there has been a statutory requirement for British local authorities to publicise planning applications. The results of some survey work (Edmundson, 1993) suggested that whilst over 75% of local authorities had changed their methods of publicity, only a third of them had committee-approved guidance concerning publicity. Whilst it could be argued that certain methods suit different cases, the scene appears as fragmented and piecemeal to the onlooker. At the same time, public involvement in development proposals tends to occur when the local
authority is considering the application and negotiating change, rather than the earlier or later phases (Barlow, 1995).

As well as the formal legislative aspects surrounding public consultation, there is another dimension which determines the nature and extent of consultation. This factor/element is the human one, and concerns the commitment of the people involved from both resident and local government employee perspectives. As Steele and Seargeant (1997:4) point out...“the success of a consultation exercise depends partly on the organisation’s experience and traditions”. In terms of local government experiences of consultation, Jowell (1975:5) reported that...“there are many British planners and politicians who argue that sufficient public involvement in planning already exists; that to seek to extend it would lead to fewer reforms and a less dynamic planning process”. There would appear to be five main objections inherent in this view, in that there is concern that increased citizen involvement:

1) increases inertia, by introducing delays to an already seemingly endless series of checks and balances;
2) builds in bias in that it offers activists an increased opportunity to have their say at the expense of the inactive;
3) retards reform in that often a planners zeal could be tempered in the face of strong public preference for the status quo;
4) distorts democracy by adding a dangerous and unnecessary layer to the democratic process;
5) compels commitment and why, for whatever reason, certain groups choose not to avail themselves of the opportunities for citizen involvement, should they be compelled to do so?

Whilst not suggesting that these attitudes exist amongst local government planners, these concerns were also alluded to by other commentators. Edmundson (1993) noted that the emphasis on the speed of decision-making, financial restrictions on local authorities, contracting out and local government reorganisation may well undermine moves to greater public consultation on development control. Indeed, circular 15/92 advised local authorities to balance consideration of the speed and cost of decision-making with providing the public with a reasonable opportunity to comment. In a survey conducted by the Council for the Protection of Rural England (CPRE, 1994) it was found that:

1) 50% of local authorities failed to make planning applications available in locations outside the planning department;

2) only 5% made general provision for public access outside of normal hours;
3) 46% of local authorities do not allow the public to take away copies of environmental statements accompanying developments;
4) only 24% of local authorities made environmental statements available free of charge;
5) although 86% allowed public access to case files related to planning applications, it was often the case that this would only become possible three days before the Planning Committee met.

This tends to highlight the existence of what Langton (1978) called ‘Top-down’ forms of participation, initiated by planners or decision-makers, as opposed to ‘bottom-up’ forms, instigated by interest groups. There exist then, two important relationships in the consultation process. First, the control exerted by planners in eliciting a response from the public, and secondly, the response of the public to the planner (Alterman et al., 1984).

Research suggests therefore, that a common complaint of residents and community groups is that public consultation tends to take place once the parameters of the Structure or Local plan have been established (Barlow, 1995). Another related complaint is the perceived lack of access to local authority planning officers or politicians. Further, this was seen as being directly attributable to the perceived importance (or lack of it) which they saw planners or politicians placing on consultation (Barlow, 1995). Most research suggests that it is only when the proposed development becomes highly visible that it creates a significant response by the public (Simmie, 1981). As such, it has been argued (Boaden et al., 1980; RTPI, 1982) that interest groups only emerge and seek involvement when their interests are affected.

There are many complex issues surrounding the utilisation of consultation opportunities by both planners and the public. These range from the:
1) building of bureaucratic barriers in order to limit participation and speed the decision process;
2) loss of “civicness” and willingness of residents to involve themselves in the planning process unless it affects them, something which has been recognised as leading to alienation from and disillusionment with local and central government goals (MacNaghten et al., 1995) leading at best to ‘passive participation’ (Hill, 1994);
3) over-representation of certain sections of the population in planning, favouring those who are better educated, of higher socio-economic status,
older and settled (Hampton & Walker, 1978). These people are categorised by Hill (1994) as belonging to a group involved in 'active participation';

4) erosion of local government powers, especially in recent times with over 200 Acts being passed between 1979-1997 as top down directives (Hambleton, 1997);

5) the emergence of active anti-development movements as pressure groups looking to circumvent the policy-making process for their own benefit (Gyford, 1991);

6) evolution of an adversarial approach to consultation based on conflict as and when the need arises.

It has been argued (Selman & Parker, 1997) that the tendency of the Thatcher-Major administrations was based on the one hand, on urging active citizenship, especially in the limited sense of volunteering and engaging with community, and on the other, to espouse passive aspects, particularly those which cast people as consumers of various commodities and services. The reaction to this period of conservative government appears on reflection to have diminished the opportunities for real citizen involvement. This situation was accentuated by the financial curbs on local government, the commercialisation of many of its activities, and the apparent disillusionment and retreat of citizens from the policy arena. In this case, the nature of organisational policies presented a barrier to entry to all but the most committed (Barron et al., 1991; Gyford et al., 1989; Rao, 1998). Indeed, popular opinion has it that the loss-of-touch with the public voice and the implementation of policy without proper consultation e.g. The Poll Tax, led to the fall of the Conservative government in 1997.

The low and falling turnout at elections bears witness to the erosion of citizen involvement in the political process in England. The Commission for Local Democracy (1995:10) highlighted low turnout..."as the most serious democratic weakness of British local government". This is an observation shared by Stewart (1996a) who warned that low turnout is a symptom of underlying weaknesses rather than the weakness itself, adding that if local democracy were strong, then turnout and involvement would not be an issue.

Lord Bassam (1998) confirms the seriousness of the need for democratic reform and renewal when he points out that it is difficult for localists and their issues to be taken seriously when the UK turnout figures are at 40%. This figure compares with 93% in the Netherlands, 85% in Italy and 78% in France. This indicates that improvements are possible and that non-participation is not a
trademark of modern society. A significant factor in the success of the Labour Party in the 1997 General Election was its declaration that a new system of British government would be created. Within this new system, responsibilities for local government would be conditional on it being modernised to ensure that it would be equal to its new anticipated role (Blair, 1998).

The modernising local government project has gained support from stakeholders as a response to the negativity of successive Conservative governments (Brooks, 1998). This project for democratic renewal has a significant intellectual basis, with the antecedents of its agenda founded in substantial research projects such as the Joseph Rowntree Foundation study on Central-Local relations, the ESRC Local Governance Programme (Miller & Dickson, 1996), the Commission for Local Democracy (Rallings et al., 1994) and the House of Lords Select Committee on relations between Central and Local government (Hunt, 1996).

The language of the DETR consultation paper on democratic renewal reflects the findings of Lord Hunt's Bill. The Local Government (Experimental Arrangements) Bill introduced to the House of Lords in November 1997 laid out a series of proposals to improve local democracy. These were aimed at both reforming the process of participation in the decision-making process as well as the structure of local government and the electoral process. In the view of Hall (1998), regardless of the experimental model adopted by a local authority, they will have to demonstrate that:

1) proposed arrangements would be likely to lead to decisions being taken in a more efficient and accountable way;
2) applications for development would be likely to lead to greater regard to the views of electors and local stakeholders;
3) there are conditions for full scrutiny of executive decisions.

These conditions are of particular interest to this research in that it seeks to develop a model which will enable the planners to access more representative groups of their communities, engage in more meaningful consultations and demonstrate higher levels of accountability to the electorate and central government.

Central to the modernising local government project is the government’s intention to introduce a new duty on councils to...

"promote the economic, social and environmental wellbeing of their areas and to strengthen councils' powers to enter into partnerships". (DETR, 1998a: 80)
Associated with this statement is the DETR’s commitment to encouraging local authorities to use community consultation and scrutiny to highlight issues which are of concern to the locality. This move towards greater degrees of community government has the effect of broadening the definition of local democracy in which new forms of participatory democracy and innovation in participation practices are encouraged to go beyond mere administration (Stewart, 1989, 1995b, 1996a, 1996b, 1996c). Key to this is the practice of improving how government engages with its citizens (Ben-Tovim, 1998). This new form of participatory democracy should not be seen as a replacement of representative democracy, but instead should be viewed as a useful complement (Stewart, 1996a; Whitehead, 1997).

The plan therefore is that participation will be extended by plans to introduce a new statutory duty on local authorities to consult with their localities on the effectiveness of service delivery. They will be encouraged to use referendums and other forms of consultation, including citizen's panels and juries (Brooks, 1998) and deliberative forums (Hall et al., 1998). These consultation methods are discussed in the next section and are seen to have both strengths and weaknesses, suggesting that they are best selected according to the specific circumstances of the local authority and its community. Each of them has to overcome issues of exclusion related to gender, education, age and ethnicity. In their report to the DETR, Lowndes et al., (1998) observed that the selection of participation approaches throughout local authorities in England is guided by a strong preference for homemade initiatives and by considerations of cost. They conclude that central guidance needs to promote flexible and locally appropriate approaches to enhance public participation. Whilst representativeness remains an illusive goal, research suggests that developing a range of participation methods to reach different citizens may be the best that can be achieved.

The pressure for democratic renewal and associated changes are being brought at great pace and with high levels of commitment from the government. The drive towards establishing greater community involvement in planning is not limited to the UK. Indeed, the framework of the European Structural Funds is being revised during 1997-1999. Much of the debate revolves around who should be eligible to get what funding, and on top of the criteria proposed by the Community Development Foundation (Chanen, 1997) is community involvement.

5.1.1 Public consultation techniques

Given the debate as to why public consultation and community involvement is important, the question emerges, as to what methods are available to
the would-be consultant? Within the public consultation literature, continuous reference is made to the variety of consultation techniques available. There are too many to list within the context of this literature review, although it is worth highlighting a few of the most popular ones. The remainder are listed and described in Appendix J

5.1.1.1 Citizens' juries

As a method of public consultation, this involves...

“a group of citizens representing the general public who meet together to explore a policy issue or a specific decision”. (Local Government Management Board, 1995: 2)

Developed in both Germany (known as planning cells) and America, they typically consist of between 12 and 24 members (America) and approximately 25 in Germany. They normally sit for one week, hearing evidence, discussing it and forming conclusions. As with all consultation processes, they must be protected against bias in the selection of jurors, the way the issue is presented, the choice of witnesses and the conduct of the process. In Germany, jurors are selected at random from the electoral register, while in America they are selected as a representative sample, controlling for such factors as age, gender, race and education. This process can be an expensive undertaking because of the cost of the payments made to jurors and for employers. In Germany, the reported range of costs of such a procedure is from £13,000 - £150,000. The overall objective of the citizen’s jury is to provide those charged with government, with the informed views of ordinary citizens who may well speak with different voices.

5.1.1.2 Consensus conferencing

Closely related to citizen’s juries, it is designed to incorporate public interests and concerns in science-policy making. As such, it is a forum in which lay people discuss sensitive scientific issues in dialogue with experts. Developed in Denmark, a lay panel of between 10 and 20 people are selected by advertisement and on the basis of the ensuing written applications. The process involves two preparatory weekends nine and four weeks prior to the conference and culminates in a three or four day conference with the aid of a professional facilitator. The costs have ranged from £35,000 to £50,000 per conference.
5.1.1.3  Deliberative opinion polls

Whereas the citizen's juries take the jury as the starting point and build on its strengths, deliberative opinion polls (DOP's) take opinion polls as the starting point and seek to correct its inherent weaknesses. Originally the use of DOP's was proposed by Fishkin (1991) as part of the process for selecting presidential candidates. Its process involved bringing together a national sample of voters to a single site to interact with the candidates and then vote on their preference. Its use has been broadened and was trialed in the UK in 1994 when a poll was conducted on issues of Law and Order through Channel 4 Television and the Independent Newspaper.

Often, opinion polls are taken before and after deliberation in order to measure what the public would think if it were truly engaged with the issue. The number of participants are typically in their hundreds and in terms of representativeness, the same issues of sampling and process bias are a real consideration.

5.1.1.4  Issues forums

Developed again in America, this mechanism was designed to enhance the quality of public judgement. Adopting many of the same principles of the DOP's, they use, amongst other measures, “Choicework” which provides information and materials to highlight key choices to support the decision. Local Issues Forums can take many forms, ranging from community-wide town meetings which meet once, to small study circles which meet several times. Sometimes used as a National Issues Forum, this method differs from other approaches in that no attempt is made to achieve a representative sample. Instead, they build on existing groups or groups constituted as interested in such discussions on a continuing basis.

5.1.1.5  Study circles

Study circles have a strong tradition in Sweden, where groups of people meet together to discuss issues or study books and reports. A small stipend is paid to participants in the study circle. Typically they meet on at least three occasions with a volunteer facilitator or group discussion leader. The approach has since been adopted in America as a way of setting goals for cities.

5.1.1.6  Standing citizen's panels

Constituted as a representative sample of citizens weighted for gender, age, ethnic background and occupation, they are composed of between 100-200
citizens. They are used as a sounding board for problems and issues. This method is presently used by York City Council which consults its panel as and when issues emerge. Membership of the panel can be changed gradually over time by, for example, replacing 10% of the panel at each meeting. In this way it is argued that the habit of citizenship is spread.

5.1.1.7 Research citizen’s panels

This type of citizen’s panel differs from standing citizen’s panels in that it is a panel constituted not for regular meetings but as a basis for carrying out opinion surveys. Bradford Metropolitan Council has established a panel of 2,500 citizens in order to identify how individual’s views, knowledge or behaviour are changing over time and why (or why not). The panel members would have expressed an interest in commenting on services and whilst this means they are more likely to respond, there is a real danger of bias.

5.1.1.8 Health Panels

Another variant on citizen’s juries and deliberative opinion polls, are the eight health panels, set up by Somerset Health Commission in 1993. Consisting of 12 people who were selected to be a representative sample of the population, they were set up to discuss issues which were being considered by the authorities. Participants were sent a short briefing package outlining the issue and were encouraged to discuss it with friends and family. A fuller set of information was provided for the meetings, where there was an emphasis on deliberation. At the conclusion of the discussion, panel members completed a series of decision sheets, effectively voting on the issues. The research team would then provide a report for the health authority. Once again, a form of replacement is utilised, with four members of the panel being replaced at every meeting.

5.1.1.9 Referendums

Generally recognised as an approach conceived at the National level, where issues such as devolution in Scotland and Wales are discussed, they also have a history of application at the local level. Regarded as a way of learning public views, it has the same legal sanction as opinion polls. Indeed, Coventry held a referendum in 1981 on its budget. In a note giving legal advice for the Audit Commission it was stated that...
"it is considered that, by virtue of section 141 of the 1992 Act (County Councils); section 15 of the Local Government Act 1992 and section 111(1) of the 1972 Act (District Councils), it is within the powers of a local authority to undertake opinion testing to ascertain public views on reorganisation issues in its area in order to inform its decision-making...opinion testing may take the form of a referendum, opinion polling, or any other recognised form of market research. (Law – issue No 2, 1993)

Referendums have achieved high turnouts when conducted through the post, they require that the electorate are informed and that relevant information is supplied as part of the process.

5.1.1.10 Teledemocracy

It is predicted that the development of new forms of communications technology will have a major impact on democratic practice. Most of the future visions such as holding an electronic town meeting are still somewhat future prospects when most people can get access to and are experienced in the use of the requisite technology (Percy-Smith, 1995). In the meantime, several councils are running trial projects. In the London Borough of Lewisham, the “Lewisham listens” section of their website has elicited 7000 resident responses to an online survey of their opinions regarding the work of the council. Schemes such as these may play a useful role in increasing young people’s involvement in the democratic process since they are both underrepresented on the one hand, and more experienced in the new communication forms on the other. Other examples of innovation include the E-mail surgeries used by Anne Campbell the MP for Cambridge, and the open computer conference piloted by the Liberal Democrats (Bartle, 1994). At present, the main use of this technology is that of disseminating information, and whilst its widespread use as a democratic tool is some way off, representative sampling can be used to address the present limitation of widespread access.

5.1.1.11 State of the town/city debates

Some councils, such as Leicester and Taunton Deane have held such debates. These are held in the boroughs, counties and districts as a means of focusing citizen attention. The issues, questions and motions developed by these area community forums are then fed into the state of the town/city debate.
These approaches indicate the general principles which are inherent within present public consultation procedures. These principles include:

1) attempting to construct a representative citizen sample;
2) informing the citizens of the issues;
3) listening to their informed and deliberative opinions;
4) utilising the feedback to assist in policy decisions whilst also making clear to the citizens both in action and feedback, how valued their input is.

This section has highlighted the purposes of public consultation, looked at the difficulties which have led to reduced effectiveness in consultation, highlighted several of the popular techniques, and discussed the emergence of the new Labour government drive for democratic renewal. The next section looks specifically at research relating to public consultation in the planning of tourism in the United Kingdom.

5.1.2 Public consultation in tourism planning

The intricacies of the participation/consultation process were introduced in the earlier sections of this chapter. It remains then to interpret the developments specific to public consultation in tourism planning. This will be achieved by reviewing developments from the 1980's up to the present day. Within this approach, reference will also be made to significant earlier works.

According to Loukissas (1983), the rationale for public participation in the community planning process has been extensively covered in the literature. The key understanding emerging from this is that participation is underpinned by political, social, psychological and economic considerations (Friedman, 1973; Grabow & Heskin, 1973; Hart, 1972; Hyman, 1969). Further, this literature suggests that community input helps to develop plans which are more responsive to local needs and have a better chance of community acceptance.

Many consultation techniques are available to the tourism planner, each of which attempts to achieve certain objectives. Glass (1979) identified a set of general objectives that local government can adopt when faced with the challenge of integrating public opinions into a participatory planning process. These objectives are information exchange, education, support building, decision-making supplement and representative input. From this initial foundation, tourism researchers appear to have taken up the challenge to develop tourism-specific public participation techniques. Examples of these are the Gaming-Simulation Approach (Loukissas, 1983), The Nominal Group Technique (Ritchie, 1985), Consensus Policy Formation (Ritchie, 1988) and Vision Crafting (Ritchie, 1993).
Despite the development of a myriad of techniques, these methods, in addition to their successes, have stumbled upon similar issues as those which compromised the earliest of attempts at consultation. These include:

1) the recognition that an attitude survey is best utilised in the early stages of goal development (Loukissas, 1983);
2) people who sit on advisory committees may not be representative of the wider population (Gil & Lucchesi, 1979; O'Riordan, 1978);
3) consultation is not widely appreciated by local government officers because it is perceived as slowing down the decision-making process which leads to apathy, mistrust and tends to emphasise citizen's inability to comprehend their own needs and articulate their interests (Haywood, 1988; Loukissas, 1983);
4) efforts to integrate social factors are limited by time and money (Haywood, 1988);
5) an ideal sharing is elusive (Haywood, 1988).

This period saw the emergence of 'Community Tourism', a notion which recognises that tourism is an industry which must attract visitors and remain competitive, whilst at the same time it seeks to extend decision-making beyond the business sector to consider the long term interests of the host community (Murphy, 1983).

Consideration of the host community has already been established due to the requirement to consult the resident population within the planning process. The manner in which this is achieved however is open to varied interpretation. During the 1940/50's, Selznick (1949) observed the development of two distinct schools of thought regarding the role of public participation and consultation. The first was termed the 'Administrative Perspective' where the citizen was used merely as a tool to achieve executive ends. The second was the 'Public Perspective' where citizens were provided with real power through consultation. Others have developed variations on this theme, adding levels to represent degrees of commitment and involvement on the part of both the consultant and the consultee. Arnstein's Ladder (1969) is probably one of the most widely recognised conceptual models. The lowest level or rung on the ladder of participation is termed Manipulation, then Therapy, Placation, Informing, Consultation, Partnership, Delegated power and finally the highest level of consultation at the top of the ladder is deemed to be Citizen control.

The interest in consultation continued into the 1990's. Keogh (1990) reflected on the failure of the Canadian National Parks Planning Programme during
the 1960/70's reporting the observation that it was unsuccessful because it was seen by residents as being imposed on them. Indeed, Lovel & Feuerstein (1992) support this view on a more general level, stating their belief that without community involvement in planning it would be very difficult to move away from an exploitative model, one which is being applied generically on specific destinations without amendment.

Including the notion of consultation within what is deemed to be appropriate and responsible tourism, Jones (1993) and Gilbert (1993) discuss the notion of 'Sustainability'. They both conclude that sustainable tourism development should appreciate socio-cultural structures, not just ecological ones. Jones (1993) reiterates and extends the important benefits of consultation and effective resident participation, stating that successful development...

1) needs resident support;
2) needs their active partnership;
3) is reliant on the extra checks which they provide;
4) benefits from their support in that it can enhance the tourist experience.

Consultation has been receiving increased recognition as a universally appropriate and effective aid to successful development. Blackwell & Associates (1992) identified a range of key resource categories within which the importance of public participation was stressed. These were coastal areas, the countryside, inland waters, historic towns and cities, and historic or heritage sites. Perhaps their most important contribution to the debate was the recommendation that consultation and participation would be more effective if a system of monitoring and review were put in place to consider the planning objectives and actions over a period of time. This would begin with the initial discussion, extend through implementation and would include a follow up which enables reflection and learning for all the stakeholders.

This attention to the nature of consultation processes led researchers, Ritchie (1993) amongst them, to suggest that three principle considerations exist. These are, that...

1) the input and impact of citizens must be real and not token;
2) input is limited and valuable;
3) input content provides direction and should be non-technical.

He suggests that attention to these principles will provide the framework within which it becomes possible to develop a long term strategic plan. The importance of input and interaction is further supported by Burr & Walsh (1993) who talk about the 'Interactional perspective'. This approach advocates the creation of a longer term and continuous consultation process which aids the creation of networks, or in their
words, 'a viable community field'. The strength of this process is that there is no gap between policy endorsement and its implementation and therefore the policies are less likely to undergo either intentional or unintentional amendment based on special interests.

In his case study of the North Pennines, Prentice (1993) observed that the community tourism debate has been developed as a reaction to externally driven tourism development. In this way, he suggests that it has mirrored the urban and regional planning debates of the 1970's which arose from the reactions of academics, and residents threatened with unwanted developments. Community driven tourism and the concept of citizen participation is laden with the idealist's perspective, that a homogeneity of view can be achieved within the community, whilst it is born out of a conflict perspective whereby the earliest examples of community involvement were reactionary and based on special interest. The ideal of sustainable tourism development, within which exists the notion of citizen participation, is not easily realised (Getz & Jamal, 1994).

The point made by Prentice (1993), that the participation debate witnessed within tourism development is the same debate as occurred previously in urban and regional planning, is also a focus of Simmons's (1994) evaluation of participation programmes in Huron County, Canada. Simmons (1994:99) comments that...

"the public's involvement has been sought in the planning of a diverse range of issues including urban development, housing, transport, energy, parks and recreation, and water resources management. As tourism has risen in significance as a tool for regional development, it too must face the call for increasing public scrutiny and involvement".

The suggestion that tourism could learn from the experiences of those other planning areas is not borne out by the conclusions of the earlier review, it appears that the same issues which haunted the early efforts at representative citizen participation still remain unresolved today. There appears to be three major tensions which combine to frustrate attempts to achieve effective citizen participation. These tensions were recorded by Sewell & Phillips in 1979 and remain today, they are:

1) the need to attain a high degree of citizen involvement - involves high numbers of citizens, each employing a high level of participation. This is unlikely therefore because of the time and space required to achieve this position;
the need to achieve equity of participation - relates to the representative nature of those involved or involving themselves. This tension is closely related to the methods employed by consultors, which often include only those who have an interest in the issue;

3) the need to achieve efficiency of participation - This is a duel-edged sword as the issue affects both parties in the consultation. On the part of the consultor, the process must be efficient in terms of time and cost, whilst to be effective, the consultee must see evidence of their efforts in terms of feedback which is a time consuming and costly addition to the initial consultation.

The results of Simmons' research suggested that focus groups were the most effective technique. It was however stated that larger urban concentrations would pose additional problems and that a variety of techniques should be utilised to suit the stage of development.

Earlier in this section, some objectives for public participation were stated (Glass, 1979). These objectives are subject to the tensions mentioned by Sewell and Phillips (1979), an influence that appears to render their complete achievement unrealistic. As a response to this issue, and the suggestion (Loukissas, 1979; Simmons, 1994), that different techniques should be used to suit the stage of development, Font (1995) developed a model which matches the objectives of public participation (Glass, 1979) with the tension between degree of involvement and number of residents involved (Sewell & Phillips, 1979). In the model it is observable that as the number of residents involved increases, so too, the potential degree of involvement is decreased. On the curve, Font (1995) depicts the point at which each of the objectives is most likely to be achieved. This model suggests what the planner could expect to receive in terms of community input depending on the techniques used to acquire it. Information exchange is the method which achieves contact with the largest community segment without demanding much commitment from either the community or the decision-maker.
There are then, many objectives, techniques and degrees of commitment to public consultation in tourism planning. For consultation to be effective, the community should be reasonably reassured that the stakeholders assembled are capable of representing their interests (Blank, 1989). It is recommended by Jamal & Getz (1994), that passive instruments such as mail surveys (Information exchange) are appropriate for gathering residents' attitudes and opinions towards tourism development and planning, but that active participation and joint-decision-making is essential in the strategic planning process. The first stage appears therefore to involve ascertaining opinions, then developing more input in the strategic phases of planning.

Fully to understand the public consultation arena, one must appreciate that traditionally, industries have been driven by levels of government rather than direct community interests. This point was made in Chapter three where the emergence of governance was suggested to have evolved from a community's willingness to pool its executive power in an elected form of ruling body. The financial and political importance of an industry is often used as an excuse for top-down planning. As a result of this few tools have been developed to enable communities to monitor the effects of implementation and...

"unless the positive and negative effects can be better monitored in communities, it will be very difficult to determine whether tourism development is the appropriate alternative to other types of economic development. (Joppe, 1996:479)."
The applied implications of the consultation debate are highlighted by Robson and Robson (1996). They note the promise of the Prime Minister Tony Blair, that he is going to oversee the growth of a 'Stakeholder society'. The stakeholders in the development of tourism come from the public sector, the private sector, as well as including visitors to the destination and the people living within the receiving community. Because of the economic implications of development, more appears to be understood about the needs of visitors and local businesses than the actual experience of residents. These stakeholders need to be identified, and relationships nurtured to ensure that analysis of concerns, goals, values and responsibilities are understood and synthesised into the strategic framework of business (Goodpaster, 1993).

Consultation is a significant part of what could be deemed a sustainable tourism approach. This review of the literature has highlighted the objectives, tensions, techniques and compromises inherent in the state of the art of planning consultation. One of the major tensions is the apparent resentment of local government to employ wide ranging consultation techniques because of the cost in terms of time and money. So how committed are local government to sustainable tourism with full and transparent consultation with their resident communities? Internationally, the Hague Declaration on Tourism and the Globe '90 Action Strategy for Sustainable tourism have set out general criteria seen as necessary to attain this 'new paradigm' (Godfrey, 1998). The principle elements of this paradigm include Partnership, Integration, Community Involvement, and Environmental Stewardship.

