Abstract of thesis

An initial investigation of the extent of private landownership and occupancy of rural land and of the importance of the countryside for recreation and tourism points to an interrelationship between private landholders and tourism and recreation in Scotland. The objective of the thesis is to elucidate this interrelationship, based on the postulation that landholders provide facilities for recreation and tourism and experience public access in general.

Investigation of the existing literature reveals that, despite expressed interest and concern, very little factual information is available on the extent, nature and effect of the interrelationship in Scotland. Various public agencies are active in this field. An associated objective of the thesis is to use the results of the research to contribute suggestions for public policy making.

Two principal surveys of landholders were carried out: first, a series of detailed interviews with landholders providing facilities; secondly, a postal survey of a random sample of landholdings throughout Scotland. The response rates achieved were high.

The results obtained from these surveys are analysed to present information on the extent to which landholders are involved in providing facilities for recreation and tourism and in experiencing
de facto access on their holdings. The relationship between these activities and the characteristics of landholdings is investigated. The nature of facility provision is studied in detail.

An examination is made of the attitudes of landholders to the development of facilities and of their reaction to de facto access. The effect of tourism and recreation on landholdings is investigated. A particular aspect of this is the assessment of the economic results of tourism and recreation enterprises. Social costs and benefits from tourism and recreation on private landholdings are discussed. In conclusion, the results of the research are applied in the formulation of a number of suggestions for future policy in Scotland.
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1.1. This thesis is concerned with private rural land in Scotland and the use of this land by the general public for recreational purposes.

1.2. Private land is seen as a category in contradistinction to public land. For the purpose of the thesis, private land covers all estates and interests in land held by individuals and institutions other than the Crown, Government departments, nationalised industries and public services, local authorities, the Forestry Commission, the Agricultural Research Council, Universities and colleges, the Nature Conservancy Council and the National Trust for Scotland. Under this definition, land owned by public agencies but occupied by individual farmers or crofters as tenants is treated as private land.

1.3. Recreation can be defined broadly, using a definition provided by the Countryside and Recreation Research Advisory Group (1970), as

"Any pursuit engaged upon during leisure time, other than pursuits to which people are normally highly committed"

Highly committed pursuits include such things as shopping, secondary work, house or car repairs, further education and

* Referred to later on as C.R.R.A.G.
religion. Thus recreation includes such diverse pursuits as
motor sports and picnicking. The thesis is concerned with the
use of rural land for recreation by the general public per se
as distinct from individuals or groups to whom the land is
available through a private arrangement or by dint of some
special relationship.

1.4. Recreation can be enjoyed by people at home, on day trips
and on trips which involve a stay away from home. The thesis
is concerned with the latter two types of recreational experi-
ence. Travel away from the home environment in leisure time
in order to discover and enjoy different environments and the
facilities for recreation which they afford and which involves
a stay away from home for one night or more is one definition
of tourism. Again, this is a definition provided by C.R.R.A.C.
(loc. cit.). Tourism can also be taken to mean any travel away
from home for short periods * and therefore to include business
travel. However, for the purposes of this thesis, the C.R.R.A.C.
definition of tourism is used. This definition sees tourism as
a particular form of recreation and accords with the concept
of tourism propounded by Burkart and Medlin (1974) in one of
the few detailed expositions of the meaning and nature of tourism
which have been made.

* This broad definition was used by Sir George Young (1973)
1.5. As a first step, the question must be asked on what basis can one suggest that there is any form of interrelationship between recreation and tourism and private rural land? This chapter puts forward an a priori argument that there is a relationship which enables an objective for the thesis to be identified. Having done so, a brief investigation of the existing knowledge of the interrelationship is carried out in Chapter Two. The investigation enables those aspects of the interrelationship which are to be examined in the thesis, to be set out more clearly. The subsequent chapters which constitute the bulk of the thesis, describe the research which was carried out, the results obtained and the implications of them for public policy.

1. Private rural land in Scotland

1.6. The total land area of Scotland is just over 19 million acres. No figures are available on the extent of private rural land in Scotland. However, figures have been collected from a number of sources * in Table 1.1 to give estimates of the area of Scotland under various uses and ownerships + in the early 1960's.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Woodland</th>
<th>Other Land</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publicly owned</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>2,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privately owned</td>
<td>14,800,000</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>16,200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Gibbons and Harrison (1973); D.A.F.S. (1975a); Locke (1976) and Forestry Commission (1974)

+ In this table, privately owned land is taken as defined above with the exception of the 82,000 acres owned by the National Trust for Scotland which is here taken as private land.