The need for effective community involvement has been voiced consistently within the literature. The achievement of this however is very much dependent on the commitment of those charged with encouraging it. In a recent study, Godfrey (1998) investigated local government officers' attitudes to sustainability and especially, community involvement. Table 15 indicates the responses of local government tourism officers to statements regarding the value of community involvement in the planning process. The results suggest that they are in favour of the positive principles, whilst also disagreeing with the negative statements which suggest that community involvement is unimportant. Overall then, the results of this research indicate that public consultation is seen as something positive although how it could be achieved effectively in practice was not clear-cut.
Table 16
Local government officers' attitudes towards community involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude statement</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better information about the costs and benefits of tourism should be provided for local residents (positive statement)</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locally based public interest groups and Resident Associations should be consulted on local tourism management issues (positive statement)</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The local tourism industry should be managed by a co-ordinated public/private organisation with resident input (positive statement)</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local residents should have a direct say in how tourism is managed in their community (positive statement)</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public participation in tourism management should be limited to the consultation format in District/Local plan preparation (negative statement)</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local residents should only be involved in tourism management if they are actually employed in a tourism business (negative statement)</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The involvement of local residents should be limited to individual initiative (negative statement)</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with local interest groups and Resident Associations is a waste of time and effort (negative statement)</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Amended from Godfrey, 1998; 221.

The tourism officers mentioned the use of several techniques such as 'joint discussions' between the tourist trade, local residents and representatives of local government. If there is such agreement with the principles of sustainable tourism development, and recognition of the available methodologies, the question arises, why did the residents in the York, Bath and Chester studies feel a lack of personal influence over the decision-making process? Having acknowledged the variety of methods available for public consultation, the following research investigates the use of one popular local government method of consulting resident groups, namely, the resident opinion survey.
5.2 THE RESEARCH
5.2.1 The methodology

The chosen methodological approach for research phase III was the telephone interview. The decision was based on the same rationale as that which guided the choice of methodology in research phase II, namely, the recognition that time was a limited commodity in the opinion of the tourism officers who were required to respond.

Telephone interviewing is a methodology that has received a respected status as a valid means of gathering information to aid effective decision-making in both the public and private sectors (Lavrakas, 1993). In most instances, its advantages are seen to outweigh its disadvantages. Probably the most important advantage is the opportunity it provides for quality control over the entire data collection process (sampling, respondent selection, the asking of questionnaire items, and where computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) is employed, it also includes data entry). When properly organised, interviewing done by telephone most closely approaches the level of unbiased standardisation that is the goal of all good surveys (de Leeuw & van der Zouwen, 1988; Fowler & Mangione, 1990).

In the early stages of the shift from personal to telephone interviewing, many were concerned that the data gathered by telephone would be of a lower quality (more bias and/or more variance) than data gathered by personal interviews. However, research in the past decade suggests that there are few consistent differences in data quality between the two modes and whatever differences may have existed appear to be getting smaller over time (de Leeuw & van der Zouwen, 1988; Groves, 1989).

A major advantage of telephone interviewing is its cost efficiency. The telephone reduces the need to travel to the research site to conduct the data collection. In addition, Groves (1989) estimates that individual questionnaire items via the telephone take 10-20% less time than the same items administered in person. Another major advantage of telephone surveying is the speed at which data can be gathered and thus processed. As Frey (1989) noted, there are certain behavioural norms regarding the telephone that have traditionally worked to the advantage of telephone interviewers. First, a ringing telephone will be answered, and if it is not, then an answering service is usually available on which the interviewer can leave an advance message informing the potential interviewee of the time of a call back. Secondly, it is implicit in a telephone conversation that it is the caller who determines the duration of the verbal interaction, that is, the caller had some
purpose in placing the call and courtesy dictates that the purpose should be fulfilled once the agreement to participate is established.

One aspect of the personal interview which always remains a concern of some magnitude to the researcher is minimised or non-existent when using telephone interviews, namely the recording of responses. The interviewee can not see the actual recording of responses and it has been found that they feel less threatened or inhibited when not required to witness this process. The recording of responses by the researcher also reduces the number of non-completed items.

Generally, the highest response rates are achieved by face to face interviews, however, the response rates in many longitudinal studies have witnessed a significant decline (Betlehem & Kersten, 1981; Goyder, 1987; Steeh, 1981; Sugiyama, 1992). As a result, the differences in response rates are getting closer, with telephone interviewing resulting in equally high sample response rates. Further, they provide an opportunity for more effective recording of the reasons respondents give for refusing to participate. In addition, when used correctly, questions which would normally be left blank by the respondent are open to discussion and clarification.

Telephone interviewing is also seen to have several disadvantages which must be appreciated when designing the research instrument. A major disadvantage, even when well executed, are its limitations regarding the complexity and length of the instrument. It had been found (Lavrakas, 1993) that respondent fatigue sets in at around 20 minutes. Complicated questions are particularly difficult to facilitate over the telephone. In addition, it becomes difficult for the interviewer to communicate interest and attention, provide encouragement and assist with concentration. Partial interviews can occur if the respondent is required to answer an important call or attend a meeting. Such instances may lead to data inconsistencies and therefore reducing the chance of this occurring can be facilitated by advance notification of the time of the interview.

Over the years, the difference in response rates between the mail survey, face to face and telephone interviews has become smaller and the telephone condition is found to perform better with local and selected samples (Hox & de Leeuw, 1992). It is important to select a method of data collection which is consistent with the research issue. The primary issue present within this phase of the research was one of access to a select sample with specialist knowledge regarding the manner in which their council carried out resident tourism surveys.

The research questions asked in this phase of the research (Appendix K) were intended first, to assess the commitment of local government councils towards
using resident tourism surveys as a method of consulting residents about their opinions regarding tourism’s impact.

Research question 5

“How committed are the local government councils in England towards using resident tourism surveys for collecting residents’ opinions regarding tourism’s impact?”

The second research objective within research phase III was designed in order to investigate the methodologies used by local government councils when consulting resident opinion through resident tourism surveys.

Research question 6

“Do local government councils in England employ reliable, valid and comparable research methods that enable them to acquire representative resident tourism opinions from their surveys?”

5.2.2 The research instrument

The seven questions developed for use in research phase III were designed to achieve three objectives:

1) to explore the systems through which tourism planning decisions are made;
2) to identify whether or not local government tourism officers conduct resident opinion surveys as a means of public consultation;
3) to observe the frequency and form of the methods employed by them to achieve public consultation using survey methodologies.

5.3 THE RESULTS

As stated above, the third phase of this research was conducted in order to gain a clearer picture of the tourism planning functions of local authority councils in England. Particular interest was placed on the processes employed in their attempts to involve the opinions of the local community into the planning process through the use of resident opinion surveys. The telephone survey consisted of seven questions, the results to which are found in Appendix I and are summarised in the following figures and tables.
Figure 14 illustrates 21 different planning routes/structures presently operating within the councils who had agreed to participate in the study. The response rate from these councils was 80% (n=44/55). Non-respondents emerged for a variety of reasons ranging from annual holiday leave, maternity leave, inability to contact due to unlisted telephone numbers, and non-response to answer machine messages. Figure 14 indicates the routing of tourism policy decisions from left to right. The process of policy agreement is rarely linear, rather, the decisions will be based on a circular chain of events, but essentially, these are the responses of tourism officers with regards to the channels through which decisions are passed, irrespective of the number of iterations of the process. The results are due to the responses of the tourism officers and their perceptions of the processes in which they are involved.

**Figure 14**

The variety of routes utilised to deploy the tourism planning function in local authority councils in England.

1) Tourism officer → Committee
2) Tourism unit/forum → Tourism officer → Committee
3) Leisure unit → Tourism/Leisure officer → quarterly forum
4) Head + Assistant → Committee/Forum
   Economic development
5) Tourism Officer → Economic Development Dept → Committee
6) Head of Planning → Committee
7) Head of Tourism + → Committee
   Head of Marketing
8) Tourism Advisory Group → Committee
9) Planning & Development → Committee
   Officer + Leisure Officer
10) Economic Development → Committee
    Officer + Tourism Officer
11) Tourism Officer + → Committee
    Marketing Officer
Such variety in administrative structures indicates a widely fragmented approach to the deployment of tourism planning functions at the level of local government in England. The following questions were designed in order to investigate further, the potentially different approaches to monitoring the impacts of tourism at that same level of government.

From Table 17, it can be seen that the majority of local authority councils do not conduct resident opinion surveys. The finding that a significantly large proportion had either conducted one in the past, or had the intention to conduct one in the future serves to accentuate the point that the commitment to understanding local community opinions of tourism is largely limited in terms of the short term monitoring of policy actions.
Table 17
Do councils conduct resident opinion surveys with regards to tourism?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Borough (n=15)</th>
<th>District (n=21)</th>
<th>City (n=5)</th>
<th>County (n=2)</th>
<th>Metropolitan District (n=2)</th>
<th>Totals (n=44)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (ongoing)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan to</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (in past)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As part of another survey</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every time a new</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development is planned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The questions were of an open nature, therefore the emergent categories were due to the tourism officers. The apparent error therefore in the totalling of responses is due to the fact that each respondent may have interpreted the question differently. For example, having answered "No" to the question of "Does your council conduct a resident opinion survey with regards to tourism?" s/he may then have placed themselves in the category of "Intend to" in response to the question "How often does your local authority council conduct resident tourism surveys?"

Again, results confirm that a high proportion of local councils do not conduct resident tourism opinion surveys (Table 17). Those that do, indicate, in the majority of cases, that they cannot remember when the last one was, that it was over five years ago, that they are conducted as the need arises, or indeed that they intend to (Table 18). These results can be read in many ways, particularly if the intention to monitor impacts and receive opinion is seen as a positive thing. The alternative however, is to conclude that local authority councils may well be planning for tourism with limited knowledge regarding the social impacts of their actions on the local resident community.
Table 18
How often do local authority councils conduct resident tourism surveys?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Borough (n=15)</th>
<th>District (n=21)</th>
<th>City (n=5)</th>
<th>County (n=2)</th>
<th>Metropolitan District Council (MDC) (n=1)</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every 2 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every 3 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every 4 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+ years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When the need arises</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-annually</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot remember</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intend to</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rely on input from parish councils</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In response to the question “do you have an annual budget for such a survey?” only three councils reported having a distinct budget. Responses from the remaining 41 councils varied with some reporting an unwillingness to disclose the extent of funding (n=5), whilst the remainder (n=39) stated that budgets were on an ad hoc basis and dependent on them conducting a successful bid. The financial commitment to conduct research of this nature appears therefore to be somewhat limited, adding strength to the notion that the monitoring and evaluation of the social impacts and resident opinions of tourism policies are not a priority of local councils.

Given a commitment to conduct a survey, the methods employed should be viewed in terms of the likely representativeness of the respondents, the nature of the data collected, the purpose for which it will be used, and the long term usefulness of it in terms of its comparability to previous and future surveys. In this way, planners would be able to monitor more precisely the impacts associated with developments.
rather than merely being able to state descriptively that things have got better, stayed the same, or become worse. Table 19 illustrates the variety of survey methods employed by the councils in order to ascertain resident opinion. Some of the methods involve a combination of methodologies aimed at broadening the likely sample frame.

Table 19
Survey methods employed by councils conducting resident opinion surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Borough</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>MDC</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None conducted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailed questionnaire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street (face to Face)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door to door</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire left in public places</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire in council leaflets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varies depending on the nature of the survey</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailed questionnaire and face to face</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door to door and street survey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left in public place and mailed questionnaire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailed questionnaire, left in public places (postage paid), resident consortium, questionnaire in civic newspapers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailed questionnaire, door to door, and street survey</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left in public place and street survey</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public displays with self completion questionnaires</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street survey, left in public place, and telephone surveys</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailed questionnaire and telephone</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whilst it is not the intention of this section to enter into a lengthy discussion of the merits or otherwise of the various survey methods, it is apparent from this research, that many different methods are employed across the sector. Having already established that resident tourism opinion surveys are conducted infrequently, if at all, this finding raises further doubts regarding the extent to which results are amenable to comparison on a year to year basis as well as with studies conducted in similar destinations elsewhere. This is becoming increasingly
important as practices relating to the benchmarking of best value and associated planning practices for tourism.

**Table 20**

| Sampling methodologies employed by local authority councils |
|---------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Response                        | Borough | District | County | City | MDC | Totals |
| None reported                   | -       | 4       | 1      | -    | -   | 5      |
| Random                          | 6       | 3       | -      | -    | 1   | 10     |
| Quota / selected                | 3       | 3       | -      | 1    | -   | 7      |
| Convenience                     | -       | 4       | 1      | 1    | -   | 6      |
| Varies depending on the survey  | 2       | 6       | -      | 1    | -   | 9      |
| Not known                       | 4       | 1       | -      | 1    | -   | 6      |
| Random & quota                  | -       | -       | -      | 1    | -   | 1      |

A high proportion of respondents (n=11) could not report which methods were used, or they did not know what methods had been employed. Further to this, six reported the use of convenience sampling, whilst the majority (n=10) suggested that they employed random methods. Whilst not wishing to appear anecdotal, additional probing questions indicated a general lack of understanding as to the nature and purpose of the various methods. The final question sought to establish who actually conducted the research for the local authorities.

**Table 20**

| Who conducts the research for the council? |
|---------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Response                        | Borough | District | County | City | MDC | Totals |
| Not reported                    | 2       | 6       | 1      | -    | -   | 9      |
| Consultants/Research Company    | 3       | 3       | -      | -    | 1   | 7      |
| Council does it themselves      | 8       | 8       | 1      | 4    | -   | 21     |
| Students                        | 2       | 3       | -      | 1    | -   | 6      |
| Assisted by Regional Tourist Board | -   | 1       | -      | -    | -   | 1      |

It may well be that the limited knowledge regarding how the studies are conducted relates to the fact that they are conducted by others on behalf of the council, or indeed that they were conducted by a previous employee. The responses to this question are interesting when keeping in mind that different research groups may possess differing agendas and research capabilities. From the results it becomes
apparent that resident opinion is sought in many ways, all of which attempt to incorporate a degree of public consultation in the planning process. In light of the results of this research phase, it appears that the answer to research question five is that local government has a low level of commitment towards conducting resident tourism opinion surveys. In addition to this finding, the answer to research question six is that local government tourism departments do not, generally, employ research methodologies that can be proven to be reliable, valid or comparable over time.

5.4 SUMMARY

Having reviewed the public consultation literature, it became evident that several key themes/issues were constantly being raised. These included:

1) the loss of civickness in communities;
2) increased bureaucratic barriers;
3) questions regarding the representativeness of the groups being consulted;
4) over-representation of certain socio-economic groups who had the time, commitment, knowledge and motivation to participate;
5) questions regarding the effectiveness of the variety of consultation forums;
6) the call from the government for more accountable planning decisions which incorporated higher degrees of delegation of authority into the community;
7) the fuller scrutiny of decisions by stakeholders;
8) the need for more local government commitment to sustainable tourism development, including the importance of community involvement.

The review was followed by a piece of research to investigate the use of mail surveys (Information exchange) as a form of resident opinion consultation by local government tourism officers in England. Results indicated low levels of commitment or potential to conduct such opinion surveys. Where tourism opinion surveys were evident, they were conducted sporadically, utilised diverse methodologies, asked only general questions and were conducted by a variety of research agencies. In this way, the data returned is fragmented, relates to general questions, is unrelated to actual policy actions, and is non-comparative and non-longitudinal. These findings raise issues regarding the effective use of this form of local government consultation with regards to integrating resident opinions of tourism development into the planning process. The most recent research (Godfrey, 1998) documents local government tourism officers' recognition of the importance
of public consultation. The commitment to, funding for and the utilisation of
effective and rigorous techniques remains elusive.

There exists the need constantly to seek to develop new models and improve
the methods and techniques employed to achieve representative public consultation.
These new models and techniques should:
1) incorporate a mechanism for assuring representativeness in the sample
   population;
2) include relevant questions which enable effective public evaluation of
   specific and policy related items;
3) be structured in such a way that they are valid in terms of their perceived
   usefulness by the practitioners;
4) enable the integration of social impacts data with a method for consulting
   that representative sample who provided their opinions.

Chapter six acknowledges the findings of research phases I, II and III,
integrating their recommendations in order to construct a new methodology for
public consultation in tourism planning in England. Chapter six describes the
development and evaluation of a computer-based public consultation model that
was designed specifically in order to achieve these objectives.
5.5 REFERENCES


RESEARCH PHASE IV: STATEMENT OF PURPOSE
"MODELLING THE SOCIAL IMPACTS OF TOURISM TO FACILITATE REPRESENTATIVE PUBLIC CONSULTATION IN THE PLANNING OF TOURISM IN ENGLAND"

CHAPTER SIX

♦ LINKS TO PREVIOUS RESEARCH PHASE

Each of research phases I, II and III contribute to the research approach of phase IV. It is however, the contribution of Chapter four in research phase II that has the greatest association with developments in Chapter six. Within Chapter four the tourism objectives, planning actions and the conceptual model, of which they formed part, were agreed in principle by the tourism officers in the historic cities. Chapter six describes the development and testing of a computer model designed to transform the conceptual model into an applied model.

♦ KEY OBJECTIVES

• To briefly review the literature related to database management, and more specifically, relational databases.

• To introduce the nature of the computer model (ComSmart).

• To state the intended objectives which the model should achieve.

• To outline the methodology employed to enable the tourism officers of York, Canterbury and Chester to evaluate its effectiveness in achieving these objectives.

• To present the results of the evaluations.

• To answer the final research question in order to determine the how successful the research was overall.
RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND QUESTIONS

Research objective 7

To test and evaluate the ComSmart computer consultation model.

Research question 7

"Does the modelling of a computer-based objectives, actions, opinions model offer the potential to incorporate/integrate, effectively, resident opinion with the objectives and actions of tourism officers in order to improve the consultation process for planning tourism in the historic city of Chester, England?"

CONTRIBUTION TO THE THESIS AS A WHOLE

Research phase IV was designed to integrate the contributions of each of the previous research phases. In doing this, it was intended that a new consultation methodology could be developed to assist with the process of planning and managing the impacts of tourism. The results suggest that this is achieved through the development of a computer-based consultation model.
6.0 INTRODUCTION

Chapter five concluded with the call for new and innovative mechanisms to improve the potential for public consultation and participation in the tourism planning process. This chapter outlines an applied response to this request. It does this by suggesting that an appropriate technique would be the development of a computer-based planning model that captures and integrates local government tourism strategies, actions and the opinions of citizens regarding these actions. In order that the structure and logic behind this approach can be fully understood, it is first necessary to outline what is involved in developing a computer model of this kind. This is best explained through reviewing the literature in order to:

1) define what a database is understood to mean;
2) outline the nature and functions of databases;
3) introduce the development of database-management systems;
4) define and explain the architecture of one such type of system, namely, the relational database;
5) explain how they work.

Having done this, the methodology employed to enable the evaluation of the ComSmart model (ver 1.0.0) is introduced and the process of demonstrating and testing it is described. Following this description of the research methodology, the results of the final evaluation by the tourism officers in York, Canterbury and Chester City Councils, are presented in order to answer research question seven:

"Does the modelling of a computer-based aims, actions, opinions model offer the potential, effectively, to incorporate/integrate resident opinion with the aims and actions of tourism officers in order to improve the consultation process for planning tourism in the historic city of Chester, England?"

6.1 LITERATURE REVIEW

Over the years, researchers and practitioners alike have been trying to specify and structure user information requirements (Klein & Hirschheim, 1987). One of the central concepts to have emerged in this context is the notion of a data model. Data models are a way of perceiving, organising and describing data. The data model consists of a set of concepts such as items, groups and relations which facilitate the specification of data in a precise format, and a set of operations which allow their manipulation. The logical organisation of data is called data modelling, a process which requires the development of a conceptual schema. This schema
formally represents a "Universe of Discourse" (UoD) which is supposed to reflect some slice of reality. Because of the attempts of the data modeller to design a model which reflects some form of reality in a system, whether it be social, economic or environmental, it is impossible to avoid philosophical assumptions.

There are two basic ontological positions: realism and nominalism. Realism suggests that the UoD comprises objectively given, immutable objects and structures which exist as empirical entities. This objectivist philosophical debate was originally advocated by Aristotle and later refined by Tarski, and stipulates that truth is a matter of correspondence between what is described in terms of propositions and the actual state of affairs. The problems occur however, when there is different use and understanding of language. The critical examination of language by people such as Leibniz and Wittgenstein suggests that the meaning of language depends primarily on how it is used in a social context. This was an important factor to appreciate when developing the conceptual schema for the ComSmart model since its logic and structure relies on the use of language and the professional understanding of tourism officers in England. This recognition of the potential lack of consistency in meaning contrasts sharply with the correspondence theory of truth and supports the nominalist, or subjectivist paradigm of data modelling. This school of thought suggests that the ideal of a unique, consistent and objective model of the UoD has to be abandoned.

The nature of the research conducted throughout research phases II and III was designed to accommodate the subjectivist paradigm. This approach was adopted in recognition that whilst the researcher utilised pragmatic research methodologies, they were also rigorous, flexible and functional in terms of their outcomes, as agreed by the tourism officers. The work contained within this thesis is therefore the reflection of an agreed worldview established by the researcher and the participating tourism officers in England.

There has been considerable interest in decision support systems and in the technological advances of information systems in general during the past 20 years (Crouch & Mjosund, 1985; Uckan, 1985). This interest has developed further in the last 15 years, although there remains a 'practicality gap' between the operations researchers and the practitioners. The problems surround the use and acceptance of such models, especially regarding aspects of performance, realism/complexity, computational cost, information requirements and ease of use. The remainder of this literature review establishes a simple understanding of the use of data models and the development of the ComSmart model. It does this within the understanding that...
"for middle and upper level management, the type of information needed from such a system is that which supports the identification of potential consequences of decisions or future business or economic conditions. Thus, the management desires information that may be used to answer 'what if' type questions". (Crouch & Mjosund, 1985: 543)

6.1.1 What is a database?

At its simplest level, a database is a collection of related data. Data are known facts that can be recorded and that have implicit meaning. This may be true of a lot of items, including the collection of words that make up this page of text. However, the common use of the term database has several implicit properties (Elmasri & Navathe, 1989):

1) it is a logically coherent collection of data with some inherent meaning;
2) it is designed, built and populated with data for a specific purpose;
3) it has an intended group of users and some preconceived applications in which the users are interested;
4) it represents some aspect of the real world, sometimes called the mini-world.

This section seeks to outline the nature of database systems. This is achieved by asking a series of practical questions such as What are they? What do they do? What do they look like? How do you develop one? Why are they a good idea? Whilst attempting to answer these practical questions, it is necessary to appreciate several associated concepts which underpin their emergence and functioning.

Having completed this, a view will be offered as to the most appropriate design for a database management system which provides tourism planners with a planning tool which assures the inclusion of representative and valid public opinion with regards to the perceived social impacts of future planning actions. The issues inherent in this field of research are multiple, overlapping and therefore complex by definition. This suggests that decisions would have to be based on the handling of a large number of factors. As such, no applied model exists that can incorporate the potential complexity of resident reaction and involve the appropriate people in a participatory planning process. Without a functional (operational), flexible (adaptable to all communities), valid (representative) and comparative method, city tourism planning departments can but imagine why some actions receive more or less support than others from the local community.
The purpose of this research is to provide such a planning tool. However, the model's development occurs within an understanding that...

"the growth in variety and quality of business/management models over the past two decades has been great, but this has not been accompanied by proportionate growth in their acceptance and use".

(Rovelstad, 1994; in Ritchie & Goeldner, 1994: 509)

Rovelstad (1994) goes on to explain that some of the reasons for this within the field of tourism include; the lag between theory and practical application, inadequate communications to potential users, and lack, in some organisations, of personnel trained to use these techniques. There are signs that this is changing, indeed, Walker et al., (1999) are developing a computer model called "The Tourism Futures Simulator" which is designed to evaluate the benefits and impacts of nature-based tourism and the policy options for managing tourism activity and development. The development, in practical terms, of a database-management system (DBMS) to assist in facilitating more effective public consultation in urban tourism planning would also appear to be long overdue.

6.1.2 Database management systems

The importance of information in most organisations - which determines the value of the database - has led to the development of a large body of concepts and techniques for the efficient management of data (Silberschatz et al., 1997). The conventional file processing systems were originally developed to hold large amounts of simple data that could be created and maintained by a series of application programmes. In traditional file processing, each user defines and implements the files needed for a specific application. An example of this would be a university, within which one user accesses their student records to keep track of student fee payment schedules. A second user may access their own student files in order to enter grades. Already, it is evident that the two separate systems require different application programmes in order to facilitate the completion of these independently specified tasks. It is obvious that some of the data in each of these files will be identical, for example, student names, identity numbers and address details. This results in wasted storage space and effort to maintain common data up-to-date.

Keeping organisational information in traditional file-processing systems has a number of distinct disadvantages:
data redundancy and inconsistency - where files, applications and programmes are created by different programmers over long periods of time, using different formats and programming languages. This leads to files being inaccessible or at best duplicated, leading to higher storage and access costs;

2) difficulty in accessing data - application programmes contain the ability to run a query, or request in the data system. If the information requests of the user change, their new unanticipated queries are impossible to run unless a new programme is written. This becomes an expensive procedure, or time consuming if it has to be executed manually;

3) data isolation - data becomes scattered in different files and formats and becomes difficult to write new applications which can access complete data records;

4) integrity problems - if parameters are built into the system, and these change, then a new computer application has to be written to address the changes. An example would be the automatic mailing of a letter to people who match certain organisational criteria e.g. they become overdrawn by a specified amount in their bank account. If this amount by which they are allowed to go overdrawn changes, then the programme would need rewriting;

5) atomicity problems - computer systems are subject to failure - it is crucial therefore to ensure that data are restored to their consistent state. The transfer of data must leave the source and arrive at the destination otherwise inconsistency develops in shared records;

6) concurrent access anomalies - where two users access and update the data simultaneously and the data system cannot handle both, it will process only one. An example would be two people withdrawing money from the same bank account from two different locations, with the system having to decide which original balance to deduct the new withdrawals from;

7) security problems - it is difficult to enforce security constraints in terms of who can access what data because applications programmes tend to be added in an ad hoc manner by a variety of sources.

In response to the recognition of these inherent weaknesses, the search began for new ways of managing data systems. This led to the development of database-management systems (Fry & Sibley, 1976; Sibley, 1976). A database-management system (DBMS) consists of...
"A collection of interrelated data and a set of programmes to access those data. The collection of data, usually referred to as the database, contains information about one particular enterprise. The primary goal of the DBMS is to provide an environment that is both convenient and efficient to use in retrieving and storing database information". (Siberschatz et al., 1997: 1)

A database management system is a collection of inter-related files and sets of programmes that allow access and enable the modification of files (Fry & Sibley, 1976; Sibley, 1976). Because many of the users of such systems are not highly computer literate, the developers hide the system's complexity from them. This is done through building in a level of abstraction to the database schema or design. This can be quite a low level of abstraction such as the physical level, where the user is privy to a description of all of the data and a view of how it is stored. The level of abstraction can increase, to the logical level, where the user can only see what data are stored in the database and what relationships exist between the data. The highest level of abstraction is termed the view level, where only the part of the database which is required by the user is described.
Figure 15 illustrates the two distinct components of a simple DBMS. The database system contains the user interface, application programmes and the database storage components, and the DBMS software which contains the software which can expedite the users query or search. The development of these systems has been seen to have additional benefits:

1) they stimulate managers to consider factors which they may have overlooked (Moutinho et al., 1996);

2) through the process of developing and understanding a database management system, it makes managers more aware of how and why they make decisions (Moutinho et al., 1996);

3) their flexibility enables the tailoring of advice to fit the problem of the particular user (Benfer et al., 1991);

4) they force the early identification of potential problems, information gaps and needs (Rovelstad, 1994);

5) they assist in the reduction of the number of factors of uncertainty on which subjective judgement must be used (Rovelstad, 1994);
6) they become the base upon which the system designer can build an even more powerful system (Benfer et al., 1991);
8) they are very versatile in that rules/parameters can be changed easily allowing great flexibility in problem solving (Bryant, 1988).

There are however some weaknesses inherent in the design of these systems, weaknesses that determine the nature of the model and demand the careful development of the logic of the system before the final model is completed. These weaknesses include the facts that:

1) they only allow observations at a given time, and given the length of time to develop them and the speed at which technology is moving, the model shell can become obsolete;
2) they possess a knowledge base that must be constructed to fit the system shell, therefore contriving to a certain degree, a particular view of the world (that of those involved in its development);
3) the use of experts to create a set of rules assumes that the experts know all the rules;
4) it is assumed that a best, or at least a viable, solution is available (Bryant, 1988).

6.1.3 Data models

Whilst it is possible to give a few insights into the strengths and weaknesses of database management systems, it would be misleading to suggest that all systems are the same, indeed, their development history is littered with a variety of representational systems. According to Whitehorn and Marklyn (1998) there are several fundamentally different ways in which data can be handled or modeled. The three most popular methods are called Hierarchical, Network and Relational models. In brief, the Network model uses links and pointers which relate sets of records, which are organised as collections of graphs. The Hierarchical model is similar to the Network model in that the relationships among data are represented by records and links. Where it differs from the Network model is that the records are organised as collections of trees rather than arbitrary graphs. The Relational model is different in that it does not use pointers or links. Designed by Codd (1970), the Relational model relates records by the values that they contain. According to Silberschatz et al., (1997), this freedom from the use of pointers allows a formal mathematical
foundation to be defined. The relational model works by relating identity numbers in one column to another number or series of numbers in another column or set of columns. In this way, the model can associate a number with a written property or indeed to many other written properties. This enables the association of logical links between constructs, and the values that the system designer chooses to associate with them.

6.1.4 Relational databases

In order to structure the relational model it is necessary to:

1) identify the real-world objects that exist;
2) identify the relationships that exist between those objects;

The next stage involves constructing a framework to capture these objects. The four most important components of such a framework are: Tables, Forms; Queries and Reports (Whitehorn & Marklyn, 1998). It is necessary therefore to:

3) create tables, one for each object. Tables are the basic structures within which data are stored within the database. The tables are the containers for all of the information that the model will require;
4) create joins between the tables which represent the relationships.
5) decide upon the forms and reports that are required by the users of the database. Whilst data can be edited directly in the tables, any manipulation of the database is typically done through the use of forms which enable the user to move quickly between individual records;
6) create the relevant queries needed to support and service those forms and reports. Queries are questions that a user may ask of the data in the system. After the question has been asked, an answer is produced in tabular layout called an answer table;
7) finally, create the forms and report. Reports are used to summarise the information in the database. The main difference between them and queries is that reports produce printed output as specified by the user;
8) add the data integrity constraints (i.e. what the acceptable limits are for analytical purposes);
9) create a user interface which ties those forms and reports into a single seamless application.

There are many more complexities behind the building of a relational database system. The simple description here is included in order to offer an insight into their structure in order that the logic behind their adoption and use in the
development of a Consultation model is evident. The next section describes the process and methodology employed in order to develop and test the model.

6.2 METHODOLOGY

6.2.1 Constructing the ComSmart model

Having determined a conceptual vision of what this research hoped to achieve, its operationalisation was designed specifically to include input from tourism officers working within local government in England. In this way, each step in the process and each of the development stages was only deemed complete when the work had been accepted as logical by those same people.

In the previous section, the process of constructing a relational database was outlined. The following section illustrates the completion of these recommended stages in order to construct the ComSmart model:

1) identify the real-world objects that exist. In the context of this thesis, this relates to the strategic objectives, the planning actions and the opinions of the citizens of Chester;

2) identify the relationships that exist between those objects. This was done through developing a logical conceptual model based on the literature and benefiting from the briefing, discussion and agreement of tourism officers working in the field;

3) create tables, one for each object i.e. each key theme area, strategic objective, planning action, and respondent. Figure 16 provides an example of a table from the ComSmart model;

4) create joins between the tables which represent the relationships. The tables within the ComSmart model relate the objectives, the actions, the opinions of the citizens regarding the actions, their self-rated level of knowledge concerning each of the objectives and the level of importance they place on each of the objectives. In addition, their socio-demographic profiles are tabularised and related in order to enable more complex and insightful questions to be asked of the database;

5) decide upon the forms and reports that are required by the users of the database. Figure 17 is an example of a form taken from the ComSmart model;

6) create the relevant queries needed to support and service those forms and reports;

7) finally, create the forms and report;

8) add the data integrity constraints;
create a user interface which ties those forms and reports into a single seamless application. Additional modeling within the ComSmart model enables this table to be presented in graphical form. Examples of this presentation can be found in Appendix M where a full example of the ComSmart model is presented as demonstrated to the tourism officers in York, Canterbury and Chester.
**Figure 16**

Example of a table within the ComSmart relational database model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>Respondent Name</th>
<th>Respondent Age</th>
<th>Respondent length of Residence</th>
<th>Respondent Gender</th>
<th>Respondent Distance of residence</th>
<th>Respondent House number</th>
<th>Respondent Building</th>
<th>Respondent Road</th>
<th>Respondent All year resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Occupier</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shires Yd, Milsom St</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Occupier</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shires Yd, Milsom St</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kristen Davis</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Flat 6</td>
<td>Milsom St</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ivy Campbell</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Flat 2</td>
<td>Milsom St</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Andrew Ash</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Flat 4</td>
<td>Milsom St</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Anthony Hill</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Flat 1</td>
<td>Milsom St</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jane Lacey</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Top Floor</td>
<td>Milsom St</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Simon Beard</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Top Flat</td>
<td>Milsom St</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Occupier</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td>Edgar Buildings</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Penelope Campbell</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>St James Sq</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example of a form used to enter and edit resident profile and response information in the Comsmart model:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>1. Provide balanced advice to new and existing tenant-related companies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Facilitate tenant's turnover and management plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Foster greater emphasis on understanding and responding to owner needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Undertake development of community-based strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Encourage programs for improved housing of older tenant buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Record: 001 of 100
Up until this point, the development of the model had been conceptual in nature. The next stage was to translate the structure of the research into a real world planning tool. The modelling contract was agreed with Robert Waller Consultancy Services (RWCS) and the prototype model developed. During a series of meetings between August 1998 and January 1999, the model went through several iterations designed to approach issues relating to its ease of use, functioning, performance, realism/complexity, computational cost, and information requirements.

6.2.2 Evaluating the ComSmart model

The final research phase was set up as a form of evaluation research whereby those who find use for the model and were involved at the beginning, were again on hand at the end to see if it met with the planned objectives. The final test of the model must therefore logically lie in the evaluation of its performance by the tourism officers in the historic cities of York, Canterbury and Chester. In adopting this research design, the tourism officers in the historic cities would be in the position to assist in evaluating the model and therefore answer research question seven. Again, it is worth reiterating, for purposes of clarity, that whilst research phase I contained social impact data for the residents of Bath, the city council chose not to be involved in the later stages due to pressure of other work commitments.

In order to pre-test the computer model, a series of pilot demonstrations were arranged. These demonstrations were conducted with Surrey County Council, Cambridge City Council, "Discover Islington" and Shillam & Smith Architects. These particular subjects were selected as they had been involved in reviewing some of the earlier drafts of work. Although they could not evaluate the validity of the model for use in the historic cities, they were all involved closely with tourism planning and consultation issues in their day-to-day work. The pilot demonstrations assisted in three ways. First they enabled the researcher to practice the demonstration, secondly it enabled the testing and interrogation of the model to be conducted in a live situation, and finally, the feedback from the subjects enabled the modification of the evaluation form in terms of how user-friendly it was.

This final research phase was therefore, by design, dependent on the involvement and feedback from the tourism officers working in the historic cities of York, Canterbury and Chester. The nature of the research was neither quantitative in terms of measuring their knowledge, nor qualitative in terms of understanding it in deeper and more comprehensive ways. Instead, this phase of the research required their evaluation of a consultation model designed according to what the
literature and the practitioners were saying was required. In order to utilise an evaluation methodology, it was essential that each of those people who would evaluate the model would also be involved in setting the objectives which it should achieve (Hakim, 1992). The degree of success of this approach is based upon agreement between the researcher, the practitioners, in this case, and the comparison of outcomes with predetermined statements of purpose (Veal, 1992). The statements of purpose were established through the deployment and agreement of the briefing document that outlined the aims of the model. The manner in which the whole evaluation process is approached is of extreme importance since it might be argued that those involved in the setting of objectives might have an ulterior motive for suggesting that they had been achieved. In the case of this research, the objectives were clearly outlined as belonging to the researcher and that to achieve any successful outcome in terms of the model's applicability to public consultation, all involved should seek to be critical of each of its component parts. Having agreed the aims and potential objectives of the model, it remains to report the evaluation of the model by the practitioners.

6.2.3 The objectives of the model

The following are a set of objectives that the model was designed to achieve. These objectives were established from the review and critique of several fields of literature, an investigation of consultation methodologies in tourism planning, and through consultation with the tourism officers working in the historic cities of YORK, Canterbury and Chester. Its design should therefore:

1) incorporate a valid set of strategic tourism objectives;
2) establish a valid means of associating specific planning actions to the relevant planning objective;
3) include questionnaire items which will enable residents to evaluate the proposed planning actions;
4) incorporate an effective system of sampling to permit greater representativeness in the consultation process;
5) develop a model which creates an effective link between the strategic objectives and actions employed in tourism planning, and the opinions of the community towards those same objectives and actions;
6) capture groups of interest according to their opinions, knowledge and the importance they believe should be placed on each of the planning objectives;
7) separate these themed groups into consultation groups for further discussion;
8) provide a means effectively to incorporate/integrate resident opinion with the objectives and actions of tourism officers thereby improving the consultation process for planning tourism in the UK.

There are three distinct parts to the demonstration; the input, the model and the output:

1) the first concerns the input, namely the way in which the subjects are selected. The ability to include a representative sample of the resident population was the primary concern of the research and is therefore emphasised in the demonstration. This was achieved in the three social impact studies in the historic cities using the Royal Mail's Postal Address File on compact disc. Given the success of achieving fairly representative samples in the earlier studies, the same random sampling mechanism will be utilised for this study. Those people attending the demonstration each receive a copy of a demonstration pack. This pack contains, amongst other things, a city map which is used to explain the sampling procedure (Figures 3, 4 & 5), and an outline of the sampling methodology (Research phase I);

2) the second part of the demonstration concerns the structure of the model. Information within the demonstration pack is used to explain the logic of the objectives, actions, opinions model and reminds them of the part that they played in the development of that logic. In addition, it illustrates the process of establishing the integrity of the data used in the model. To illustrate this, it contains some examples from the briefing document (Appendix H), an outline of the research process (Appendix N), and a list of the emergent strategic tourism objectives (Table 12);

3) the third part of the demonstration involves using the model for the purpose for which it was intended, namely, capturing resident socio-demographic profiles along with their evaluative opinions of tourism's strategic objectives in their community, analysing them and then maintaining the data in order to enable the tourism officer to invite people with particular response profiles to participate in the consultation process.

6.2.4 The research instrument

In order to enable the tourism officers to evaluate the model and its functions, an evaluation form was developed which addresses each of the objectives'
set prior to its development. The research instrument consisted of two pages. Page one contains a brief description of the model and what it set out to achieve, followed by eight short statements which relate to these objectives and require the respondent to state their level of agreement on a Likert scale ranging between 1=Strongly disagree through to 7=Strongly agree. Page two requests the respondent to state their name, contact details, department, and job title. It also provides a section for additional comments and notes. The final completed evaluation forms provided by the tourism officers in York, Chester and Canterbury can be viewed in Appendix O.

6.3 THE RESULTS

The results are set out in such a way as to address the eight objectives identified as being important to the successful development of the model.

6.3.1 Objective 1: Was the analysis of strategy documents successful in highlighting key local authority strategic objectives for tourism in the UK?

The responses from the tourism officers in each of the cities indicated that they agreed that this objective was successfully achieved. Remembering that responses for all evaluations items were on a Likert scale ranging from 1=Strongly disagree to 7=Strongly agree, their responses were York (5), Canterbury (6) and Chester (6).

6.3.2 Objective 2: The process of associating the actions with the strategic objectives is a valid approach.

This is an important objective as it underpins the very structure of the model. Again, the responses indicated agreement that this process was indeed a valid and useful one. Their responses were York (6), Canterbury (7) and Chester (7).

6.3.3 Objective 3: The process by which questionnaire items were developed to enable residents to evaluate the actions was effective.

This was a difficult objective to evaluate, as the final questionnaire has not yet been utilised by the city of Chester. The process and the items are however complete and the tourism officers felt they could still make a judgement. Their responses were York (4), Canterbury (5) and Chester (6).
6.3.4 Objective 4: The sampling mechanism is effective.

The evaluation of this objective showed greater variation with responses ranging from York (2) through to Canterbury (5) and Chester (5). The lower rating by York was accompanied by the statement that "ten (grid squares) is fine but supposing the random number between 1 and 131 was 17?" This comment is fully explained in the discussion section.

6.3.5 Objective 5: The links between the levels of the model appear valid.

The cities were agreed that this objective was achieved successfully, responses were York (5), Canterbury (6) and Chester (6).

6.3.6 Objective 6: The model is effective in capturing groups of interest.

This objective related to the model's ability to segment the responses according to opinions, knowledge, importance and socio-economic and demographic characteristics. Responses were again in agreement, with York rating the objective (5), Canterbury (6) and Chester (5) respectively.

6.3.7 Objective 7: The method for generating representative consultation groups is effective.

This relates to one of the key functions of the model, namely the mail merge function which filters out the respondents who possess specific opinions regarding tourism planning actions. The evaluation indicates that this is achieved in the eyes of each city tourism officer, York (5), Canterbury (5) and Chester (6).

6.3.8 Objective 8: The modelling of a computer-based objectives, actions and opinions model offers the potential effectively to incorporate/integrate resident opinion with the objectives and actions of tourism officers thereby improving the consultation process for planning tourism in the historic city of Chester, England?

This objective is the key to the whole development process and is established within this research as the primary research question. The evaluation of this objective is essential in determining whether or not the model has the potential
to fulfil its intended purpose. The responses were (York (4) supported by the comment "only if residents were the only component in the tourism planning process. Realistically they are not - businesses, visitors and government (re. Role in looking after historic buildings e.t.c) are also crucial". Other evaluations were Canterbury (6) and finally Chester where the model was specifically designed to operate (7).

6.3.9 Additional comments
Page two of the evaluation form provided space for notes and additional comments. These are reported below.

6.3.9.1 York's comments
"It would be useful to extend this to the other players in tourism e.g. visitor surveys. There's now an emphasis on benchmarking tourism destinations based on visitor responses. Some of your questions are relevant to them and to business as well. Support absolutely the context in which you are working - i.e. that it is important to keep residents supportive of tourism initiatives. The problem then is what to do with the data. Your planning actions list is a start".

6.3.9.2 Canterbury's comments
In a similar comment as that made by York, it was suggested that the researcher should "Consider incorporation of visitors' opinions on proposals".

6.3.9.3 Chester's comments
"Difficult to comment until the local methodology has been fully tested in Chester. The initial benchmarking element (see chapter two studies) is important and should be retained (perhaps as a recommendation in user guidance notes). Analysis of this needs summarising in non-technical jargon. Generally the model has applications way beyond tourism although I am delighted that tourism has been the test discipline".

6.4 FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION
Chapter six described the development of the ComSmart model (ver 1.0.0) and the process of demonstrating and evaluating it. The results of the evaluation are based on three respondents. This is the nature of this type of evaluation research
where the judgement of whether the predetermined statements of purpose or objectives are achieved comes down to the opinion of those with specialist knowledge. Having been involved in the setting of objectives, their evaluations are an indication of the degree of success or otherwise achieved by the research intervention. The evaluation form contained two pages, the first page consisted of the eight evaluation questions. These were divided into three sections; 1) the research process, 2) the methodology, and 3) the model. The following summary and discussion is conducted under these section headings.

6.4.1 The research process

The aim of this section was to provide the model structure with valid information regarding local government’s strategic tourism objectives, planning actions and residents’ opinions of them. Each of the three cities responded positively, suggesting that they agreed that this aim had been achieved. The three evaluation questions in this section related to the logic of the process by which the objectives, actions and opinions were associated. This is an important contribution to the evaluation of policy-specific social impact studies and establishes the potential for developing a higher degree of integration in the tourism planning process. In terms of integration, it is worth reiterating the opinion of Inskeep (1991:22) who observed that...

“although complicated, cutting across sectoral categories, and fragmented, tourism is and should be viewed as a single system comprised of interrelated parts. As a system, it can be defined, analysed, planned, and managed in an integrated manner”.

The concept of integration is discussed again later in the summary where the tourism officers suggest that greater integration can be achieved through further development.

6.4.2 The methodology

The aim of this section was to enable the tourism officers to evaluate whether or not the random sample mechanism used in the three earlier studies (see chapter two) appeared effective and would therefore be appropriate to use in further studies. The officers in Canterbury and Chester agreed that it did appear effective, whilst the officer in York disagreed. The basis of the sampling mechanism relies upon the random sampling of ten grid squares from within the 131 that exist
within a four mile radius of the cities. This number of ten was originally established as the result of a random selection process, using Microsoft Excel, for the original study of York (Snaith & Haley, 1994). The point made by the officer in York was that “ten is fine but supposing the random number between 1 and 131 was 1?” This is a good question and one that had not occurred to the researcher at the time of the first study. The fact that the number ten was selected was due to chance as was the fact that it worked effectively in achieving a representative sample in the city of York. From the initial exploratory research in the city of York, this methodology has been consolidated through adjusting sample sizes to allow for non-response.

Whilst the sampling mechanism has remained successful in the studies of York (1995), Bath (1996) and Chester (1998), it remains to be seen whether it retains consistency or whether it is confounded by methodological flaws which become apparent in the future. Sometimes, certain aspects of research work by chance, and although it is preferable to reduce the likely error through design, there will always be a degree of oversight.

6.4.3 The model

The four questions within this section enabled the tourism officers to evaluate the functioning of the model. They were required to determine whether or not the model could capture and maintain the research data and relate it in a way which enables the user to observe residents' opinions and target either individuals or groups for analysis, consultation, or both. The first three questions related specifically to the functioning of component parts of the model. Results of the evaluation suggest that all three officers agreed that the model is effective in the internal sense, that is, that the levels are functionally related and efficient at their tasks. The final evaluation question related to the overall effectiveness of the model as a mechanism for enabling effective public consultation in tourism planning. This is, in effect, the primary research question contained within this research.

Each of the cities' tourism officers agreed that the model offered the potential to improve the consultation process. The city of York's rating was the lowest with a 4 on a scale of 7. Whilst this errs on the lowest level of agreement, the attached comments explain that their rating is conservative because they see a much greater potential use for the model. They suggest that a three-part model which integrates the opinions of residents, visitors and local businesses would be an extremely powerful consultation tool. This point is well made and will be investigated as the development of the model continues. The same point was made by Canterbury, who whilst rating the model on its present merits (6) also suggested
the inclusion of a visitor evaluation of local tourism objectives and actions. These points suggest that the local government tourism officers in these historic cities are aware of the need for integrating logical information networks and research to support their planning efforts. The government has talked of joined-up solutions, and this is evident both in their thinking, and in their appreciation of the ComSmart model's ability to do this, albeit in part.

The final evaluation was completed by the city of Chester. The prototype model was purpose designed for use in Chester and therefore their evaluation of the degree to which it achieves the intended outcomes is most important. The fact that they rated the model 7 out of 7 permits the answering of the research question, and establishes that yes...

"the modelling of a computer-based objectives, actions, opinions model does offer the potential to incorporate/integrate, effectively, resident opinion with the objectives and actions of tourism officers in order to improve the consultation process for planning tourism in the historic city of Chester, England".


CHAPTER SEVEN

7.0 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of Chapter seven is to reiterate the findings from each of the four research phases and discuss them in relation to the research questions put forward at the outset. Within this exposition, problem areas are highlighted and reference is made to the literature on which this study was founded. In doing this, it becomes possible to reflect on the outcomes of the research and whether or not it adds to the understanding of both the social impacts of tourism and the public consultation process within tourism planning. The chapter concludes with a statement of conclusions, limitations of the study, and recommendations for future action with regards to the development of the computer-based public consultation model.

7.1 RESEARCH PHASE I: Discussion

It was suggested at the outset of this research that the field of SIA studies was somewhat fragmented and in need of a degree of consolidation. In addition, it was suggested that previous research may have jumped too quickly from the description, to the modeling and explanation of social impacts, and that there was not enough comparative work to enable such assured progression. In order to address this point, three comparative studies were conducted in the historic cities of York, Bath and Chester. Within this phase of the research, three research questions were asked.

The first research question concerned whether or not there were any underlying dimensions regarding residents’ opinions of tourism development in the three city samples. It had been suggested (Kim, 1992; Madrigal, 1993; Perdue et al., 1990; Snaith & Haley, 1994) that a two-factor structure existed which indicated positive and negative dimensions. Results from this research confirm these observations with two-factor structures apparent in all three samples. This enabled the rejection of the null hypothesis and established consistency in the use of this research approach. There has, however, been criticism of this approach (Ap & Crompton, 1998; Snaith et al., in progress) supported by the discovery of another four potential dimensions; crowding and congestion, services, taxes and community attitude. Whilst this new approach is welcomed, the continual development of new instrumentation carries with it an important implication.

Increasing the understanding of the underlying dimensions is an important step forward, but it must be remembered that consistent historical data also serves a
purpose. In order to trace the changing nature of residents' opinions and compare them alongside developments in tourism and its planning within a destination, some degree of continuity must exist which acts as a baseline for reference. It is suggested therefore, that there is a place for several different approaches that either possess the potential for comparative analysis or seek to drive more specific understanding. This consideration was apparent in the comments of the tourism officer in Chester following the final evaluations of research phase IV.

The second research question sought to discover whether or not the residents of the three historic cities possessed similar opinions regarding the nature and impact of tourism in their community. Chester residents appeared to be more positive than the residents of York and Bath, however, this indicates that the residents of each of the cities do recognise the positive benefits of tourism. The lowest scoring item for all three samples was "I feel that I can personally influence the decision-making process for tourism". This supports the findings of Murphy (1981) who suggested that the city of York should concentrate more effort on educating residents about tourism and involving them in the planning. This finding is common in social impacts research and may indeed be reflected in the fact that the most consistent finding is that those employed and therefore involved in the tourism industry see it more positively.

The results were such that the null hypothesis could not be rejected, therefore recognising that the residents of the cities had different opinions regarding the impacts of tourism. Perhaps the most important observation is that there are fewer differences between the residents of York and Bath, suggesting that as destinations, they may be more similar in terms of the nature of their development and the residents' experiences of tourism. What becomes evident from this research is that there remains a great number of potential contributory factors which could influence the opinions of residents and which are not presently accounted for in any measurable way. This is always going to be the case with the use of a longitudinal and comparative research instrument such as the one employed here.

The third research question was based on a contentious issue within the literature, namely, the debate regarding the potential for using resident characteristics such as socio-economic and demographic variables, and economic reliance as indicators of differing opinions and perceptions of tourism. This debate has continued throughout the last twenty years with a great deal of disagreement. The reason for this may well lie in the limited attempts, by the research groups, to define the type of destination, utilise the same methodology and develop models
which are broad enough to contain all of the potentially contributory variables. In this way there is little confidence in establishing whether or not socio-economic and demographic variables are significant indicators of distinct opinions regarding tourism.

As things are, there is not a sufficient body of longitudinal and comparative research in specific destinations to enable those general predictions. With this in mind, research question three sought to ask whether socio-economic and demographic characteristics act as useful predictors of residents' opinions within urban historic cities in England. The results suggest that some of the variables may indeed provide the basis for a general understanding of which people are more susceptible to perceiving certain impacts of tourism. This reopens a debate that had all but been put behind us because of the premature closure of enquiry. It appears based on this research that such variables are not insignificant in terms of our understanding of the way in which tourism impacts people's lives. The most notable findings were:

1) in York, where results suggested that younger people were more supportive of attracting more tourists, a finding which supports the observations of Husbands (1989) who said that age was one of the most important variables affecting residents' perceptions of tourism;

2) in each of the three cities where it was found that as income level fell, the residents were more likely to support more tourism. Those on lower incomes were also more likely to accept their city becoming more of a tourist destination. In support of this, it was also observed that those on lower incomes also felt that tourism should play a vital role in the future of York. This is further established by the finding that in York, those employed in the tourism industry were more supportive of the city becoming more of a tourist destination;

3) in Chester, where those on higher incomes appeared more supportive of attracting more tourists, the opposite to that found in the York sample. These observations may be related to the respondents' recognition of the economic opportunities and benefits afforded by tourism development. They certainly support the consistent research finding that those who perceive that they may, or actually do, benefit economically from tourism are more supportive of further tourism development (Perdue et al., 1990).

4) in Bath where it was found that those people living closer to the CTZ were likely to more supportive of local government restrictions on tourism
development. Belisle and Hoy (1980) first observed the distance of residence from the CTZ as a significant variable. In their study of Santa Marta in Colombia, the opposite was found, that those living closer to the CTZ were more positive and supportive than those living further away. This was seen as being due to the incipient stage of development present at that time. It may well be therefore, that later on in the lifecycle of the destination, that those living closer to the main CTZ become increasingly impacted by the pressure of increasing numbers of tourists on the local infrastructure;

5) in all three city samples the direction and size of the beta coefficients suggested that those on lower incomes were more likely to feel that they could influence the decision-making process. Perhaps this indicates the influence of older people who have the time in retirement to involve themselves in local issues, or perhaps indicates a degree of unemployment amongst the younger age groups and a similar ability to become involved. Either way, this was a concern of Keogh (1990) and remains an interesting area of research to develop since it may offer an insight into the motivations and ability of individuals to involve themselves in local issues and the planning of their communities;

6) in each of the three samples, the shorter the length of residence, the more positive appeared the perceptions of tourism. This agrees with the findings of Liu and Var (1986) in their study of the residents of Hawaii, and again by Fordham Research Services (1998) in the city of Cambridge. This suggests that irrespective of the destination type, a point is reached in the minds of the residents when the continued presence or development of tourism reaches a threshold, or exceeds the capacity which they are willing to accept;

7) in York, it was also found that home owners appeared more positive than those that rented, suggesting perhaps a greater association or sense of place/ownership and therefore attachment to the city and its reliance on tourism;

8) it was also found that those employed in the tourism industry in York were more positive. This acts to support the findings of earlier research (Pizam, 1978; Rothman, 1978). Similarly, in Bath, those who perceived tourism as being important to their occupation were more likely to see the positive side of tourism, a finding which was repeated in the Chester sample. These results indicate further support for the importance of perceived economic
benefit as a catalyst for the acceptance of tourism as a positive element within a community;

9) in the Bath sample, those people who were born in the city appeared more likely to notice the negative impacts of tourism. This supports the earlier finding that the shorter the length of residence, the more positively residents see the impacts of tourism.

These findings appear to establish contradictions in the nature of social impact research both within the three city studies, and between these and other studies. Rather than detracting from the nature of the findings, this adds strength to the argument that is developed within this thesis, that this is a complex research area. These inconsistencies and variations need to be observed and recorded in order to further the understanding of residents' deeper perceptions of tourism development.

Chapter two established three different directions. It notes that this particular method of investigating the social impacts of tourism requires further consolidation, whilst at the same time recognising that two weaknesses exist which limit the validity of its approach. The first is that studies of this type need to be grounded within a much deeper historical context in order fully to understand the complexities of the changes which tourism has brought to a city and its people. Secondly, that in order to link social impact assessment to a more effective method of public consultation, the questions asked of residents must be more focused on the actual planning actions that are being taken on behalf of the city and its people.

7.2 RESEARCH PHASE II: Discussion

Within Chapter two, the recommendations of Becker (1997) were acknowledged. He advocates SIA's that contain a baseline referent point for the area under investigation. This involves a general version which provides a global overview of the place under study, and a focused version which deals with the variables which are closely connected to the current or future action, the consequences of which are being analysed.

In the case of this research, Chapter three provides a brief outline of such baseline information. Historically, it was observed that the cities each possess a rich and deep past. The sites on which they emerged and grew were successful because of the presence of natural resources, trade access, and their defensive qualities. Because of this, many different peoples have resided in them, the cities were populated at some time by The Romans, The Vikings, The Anglo-Saxons, and The
Normans. It seems quite apt therefore that the people presently residing in the cities are supported to a certain extent by a tourist invasion, many of whom arrive from overseas.

The cities possess similar size populations, whilst economically the cities report similar amounts of tourist spending. As a result, tourism-related employment supports between 14% and 30% of the local populations. In terms of their tourism product, each possesses historic attractions that relate to the same periods in history, most notably, the Roman experience. As ecclesiastical centres, each possesses a Cathedral or Abbey, and because of the development of core historic centres based in the old town areas, they each state that transport congestion is the greatest problem facing them and their community. The discussion in chapter three establishes enough similarities to talk of the cities as being an example of the same phenomenon, namely, the historic tourist-city. As such, they fall within Page’s (1995) category of “walled historic cities” in which tourism has become a vital part of the local economy. This assessment is further confirmed by the similarities in their action plans to manage their tourism industry. As a result of these observations, chapter four focused on governmental planning responses to the growth and changes in society witnessed during the 20th Century. Tourism, as an emerging key economic industry, receives particular attention, including some research which investigates the strategic objectives and planning actions of local government tourism departments.

During the 1990’s, several papers were published by the DCMS and its predecessor the DNH. Whilst they did not outline the precise details of how to plan for tourism, they did specify the issues and recommend local government involvement in tourism as a means to enhance local economic potential. Recommendations included raising the awareness of the economic importance of tourism, making the planning system more transparent and accessible to developers, and underpinning new developments with the principles of sustainable development. In 1998, the National Planning Forum released a report entitled ‘Planning for tourism’. In the report, it was stated that...

"an increasing number of local authorities are now preparing tourism and leisure strategies for their areas. However, there is no doubt that the level of coverage could and should be improved".
This point is well made in light of the limited response (95/355; 15.5%) to the request for tourism strategy documents from local government councils, and even more so for those councils in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland (7/75; 6.6%).

The strategies, which the local government councils develop in order to meet this challenge, were found not to be purely the product of central government strategies. Rather, they were the result of a combination of the needs of the tourism industry and the specific requests of those stakeholders who can be heard. These needs are set within the present social, political and economic environment, reflect emergent local issues, are somewhat based on the training of the managers themselves, and may include the influence of a certain amount of informal/formal networking and agreement between tourism officers as to what the present issues are.

The observation that the 14 emergent strategic objectives from the analysis have no point of reference in the literature establishes the need for greater understanding and consolidation of the nature of local government tourism strategies. Similarly, the planning actions employed by local government councils require greater scrutiny in terms of what they are, how they change over time, their congruence with the objectives they are stated as being designed to achieve, how successful they are, and how the residents perceive them in terms of their appropriateness and the level of involvement they are afforded in their development and evaluation. This raises the question regarding the methods of and commitment to public involvement in local government in England. Research phase III discusses this.

7.3 RESEARCH PHASE III: Discussion

The literature indicated that many consultation techniques are available to the tourism planner (Glass, 1979), and indeed that many different methodologies had been developed (Loukissas, 1983; Ritchie, 1985, 1988, 1993). One such methodology utilised to incorporate resident opinions is the survey. This method is best used at the early stages of goal development (Loukissas, 1983), although its use has been found to generate tensions with regards to its intended objectives (Haywood, 1988; Loukissas, 1983; Font, 1995). These tensions are born out of the need to incorporate a high degree of representative citizen involvement which is both equitable and efficient in terms of the costs of time and money invested in the process (Sewell & Phillips, 1979).

This phase of the research involved conducting a piece of research to investigate the use of mail surveys (Information exchange) as a form of resident
opinion consultation by local government in England. Results indicated low levels of commitment to, or potential for conducting such opinion surveys. Where tourism opinion surveys were evident, they were conducted sporadically, utilised diverse methodologies, asked only general questions and were conducted by a variety of research agencies. In this way, the data returned is fragmentated, relates to general questions and is therefore unrelated to actual policy actions, rendering it non-comparative and non-longitudinal.

These findings raise issues regarding the effective use of this form of local government consultation with regards to integrating resident opinions of tourism development into the planning process. The tensions which were apparent in the literature appeared to remain unsolved, so much so, that there appeared to be a movement even further away from the principles of representative input, and towards what Langton (1978) called 'Top-down' forms of participation. This finding supports the view that local government tends to adopt what Steele & Seargeant (1997) called 'instrumental reasons' for involving citizens. This, they suggest has more to do with going through the motions, in instances where there is a requirement to consult, or where they are attempting to put off difficult decisions.

If the findings of this research are representative of the larger picture, then the state of knowledge, and the utilisation of effective participation mechanisms may still be at an experimental stage whereby no range of methods have been selected, trialled and their suitability to certain situations established. It may be, that local government are conducting public consultation according to locally developed and constructed solutions (Godfrey, 1998) with no true referent point on which to base a judgement of its success or otherwise.

The difficulty in discussing these findings comes from the fact that no other research was available which had dealt with the same issues. It remains to conclude, that whilst the sample size was fairly small (n=44), the results indicated a worrying pattern that suggested the lack of availability of funds and the concomitant lack of motivation to conduct meaningful surveys of the resident population.

Even within the context of a marginalisation of resident opinions, there exists the need to constantly seek to develop new models and improve the methods and techniques employed to achieve representative public consultation. This is a view shared by many in central government, something which was made evident by the widespread agreement with the principles of the Local Government (Experimental Arrangements) Bill introduced to the House of Lords in November 1997 which laid out a series of proposals to improve local democracy. These proposals were aimed at both reforming the process of participation in the decision-
making process as well as the structure of local government and the electoral process. The proposals stated that successful local government reorganisation would be judged on:

1) whether proposed arrangements would be likely to lead to decisions being taken in a more efficient and accountable way;

2) whether or not applications for development would be likely to lead to greater regard to the views of electors and local stakeholders;

3) whether there are conditions for full scrutiny of executive decisions.

Research phase IV was designed to develop a new consultation methodology which addressed the issues emerging from the earlier research phases.

7.4 RESEARCH PHASE IV: Discussion

As a response to this call for the greater regard of local stakeholder views and opinions, this research culminated in the development, testing and evaluation of a computer-based public consultation model. This model has been named "ComSmart" which stands for Community Smart.

The field of computer modeling moves at great pace (Crouch & Mjosund, 1985), with the constant development of new programming languages and graphical interfaces. The relational database technology utilised in this research phase was introduced by Codd (1970) and was widely used during the 1980's. Its widespread use continues, although it provided the foundation for the development of higher level methods such as expert systems and neural networking. The environment modeled within this research is a simple one and requires, at present, no higher level technology. The nature of the 'relational database' lends itself quite easily to the logical relation of the objectives, actions and opinions model.

The success of the model was ultimately based on the evaluation of three respondents. This is the nature of this type of evaluation research where the judgement of whether the predetermined statements of purpose or objectives are achieved comes down to the opinion of those with specialist knowledge. Having been involved in the setting of objectives, their evaluations are an indication of the degree of success or otherwise achieved by the research intervention.

This research again finds itself in uncharted areas and therefore its success or otherwise is grounded in a process that evolved out of the recognition of weaknesses both in a methodological and an applied sense. The logic and rationale behind the developing research design relies for its evaluation on the opinions of a select group of people who possess the specialist knowledge.
The evaluation consisted of eight questions (Appendix O), the final one required the respondents to judge the effectiveness of the model in achieving its primary aim. This aim was to provide a public consultation model that had the potential to improve the consultation process in historic tourist cities in England.

Each of the cities' tourism officers agreed that the model offered the potential to improve the consultation process. The city of York rating was the lowest with a 4 on a scale of 7. Whilst this errs on the lowest level of agreement, the attached comments explain that their rating is conservative because they see a much greater potential use for the model. The tourism officers were agreed that a three-part model that integrates the opinions of residents, visitors and local businesses would be an extremely powerful consultation tool. This point is well made and will be investigated as the development of the model continues. The same point was made by Canterbury, who whilst rating the model on its present merits (6) also suggested the inclusion of a visitor evaluation of local tourism objectives and actions. These points suggest that the local government tourism officers in these historic cities are aware of the need for integrating logical information networks and research to support their planning efforts. The government has talked of joined-up solutions, and this is evident both in their thinking, and in their appreciation of the ComSmart model's ability to do this, albeit in part. These findings confirm the suggestions of Moutinho et al., (1996), that the process involved in modeling these types of systems stimulate managers to consider factors that they may have overlooked.

The final evaluation was completed by the city of Chester. The prototype model was purpose designed for use in Chester and therefore their evaluation of the degree to which it achieves the intended outcomes is most important. The fact that they rated the model 7 (Strongly agree) out of a possible 7 enables the rejection of the null hypothesis and establishes comprehensively that the design and outcomes of the research offer a valid contribution to the tourism planning consultation process within historic cities in the UK, and most notably within the city of Chester.

It is worth reflecting at this stage whether the model is applicable to other historic cities and to other tourist destinations. As it stands, the applied model is specific to the city of Chester, however, the conceptual model was designed in order that it could be used in other destinations. The most important element within the development and use of the model is in the construction of the objectives, actions and opinion's stages. This being the case, consultation should be conducted with the tourism officer(s) in order to define these stages. In this way, the architecture of the model is flexible enough to be used across destinations, as long as the content specifically mirrors the tourism planning experiences of that destination.
7.5 CONCLUSIONS

- The results of the three studies indicate the existence of two underlying dimensions regarding residents' opinions of tourism development. These dimensions relate to their positive and negative opinions.

- The resident population within the historic cities of York, Bath and Chester possess different perceptions of the degree to which tourism has an impact on both themselves and their respective cities.

- Residents' socio-economic and demographic characteristics are useful indicators of differing levels of support for, and opposition to tourism development.

- There exist, 14 primary strategic tourism objectives that are pursued by local government in England.

- Tourism officers in local government in England use a wide variety of planning actions to achieve their planning objectives.

- Resident tourism surveys are accepted in the research literature as an effective means of acquiring an exchange of information from residents regarding their opinions. The research findings of this study indicate limited opportunities within local government to conduct such studies, as well as an associated low level of commitment to conduct them.

- The computer-based consultation model was developed as a result of extensive research and conceptual development. The conceptual model was scrutinised and approved at each stage by tourism professionals. Within this process, several predetermined statements of purpose were set, purposes which were translated into objectives. These objectives were then evaluated through the development of an applied consultation model. The outcome of this evaluation concluded that the computer-based model does in fact offer a useful contribution to the process of improving public consultation in tourism planning.
Whilst conducting this research, many challenges emerged, the majority of which were dealt with in a successful manner. There were however several limiting factors which either delayed the progress of the research, or required the researcher to reconsider his research approach. These limitations deserve mention, first, in order that the research can be understood from a deeper perspective and secondly so that in the future, researchers can improve on the process established by this research.

- Whilst the sample response rates were fairly high in research phase I; York (n=303; 50.5%), Bath (n=368; 46.4%) and Chester (n=248; 31%), only Bath attained the recommended number of returns (n=348) suggested by DiGrino (1986). The response rate in York was the highest, but the sample size was too small. In Bath, the sample size was increased to allow for the non-response level found in the York study. Having done this it achieved the desired number of responses. The sample size was retained for Chester, but delays in the research process forced the mailings close to the Christmas period. This, it is suggested, proved to be a major limitation on the willingness of the population to respond.

- Because of the fragmented nature of data collection within the tourism industry, it was difficult to acquire consistent and meaningful reference data for the number of visitors to cities, the amount spent by those visitors, and even for population sizes within the urban centres. This caused difficulties in comparing the sample data to that of the resident populations.

- As already mentioned in research phase I, the use of a longitudinal and comparative research instrument holds both advantages and disadvantages. Its use has limitations in that the researcher loses the ability to adjust or tune the questionnaire items to accommodate recent development issues.

- The analysis of local government tourism plans was achieved through utilising Strauss's (1991) 'memoing and coding' technique. Whilst this has been found effective in pinpointing patterns and trends within written documents, it is still reliant on a degree of perceptual interpretation which each researcher brings with them as a result of their life's experiences. Even
though the validity of the 14 strategic objectives was confirmed by the tourism officers in the historic cites, it is a potential limitation worth noting.

- The number of local government tourism officers participating in the study was limited (n=60/393; 16.9%) as a result of them either not possessing a tourism plan at the time of the study, or because they deemed themselves too busy to participate.

- In hindsight, it would have proved useful to have disaggregated the authorities that contained historic cities within their sphere of influence from those which did not. In this way, it would have enabled an additional insight into the potentially different issues facing historic cities throughout the country rather than just the three selected for the study. This could have been achieved by asking the respondents to state whether or not they managed the tourism functions of an historic city. This information could then be corroborated through reference to a map of local authority boundaries.

- The reliance of the research design on the confirmation of those working in the industry meant that long time delays occurred between development and confirmation. There is very little one can do about this as the practitioners are extremely busy with their own work.

- The final survey that was to have produced the data to populate the computer model was not conducted due to delays in the release of funding and resources. The researcher was therefore unable to assess the effectiveness of the survey instrument (Appendix K) in terms of the response rate it achieved and the feedback from respondents. This survey will be conducted, but outside the remit of this doctoral submission.
7.7 RECOMMENDATIONS

These recommendations are established in response to the conclusions and limitations of the study. They are intended to assist in the future development of an improved methodological approach.

- The original purpose of the studies conducted during research phase I was to collect social impact data during the summer season. This, it was hypothesised, would be the time of year when residents would be particularly aware of the presence of tourists. The study of Chester's residents was unfortunately delayed until the Christmas season. To be a truly longitudinal and comparative research design, future studies should be as similar in their execution as is possible given the restrictions of time and resources.

- Extensive efforts should be made to establish a sound contextual basis for future studies. By this, it is meant that the socio-economic and historical development of the destination(s) should form a substantial part of the conceptualisation of the research. In doing this, the results can be interpreted in ways which are more meaningful and enable a deeper understanding of the place and its people.

- Whilst it is possible to achieve multiple objectives within a research project, it is important to recognise that it is not possible to capture everything at once. There are strong arguments set out within this study, that there are many valid approaches both to the study of tourism's social impacts, and the development of public consultation techniques. There is a place for historical studies as well as research that looks to achieve greater refinement in measurement and item construction.

- Perhaps one of the most significant outcomes of the research was the agreement between the tourism officers and the researcher, that a larger all-inclusive model should be developed. This model should consist of the same objectives, actions and opinions structure, but could be designed to capture the responses of the three primary stakeholder groups, namely, the residents, the visitors and the local businesses. In this way, the same planning actions could be evaluated by the three separate groups, enabling
the tourism officers an insight into the ramifications of their actions across a wider range of the local community.

Despite any limitations, this research has taken things forward by building on research and theories in the fields of social impact assessment and public consultation. Bringing these together, the research shows how they can be combined effectively to establish a community consultation mechanism which, in the view of those involved in planning tourism in historic cities in England, offers the opportunity to strengthen the democratic process by placing the community at the centre of a truly community based tourism planning process.
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APPENDIX A

RESEARCH PHASE I

EXAMPLE OF COVER LETTER AND FOLLOW UP LETTER SENT TO THE RESIDENTS OF YORK, BATH AND CHESTER.
November 1998

Dear ***Name***

Having lived in the city of York for over 20 years, I have developed a great interest in the social impacts associated with tourism development in historic cities in the United Kingdom. I am conducting a collaborative study (in association with The University of Surrey, Arizona State University and Chester City Council) that will provide an insight into the nature of residents' opinions regarding tourism development in the city of Chester.

This research is being conducted by carrying out a postal questionnaire of a sample of Chester's residents. Your name and address have been randomly selected from the electoral register.

Although participation in this study is completely voluntary, your co-operation in filling out the questionnaire will assist greatly in gaining a better understanding of how residents feel about tourism. This information will serve to inform future tourism policy.

This questionnaire should be completed by an ADULT MEMBER OF THE HOUSEHOLD (over 18 years of age).

Information from this questionnaire will be grouped with others. Please rest assured that all the information is strictly confidential and will only be used in an anonymous statistical form.

I have enclosed a stamped addressed envelope for you to use to return the completed questionnaire. Should you have any questions regarding this research please do not hesitate to call me on 01483 539703.

Thank you very much for your co-operation.

Yours sincerely

Tim Snaith (BA Hons; MSc.)
PhD RESEARCHER
Dear «Name»

Two weeks ago I posted you a questionnaire seeking your opinions about tourism's impact on Chester. My research unit has undertaken this study because of the belief that the opinions of local people should be taken into account when forming public policies for the planning and development of tourism within communities.

If you have already completed and returned the questionnaire, please accept my sincere thanks. If you have not, may I ask that you do complete it and return it to me.

Although participation is voluntary, I would like to encourage each person in the survey to return their completed questionnaire. The greater the number of returns, the more the results can be deemed truly representative of all Chester residents.

As mentioned in the previous letter, the questionnaire should be completed by an ADULT MEMBER OF THE HOUSEHOLD (over 18 years of age).

In the event that your questionnaire has been misplaced, a replacement is enclosed along with a stamped addressed envelope. Your co-operation is greatly appreciated.

Yours sincerely

Tim Snaith (BA Hons; MSc.)
PhD RESEARCHER
APPENDIX B

RESEARCH PHASE I

EXAMPLE OF MAIL SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO THE RESIDENTS OF YORK, BATH AND CHESTER.
b) Please answer every item (this is critical to our study).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>NEUTRAL</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>NEUTRAL</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Tourism development increases the traffic problems in Chester.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Increasing the number of tourists visiting Chester improves the local economy.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The benefits of tourism in Chester outweigh its negative consequences.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Local government should control tourism development in Chester.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Tourism development improves the appearance of Chester.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Tourism development improves the quality of life in Chester.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Tourism development has a negative impact on the physical environment.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Long-term planning will control the negative impacts of tourism development.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Tourism development increases the number of recreational opportunities for local residents.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Tourism leads to more litter in our streets.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Chester should not try to attract more tourists.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Tourism related businesses have too much political influence in Chester.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I believe that tourism should play a vital role in the future of Chester.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Tourism development in Chester provides good jobs for local residents.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Chester should become more of a tourist destination.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I would support local tax levies for tourism development.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I feel that I can personally influence the decision making process associated with tourism development in Chester.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Tourism development unfairly increases property prices.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Tourism increases the amount of crime in Chester.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Local government should restrict tourism development.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Tourism development reduces the quality of my outdoor recreation experiences.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Tourism development increases the Council Tax.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Tourists should pay more than local residents to visit parks and outdoor recreation attractions.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>When I talk to fellow residents of Chester concerning tourism in the city, I am generally very positive.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. How long have you lived in the Chester area?
   Years: _______ Months: _______

2. Were you born in the Chester area?
   □ Yes □ No

3. What is your gender?
   □ Male □ Female

4. When were you born?
   Year: _______

5. Do you own or rent your place of residence?
   □ Own □ Rent

6. Are you a year-round resident?
   □ Yes □ No

7. Are you or is a member of your family currently employed in a tourism related business?
   □ Yes □ No

8. Does your family/ancestors have a history of residence in/around the city of Chester?
   □ Yes □ No
   If Yes, how long (approx) ______ years

9. How many times per week do you enter the city of Chester for:
   Shopping ______ Recreation ______ Work ______

10. Average duration of your visit?
    (mins/hours)
    Shopping ______ Recreation ______ Work ______

11. Approximately how many miles do you live from the centre of Chester?
    Miles: _______

12. How important is the tourism industry to your occupation?
    □ Very important
    □ Important
    □ Neither important nor important
    □ Unimportant
    □ Very unimportant

13. What is your annual household income (in £,000s)
    □ Under £9,999
    □ £10,000 to £14,999
    □ £15,000 to £19,999
    □ £20,000 to £24,999
    □ £25,000 to £29,999
    □ £30,000 to £34,999
    □ £35,000 to £44,999
    □ £45,000 or more

14. Do you have any comments about tourism development in Chester? (If you need more space please use the back of this sheet).
APPENDIX C

RESEARCH PHASE II

LETTER TO LOCAL GOVERNMENT COUNCILS REQUESTING A COPY OF THEIR MOST RECENT TOURISM STRATEGY DOCUMENT
Dear Sir/Madam,

As part of my doctoral research work, I am presently involved in identifying the nature of local government planning policies for tourism.

To aid the successful completion of this research it would be greatly appreciated if you were able to assist by forwarding a copy of your council's most recent tourism strategy document to the address above.

Thank you for your kind attention

Yours sincerely

T.G Snaith (BA Hons; MSc.)
PhD Researcher
APPENDIX D

RESEARCH PHASE II

LISTING OF LOCAL AUTHORITY COUNCILS (INCLUDING REGIONAL TOURIST BOARDS) STATED AS POSSESSING SPECIFIC TOURISM DEPARTMENTS

(N=230/471; MUNICIPAL YEARBOOK, 1997)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Address1</th>
<th>Address2</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Tourist Board</td>
<td>Thames Tower</td>
<td>Black's Road</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>W6 9EL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbria Tourist Board</td>
<td>Ashleigh</td>
<td>Holly Road</td>
<td>Windermere</td>
<td>LA23 2AQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Anglia Tourist Board</td>
<td>Toppesfield Hall</td>
<td>Hadleigh</td>
<td>IF7 5DN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands Tourist Board</td>
<td>Exchequer gate</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>LN2 1FX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart of England Tourist Board</td>
<td>Woodside</td>
<td>Larkhill Road</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>WR5 2EZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Tourist Board</td>
<td>26 Grosvenor</td>
<td>Larkhill Road</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>SW1 W 0DU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumbria Tourist Board</td>
<td>Aykley Heads</td>
<td></td>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>DH1 5UX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West Tourist Board</td>
<td>Swan House</td>
<td>Swan Meadow Road</td>
<td>Wigan</td>
<td>WN3 5BB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East England Tourist Board</td>
<td>The Old Brew House</td>
<td>Warwick Park</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>IN2 5TU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Tourist Board</td>
<td>40 Chamberlayne</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastleigh</td>
<td>SO50 5JH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Country Tourist Board</td>
<td>60 St. David's</td>
<td></td>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>EX4 4SY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire &amp; Humber Side Tourist Board</td>
<td>312 Tadcaster Road</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>YO2 2HF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales Tourist Board</td>
<td>Brunel House</td>
<td>2 Fitzalan Road</td>
<td>Cardiff</td>
<td>CF2 1UY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Tourist Board</td>
<td>23 Ravelston</td>
<td></td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>EH4 3EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland Tourist Board</td>
<td>St Anne's Court</td>
<td>59 North Street</td>
<td>Belfast</td>
<td>BT1 1NB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jersey Tourism</td>
<td>Liberations Square</td>
<td></td>
<td>St Helier, Jersey</td>
<td>JER 1BB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester County Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>CH1 2HN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall County Council</td>
<td>Cornwall Tourist Board</td>
<td>59 Lemon Street</td>
<td>Truro</td>
<td>TR1 21SY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bexley County Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept</td>
<td>Hill View, Hill View Drive</td>
<td>Welling, London</td>
<td>DA16 3RY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwich County Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept</td>
<td>151 Powis Street</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>SE18 6JL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islington County Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept</td>
<td>Upper Street</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>N1 2UD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston upon Thames County Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept</td>
<td>Fairfield Road</td>
<td>Kingston upon Thames</td>
<td>KT1 2PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton County Council, Tourism Dept</td>
<td>Central Library</td>
<td>St Nicholas Way</td>
<td>Sutton</td>
<td>SM1 1EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower Hamlets County Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept</td>
<td>Mulberry Place, 5 Clove Crescent</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>E14 2BG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford City Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept, Mercury House</td>
<td>4 Manchester Road</td>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>BD5 0QL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calderdale County Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept</td>
<td>Tourist Information Centre</td>
<td>Hebden Bridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doncaster District Council</td>
<td>Marketing &amp; Promotions</td>
<td>The Council House, College Road</td>
<td>Doncaster</td>
<td>DN1 3LD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateshead District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept</td>
<td>Central Library, Prince Consort Road</td>
<td>Gateshead</td>
<td>NE8 4LN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

263
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Address1</th>
<th>Address2</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kirkless District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept</td>
<td>Civic Centre Phase 111</td>
<td>Huddersfield</td>
<td>HD1 2EY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds City District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept.,</td>
<td>The Headrow</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>LS1 3AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester City District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>M60 2LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Tyneside District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept</td>
<td>Graham House, Whitley Road</td>
<td>Benton, Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>NE12 9TQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sefton District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Department</td>
<td>Fromenade</td>
<td>Southport</td>
<td>PR9 0DZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield City District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept</td>
<td>Leader House, Surrey Street</td>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>S1 2LH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Tyneside District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept</td>
<td>Town Hall &amp; Civic Offices</td>
<td>South Shields</td>
<td>NE33 2RL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tameside District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept,</td>
<td>Wellington Road</td>
<td>Ashton under Lyne</td>
<td>OL6 6DL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakefield City District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept,</td>
<td>Newton Road</td>
<td>Wakefield</td>
<td>WF1 1XS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wigan District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept,</td>
<td>Wallgate</td>
<td>Wigan</td>
<td>WN3 4EF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wirral District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept,</td>
<td>Hamilton Street</td>
<td>Birkenhead</td>
<td>L41 5FN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allerdale District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept</td>
<td>Allerdale House</td>
<td>Workington</td>
<td>CA14 3YJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alnwick District Council</td>
<td>Tourist Office</td>
<td>Allerburn House</td>
<td>Alnwick</td>
<td>NE66 1YY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber Valley District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept</td>
<td>Town Hall, Ripley</td>
<td>Derbyshire</td>
<td>DE5 3BF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arun District Council</td>
<td>Tourism &amp; Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road</td>
<td>Littlehampton</td>
<td>BN17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashford District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office,</td>
<td>Tannery Lane</td>
<td>Ashford</td>
<td>TN23 1PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basingstoke &amp; Deane District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dev. Office, Old Town Hall</td>
<td>Market Place</td>
<td>Basingstoke</td>
<td>RG21 7QD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassetlaw District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept</td>
<td>Grove House, 27 Grove Road</td>
<td>Retford</td>
<td>DN22 6JP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office,</td>
<td>St. Paul's Square</td>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>MK40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackburn District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>Blackburn</td>
<td>BB1 7DY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackpool District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept</td>
<td>1 Clifton Street</td>
<td>Blackpool</td>
<td>FY1 1LY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blyth Valley District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept,</td>
<td>Seaton Delaval</td>
<td>Whitley Bay</td>
<td>NE25 0DX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept</td>
<td>Municipal Buildings</td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>PE21 8QR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bournemouth District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept, Visitor Information Bureau</td>
<td>Westover Road</td>
<td>Bournemouth</td>
<td>BH1 2BU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braintree District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept</td>
<td>Causeway House, Becking End</td>
<td>Braintree</td>
<td>CM7 9HB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentwood District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept,</td>
<td>Ingrave Road</td>
<td>Brentwood</td>
<td>CM15 8AY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgnorth District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept</td>
<td>Westgate</td>
<td>Bridgnorth</td>
<td>WV16 5AA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept,</td>
<td>Old Steine</td>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>BN1 1EQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Address1</td>
<td>Address2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Postal Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnley District Council</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Manchester Road</td>
<td>Burnley</td>
<td>BB11 1JA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge City District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept</td>
<td>Wheeler Street</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>CB2 3QB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannock Chase District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept, Civic Centre</td>
<td>PO Box 28, Beecroft Road</td>
<td>Cannock</td>
<td>WS11 1BG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caradon District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>Luxstowe House</td>
<td>Liskeard</td>
<td>PL14 3DZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlisle City District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept</td>
<td>Civic Centre</td>
<td>Carlisle</td>
<td>CA3 89G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrick District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept</td>
<td>Carrick House, Pydar Street</td>
<td>Truro</td>
<td>TR1 1EB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheltenham District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept, Promenade</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cheltenham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept</td>
<td>Peacock Centre, Low Pavement</td>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>S40 1FB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester District Council</td>
<td>Tourist Information Office</td>
<td>29a South Street</td>
<td>Chichester</td>
<td>PO19 1EL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorley District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>Council Offices, Gillibrand Street</td>
<td>Chorley</td>
<td>PR7 2EL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept, Bridge Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td>BH23 1AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester District Council</td>
<td>Marketing &amp; Tourism Office, PO Box 331</td>
<td>Town Hall, High Street</td>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>CO1 1GL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copeland District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Inf. Office</td>
<td>Market Place</td>
<td>Whitehaven</td>
<td>CA28 7JG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corby District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>Civic Centre, George Street</td>
<td>Corby</td>
<td>NN17 1QB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crewe &amp; Nantwich District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office, Municipal Buildings</td>
<td>Earl Street</td>
<td>Crewe</td>
<td>CW1 2BJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dacorum District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept, Civic Centre</td>
<td>Marlowes</td>
<td>Hemel Hempstead</td>
<td>HP1 1HH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlington District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept</td>
<td>10 Houndgate</td>
<td>Darlington</td>
<td>DL1 5RE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derbyshire Dales District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>Matlock</td>
<td>DE4 3NN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham City District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>Byland Lodge, Hawthorn Terrace</td>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>DH1 4TD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbourne District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>College Road</td>
<td>Eastbourne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lindsey District Council</td>
<td>Leisure &amp; Tourism Office</td>
<td>Teddar Hall, Manby Park</td>
<td>Louth</td>
<td>LN11 8UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Northamptonshire District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>14 West Street</td>
<td>Oundle</td>
<td>PE8 4EF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Staffordshire District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dev Office, Tourist Info. Centre</td>
<td>Unit 40, Octagon Centre, New Street</td>
<td>Burton upon Trent</td>
<td>DE14 3TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epping Forest District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept, Civic Offices</td>
<td>High Street</td>
<td>Epping</td>
<td>CM16 4BZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter (City) District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>Civic Centre</td>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>EX1 1RP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fareham District Council</td>
<td>Tourism &amp; Leisure Office,</td>
<td>PO Box 14, Civic Offices</td>
<td>Fareham</td>
<td>PO16 7TR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest of Dean</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td>Coleford</td>
<td>GL16 8HG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Address1</th>
<th>Address2</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fylde District Council</td>
<td>Tourism &amp; Leisure Dept</td>
<td>188 Clifton Drive</td>
<td>St Annes</td>
<td>FY8 1LH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gedling District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept, Civic Centre</td>
<td>Arnot Hill Park, Arnold</td>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>NG5 6LU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillingham District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept</td>
<td>Municipal Buildings</td>
<td>Gillingham</td>
<td>ME7 5LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester (City) District Council</td>
<td>Leisure &amp; Tourism Office</td>
<td>Herbert Warehouse, The Decks</td>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>GL1 2EQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravesham District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept, Civic centre</td>
<td>Windmill Street</td>
<td>Gravesend</td>
<td>DA12 1AU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Yarmouth District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>Town Hall, Hall Quay</td>
<td>Great Yarmouth</td>
<td>NR30 2FP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dev Office</td>
<td>Millmead House, Millmead</td>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>GU2 5BB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrogate District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept, Harrogate Internat</td>
<td>Kings Road</td>
<td>Harrogate</td>
<td>HG1 5LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings District Council</td>
<td>Tourism &amp; Leisure Dept</td>
<td>5 Robertson Terrace</td>
<td>Hastings</td>
<td>TN34 1JE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hereford City District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Services</td>
<td>Widemarsh Street</td>
<td>Hereford</td>
<td>HR4 9EH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Peak District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept</td>
<td>Pavilion Gardens, St Johns Road</td>
<td>Buxton</td>
<td>SK17 6BE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinckley &amp; Bosworth District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept, Council Offices</td>
<td>Argents Mead</td>
<td>Hinckley, Leics</td>
<td>LE10 1BZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hove District Council</td>
<td>Marketing &amp; Tourism Dept</td>
<td>Kingsway</td>
<td>Hove</td>
<td>BN3 2WW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyndburn District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>Council Offices, Eagle Street</td>
<td>Accrington</td>
<td>BB5 1LN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>Civic Centre, Civic Drive</td>
<td>Ipswich</td>
<td>IP1 2EE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennet District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept</td>
<td>Browfort, Bath Road</td>
<td>Devizes</td>
<td>SN10 2AT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Information Office</td>
<td>Sheep Street</td>
<td>Kettering</td>
<td>NN16 0ANU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster (City) District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>LA1 1FJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester City District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept</td>
<td>7-9 Every Street, Town Hall Square</td>
<td>Leicester</td>
<td>LE1 6AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leominster District Council</td>
<td>Leisure &amp; Tourism Offices</td>
<td>PO Box 3</td>
<td>Leominster</td>
<td>HR6 8LU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewes District Council</td>
<td>Leisure &amp; Tourism Office</td>
<td>Lewes House, 32 High Street</td>
<td>Lewes</td>
<td>BN7 2LX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lichfield District Council</td>
<td>Tourist Information Centre</td>
<td>Donegal House, Bore Street</td>
<td>Lichfield</td>
<td>WS12 6NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macclesfield District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Services Dept</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>Macclesfield</td>
<td>SK10 1AH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maidstone District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Development Office</td>
<td>12 Tonbridge Road</td>
<td>Maidstone</td>
<td>ME16 8HG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldon District Council</td>
<td>Leisure &amp; Tourism Dept</td>
<td>Council Office, Princes Road</td>
<td>Maldon</td>
<td>CM9 7DL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malvern Hills District Council</td>
<td>Marketing &amp; Tourism Office</td>
<td>Rockcliffe, Church Street</td>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td>WR14 2AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melton District</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>Council Offices, Melton Mowbray</td>
<td>Melton</td>
<td>LE13 OUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Address1</td>
<td>Address2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Postal Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Bedfordshire District Council</td>
<td>Leisure &amp; Tourism Dept</td>
<td>23 London Road</td>
<td>Biggleswade</td>
<td>SG18 8ER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton Keynes District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Development Office</td>
<td>1 Saxon Gate East</td>
<td>Milton Keynes</td>
<td>MK9 3HG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark &amp; Sherwood District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>Kelham Hall</td>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>NG23 5 QX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newbury District Council</td>
<td>Tourism &amp; Marketing Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices, Market Street</td>
<td>Newbury</td>
<td>RG14 5LD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle-under-Lyme District Council</td>
<td>Leisure &amp; Tourism Dept</td>
<td>Civic Offices, Merrial Street</td>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>ST5 2AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Forest District Council</td>
<td>Tourism &amp; Publicity Office</td>
<td>Appletree Court</td>
<td>Lyndhurst</td>
<td>SO43 7FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept</td>
<td>The Guildhall</td>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>NN1 1DA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Devon District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Development Dept</td>
<td>Civic Centre</td>
<td>Barnstaple</td>
<td>EX31 1EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Warwickshire District Council</td>
<td>Leisure &amp; Tourism Office</td>
<td>South Street</td>
<td>Atherstone</td>
<td>CV9 1BD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Wiltshire District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Services Office</td>
<td>The Citadel, Bath Road</td>
<td>Chippenham</td>
<td>SN15 2AA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich City District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept</td>
<td>The Guildhall, Gaol Hill</td>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>NR2 1NF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept</td>
<td>Castlegate House, 24-30 Castlegate</td>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>NG1 7AT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuneaton &amp; Bedford District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>Nuneaton</td>
<td>CV11 5AA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oswestry District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>Council Offices, Castle View</td>
<td>Oswestry</td>
<td>SY11 1JR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pendle District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>BB9 7LG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penwith District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>Council Office, St Clare</td>
<td>Penzance</td>
<td>TR18 3QW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth (City) District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>Civic Centre</td>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>PL1 2EW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poole District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>Poole Quay</td>
<td>Poole</td>
<td>BH15 2SQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>Civic Offices, Guildhall</td>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>PO1 2BG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston District Council</td>
<td>Leisure &amp; Tourism</td>
<td>Guild Hall</td>
<td>Preston</td>
<td>PR1 1HT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading District Council</td>
<td>Publicity &amp; Tourism Office</td>
<td>Civic Centre</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>RG1 7TD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restormel District Council</td>
<td>Tourism &amp; Leisure Office</td>
<td>Borough Office, Penwithick Road</td>
<td>St Austell</td>
<td>PL25 5DR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribble Valley District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>Council Offices, Church Walk</td>
<td>Clitheroe</td>
<td>BB7 2RA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmondshire District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>Friars Wynd</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>DL10 4RT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester upon Medway City District Council</td>
<td>Tourism &amp; Marketing Office</td>
<td>Civic Centre, Stroud</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>ME2 4AW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossendale District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Management Dept</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>Rawtenstall</td>
<td>BB4 7LZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryedale District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Services</td>
<td>Ryedale House</td>
<td>Malton</td>
<td>YO17 0HH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Edmundsbury District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Info. Centre</td>
<td>Borough Offices, Angel Hill</td>
<td>Bury St Edmunds</td>
<td>IP33 1XB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Address 1</td>
<td>Address 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Postal Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury District Council</td>
<td>Development &amp; Tourism Office</td>
<td>The Council House, Bourne Hill</td>
<td>Salisbury</td>
<td>SP1 3UZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarborough District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>Londesborough Lodge, The Crescent</td>
<td>Scarborough</td>
<td>YO11 2FW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedge Moor District Council</td>
<td>Tourism &amp; Marketing Office</td>
<td>Bridgewater House, King Square</td>
<td>Bridgewater</td>
<td>TA6 3AR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepway District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Development Office</td>
<td>Civic Centre, Castle Hill Avenue</td>
<td>Folkestone</td>
<td>CT20 2QY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrewsbury and Atcham District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>Music Hall, The Square</td>
<td>Shrewsbury</td>
<td>SY1 1LH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southampton City District Council</td>
<td>Leisure &amp; Marketing Dept</td>
<td>Civic Centre</td>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>SO14 7LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hams District Council</td>
<td>Marketing &amp; Tourism Office</td>
<td>FollatonHouse, Plymouth Road</td>
<td>Totnes</td>
<td>TQ9 5NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Holland District Council</td>
<td>Leisure &amp; Marketing Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices, Priory Road</td>
<td>Spalding</td>
<td>PE11 2XE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lakeland District Council</td>
<td>Assets &amp; Dev. Office</td>
<td>South Lakeland House, Lowther Street</td>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>LA9 4UQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Norfolk District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>South Norfolk House, Swan Lane</td>
<td>Long Stratton</td>
<td>NR15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Somerset District Council</td>
<td>Tourism &amp; Marketing Office</td>
<td>Council Offices, Brympton Way</td>
<td>Yeovil</td>
<td>BA20 2HT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stafford District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>Civic Offices, Riverside</td>
<td>Stafford</td>
<td>ST16 3AQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffordshire Moorlands District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>1 Market Place</td>
<td>Leek</td>
<td>ST13 5HH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoke-on-Trent District Council</td>
<td>City Tourism Office</td>
<td>FO Box 670, Civic Centre, Glebe Street</td>
<td>Stoke-on-Trent</td>
<td>ST4 1RF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford-on-Avon District Council</td>
<td>Tourism &amp; Development Office</td>
<td>Elizabeth House, Church Street</td>
<td>Stratford-upon-Avon</td>
<td>CV37 6HX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroud District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>Stroud Subscription Rooms</td>
<td>Stroud</td>
<td>Glos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk Coast District Council</td>
<td>Leisure &amp; Tourism Dept</td>
<td>Melton Hill</td>
<td>Woodbridge</td>
<td>IP12 1AU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swale District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dev. Office</td>
<td>Swale House, East Street</td>
<td>Sittingbourne</td>
<td>ME10 3HT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamworth District Council</td>
<td>Dev. Servs. Office</td>
<td>Marhnion House, Lichfield Street</td>
<td>Tamworth</td>
<td>B79 7BZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teignbridge District Council</td>
<td>Leisure &amp; Tourism Office</td>
<td>Forde House</td>
<td>Newton Abbot</td>
<td>TQ12 4XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendring District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td>Weeley</td>
<td>CO16 9AJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanet District Council</td>
<td>Tourism &amp; Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices, Cecil Street</td>
<td>Margate</td>
<td>CT9 1XZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonbridge and Malling District Council</td>
<td>Promotions Office</td>
<td>Tonbridge Castle</td>
<td>Tonbridge</td>
<td>TN9 1BG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torbay District Council</td>
<td>Tourism &amp; Marketing Dept</td>
<td>Torbay Tourist Board, Vaughan Parade</td>
<td>Torquay</td>
<td>TQ2 5JG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunbridge Wells District Council</td>
<td>Tourism &amp; Marketing Dept</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>Royal Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>TN1 1RS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Address1</td>
<td>Address2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Postal Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tynedale District Council</td>
<td>Leisure &amp; Tourism Office</td>
<td>Prospect House</td>
<td>Hexham</td>
<td>NE46 3NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vale Royal District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>Wyvern House, The Drumber</td>
<td>Winsford</td>
<td>CW7 1AH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick District Council</td>
<td>Marketing Dept</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>Royal Leamington Spa</td>
<td>CV32 4AT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waveney District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Services</td>
<td>Mariners Street</td>
<td>Lowestoft</td>
<td>NR32 1JT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellingborough District Council</td>
<td>Rec. &amp; Amen Office</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td>Wellenbrough</td>
<td>NN8 1BP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Oxfordshire District Council</td>
<td>Tourism &amp; Countryside Office</td>
<td>Council Offices, Woodgreen</td>
<td>Winchester</td>
<td>OX8 6NB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester City District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>City Offices, Colebrook Street</td>
<td>Winchester</td>
<td>SQ23 9LJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester City District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Services</td>
<td>Orchard House, Farrier Street</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>WR1 3BW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthing District Council</td>
<td>Tourism &amp; Ents.</td>
<td>Fortland House, Richmond Road</td>
<td>Worthing</td>
<td>BN11 1HJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrekin District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>Civic Offices, PO Box 212</td>
<td>Telford</td>
<td>TF3 4LD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wychavon District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept</td>
<td>Civic Centre, Queen Elizabeth Drive</td>
<td>Pershore</td>
<td>WR10 1PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wycombe District Council</td>
<td>Direct Leisure Services, Council Officers</td>
<td>Queen Victoria Road</td>
<td>High Wycombe</td>
<td>HP11 1BB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyre District Council</td>
<td>Countryside Leisure &amp; Tourism Office</td>
<td>Wyre Civic Centre, Breck Road</td>
<td>Poulton-le-Fylde</td>
<td>FY6 7PU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyre Forest District Council</td>
<td>Local Plans &amp; Tourism Office</td>
<td>Land Oak House, Chester Road North</td>
<td>Kidderminster</td>
<td>DY10 1TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath &amp; North East Somerset Council</td>
<td>Bath Tourism Bureau,</td>
<td>Abbey Chambers, Abbey Church Yard</td>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>BA1 1LY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office, The Council House</td>
<td>College Green</td>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>BS1 5TR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Riding Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>County Hall</td>
<td>Beverley</td>
<td>HU17 9BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartlepool Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>Civic Centre</td>
<td>Hartlepool</td>
<td>TS24 8AY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston upon Hull Council</td>
<td>Tourism &amp; Marketing Dept., Hull Tourism</td>
<td>79 Ferensway</td>
<td>Hull</td>
<td>HU2 8LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesborough Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>PO Box 99A, Municipal Bgs.</td>
<td>Middlesborough</td>
<td>TS1 2QQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Lincolnshire Council</td>
<td>Dev. &amp; Tourism Office, Municipal Offices</td>
<td>Town Hall Square</td>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>DN31 1HU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lincolnshire Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>18 Bigby Street</td>
<td>Brigg</td>
<td>DN20 8ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Somerset Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>Weston-Super-Mare</td>
<td>BS23 1UJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redcar &amp; Cleveland Council</td>
<td>Leisure &amp; Libs Office, Town Hall</td>
<td>Fabian Road, PO Box 8</td>
<td>South Bank</td>
<td>TS6 9AR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Gloucestershire Council</td>
<td>Leisure &amp; Community Resources Dept</td>
<td>Broad Lane Offices, Engine Common Lane</td>
<td>Yate</td>
<td>BS17 5PN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton-on-Tees Council</td>
<td>Leisure Services</td>
<td>Gloucester House, 72 Church Road</td>
<td>Stockton-on-Tees</td>
<td>TS18 1YB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Address1</td>
<td>Address2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Postal Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of York Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept</td>
<td>Davygate</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>YO1 2QE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaenau Gwent Council</td>
<td>Heritage &amp; Tourism Office</td>
<td>Municipal Office, Civic Centre</td>
<td>Ebbw Vale</td>
<td>NP3 6XB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgend Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office, Civic Centre</td>
<td>Angel Street</td>
<td>Bridgend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caerphilly District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>Nelson Road, Tredomen</td>
<td>Ystrad Mynach, Hengoed</td>
<td>CF82 7WF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office, c/o South Glamorgan CC</td>
<td>County Hall, Atlantic Wharf</td>
<td>Cardiff</td>
<td>CF1 5UW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmarthenshire Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office,</td>
<td>Tw Elwyn</td>
<td>Llanelli</td>
<td>SA15 3AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceredigion Council</td>
<td>Marketing Dept</td>
<td>Lisburn House, Terrace Road</td>
<td>Aberystwyth</td>
<td>SY23 2AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conway Council</td>
<td>Tourism &amp; Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Glan-y-Don, Civic Centre</td>
<td>Colwyn Bay</td>
<td>LL29 8AR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denbighshire Council</td>
<td>Tourism &amp; Leisure Services</td>
<td>Russell House, Churton Road</td>
<td>Rhyif</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flintshire Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>County Hall</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>CH7 6NB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwynedd Council</td>
<td>Marketing Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td>Caernarfon</td>
<td>LL55 18H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isle of Anglesey Council</td>
<td>Marketing Office, Council Offices</td>
<td>Llangefni</td>
<td>Anglesey</td>
<td>LI77 7TW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merthyr Tydfil Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office, Civic Centre</td>
<td>Castle Street</td>
<td>Merthyr Tydfil</td>
<td>CT47 8AN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monmouthshire Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>County Hall</td>
<td>Cwmbran</td>
<td>NP44 2XH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neath Port Talbot Council</td>
<td>Marketing &amp; Tourism Centre</td>
<td>Neath Civic Centre</td>
<td>Neath</td>
<td>SA11 3QZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>Civic Centre</td>
<td>Newport</td>
<td>NP9 4UR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembrokeshire Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>Cambria House, Haverfordwest</td>
<td>Pembrokeshire</td>
<td>SA61 1TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powys Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>County Hall</td>
<td>Llandrindod Wells</td>
<td>LD1 5LG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhonda Cynon Taff Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>Mountain Ash</td>
<td>CF45 4EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swansea Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>The Guildhall</td>
<td>Swansea</td>
<td>SA1 4PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torfaen Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>Civic Centre</td>
<td>Pontypool</td>
<td>NP4 6YB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Vale of Glamorgan Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept</td>
<td>Docks Office, Subway Road</td>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>CF63 4RT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrexham Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Roxburgh House</td>
<td>Wrexham</td>
<td>LL11 1AY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shetland Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>Information Centre, Lerwick</td>
<td>Shetland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argyll &amp; Bute Council</td>
<td>Dev. &amp; Tourism Office</td>
<td>Greenfield, Alloa</td>
<td>Clackmannanshire</td>
<td>FK10 2AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Ayrshire Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office, c/o Kilmarneck &amp; Loudoun DC</td>
<td>Civic Centre</td>
<td>Kilmarnock</td>
<td>KA1 1BY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Dunbartonshire Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office, PO Box 4</td>
<td>Tom Johnson House, Civic Way</td>
<td>Kirkintilloch</td>
<td>G66 4TF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Renfrewshire Council</td>
<td>Cultural Services, Council Offices</td>
<td>Eastwood Park, Rouken Glen Road</td>
<td>Giffnock</td>
<td>G46 6UG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falkirk Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>Abbotsford House, David's Loan</td>
<td>Falkirk</td>
<td>FA3 4QH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Council</td>
<td>Tourism, Dev &amp; Marketing Office</td>
<td>Glenquhart Road</td>
<td>Inverness</td>
<td>IV3 5NX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverclyde Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office, Municipal Buildings</td>
<td>Clyde Square</td>
<td>Greenock</td>
<td>FA15 1LY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Address1</td>
<td>Address2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Postal Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlothian Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept</td>
<td>Buccleuch Street, Dalkeith</td>
<td>Midlothian</td>
<td>EH22 1DJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lanarkshire Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>Civic Centre</td>
<td>Motherwell</td>
<td>ML1 1TW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perthshire &amp; Kinross Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>PO Box 77, 1 High Street</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>PH1 5ZA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renfrewshire Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept, Municipal Buildings</td>
<td>Cotton Street</td>
<td>Paisley</td>
<td>PA1 1BU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Borders Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept</td>
<td>70 High Street</td>
<td>Selkirk</td>
<td>TD7 4DD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Ayrshire Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>PO Box 1996, Wellington Square</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td>KA7 1DS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lanarkshire Council</td>
<td>Tourism, Council Offices</td>
<td>Almada Street</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>ML3 0AA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stirling Council</td>
<td>Tourism &amp; Marketing Dept</td>
<td>Viewforth</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>FK8 2LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Dunbartonshire Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office, Council Offices</td>
<td>Garshake Road</td>
<td>Dumbarton</td>
<td>G82 3FU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lothian Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office, District HQ</td>
<td>South Bridge Street, Bathgate</td>
<td>West Lothian</td>
<td>EH47 1TS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ards District Council</td>
<td>Tour.Dev.Office</td>
<td>2 Church Street</td>
<td>Newtownards</td>
<td>BT23 4AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armagh District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dev. Office</td>
<td>The Palace Demesne</td>
<td>Armagh</td>
<td>BT60 4EL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballymena Council</td>
<td>Dev. &amp; Leis Services</td>
<td>80 Galgorm Road</td>
<td>Ballymena</td>
<td>BT42 1AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banbridge District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office, Council Offices</td>
<td>Downshire Road</td>
<td>Banbridge</td>
<td>BT32 3JY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrickfergus District Council</td>
<td>Tourist Info Centre</td>
<td>Heritage Plaza</td>
<td>Carrickfergus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coleraine District Council</td>
<td>Tourism &amp; Arts Office</td>
<td>Cloonavin</td>
<td>Coleraine</td>
<td>BT52 1EY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craigavon District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>Civic Centre, Lakeview Road</td>
<td>Craigavon</td>
<td>BT64 1AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Down District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office</td>
<td>74 Market Street</td>
<td>Downpatrick</td>
<td>BT30 6LZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dungannon District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Services, Council Offices</td>
<td>Circular Road</td>
<td>Dungannon</td>
<td>BT70 1HT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisburn District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Services, Borough Offices</td>
<td>The Square</td>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td>BT26 6AH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magherafelt District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept, Council Offices</td>
<td>50 Ballyronan Road, Magherafelt</td>
<td>Londonderry</td>
<td>BT45 6EN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moyle District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept., Sheskburn House</td>
<td>7 Mary Street, Ballycastle</td>
<td>Co. Antrim</td>
<td>BT54 6QH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newry &amp; Mourne District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Dept, Haughey House</td>
<td>Unit 19 Rampart Road, Greenbank Industrial Estate</td>
<td>Newry</td>
<td>BT34 2QU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Down District Council</td>
<td>Tourism Office, Tower House</td>
<td>Quay Street</td>
<td>Bangor</td>
<td>BT20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omagh District Council</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Tourism Dept</td>
<td>The Grange, Mountjoy Road</td>
<td>Omagh</td>
<td>BT79 7BL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochford District Council</td>
<td>Info. Office, Council Offices</td>
<td>South Street</td>
<td>Rochford</td>
<td>SS4 1BW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

RESEARCH PHASE II

LISTING OF LOCAL AUTHORITY COUNCILS WHOSE TOURISM FUNCTIONS ARE STATED AS EXISTING WITHIN LEISURE SERVICES

(N=200/471; MUNICIPAL YEARBOOK, 1997)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Address 1</th>
<th>Address 2</th>
<th>Address 3</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barking &amp; Dagenham Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td>Barking</td>
<td>G11 7LU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnet Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>1 Friern Barnet Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td>London</td>
<td>N1 3DL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brent Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>4th Floor, Brent House West</td>
<td>349 - 357 High Road</td>
<td>Wembley</td>
<td>HA9 6BZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromley Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Central Library</td>
<td>High Street</td>
<td>Bromley</td>
<td>BR1 1EX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Crowndale Centre</td>
<td>218-220 Evershot Street</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>NW1 2BD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation of London Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>West Ham Park</td>
<td>Upton Lane, Forest Gate</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>E7 9PU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Crossfield House</td>
<td>Mint Walk</td>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>CR9 1BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ealing Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Perceval House</td>
<td>Uxbridge Road</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>W5 2HL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfield Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>PO Box 58</td>
<td>Civic Centre, Silver Street</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>EN1 3XJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haringey Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Tottenham Green Centre</td>
<td>1 Philip Lane</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>N1 5 4JA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrow Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>PO Box Green</td>
<td>Civic Centre, Station Road</td>
<td>Harrow</td>
<td>HA1 2UZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havering Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>The Broxhill Centre</td>
<td>West Havering</td>
<td>Romford</td>
<td>RM4 1XN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillingdon Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Civic Centre</td>
<td>Uxbridge</td>
<td>Middx</td>
<td>UB8 1UW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Civic Centre</td>
<td>Lampton Road</td>
<td>Hounslow</td>
<td>TW3 4DN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Office</td>
<td>37 Pembroke Road</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>W8 6PW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Courtenay House</td>
<td>9-15 New Park Road</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>SW2 4DU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Laurence House</td>
<td>1 Catford Road</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>SE6 4RU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merton Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Merton Civic Centre</td>
<td>London Road</td>
<td>Morden</td>
<td>SM4 5DX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newham Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>292 Barking Road</td>
<td>East Ham</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>E6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redbridge Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Lynton House</td>
<td>255-259 High Road</td>
<td>Ilford</td>
<td>IG1 1NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond upon Thames Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Langholm Lodge</td>
<td>146 Petersham Road</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>TW10 6UX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>15 Spa Road</td>
<td>Bermondsey</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>SE16 3QW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford Forest Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Sycamore House</td>
<td>Town Hall, Forest Road</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>E17 7JH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandsworth Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Wandsworth Town Hall</td>
<td>Wandsworth High Street</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>SW18 2PU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster City Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Westminster City Hall</td>
<td>Victoria Street</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>SW1 6QP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnsley District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Berneslai Close</td>
<td></td>
<td>Barnsley</td>
<td>S70 2HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham City District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>PO Box 2122</td>
<td>Baskerville House, Broad Street</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>B1 2NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolton District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>The Wellsprings</td>
<td>Civic Centre</td>
<td>Bolton</td>
<td>BL1 1US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bury District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Manchester Road</td>
<td>Bury</td>
<td>Bury</td>
<td>BL9 0DG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coventry City District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Spire House</td>
<td>New Union Street</td>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td>CV1 2FS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Claughton House</td>
<td>Blowers Green Road</td>
<td>Dudley</td>
<td>DY2 8UZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowsley District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>PO Box 22</td>
<td>Municipal Buildings, Knowsley</td>
<td>Knowsley</td>
<td>L36 9YX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Address1</td>
<td>Address2</td>
<td>Address3</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Postal Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool City District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>3rd Floor, Steers House</td>
<td>Canning Place</td>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>L1 8HN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Civic Council</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>Oldham</td>
<td>NE1 8DQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldham District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>PO Box 40</td>
<td>Civic Centre, West Street</td>
<td>Oldham</td>
<td>OL1 1XJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochdale District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>PO Box 122, Municipal Offices</td>
<td>Smith Street</td>
<td>Rochdale</td>
<td>OL16 1YB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherham District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Grove Road</td>
<td>Rotherham</td>
<td></td>
<td>S60 2ER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salford City District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Vulcan House</td>
<td>Albion Place, Crescent</td>
<td>Salford</td>
<td>M15 4NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandwell District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>PO Box 41 Shaftsbury Avenue</td>
<td>402 High Street</td>
<td>West Bromwich</td>
<td>B70 9LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield City District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>PO Box 51, Meersbrook Park</td>
<td>Brook Road</td>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>S8 9FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solihull District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council House</td>
<td>Solihull</td>
<td></td>
<td>B91 3QT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockport District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Stopford House</td>
<td>Piccadilly</td>
<td>Stockport</td>
<td>SK1 3XE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunderland District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>PO Box 101</td>
<td>Civic Centre</td>
<td>Sunderland</td>
<td>SR2 7DN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trafford District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Trafford Town Hall</td>
<td>Talbot Road, Stretford</td>
<td>Trafford</td>
<td>M32 OYZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsall District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>PO Box 42</td>
<td>Civic Centre</td>
<td>Walsall</td>
<td>WS1 1TZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolverhampton District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Civic Centre</td>
<td>St Peter's Square</td>
<td>Wolverhampton</td>
<td>WV1 1Sj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adur District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Civic Centre</td>
<td>Ham Road</td>
<td>Shoreham by Sea</td>
<td>BN43 6FR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashfield District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td>Urban Road</td>
<td>Kirkby-in-Ashfield</td>
<td>NG17 8DA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aylesbury Vale District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>84 Walton Street</td>
<td>Aylesbury</td>
<td></td>
<td>HF21 7QP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babergh District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td>Corks Lane, Hadleigh</td>
<td>Ipswich</td>
<td>IP7 6SJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrow-in-Furness District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>Barrow-in-Furness</td>
<td></td>
<td>LA14 1HU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basildon District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Central Depot</td>
<td>Barleylands Road</td>
<td>Billericay</td>
<td>CM11 2UF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berwick on Tweed District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td>Wallace Green</td>
<td>Berwick on Tweed</td>
<td>TD15 1ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaby District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td>Narborough</td>
<td>Leicester</td>
<td>LE9 5EP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolsover District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Sherwood Lodge</td>
<td>Bolsover</td>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>S44 6NF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bracknell Forest District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Easthampstead House</td>
<td>Town Square</td>
<td>Bracknell</td>
<td>RG12 1AQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breckland District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>The Guildhall</td>
<td>Dereham</td>
<td></td>
<td>NR19 1EE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadland District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Thorpe Lodge, 1 Yarmouth Road</td>
<td>Thorpe St Andrew</td>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>NR7 0DU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromsgrove District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td>Burcot Lane</td>
<td>Bromsgrove</td>
<td>B60 1AA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broxbourne District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Bishops College</td>
<td>Churchgate</td>
<td>Waltham Cross</td>
<td>EN8 9XF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broxtowe District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices, Forest Avenue</td>
<td>Beeston</td>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>NG9 1AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury City District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>49 Harbour Street</td>
<td>Whitstable</td>
<td></td>
<td>CT5 1AX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Address1</td>
<td>Address2</td>
<td>Address3</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Postal Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Point District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td>Kiln Road</td>
<td>Benfleet</td>
<td>SS7 1TF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Morpeth District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td>The Kylins</td>
<td>Morpeth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charwood District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Southfields</td>
<td></td>
<td>Loughborough</td>
<td>LE11 2TT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelmsford District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices, Civic Centre</td>
<td>Duke Street</td>
<td>Chelmsford</td>
<td>CM1 1JE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherwell District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Bodicote House</td>
<td></td>
<td>Banbury</td>
<td>OX15 4AA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester City District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>The Forum</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>CH1 2HN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester-le-Street Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Civic Centre</td>
<td>Newcastle Road</td>
<td>Chester-le-Street</td>
<td>DH3 3UT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiltern District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td>King George V Road</td>
<td>Amersham</td>
<td>HP6 5AW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congleton District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Municipal Offices</td>
<td>Market Square</td>
<td>Congleton</td>
<td>CW12 1EX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotswold District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Cotswold Leisure Services</td>
<td>Tetbury Road</td>
<td>Cirencester</td>
<td>GL7 1US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craven District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td>Granville Street</td>
<td>Skipton</td>
<td>BD12 1PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawley District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>The Boulevard</td>
<td>Crawley</td>
<td>RH10 1UZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartford District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Civic Centre</td>
<td>Home Gardens</td>
<td>Dartford</td>
<td>DA1 1DR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daventry District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Lodge Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>Daventry</td>
<td>NN11 5AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derby City District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council House</td>
<td>Corporation Street</td>
<td>Derby</td>
<td>DE1 2FS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derwentside District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>The Louisa Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stanley</td>
<td>DH9 0TE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td>Whitecliffs Business Park</td>
<td>Dover</td>
<td>CT16 3PG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easington District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>30 Yoden Way</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peterlee</td>
<td>SR8 1AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Cambridgeshire District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Paradise Poole</td>
<td>Ely</td>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Devon District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td>Knowle</td>
<td>Sidmouth</td>
<td>EX10 8HL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Dorset District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td>Furzehill</td>
<td>Wimborne</td>
<td>BH21 4HN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Hampshire District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Penns Place</td>
<td></td>
<td>Petersfield</td>
<td>GU31 4EX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Hertfordshire District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>PO Box 103</td>
<td>Wall Fields, Pegs Lane</td>
<td>Hertford</td>
<td>SG13 8EQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastleigh District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Civic Offices</td>
<td>George Road</td>
<td>Eastleigh</td>
<td>SO50 9YN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eden District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Mansion House</td>
<td>Penrith</td>
<td>Cumbria</td>
<td>CA11 7YG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellesmere Port &amp; Neston District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td>4 Civic Way</td>
<td>Ellesmere Port</td>
<td>L65 0BE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embridge District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Civic Centre</td>
<td>High Street</td>
<td>Esher</td>
<td>KT10 9SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epsom &amp; Ewell District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>The Parade</td>
<td>Epsom</td>
<td>KT18 5BY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erewash District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>Long Eaton</td>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>NG10 1HU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenland District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Fenland Hall, County Road</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>Cambs</td>
<td>PE15 8NQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Heath District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>District Offices</td>
<td>College Heath Road</td>
<td>Mildenhall</td>
<td>IP28 7EY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Address1</td>
<td>Address2</td>
<td>Address3</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Postal Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosport District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>Gosport</td>
<td>Hants</td>
<td>PO12 1EB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halton District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>Heath Road</td>
<td>Runcorn</td>
<td>WA7 7TD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hambledon District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Civic Centre</td>
<td>Stone Cross</td>
<td>Northallerton</td>
<td>DL6 2UU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harborough District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td>Adam &amp; Eve Street</td>
<td>Market Harborough</td>
<td>LE16 7AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlow District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>The High</td>
<td>Harlow</td>
<td>CM20 1HJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hart District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Civic Offices</td>
<td>Harlington Way</td>
<td>Fleet</td>
<td>GU13 8AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havant District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Civic Centre Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>Havant</td>
<td>PO9 2AX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hertsmere District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Civic Offices</td>
<td>Elstree Way</td>
<td>Borehamwood</td>
<td>WD6 1WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsham District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Park House</td>
<td>North Street</td>
<td>Horsham</td>
<td>RH12 1RL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntingdonshire District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Pathfinder House</td>
<td>St Mary's Street</td>
<td>Huntingdon</td>
<td>FE18 6TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerrier District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td></td>
<td>Camborne</td>
<td>TR14 8SX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Lynn &amp; West Norfolk District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td>Valentine Road</td>
<td>Hunstanton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln City District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>City Hall</td>
<td>Beaumont Fee</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>LN1 1BW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luton District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Wardown Park</td>
<td>Old Bedford Road</td>
<td>Luton</td>
<td>LU2 7HA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Civic Centre</td>
<td>Chesterfield Road South</td>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>NG19 7BH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendip District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td>Cannards Grave Road</td>
<td>Shepton Mallet</td>
<td>BA4 5BT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Devon District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Ailsa House</td>
<td>Tidcombe Lane</td>
<td>Tiverton</td>
<td>EX16 4DZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Suffolk District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td>Needham Market</td>
<td>IP6 8DL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Sussex District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Oaklands Road</td>
<td>Haywards Heath</td>
<td>RH16 1SS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mole Valley District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Pippbrook</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dorking</td>
<td>RH4 1SJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dorset District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Norden, Salisbury Road</td>
<td>Blandford Forum</td>
<td>Dorset</td>
<td>DT11 7LL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Derbyshire District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council House</td>
<td>Sallergate</td>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>S40 1LF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hertfordshire District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td>Gernon Street</td>
<td>Letchworth</td>
<td>SG6 3JF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Kesteven District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>PO Box 3, District Council Offices</td>
<td>Kesteven street</td>
<td>Sleaford</td>
<td>NG34 7EF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Norfolk District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>PO Box 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cromer</td>
<td>NR27 9EL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West Leicestershire District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coalville</td>
<td>LE67 2JF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oadby &amp; Wigston District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td>Station Road</td>
<td>Wigston</td>
<td>LE18 2DR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford City District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>109 - 113 St. Aldates</td>
<td>Church Street</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>OX1 1DS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterborough District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Norwich Union House</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peterborough</td>
<td>PE1 1HZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purbeck District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Purbeck Sports Centre</td>
<td>Worgret Road</td>
<td>Wareham</td>
<td>BH20 4PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redditch District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>Alcester Street</td>
<td>Redditch</td>
<td>B98 8AH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Address1</td>
<td>Address2</td>
<td>Address3</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Postal Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigate &amp; Banstead District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>Reigate</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>RH2 0SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rother District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>10 London Road</td>
<td>Bexhill</td>
<td>TN39 3JU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>CV21 2LB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runnymede District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Civic Offices</td>
<td>Station Road</td>
<td>Addlestone</td>
<td>KT15 2AH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushcliffe District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Civic Centre</td>
<td>Pavilion Road,</td>
<td>West Bridgford</td>
<td>NG2 5FE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushmoor District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td>Farnborough</td>
<td>Farnborough</td>
<td>GU14 7JY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutland District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Catmose</td>
<td>Oakham</td>
<td>Rutland</td>
<td>LE15 6HP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Albans City District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Civic Centre</td>
<td>St Albans</td>
<td>AL1 3JE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedgemoor District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>King Square</td>
<td>Bridgewater</td>
<td>TA 3AR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selby District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>The Civic Centre</td>
<td>Fortholme Road</td>
<td>Selby</td>
<td>YO8 0SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sevenoaks District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Argyle Road</td>
<td>Sevenoaks</td>
<td>TN13 1HG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slough District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>Bath Road</td>
<td>Slough</td>
<td>SL1 3UQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bedfordshire District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>District Offices</td>
<td>High Street North</td>
<td>Dunstable</td>
<td>LU6 1LF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bucks District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td>Windsor Road</td>
<td>Slough</td>
<td>SL1 2HN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Cambridgeshire District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>9-11 Hills Road</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>CB2 1PB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Derbyshire District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Civic Offices</td>
<td>Civic Way</td>
<td>Swadlincote</td>
<td>DE1 0AH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southend-on-Sea District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Civic Centre</td>
<td>Southend on Sea</td>
<td>SS2 6ER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Herefordshire District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Brockington</td>
<td>35 Hadford Road</td>
<td>Hereford</td>
<td>HR1 1SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Kesteven District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td>St Peter's Hill</td>
<td>Grantham</td>
<td>NG31 6FZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Northamptonshire District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Springfields</td>
<td>Towcester</td>
<td>NN12 6AE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Oxfordshire District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td>PO Box 21, Crowmarsh</td>
<td>Wallingford</td>
<td>OX10 8HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Ribble District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Civic Centre</td>
<td>West Paddock</td>
<td>Leyland</td>
<td>PR5 1DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Shropshire District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Stone House</td>
<td>Gorve Street</td>
<td>Ludlow</td>
<td>SY8 1DG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Staffordshire District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td>Codsall</td>
<td>WVS 1FX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelthorne District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td>Knowle Green</td>
<td>Staines</td>
<td>TW18 1XB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevenage District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Daneshill House</td>
<td>Danestrete</td>
<td>Stevenage</td>
<td>SG1 1HN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey Heath District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Surrey Heath House</td>
<td>Knoll Road</td>
<td>Camberley</td>
<td>GU15 3HD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taunton Deane District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Deane House</td>
<td>Belvedere Road</td>
<td>Taunton</td>
<td>TA1 1HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teesdale District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Teesdale Sports Centre</td>
<td>Strathmore Road</td>
<td>Barnard Castle</td>
<td>DL12 8DS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teignbridge District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Forde House</td>
<td>Newton Abbot</td>
<td>TQ12 4XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendring District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>Clacton-on-Sea</td>
<td>CO15 1SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Valley District</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Beech Hurst</td>
<td>Weyhill Road</td>
<td>Andover</td>
<td>SP10 3A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Address1</td>
<td>Address2</td>
<td>Address3</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Postal Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tewkesbury District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td>Gloucester Road</td>
<td>Tewkesbury</td>
<td>GL20 5TT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thamesdown District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Civic Offices</td>
<td></td>
<td>Swindon</td>
<td>SN1 2JH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Rivers District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Three Rivers House</td>
<td>Northway</td>
<td>Rickmansworth</td>
<td>WD3 1RL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurrock District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Civic Offices</td>
<td>Grays</td>
<td>Thurrock</td>
<td>RM17 6NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torridge District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Riverbank House</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bideford</td>
<td>EX39 2QG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulllesthorpe District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td>London Road</td>
<td>Saffron Walden</td>
<td>DB11 4ER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vale of White Horse District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>The Abbey House</td>
<td></td>
<td>Abingdon</td>
<td>OX14 3JE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wansbeck District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>DSO Bomarsund Depot, East View</td>
<td>Bomarsund</td>
<td>Stakeford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrington District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td>Warrington</td>
<td>WA1 1UH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watford District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td>Watford</td>
<td>WD1 3EX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waverley District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td>The Burys</td>
<td>Godalming</td>
<td>GU7 1HR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealden District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td>Vicarage Lane</td>
<td>Hailsham</td>
<td>BN27 2AX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wear Valley District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Civic Centre</td>
<td>Crook</td>
<td></td>
<td>DL15 9ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welwyn Hatfield District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Campus West</td>
<td>The Campus</td>
<td>Welwyn Garden City</td>
<td>AL8 6BX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Devon District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Kilworth Park</td>
<td>Drake Court</td>
<td>Tavistock</td>
<td>PL19 0BZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Dorset District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Stratton House</td>
<td>58-60 High Street</td>
<td>Dorchester</td>
<td>DT1 1UZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lancashire District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>52 Derby Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ormskirk</td>
<td>L39 2DF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lindsey District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>26 Spital Terrace</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gainsborough</td>
<td>DN21 2HG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Somerset District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>20 Fore Street</td>
<td>Williton</td>
<td>Taunton</td>
<td>TA4 4QA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Wiltshire District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td>Bradley Road</td>
<td>Trowbridge</td>
<td>BA14 0RD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weymouth &amp; Portland District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Municipal Offices</td>
<td>North Quay</td>
<td>Weymouth</td>
<td>DT4 8TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor &amp; Maidenhead Royal District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>St. Ives Road</td>
<td>Maidenhead</td>
<td>SL6 1RF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woking District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Civic Offices</td>
<td>Gloucester Square</td>
<td>Woking</td>
<td>GU21 1YL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wokingham District Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td>PO Box 153, Shute End</td>
<td>Wokingham</td>
<td>RG40 1WL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orkney Island Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td>Kirkwall</td>
<td></td>
<td>KW15 1NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Isles Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices, Sandwick Road</td>
<td>Stornoway</td>
<td>Isle of Lewis</td>
<td>HS1 2BW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen City Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>St. Nicholas House</td>
<td>Broad Street</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>AB10 1GU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeenshire Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Woodhill House</td>
<td>Westburn Road</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>AB16 5EB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumfries and Galloway Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td>English Street</td>
<td>Dumfries</td>
<td>DG1 2DD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee City Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>21 City Square</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dundee</td>
<td>DD1 3BY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Ayrshire Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Buildings</td>
<td>Court Street</td>
<td>Haddington</td>
<td>EH41 3HA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Address1</td>
<td>Address2</td>
<td>Address3</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Postal Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh City Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>141/143 London Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>EH7 6AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow City Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>37 High Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>G1 1LX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moray Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>Moray</td>
<td>IV30 1BX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antrim Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>The Steeple</td>
<td></td>
<td>Antrim</td>
<td>BT41 1BJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballymoney Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Riada House</td>
<td>14 Charles Street</td>
<td>Ballymoney</td>
<td>BT53 6DZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belfast City Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Cecil Ward Building</td>
<td>4-10 Linenhall Street</td>
<td>Belfast</td>
<td>BT2 8BF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castlereagh Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Dundonald</td>
<td>111 Old Dundonald Road</td>
<td>Dundonald</td>
<td>BT16 0XT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cookstown Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td>Burn Road</td>
<td>Cookstown</td>
<td>BT80 8DT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derry City Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td>98 Strand Road</td>
<td>Derry</td>
<td>BT48 7NN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fermanagh Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>Emmiskillen</td>
<td></td>
<td>BT74 7BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larne Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Victoria Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>Larne</td>
<td>BT40 1RU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limavady Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>7 Connell Street</td>
<td>Limavady</td>
<td></td>
<td>BT49 0HA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtownabbey Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Glenmount</td>
<td>49 Church Road</td>
<td>Newtownabbey</td>
<td>BT36 7LG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strabane Council</td>
<td>Leisure Dept</td>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td>Derry Road</td>
<td>Strabane</td>
<td>BT82 8DY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

RESEARCH PHASE II

LISTING OF LOCAL AUTHORITY COUNCILS WHO SUBMITTED
TOURISM STRATEGY DOCUMENTS, AND THE INITIAL ANALYSIS OF
THOSE DOCUMENTS
(N=60)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Council</th>
<th>Type of Council</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Marketing enhancement</th>
<th>Product enhancement</th>
<th>New Icons</th>
<th>Accommodation</th>
<th>Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forest of Dean</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryedale</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Somerset</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merthyr Tydfil</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fylde</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmondshire</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hereford</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lakeland</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanarkshire</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morecambe</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedgemoor</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesborough</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Peak</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartlepool</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dungannon &amp; South Tyne</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newmarket &amp; Sherwood</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islington</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepway</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hams</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Warwickshire</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackpool</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyre</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanet</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moyle</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causeway Coast</td>
<td>Tourist Development Agency</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Council</td>
<td>Type of Council</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Product enhanced</td>
<td>New Icons</td>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester-upon-Medway</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Forest</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newbury</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Edmundsbury</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrekin</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrewsbury &amp; Atcham</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber Valley</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakefield</td>
<td>Metropolitan District Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>County Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restormel</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King's Lynn &amp; West Norfolk</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Sussex</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Dorset</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lindsey</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Hampshire</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Devon</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadland</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutland</td>
<td>County Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aylesbury Vale</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealdon</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolsover</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Derbyshire</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derby</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eden</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Valley</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Derbyshire</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Council</td>
<td>Type of Council</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Product enhanced</td>
<td>New Icons</td>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor &amp; Maidenhead</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Devon</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Staffordshire</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath &amp; N.E Somerset</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OBJECTIVES CONTINUES...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Council</th>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Partnership with Industry</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Extend Season</th>
<th>Regeneration</th>
<th>Heritage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forest of Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryedale</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Somerset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merthyr Tydfil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fylde</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmondshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hereford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lakeland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanarkshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morecambe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedgemoor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesborough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Peak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartlepool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dungannon &amp; South Tyr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark &amp; Sherwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Council</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Partnership with Industry</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Extend Season</td>
<td>Regeneration</td>
<td>Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islington</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepway</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hams</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Warwickshire</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackpool</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyre</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanet</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moyle</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causeway Coast</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester-upon-Medway</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Forest</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newbury</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Edmundsbury</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrexin</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrewsbury &amp; Atcham</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber Valley</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakefield</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restormel</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King's Lynn &amp; West Norfolk</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Sussex</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Dorset</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lindsey</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Hampshire</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Devon</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadland</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutland</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Council</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Partnership with Industry</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>External Support</td>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>Regeneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aylesbury Vale</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealden</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolsover</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Derbyshire</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derby</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eden</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Valley</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derbyshire</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor &amp; Maidenhead</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Devon</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Staffordshire</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath &amp; N.E. Somerset</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

RESEARCH PHASE II

COPY OF FACSIMILE QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO PARTICIPATING LOCAL GOVERNMENT TOURISM OFFICERS
Dear ***Name here***

Thank you for your continued efforts with regards to answering our research questions. The information that you are contributing is being analysed with a view to developing a new planning tool. The computer-based planning will be designed to assist in the construction of representative and effective public consultation. Due for completion and ready for trials within the next 10 months, we will call you to explain exactly what the system will do, and how it may benefit you in planning for tourism development.

In the meantime, we would be grateful if you could fax us your answers to the following two questions:

A) Given their response to opinion surveys, what do you believe are the main impacts of tourism as perceived by your residents? Please place them in priority order (1 being their highest priority)

1) __________________________________________________________
2) __________________________________________________________
3) __________________________________________________________
4) __________________________________________________________
5) __________________________________________________________

B) Could you list examples of actions that your council has taken within the last five years to either INCREASE, DECREASE, or MAINTAIN tourism. (e.g. Marketing campaigns, appointment of tourism officer, passing bye-laws, agreed the building of new attraction e.t.c)

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for your kind attention
APPENDIX H

RESEARCH PHASE II

EXAMPLE OF THE BRIEFING DOCUMENT SENT IN ADVANCE OF MEETINGS WITH THE TOURISM OFFICERS OF YORK, CANTERBURY AND CHESTER.
Dear,

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research. You have been approached because of your role and involvement in the planning and management of tourism within the city of ______.

As I explained on the telephone, the aim of the work is to develop a computer-based consultation model which integrates the objectives / aims and actions of your authority related to tourism, and the reactions of your residents to both the impacts of tourism and your planning actions.

I have enclosed a briefing document which represents the findings of my research to date. This document consists of three sections (A, B & C), which contain 6 tasks. I hope you will have time to consider and complete these tasks before our meeting as they will provide an invaluable introduction to our discussion.

Whilst the definitions, planning actions and impact statements are interesting in their own right, it is hoped that as a result of this stage of the research we can achieve more. The final version of the model will, it is hoped, improve the validity and reliability of resident tourism surveys, provide improved mechanisms for accountability, and illicit, in advance, a view of the likely reactions of residents to planned tourism initiatives.

Once again thank you for the time and effort you have given to assist this research. I will telephone you in a weeks time to answer any questions that you may have on the tasks. If you would like to contact me earlier, please do so on:

01483 300800 ext. 3118(W) 
01483 539703 (H)

I look forward to our meeting on ________ February 1998

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

T.G. Snaith (BA Hons; MSc.)
Ph.D Researcher
Briefing document

Section A:

Each of the strategic objectives / aims is defined (a), associated actions are identified (b) and the types of questions asked of the residents to assess their reactions to the objectives / aims and their associated actions are outlined (c).

Task 1) a) Considering the fourteen strategic objectives / aims and their definitions (1a-14a), **Do you agree with the definitions?** (Use Agree / Disagree box provided). **If not,** how do you believe they could be improved? (Use comments section provided).

Task 2) b) Examples of planning actions (1b-14b) are derived from the responses from a survey of 22 councils. **Do you pursue these actions to achieve the same strategic objectives / aims?** (Use agree / disagree boxes provided). **If not,** please comment and make additions which reflect the planning actions which your council pursues, or intends to pursue.

Task 3) c) These sections regarding related social impact statements (1c-14c) contain examples of the sort of questions which have been used in resident tourism impact studies in The United States, The United Kingdom, and Hong Kong. **Indicate which questions you would choose to ask** (use tick boxes), **Add new questions which would be useful / helpful to you.** (Use additions section)

Section B:

This section requires you to confirm / disconfirm whether or not you agree with the fourteen strategic objectives / aims which emerged from the analysis of sixty tourism plans from councils in England.

Task 4) **Confirm whether you believe that these strategic objectives / aims concern / apply to the tourism planning objectives / aims of your authority** (Use tick boxes provided). **If not,** are there others which you could add? (Use additions section)

Task 5) **Of the 14 strategic aims / objectives, please select the top four priorities at this time for your authority.** (Use boxes provided)
Next, would you indicate the four which have the lowest priority at this moment.

Section C:
Section C lists the types of socio-economic and demographic information which has been collected in previous research.

Task 6) Please tick the resident profile information which you feel would be most useful to you were you to conduct a resident tourism impact survey. (Use tick boxes provided). Please feel free to make additions.
Section A (Tasks 1-3):

Objective / aim 1a) Product Enhancement
The aim of this objective is to enhance the tourism product through, for example, the development of excellent tourist information centres, encouraging old attractions to improve and new ones to emerge, and by improving the image and identity of the destination.

Agree/Disagree □

Comments: ____________________________________________________________

1b) Tourism Planning Actions:
□ Open a Tourist Information Centre
□ Make further Investment in the Tourist Information Centre (TIC)
□ Improve services provided by the TIC (Extend opening times)
□ Provide business advice to new and existing tourism related companies

Additions: ____________________________________________________________

1c) Questions to be asked of the residents
□ Tourism development improves the appearance of York (also included under Environmental)
□ I believe that there is not enough tourist information available for visitors to York
□ Tourism improves the image and identity of York
□ Tourism improves the image of my community
□ The tourism authorities should encourage old attractions to update, refurbish & improve
□ The tourism authorities should encourage the development of new attractions
□ I like the amount of tourism development which has occurred in York

Additions: ____________________________________________________________
Objective / aim 2a) Marketing

The aim of this objective is, through promoting and advertising, to increase demand, target and protect specific markets, and to gather market intelligence to assist the aforementioned.

Agree/Disagree

Comments:

2b) Tourism Planning Actions:

☐ Publish and distribute official guidebooks (Attractions and Accommodation), promotional videos and leaflets
☐ Update marketing publications regularly
☐ Design marketing campaigns to target overseas markets (N. Europe, USA)
☐ Design marketing campaigns to target domestic markets (exhibitions, direct mail, and national advertising)
☐ Design marketing campaigns to target special interest tourists (Archaeology, themed trails, events and itineraries)
☐ Market to the travel trade (Exhibition/Trade fair attendance, Familiarisation trips and direct mailing)
☐ Participate in joint marketing initiatives with neighbouring councils
☐ Distribute information through the TIC’s, shops, post offices, and direct mailing
☐ Produce and distribute newsletters to local businesses
☐ Undertake market research to assist the council and local traders
☐ Deploy new brown attraction signs on strategic road networks
☐ Increase media attention.

Additions:

________________________________________________________________________

2c) Questions to be asked of the residents

☐ York should not try to attract more tourists
☐ I believe that tourism should play a vital role in the future of York
☐ York should try to become more of a tourist attraction
☐ Money spent on the marketing of York is well spent
☐ Attracting high spending tourists has an undesirable effect on the cost of living in York
Money spent on collecting market research to assist the management of tourism in York is money well spent.

Additions:
Objective / aim 3a) Infrastructure issues

The aim of this objective is to improve and extend transport access to the destination

Agree/Disagree □

Comments:

3b) Tourism Planning Actions:

□ Agree planning permission for a new bus station
□ Negotiate Improved / extended rail provision
□ Introduce park and ride scheme

Additions:

3c) Questions to be asked of the residents

□ Tourism has led to an improvement in the standard of transportation infrastructure (e.g. basic road, rail and air facilities)
□ Tourism has led to improved transport access to York
□ Tourism development increases the traffic problems in York
□ Tourism leads to reduced parking for residents
□ Because of tourism our roads and other public facilities are kept at a higher standard than they might otherwise be

Additions:
Objective / aim 4a) Social issues

The aim of this objective is to encourage community involvement, develop plans that benefit both tourists and residents alike, raise awareness of the benefits of tourism, improve the quality of life, encourage the locals to use facilities and educate and familiarise them with the nature of tourism.

Agree/Disagree

Comments:

4b) Tourism Planning Actions:

- Improve public consultation methods
- Introduce residents first weekends (free entry to attractions)

Additions:

4c) Questions to be asked of the residents

Tourism development…

- improves the quality of life in York
- increases the number of recreational opportunities for local residents
- increases the amount of crime in York
- leads to increased vandalism in a community (also included under Environmental)
- reduces the quality of my outdoor recreation opportunities
- When I talk to fellow residents concerning tourism, I am generally positive
- Living in a place such as York, instills in me a sense of pride in the community
- I personally receive social benefits from tourism development
- Overall I personally receive benefits from tourism development in York
- Tourism provides opportunities for residents to learn about other peoples’ cultures
- Because of the crowds during the tourist season, I cannot enjoy activities in public areas
- Tourism has increased my awareness of what York has to offer
- Tourism has improved my standard of living
- I am likely to support new tourism development in York
- Tourism creates the opportunities to meet interesting people
- Tourism helps to undermine community spirit among local residents
☐ The changes brought about by tourism creates a sense of pride in the local residents

☐ I feel that I can personally influence the decisions associated with tourism development in York (also included under Management)

☐ Tourism negatively affects a community's way of life

☐ Because of tourism, communities develop more parks and recreational areas that residents can use

☐ Shopping opportunities are better in communities as a result of tourism

☐ It is important that community residents are involved in decisions about tourism

☐ I believe that community residents share equally in the enjoyment of facilities developed for tourists

Additions:
Objective / aim 5a) Employment generation

The aim of this objective is to increase the potential for employment in the area through tourism (more of a general policy, with most tourism initiatives expected to gain some rewards in terms of employment opportunities for the region).

Agree/Disagree □

Comments:

5b) Tourism Planning Actions:

□ Build attractions and stage events which create employment opportunities

Additions: ____________________________________________________

5c) Questions to be asked of the residents

□ Tourism increases the number of jobs in York
□ I like the type of jobs which tourism brings to York
□ Tourism creates unattractive jobs which are seasonal, low paying or menial
□ Tourism attracts a transient (that is, temporary and short stay) labour force
□ Tourism development creates good jobs for local residents in York
□ Tourism creates more jobs for outsiders / foreigners than for local people in the region
□ The tourism industry provides many worthwhile job opportunities for community residents

Additions: ____________________________________________________
Objective / aim 6a) Quality assurance

The aim of this objective is to promote the theme of visitor enjoyment through improved service, training, standards, signposting and accommodation.

Comments:

6b) Tourism Planning Actions:

- Deploy pedestrian signs in towns
- Appoint a tourism training manager
- Establish awards for tourism employer's of distinction
- Establish market segmentation training courses to assist local companies in target marketing

Additions:

6c) Questions to be asked of the residents

- Service workers in York tend to be courteous towards tourists / visitors
- Overall, I think that the tourist is well catered for in York
- York is a high quality tourist destination
- The standard of service in York's restaurants, shops and bars has improved because of training initiatives linked to the tourism industry
- Whenever I talk to visitors to York they always seem to have had an enjoyable time
- Because of the improved signposting and information services, tourists very rarely have to stop local residents to ask directions
- There is ample high quality accommodation for tourists in York
- Tourism has led to increased queuing and waiting for services

Additions:
Objective / aim 7a) Partnership

The aim of this objective is to encourage joint working initiatives with local industry and neighbouring tourism offices, and to encourage inward investment and the twinning of towns

Agree/Disagree

Comments:

7b) Tourism Planning Actions:

☐ Establish tourism forum to encourage liaison between private and public sector
☐ Work in partnership with regional tourism bureau
☐ Pursue partnership activities to encourage public transport
☐ Assist attractions with lottery bids
☐ Develop closer working relationship with local trade through quarterly newsletter / meetings
☐ Form partnership agreements with national / international carriers
☐ Disseminate market research to all tourism-related businesses
☐ Support regional tourism initiatives,
☐ Join Regional Tourist Boards / Associations,
☐ Establish tourism conferences to inform / develop relations with tourism related businesses.

Additions:

7c) Questions to be asked of the residents

☐ The York city council has developed effective private sector partnerships to develop tourism development initiatives
☐ Private sector tourism related businesses have too much political influence in York
☐ York has become the poorer partner due to its association with neighbouring tourism offices
☐ I feel that York benefits from its twinning with ...
☐ York would be better served if it marketed itself rather than jointly with a neighbouring council
Additions:
Objective / aim 8a) Environmental Protection

The aim of this objective is to improve and protect the built as well as the natural environment

Agree/Disagree: □

Comments:

---

8b) Tourism Planning Actions:

- Develop projects which aim to enhance the town centre
- Introduce new environmental projects (e.g. mobile rangers, reclaimed parkland)

Additions:

---

8c) Questions to be asked of the residents

Tourism development...

- increases the traffic problems in York (also included under Infrastructure)
- improves the appearance of York (also included under Product enhancement)
- has a negative impact on the physical environment
- leads to more litter on the streets
- results in more litter in an area
- creates increased noise levels in the community
- causes a reduction in the quality of the natural environment
- offers the opportunity to preserve the environment
- provides an incentive for the restoration of historical buildings (also included under Cultural / Heritage issues)
- provides an incentive for the conservation of natural resources
- Tourism results in unpleasant crowding for the local population
- The construction of hotels & other tourist facilities has destroyed the natural environment in York
- The environmental impacts of tourism are relatively minor
- Tourism results in more vandalism in a community (also included under Social issues)

Additions:
Objective / aim 9a) Extend season

The aim of this objective is to develop strategies which serve to extend the tourist season into the shoulder periods / all year round

Agree/Disagree

Comments:

9b) Tourism Planning Actions:

☐ Build large all year round leisure / entertainment complexes,
☐ Encourage school parties to visit all year round,
☐ Introduce seasonal festivals.

Additions: ____________________________________________________

9c) Questions to be asked of the residents

☐ I believe that York should try to become more of a tourist attraction (also included under Marketing)
☐ Tourism is bearable because it occurs predominantly within certain periods of the year
☐ Local tourism officers should be attempting to extend the tourist season in York so that we benefit all year round
☐ Introducing seasonal festivals is an excellent idea as it makes York a more vibrant and exciting place to live
☐ Introducing seasonal festivals is an excellent idea as they generate important economic benefits within the community

Additions: ____________________________________________________
Objective / aim 10a) Management issues

The aim of this objective is to improve management systems, to co-ordinate and develop more effective monitoring and evaluation of the tourism industry.

Agree/Disagree

Comments:

10b) Tourism Planning Actions:

- Develop / implement a tourism strategy
- Establish a tourism forum
- Participate in the S.T.E.A.M. model (Scarborough Tourism Economic Assessment Model)
- Include specific tourism section in the local plan
- Increase staffing (e.g. two officers for tourism)
- Integrate tourism with Business & Economic development
- Conduct market research
- Establish a tourism unit
- Appoint a full-time tourism officer

Additions:

10c) Questions to be asked of the residents

- Long term planning will control the negative impacts of tourism development
- Local government should control tourism development in York
- Tourism related businesses have too much political influence in York
- I feel that I can personally influence the decision-making processes regarding tourism
- Local government should restrict tourism development
- I believe that the council truly understands what its residents feel about the presence of tourism in York

Additions:
Objective / aim 11a) Economic issues
The aim of this objective is to increase the economic value of tourism to the local economy. (This objective is closely related to those of employment generation and the development of new icons since any action in these areas is assumed to be one of improving the economy through employment and inward investment)

Agree/Disagree

Comments:

11b) Tourism Planning Actions:
- See also Employment generation and New Icon development
- Encourage private sector investment (e.g. refurbishment, redevelopment, expansion, resettlement and rebuilding of offices, hotels, shops, restaurants, tour buses / boats, shopping arcades and sports venues.

Additions:

11c) Questions to be asked of the residents
- Increasing the number of tourists visiting York improves the local economy
- Tourism development increases the council tax
- I would support local tax levies for tourism development
- Tourists should pay more than local residents to visit parks & recreation attractions
- The costs of tourism are greater than the rewards
- Tourism development in York provides good jobs for local residents (also included under Employment)
- Tourism development unfairly increases property prices
- I personally receive economic benefits from tourism development in York
- Tourism attracts more investment and spending to the region
- Our standard of living is increasing more rapidly because of the money that tourists are spending in the region
- Prices of many goods and services in the region have increased because of tourism

Additions:
Objective / aim 12a) Cultural / Heritage issues

The aim of this objective is to conserve / preserve the cultural and historic environment of the destination

Agree/Disagree ☐

Comments:______________________________

12b) Tourism Planning Actions:
☐ Invest in interpretation initiatives (e.g. cyber-life)
☐ Establish new museums / heritage centres / visitor centres
☐ Establish new arts centre
☐ Develop lottery bids to fund said projects
☐ Refurbish museums / art centres / historic buildings / ships e.t.c
☐ Promote the historic and cultural through festivals and events (also included under new Icon development)

Additions:__________________________________________________

12c) Questions to be asked of the residents
☐ Tourism raises the awareness / recognition of the local culture and heritage
☐ Tourism increases the opportunities to restore and protect historical buildings/structures
☐ Tourism increases the demand for historical activities and programmes
☐ Tourism increases the variety of cultural facilities and activities in the community
☐ Tourism leads to the commercialisation of culture and the arts

Additions:__________________________________________________
Objective / aim 13a) New Icon development

The aim of this objective is to encourage the development of conferencing, new attractions and events

Agree/Disagree □

Comments:

13b) Tourism Planning Actions:

☐ Develop a calendar of events
☐ Establish annual festivals (also included under Cultural/Heritage issues)
☐ Give planning permission for new developments
☐ Run conference promotion campaigns
☐ Build new centres for conferencing

Additions:

13c) Questions to be asked of the residents

☐ I favour building new tourism facilities which will attract more tourists
☐ Tourism development increases the variety of entertainment in the community
☐ Tourism development increases the variety of restaurants in York
☐ Tourism development increases the variety of cultural facilities and activities in the community
☐ The costs of developing new attractions outweigh the benefits

Additions:
Objective / aim 14a) Accommodation

The aim of this objective is to increase the number of bed spaces

Agree/Disagree ☐

Comments:_________________________________________________

14b) Tourism Planning Actions:

☐ Encourage the refurbishment and expansion of hotels

☐ Encourage the establishment of new accommodation through tax holiday’s / incentives

Additions:__________________________________________________

14c) Questions to be asked of the residents

☐ The city of York does not need any more bed spaces / hotels to support the influx of tourists

☐ The city of York should be encouraging the building of more hotels to attract more tourists

☐ Tax holidays should be given to developers in order to encourage the further development of tourist accommodation

Additions:__________________________________________________
**Section B: Strategic objectives / aims:**

Remember, the task is to confirm whether or not these categories represent areas of strategic tourism concern for your city

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>(Task 4) Agree with category</th>
<th>(Task 5) a) Top four priorities, b) Bottom four priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Product enhancement</td>
<td>☐ □</td>
<td>☐ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>☐ □</td>
<td>☐ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure issues</td>
<td>☐ □</td>
<td>☐ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social issues</td>
<td>☐ □</td>
<td>☐ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment generation</td>
<td>☐ □</td>
<td>☐ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality assurance</td>
<td>☐ □</td>
<td>☐ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>☐ □</td>
<td>☐ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental protection</td>
<td>☐ □</td>
<td>☐ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend season</td>
<td>☐ □</td>
<td>☐ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management issues</td>
<td>☐ □</td>
<td>☐ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic issues</td>
<td>☐ □</td>
<td>☐ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural / Heritage issues</td>
<td>☐ □</td>
<td>☐ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Icon development</td>
<td>☐ □</td>
<td>☐ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>☐ □</td>
<td>☐ □</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additions:_________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Section C:
Socio-economic and Demographic information

Task 6  Tick the information you feel would be most useful to you when analysing the different impacts perceived within the community.

PLEASE ADD ANY OTHER QUESTIONS WHICH YOU FEEL WOULD PROVIDE VALUABLE RESIDENT INFORMATION.

☐ Length of residence?
☐ Were they born in the area?
☐ Sex?
☐ Age?
☐ Ethnic group
☐ Own or rent house?
☐ All year round resident?
☐ Are they or member of family employed in the tourism industry?
☐ How important is tourism to their occupation?
☐ Respondents occupation
☐ Distance of residence from the central tourist zone?
☐ How frequently do you enter the city for shopping per week?
☐ How frequently do you enter the city for recreation per week
☐ How frequently do you enter the city for work per week?
☐ Annual household income?
☐ Households average net monthly income?
☐ Average duration of visit for shopping?
☐ Average duration of visit for work?
☐ Average duration of visit for recreation?
☐ Level of education of respondent?
☐ Political affiliation
☐ Political control in the district / ward in which they live?

Comments/Additions:

______________________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________________
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APPENDIX I

EXAMPLE OF COMSMART QUESTIONNAIRE TO BE USED IN CHESTER
CHESTER RESIDENT TOURISM SURVEY

SECTION A:
PLEASE INDICATE YOUR LEVEL OF AGREEMENT / DISAGREEMENT WITH EACH OF THE QUESTIONS BY CIRCLING THE NUMBER WHICH BEST REPRESENTS YOUR OPINION

CHESTER AS A PLACE FOR TOURISTS

What are your opinions regarding the following questions?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>DON'T KNOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1) Tourism Information Services should be further developed to improve the Standard of service  
   1  2  3  4  5  0

2) It is important that the city of Chester is aware of how well tourism is doing compared to other cities (e.g. York, Bath e.t.c)  
   1  2  3  4  5  0

3) Selected historic buildings should be highlighted by improving the floodlighting on them at night  
   1  2  3  4  5  0

PROMOTING CHESTER

4) Efforts should be made to find out how effective Chester's promotional activities are.  
   1  2  3  4  5  0

5) Local hotels and guest houses should take part in the occupancy surveys so that we know when the busiest times of the year are for tourists  
   1  2  3  4  5  0

GETTING ABOUT IN CHESTER

6) The Park and Ride scheme should be developed further to reduce visitor traffic in the centre of Chester  
   1  2  3  4  5  0

7) Chester railway station needs to undergo improvements  
   1  2  3  4  5  0

8) Parking and drop-off facilities should be improved for coaches visiting Chester  
   1  2  3  4  5  0

TOURISM AND THE QUALITY OF LIFE

9) Tourism reduces the quality of life in Chester  
   1  2  3  4  5  0

10) Tourism increases the quality of my outdoor recreation experiences  
    1  2  3  4  5  0

11) The negative consequences of tourism in Chester outweigh its benefits  
    1  2  3  4  5  0

12) The City Council should spend more time talking with the people of Chester about tourism to find out what we want  
    1  2  3  4  5  0
13) The people of Chester need to be given more information about tourism so that we can understand what it does for the city

14) Visitors from overseas add to the city's vibrancy and quality of life

WORKING IN TOURISM

15) Developing tourism creates jobs in Chester

16) The City Council should help the training & business needs of the tourism industry in Chester

VISITOR ENJOYMENT

17) The city should help improve the quality of services provided for visitors to Chester

18) The training of local tourist guides is important to the success of tourism in Chester

WORKING TOGETHER

19) Chester should set up a Tourism Forum through which the council, residents and the Private sector can plan tourism together

PROTECTING CHESTER'S ENVIRONMENT

20) Chester should be giving priority to projects which improve the city centre

21) Improving the railway station and its services will help to reduce the pressure of tourist traffic in Chester

22) Expanding parking for coaches at the Little Roodee car park will reduce the pressure of tourism traffic in Chester

23) Chester needs to develop a Visitor Management Plan in order to manage the environmental impacts of tourism

WELCOMING TOURISTS ALL YEAR ROUND

24) Organising more festivals will make Chester a more attractive place to visit all year round

25) More should be done to attract tourists all year round

MONITORING TOURISM IN CHESTER

26) Tourism is so important to Chester that more should be done to include it in the Local Plan

27) A Chester Visitor Management Plan is essential if tourism is to be effectively managed in Chester
28) More research should be done in order to get the information which tourism management decisions need.

**TOURISM AND LOCAL PROSPERITY**

29) More should be done to encourage local tourism-related businesses to spend more on refurbishment, redevelopment & expansion of hotels, shops e.t.c.

30) Tourism should be considered within all of the Council’s policies which affect it.

31) A Chester Visitor Management Plan is essential in order to manage the economic impacts of tourism in Chester.

32) More should be done to attract visitors to Chester’s rural areas.

**LOOKING AFTER CHESTER’S HERITAGE**

33) Chester should establish a new Arts Centre.

34) Chester should try to develop the tourism potential of the Dee house/Roman Amphitheatre areas.

35) Chester should try to develop the tourism potential of the area around the castle.

36) A City Heritage Trail to introduce visitors to lesser known parts of the city is a good idea.

**NEW ATTRACTIONS FOR CHESTER**

37) Chester should encourage the development of new tourism facilities and attractions.

38) Chester should consider turning its festivals into National/International events.

**STAYING IN CHESTER**

39) A Tourism Investment Study should be carried out in order to see whether Chester needs any more hotel developments.

40) Chester should be actively seeking to attract investors to build new hotel accommodation.

41) Hotels and B&B’s should only be allowed to promote themselves in Chester’s publicity brochures if they have been inspected by the national accommodation inspection Scheme.
### SECTION B

How **KNOWLEDGABLE** do you feel you are with regards to each of the categories?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>NOT AT ALL KNOWLEDGABLE</th>
<th>EXTREMELY KNOWLEDGABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chester as a place for tourists</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting Chester</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting about in Chester</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism and the quality of life</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in tourism</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor enjoyment</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working together</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting Chester's environment</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcoming tourists all year round</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring tourism in Chester</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism and local prosperity</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking after Chester's heritage</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New attractions for Chester</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying in Chester</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION C

**How IMPORTANT do you feel each of the issues are?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>EXTREMELY IMPORTANT</th>
<th>EXTREMELY UNIMPORTANT</th>
<th>DONT KNOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How important do you think it is to improve Chester as a place for tourists?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important do you think it is to promote Chester?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important do you think it is to improve and develop appropriate forms of access to Chester?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important do you think it is to include quality of life issues in planning tourism in Chester?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important do you think it is to maintain and protect employment in Chester through tourism?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important do you think it is to make Chester an enjoyable place to visit?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important do you think it is to encourage the various organisations involved in tourism in Chester to work together?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important do you think it is to improve and protect Chester’s environment?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important do you think it is to try and attract tourists to Chester all year round?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important do you think it is to monitor tourism? in Chester?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important do you think tourism is to the prosperity of Chester &amp; its surrounding area?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important do you think it is to look after Chester’s heritage?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important do you think it is to develop new attractions for Chester?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important do you think it is to increase the number of bed spaces to satisfy the demand from visitors to Chester?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION D
ABOUT YOU

A) How long have you lived in the Chester area? ____________Years

B) Were you born in the area? □ Yes □ No

C) Sex □ Male □ Female

D) Year of birth 19_____

E) Do you own or rent your home? □ Own □ Rent

F) Are you an all year round resident? □ Yes □ No

G) Are you or a member of your family employed in the tourism industry? □ Yes □ No

H) How far do you live from the central tourist zone (Roman Amphitheatre)? ____________Mile(s)

I) How dependent is your job on tourism N D E

J) Are you the person named on the LETTER? If not, please add your name here __________________________

Thank you for taking the time to answer these important questions.
Your answers will be dealt with in total confidentiality.
If you are willing to discuss your opinions further please tick the AGREE box below.
Should you be selected to participate in brief discussions, you will be compensated for your time and effort.

□ I AGREE TO PARTICIPATE SHOULD MY OPINIONS BE REQUIRED

We believe your opinions are extremely important in helping us to develop tourism in a way that both reflects the wishes of residents, and meets the needs of visitors to Chester.
Once again, thank you for your time and effort
APPENDIX J

LIST OF POPULAR CONSULTATION METHODOLOGIES
Within public consultation, there exists a myriad of techniques designed to fulfill the commitment of local government to effective public consultation. The following is a list of examples of these methods. They are operationally more specific and can be used singularly or in combination within the approaches discussed in chapter five:

1) Focus groups (a small group of people with a particular interest are drawn together to discuss their needs or examine issues such as the quality of services);

2) User involvement (which gives community representatives a direct involvement in decision-making or even to move towards user control where a community of users manage the services);

3) Planning for Real (developed by the Neighbourhood Initiatives Foundation: The Poplars, Lightmoor, Telford TF4 3QN, this involves local people in constructing a 3D model of their neighbourhood. Onto the model are placed suggestion cards to create a breadth of potential planning options);

4) Resolving conflict (involves bringing together the different interested parties and discussing the extent to which they agree/disagree in order to clarify the issue and build on common ground);

5) Consensus building (developed by Environmental Resolve, an initiative of The Environmental Council: 21 Elizabeth Street, London SW1W 9RP, it challenges the adversarial approach through using mediation groups);

6) Future search was introduced by Weisbrod & Janoff (1995). It involves bringing together all the stakeholders for a period of 3 days and is designed to aid the process of exploration and forming the common ground on which to base action planning);

7) Community Visioning (called ‘visioning’ in America, it involves creating a shared vision of the optimal future for the community through involving citizens at the local level in setting goals and taking decisions. This method has been developed in the UK by the New Economics Foundation (1st Floor, Vine Court, 112-116 Whitechapel Road, London E1 1JE));

8) Roundtables (local roundtables normally consist of between 16-24 members who are brought together because of their adversarial positions);

9) Community needs analysis (brings together the basic statistical analysis of an area, the views of community representatives and front line workers and the results of a resident survey. The findings and issues are circulated to local residents inviting them to join discussion groups on specific themes);
10) Priority search (after planning a project, a cross section of the community is invited to attend a focus group. The ideas from this meeting are taken and a questionnaire is generated. The resulting analysis of a wider survey generates a priority ranking of planned actions);

11) Public scrutiny (Introduced by Haringey borough, this method involves “councillors encouraging service users and anyone else to come to a public meeting at the council chamber to criticise and complain about the standards and quality provision of selected council services. Follow up scrutiny meetings are held after three months and after a year to deal with the council service’s response” (Municipal Review, 1995);

12) Action planning (This method “involves carefully structured collaborative events at which all sections of the community work closely with specialists from different disciplines to deal with planning and urban design issues” (New Economics Foundation, 1997). The first event took place in 1985, with around 50 taking place since. It typically involves between 150-300 people and lasts between 3-5 days;

13) Act, Create, Experience (ACE) (Aims to explore and encourage youth participation within the Local Agenda 21 process. The basic premise is that the most effective way of involving young people is to start with their enthusiasm rather than established practice);

14) Choices method (An elaborate process needing long lead in times and the support of local media and volunteers. Meetings are held within the community in order to generate ideas. These are then consolidated through presentation to meetings or workshops. A vision fair is held to vote on choices, and then action groups are formed to carry out the chosen ideas);

15) Community/Village appraisal (A survey of the community, by the community, for the community concluding with an action plan or list of recommendations for the future of the community. Usually takes about a year to complete and is repeated every ten years);

16) Community indicators (Local people get together to decide what is important to them and how best to measure whether things are getting better or worse. The indicators act as flags for drawing attention to important issues;

17) Enspirited envisioning (Formerly called ‘Futures-invention’ this method employs deep imaging, listening and questioning in order to arouse participants deepest visions/images of future development;
18) Guided visualisation (similar to enspirited envisioning, except that a visualisation script is used to frame the area of concern within which the participants have freedom to interpret the future vision);

19) Imagine (developed in Chicago, imagine is based on appreciative enquiry whereby participants are required to seek an understanding and appreciation of the best of the past as a basis for imaging what might be, and then creating it);

20) The local sustainability model (A method for enabling a community to assess its present position and test the likely effects of projects);

21) Open space (The structure of this method involves removing structure, those people that turn up are the right people, and the discussion is open and lively, with the issues generated in situ, enabling the creation of relevant and timely discussions);

22) Parish maps (Not necessarily a map, many forms are used such as video diaries, tapestries, photographs and anything else which enables the residents to indicate what it is that they value about the place in which they live, enabling them to take an active part in its care and development);

23) Participatory appraisal (emerged originally as Participatory Rural Appraisal in the southern hemisphere during the 1980's, it involves a cycle of data gathering, reflection and learning and then action);

24) Participatory strategic planning (Should involve those who are actually going to implement the results. Through brainstorming, organising, and naming areas of contradiction, the groups highlight ways forward to achieve a vision which deal with such contradictions);

25) Participatory theatre (Using games, exercises, animation and transitory imaging, participants use physical movements and creativity to explore their own experience, releasing blocks and frustrations, with the ultimate aim of developing a common vision);

26) Social auditing (This is a cyclical process rather than a one-off event. Participants seek to measure, understand, report on and ultimately improve an organisation's social and ethical performance based on its own stated objectives);

27) Talkworks (A preparatory workshop, which involves people in attending a one-day core workshop in essential conversational skills as preparation for participation in further activities);

28) Team syntegrity (Syntegration is the amalgamation of synergy and integration, it involves the participation of around 30 people over a period
of three to five days. They met to discuss a specific question and 
participants are carefully chosen to ensure that they represent the cross-
section of ideas within the community);

29) Citizen advocacy (This involves trained volunteers working on behalf of 
those who are disabled/disadvantaged);

30) Broad-base organising (This involves a trained organiser spending a year 
talking one-to-one with hundreds of local citizens to uncover the issues 
that most concern them);

31) Community site management plans (Usually written by a consultant 
ecologist, this method helps communities write one over one or two days, 
learning to tackle particular types of project and developing the insight and 
motivation to make the plan happen).
APPENDIX K

RESEARCH PHASE III

KEY TO TELEPHONE QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE MATRIX
Question 1: Who is charged with deploying tourism functions i.e. planning for tourism?

1) Tourism officer → Committee
2) Tourism unit / forum → Tourism officer → Committee
3) Leisure unit → Tourism / Leisure officer ← 1/4 forum
4) Head + Assistant → Committee / Forum

Economic development
5) Tourism Officer → Economic Development Dept
6) Head of Planning → Committee
7) Head of Tourism + Head of Marketing
8) Tourism Advisory Group → Committee
9) Planning & Development Officer + Leisure Officer → Committee
10) Economic Development Officer + Tourism Officer
11) Tourism Officer + Marketing Officer
12) Development & Planning Dept → Committee
13) Tourism Officer → Forum
14) Tourism Officer → Committee → Housing & Planning
15) Leisure Officer → Agency
16) Leisure Officer → Leisure Committee
17) Director of Tourism Officer Economic Development Unit
    Tourism → Committee

Question 2: Does the council conduct resident opinion surveys with regards to tourism?

1) Yes (ongoing)
2) No
3) Plan to
4) Yes (in past)
5) As part of another survey
6) Every time a new development is planned

Question 3: If Yes, How often and when was the last time?

1) Never
2) Annual
3) Occasional
4) Every 2 years
5) Every 3 years
6) Every 4 Years
7) Every 5+ Years
8) Spontaneous / when the need arises
9) Bi-annual
10) Quarterly
11) Cannot remember
12) Intend to.

Question 4: Do you have an annual budget for such a survey?
Enter amount directly into spreadsheet

Question 5: What survey methods do you use?
1) Mailed questionnaire
2) Street (face to face)
3) Door to Door
4) Questionnaire left in public places
5) Focus groups / forums
6) Questionnaire in council leaflets
7) Varies depending on the nature of the survey
8) Mailed questionnaire and face to face (combination 1)
9) Door to Door and Street survey (combination 2)
10) Left in public place and Mailed questionnaire (combination 3)
11) Mailed questionnaire, left in public places (postage paid), resident consortium, Questionnaire in civic newspapers (combination 4)
12) Mailed questionnaire, Door to Door, and Street survey (combination 5)
13) Left in public place and street survey (Combination 6)
14) Public displays with self completion questionnaires
15) Street survey, Left in public place, and telephone surveys (Combination 7)

Question 6: What type of sampling do you use?
1) Random
2) Quota / selected
3) Convenience
4) Varies depending on the survey
5) Not Known

Question 7: Who conducts the research for you?
1) Consultants / Research Company
2) Council does it themselves
3) Students
4) Not reported
5) Other
APPENDIX L

RESEARCH PHASE III

LOCAL AUTHORITY TELEPHONE SURVEY: RESPONSE MATRIX (N=55)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Council</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Type of Council</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Q6</th>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Windsor &amp; Maidenhead</td>
<td>Sarah Dunn 01628 798888</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyre</td>
<td>Tom Grimore 01253 891000</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derby</td>
<td>01332 295111</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q5: Other Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hereford</td>
<td>01905 763763</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.O on maternity leave please don't include us in your survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morecambe</td>
<td></td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No telephone number BT/Mercury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>Peter Roberts 01752 261125</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Q2: Consults with resident consortium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester-upon-Medway</td>
<td>David Wood 01634 727777</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q4: Wouldn't say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>0171 650 3450</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Q3: Assistant not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>Patrick Loin 01904 613161</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutland</td>
<td>Shelley Wood 01572 722577</td>
<td>County Council</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Q2: Newly est, Q5 Other Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>Phil Train 0181 541 9634</td>
<td>County Council</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Q5: Plan to..Help please</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aylesbury Vale</td>
<td>Ian Barham 01296 585184</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Q4: No info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath &amp; N.E Somerset</td>
<td>Evonne Hearne 01225 477256</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolsover</td>
<td></td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No telephone number BT/Mercury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadland</td>
<td>Trevor Johnson 01603 431133</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Q3: In Newsletter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dungannon &amp; South Tyne</td>
<td>Mrs McLean 01868 725311</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Q's 5,6,7 Advice from university Mrs Pauline McLaren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Dorset</td>
<td>Neil Farnham 01202 886201</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Q3: Just done one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Council</td>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td>Type of Council</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Hampshire</td>
<td>Mark Stoner 01730 266551</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest of Dean</td>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanarkshire</td>
<td>Katrina McVale 0141 304 1800</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Newly Established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Devon</td>
<td>Jane Bell 01884 255718</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Sussex</td>
<td>Andy Waters 01444 458166</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moyle</td>
<td></td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No telephone number BT/Mercury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Forest</td>
<td>Anthony Kimpson 01703 285000</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark &amp; Sherwood</td>
<td>Rainne Van Dam 01636 605111</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Q4: Varies..Lottery requirement(+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newbury</td>
<td>Maria Mallay</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Back on the 12 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Derbyshire</td>
<td>Brian Oldfield 01426 231111</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Q5: Other surveys With neighbour districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Somerset</td>
<td>Alison Grimble 01934 888888</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmondshire</td>
<td>Jackie Ellis 0181 891 1411</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q4: Kingston university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryedale</td>
<td>Joe Hill 01653 600666</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Q5,6,7 info not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedgemoor</td>
<td>Elaine Ford 01278 435435</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepway</td>
<td>Mr Astridge 01503 850388</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Derbyshire</td>
<td>Kevin Mason 01288 221000</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Council</td>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td>Type of Council</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lakeland</td>
<td>Mr Walker 01539 733333</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q2: ask P.C, Q5,6,7: other surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Staffordshire</td>
<td>Mr Burkhampe 01902 696428</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealdon</td>
<td>Deborah Jarret 01323 42666</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Back on the 12 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lindsey</td>
<td>Louise Smoule 01427 610101</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakefield</td>
<td>Alison Harpin 01924 306090</td>
<td>Metropolitan District Council</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q5: other surveys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX: M

RESEARCH PHASE IV

SCREEN SHOT DEMONSTRATION OF THE COMSMART MODEL
Demonstration of the ComSmart Model

The demonstration of ComSmart is best illustrated by presenting screen-by-screen pictures of it in action.

The demonstration

The demonstration is conducted using an as if case study scenario. The same method was utilised with each of the demonstrations and concluded with the audience being asked to complete an evaluation form (Appendix O). The results of this are presented in Chapter six.

Selecting the search criteria

It is 15 minutes before an important policy group meeting and you (the tourism officer) have been requested to report on the likely reactions of residents to the proposed policy of reclaiming unused parkland for tourism development projects. You turn on your computer and load the ComSmart Model.

After the five second splash screen has completed, the first screen is loaded and you begin selecting the parameters for the required analysis of resident opinions. The first choice is specific to the city of Chester and therefore relates to the key theme areas within which they talk about their strategic objectives.
Through selecting Visitor management as the key theme area, this then takes you to the second scroll menu where you are required to select the strategic objective within which area the proposed action exists. This is entitled "Environmental Protection".
Having selected "Environmental Protection", a choice of the proposed policy actions appears in the active window. From this screen you select "Introduce new environmental projects (e.g. mobile rangers, reclaimed parkland)".
Screen one: Selection of proposed policy action "Introduce new environmental projects (e.g. mobile rangers, reclaimed parkland)"

With this first selection stage complete, you click on the next button to enter filter screen two. In screen two, you are faced with choices concerning how to filter the resident's responses. At this stage however, we are interested in the overall level of agreement from the whole sample and therefore no filter parameters are selected.
Screen two: Filter selections by respondent socio-demographic and response profile

By clicking next on the toolbar, the model performs a search for all the responses for that specific question regarding the reclamation of unused parkland. It reports the number of respondents and the number of responses found.
ComSmart begins to filter the responses in order to create the analysis page

The filter is caught in mid-cycle, it has completed the search for respondents (n=336) and is beginning to count the responses found. The final total matches the 336 respondents found, therefore intimating that no empty cells/non-respondents are found.

**Conducting the analysis**

When the filter is complete, screen three appears, this is the initial analysis of returns and indicates the mean score (x=3.22) for the total sample (n=336).
Having achieved this first level of analysis, it is decided that more detailed information is required as to the nature of resident responses, particularly those who are least agreeable to the proposed policy action. The data is then filtered by each of the potentially contributory resident profile variables. It is found that the lowest level of agreement is found when the data is analysed by gender (X Axis) and by whether or not the residents are employed in the tourism industry (Z Axis).
From the above screen it is evident that males who do not work in the tourism industry are the least agreeable to the proposed policy ($x=3.16; n=124$). This is still a relatively high mean score based on the likert scale of 1=Strongly disagree through to 5=Strongly agree. It is however decided that it would be useful to talk with these people to see why it is that they feel less positive than other sections of the community. At this point, the back button is selected from the toolbar and the choices are made in filter screen two i.e. select "Male" from the Gender option box and "No" on the employed in tourism option box. Having clicked the next button, the model filters the data by the criteria set and comes to a total of 124 people.

The "Mail merge" function

The scenario continues, stating that unfortunately the local council cannot afford to host 124 residents and so elects to select only those who answered 1=Strongly disagree, or 2=Disagree. By selecting the mail merge button on the tool
bar, it is possible to filter out all responses other than those required. In this way, 17 residents are selected that match the search criteria.

Screen three: Mail merge option selected

Next, select create file, this saves the details of those residents into the ComSmart programme file and enables the construction of a mail merge document. This consists of a letter as follows, and is merged with the data of those residents as in table over page. The data within this search has been constructed in order that it does not relate to actual people and their responses to the questionnaire conducted in the city of Chester.
Database record of the seventeen males who are not employed in tourism and whom disagree with the proposed policy to introduce new environmental projects such as the reclamation of unused parkland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Length of Residence</th>
<th>Born in City?</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Home Owner</th>
<th>Distance to Date of residence</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Building</th>
<th>House number</th>
<th>Road</th>
<th>All Year Resident</th>
<th>Employed in Tourism</th>
<th>Agree to participate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>Roland Devrell</td>
<td>Crown Hill</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>James Bale</td>
<td>Camden Crescent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Anthony Hill</td>
<td>Milson St</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Malcolm Ablett</td>
<td>Nash Gardens, Circus Mews</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Occupier</td>
<td>Mill's Buildings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Douglas Connor</td>
<td>Rivers St</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>Harold Cheeseman</td>
<td>Lucklands Rd</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Matthew Nimmo</td>
<td>Marlborough Buildings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Occupier</td>
<td>George St</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>Fredrick Moules</td>
<td>The Grange, West Park West</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>Robert Peggie</td>
<td>Winifred's Dale</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>George Owen</td>
<td>Summerhill Rd</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>Kevin Muyniddin</td>
<td>St James Sq</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>Occupier</td>
<td>Chatham Row</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>Owen Train</td>
<td>Cleveland Reach</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>Tim Crockatt</td>
<td>Cleveland Place East</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>Peter Rainsford</td>
<td>Camden Crescent</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The following two examples of the mail merge letter illustrate the layout and format for one resident who declined to participate at the time, and one who accepted the opportunity to participate.
Roland Devrell
5 Crown Hill
Chester
CH1 2QY

31 October 1999
Ref: GCN/268

Dear Mr Devrell

You recently agreed to take part in a questionnaire regarding the tourism industry in and around Chester. We are currently following up the results of this questionnaire.

At the time you declined to be part of the follow up procedure. However we would like to give you this opportunity to reconsider. Should you now be willing to help us with further information please contact us on the number given above.

Thank you for your help in this matter.

Yours faithfully,

Colin Potts
Tourism Manager

Ps You gave a response of 2 to question 42. This question regards the proposal to introduce new environmental projects to the city of Chester. We look forward to having the opportunity of discussing this issue with you on either Friday 14 May or Tuesday 18 May at 8.00 p.m. at the Chester Visitor Centre.
Dear Mr Bale,

You recently agreed to take part in a questionnaire regarding the tourism industry in and around Chester. We are currently following up the results of this questionnaire.

At the time you agreed to be part of the follow up procedure, we would therefore like to take the opportunity to discuss your views further.

Thank you for your help in this matter.

Yours faithfully,

Colin Potts
Tourism Manager

Ps You gave a response of 2 to question 42. This question regards the proposal to introduce new environmental projects to the city of Chester. We look forward to having the opportunity of discussing this issue with you on either Friday 14 May or Tuesday 18 May at 8.00 p.m. at the Chester Visitor Centre.
The "Copy" function

The next stage of the demonstration involves the other two forms of output from the model. The first involves the use of the "Copy" button on the toolbar and enables the tourism officer to export the analysis into a document as part of a report. Having selected copy, the user opens a Word for Windows document, either new or a pre-prepared and performs a "paste special..." function in order to insert the desired table. The following is an extract from a dummy report that utilises this procedure.

Resident Opinions of the Proposed Introduction of New Environmental Projects in Chester

A ComSmart Analysis Report

By
Colin Potts
Chester City Council

Presented to
Chester City Council Policy group

Thursday 13 May 1999 2.00 p.m.

INTRODUCTION

There has been much talk in Chester regarding the reclamation of unused land and its potential for redevelopment to support the growth of tourism.

It is a requirement of both the structure and local plan that Local authorities conduct extensive consultation with the residents living in areas which may be affected by this policy.

In line with this requirement, Global Consultancy Network were contracted to conduct a resident opinion survey and develop a consultation mechanism which facilitated both analysis of the issues, and provided the means by which concerned residents could be recognised and brought forward to share their views.

RESEARCH DESIGN

The research design remains the same as for the previous discussion paper (REF: GCN/CP1) "Do the residents of Chester believe that more money should be spent on
Promoting Chester? In this paper, the ComSmart model and its development is discussed fully.

RESULTS

The first phase of the analysis determined what the overall opinions were of the sample (n=336). Table 1 indicates that on a scale of 1-5 (1=strongly disagree, 5=Strongly Agree), the mean score is 3.22 (n=336).

Table 1
Should Chester City Council reclaim unused parkland for tourism development purposes?

![Bar chart showing the opinions of the sample](image)

It was then decided to separate the opinions out by Gender; Table 2 below shows that men (3.23; n=202) are slightly more agreeable than their female counterparts (3.19; n=134).

Table 2
Opinions regarding whether to support the reclamation of unused parkland by gender

![Bar chart showing opinions by gender](image)

The responses of the male population of the sample were then explored to see where the greatest and most significant opposition lay. This was found to exist in those
men who were not employed in a tourism-related job (3.16; n=124). This time the data is represented using the 3D perspective

Table 3
Opinions regarding whether to support the reclamation of unused parkland by male and whether or not employed in tourism.

The "Print" function
The print button on the toolbar enables the user to print single copies of the search criteria and the final analysis onto one page. In this way, the document can be taken to meetings as an executive summary of resident opinions rather than drafting a full report. The following example relates to the example used in this demonstration.
ComSmart Analysis Program

Analysis for Action:
Introduce new environmental projects (e.g. mobile rangers, reclaimed parkland)

Filter settings:
Knowledge 1-5
Residence 0-99
Job Dependency on Tourism 1-5
Born in Area: Any
Employed in Tourism: Any
Gender: Either

Importance 1-5
Age 1-99
Home Owner: Any
All year res: Any
Agreed to Participate: Any

X Axis: Gender
Y Axis: Average of Responses
Z Axis (Legend): Employed in Tourism

![Graph showing analysis results]
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OUTLINE OF THE RESEARCH PROCESS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Mail survey of residents of York (1995), Bath (1996) and Chester (1998)</td>
<td>Search for commonality/divergence among residents’ opinions of tourism’s impact in historic cities in the UK</td>
<td>Questions too general, not specific enough or meaningful in assessing/evaluating Local authority management of tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Analysis of tourism strategy documents</td>
<td>Categorise strategic tourism objectives/aims of local authorities in the UK (Objectives)</td>
<td>14 core categories emerged from analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facsimile questionnaire to Local authority tourism officers</td>
<td>Develop listing of tourism planning actions employed or planned (Actions)</td>
<td>Local authority tourism officers reported 60 distinct actions (actual/planned)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Telephone interviews of tourism officers who responded with strategy documents in phase II</td>
<td>Investigate local government approaches/commitment to resident tourism surveys</td>
<td>Wide variation in methods used combined with low level of commitment to resident tourism opinion surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Construct first draft of Objectives/Actions/Opinions Model</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews of tourism officers in York and Canterbury</td>
<td>Check content validity of the model</td>
<td>Model confirmed with minor adjustments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview of tourism officer in Chester</td>
<td>Construct destination specific objectives/actions/opinions model</td>
<td>Model confirmed with minor adjustments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Mail survey of residents of Chester (May, 1999)</td>
<td>Residents' opinions (Opinions) to impacts of tourism and the actual/planned tourism policy actions of Chester City Council</td>
<td>TO BE CONDUCTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Construct Objectives/Actions/Opinions Computer Model</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>COMPLETED Ver 1.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstration to tourism officers of York, Canterbury, Chester, Surrey County Council, Melton Mowbray District Council, Shillam &amp; Smith Associates, &quot;Discover Islington&quot;.</td>
<td>Demonstrate functions of computer-based consultation model and ask question “does this do what you want it to?”</td>
<td>COMPLETED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX O

RESEARCH PHASE IV

THE COMSMART EVALUATION FORMS FROM THE CITIES OF YORK, CANTERBURY AND CHESTER
COMSMART EVALUATION FORM

"COMSMART" is a planning model which aims to integrate local authority planning objectives, the actions proposed to achieve these objectives, and the reactions of the local community in advance of taking these actions. This is achieved in five stages: 1) analysis of local authority strategic objectives and their associated actions, 2) selection of a representative sample of the local population, 3) generation of a resident survey which enables the community to evaluate the proposed strategies and actions, 4) construction of a computer model to capture and relate the data, and 5) provision of a user interface which enables the user to select general or specific audiences for public consultation exercises.

THE RESEARCH PROCESS: aims to provide valid information regarding local authority tourism strategies/actions, and residents' opinions of them

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) The analysis of strategy documents was successful in highlighting key local authority strategic objectives for tourism in the UK.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 (5) 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) The process of associating the actions with the strategic objectives is a valid approach.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 (6) 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) The process by which questionnaire items were developed to enable residents to evaluate the actions was effective.</td>
<td>1 2 3 (4) 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) The sampling mechanism is effective.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) The links between the levels of the model appear valid.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 (5) 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) The model is effective in capturing groups of interest.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 (5) 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) The method for generating representative consultation groups is effective.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 (5) 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) The modelling of a computer-based aims, actions, reactions model offers the potential to effectively incorporate/integrate resident opinion with the objectives and actions of tourism officers thereby improving the consultation process for planning tourism in the UK.</td>
<td>1 2 3 (4) 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only if residents were the only component in the tourism planning process. Realistically, they are not - businesses, visitors and government (eg. like in looking after historic buildings etc) are also crucial.
**Woud You Like Any More Information?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Yes</strong></th>
<th><strong>No</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Your Department:**

| Economic Development Group |

**Your Job Title:**

| Economic Development Officer |

**Do You Have Any Comments Regarding The Features Of The Model, Or Any Additional Features You Feel Would Be Useful?**

Yes - see right:

---

**Notes**

Would be useful to extend this to the other players in tourism eg. visitor surveys. There is now an emphasis on benchmarking tourism destinations (I know Chester is in the ETB scheme) based on visitor response. Some of your questions are relevant to them - and to businesses as well.

Support absolutely the context in which you are asking - i.e. that is important to keep readers' support of relevant initiatives.

The problem then is what to do with the data. Your plan: Actions List is a start.

We have recently updated our Please return to:

Tim Smith

Room 45 First Floor

1 Standard Hottest

Grange Road, Widmer End

Buckinghamshire, HP15 6AD
**COMSMART EVALUATION FORM**

"COMsmart" is a planning model which aims to integrate local authority planning objectives, the actions proposed to achieve these objectives, and the reactions of the local community in advance of taking these actions. This is achieved in five stages: 1) analysis of local authority strategic objectives and their associated actions, 2) selection of a representative sample of the local population, 3) generation of a resident survey which enables the community to evaluate the proposed strategies and actions, 4) construction of a computer model to capture and relate the data, and 5) provision of a user interface which enables the user to select general or specific audiences for public consultation exercises.

**THE RESEARCH PROCESS: aims to provide valid information regarding local authority tourism strategies/actions, and residents opinions of them**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1) The analysis of strategy documents was successful in highlighting key local authority strategic objectives for tourism in the UK.

2) The process of associating the actions with the strategic objectives is a valid approach.

3) The process by which questionnaire items were developed to enable residents to evaluate the actions was effective.

**THE METHODOLOGY: aims to achieve a random sample from within the local community**

4) The sampling mechanism is effective.

**THE MODEL: aims to capture the research data and relate it in a way which enables the user to observe residents' opinions and target either individuals or groups for analysis or consultation or both**

5) The links between the levels of the model appear valid.

6) The model is effective in capturing groups of interest.

7) The method for generating representative consultation groups is effective.

8) The modelling of a computer-based aims, actions, reactions model offers the potential to effectively incorporate/integrate resident opinion with the objectives and actions of tourism officers thereby improving the consultation process for planning tourism in the UK.
DO YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS REGARDING THE FEATURES OF THE MODEL, OR ANY ADDITIONAL FEATURES YOU FEEL WOULD BE USEFUL

CONSIDER INCORPORATION OF VISITORS' OPINIONS ON PROPOSALS

Please return to:
Tim Snaith
1 Standard Cottages
Grange Road, Widmer End
Buckinghamshire, HP15 6AD
<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMSMART EVALUATION FORM**

*Comment:* A planning model which aims to integrate local authority planning objectives, the actions proposed to achieve these objectives, and the reactions and their associated actions of the local community. It is achieved in five stages: 1) analysis of a representative sample of the local population; 2) construction of a computer-based model to capture and relate the data, and provision of a user interface which enables the user to select general or specific audiences for public consultation exercises; and 3) construction of a computer-based model to capture and relate the data, and provision of a user interface which enables the user to select general or specific audiences for public consultation exercises.

**THE RESEARCH PROCESS:** Aims to provide valid information regarding local authority planning strategies, actions, and residents' opinions of them.

**THE METHODOLOGY:**

1. The analysis of strategy documents was successful for planning in the UK.
2. The process of associating the actions with the strategic objectives is a valid approach.
3. The process by which questionnaire items were developed to enable residents to evaluate the actions was effective.
4. The sampling mechanism is effective.
5. The model is a model to effectively incorporate interactive consultation processes for groups of interest.
6. The method for generating representative consultation processes for groups is effective.
7. The modelling of a computer-based model to effectively incorporate interactive consultation processes for groups is effective.
8. The modelling of a computer-based model incorporates interactive consultation processes for groups.

**Results:**

- Strongly agree: 7
- Agree: 6
- Neutral: 5
- Disagree: 4
- Strongly disagree: 3

**Planning Horizon in the UK:**

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion:**

- The planning model is effective in incorporating interactive consultation processes for groups.
- The planning model is effective in incorporating interactive consultation processes for groups.
- The planning model is effective in incorporating interactive consultation processes for groups.
- The planning model is effective in incorporating interactive consultation processes for groups.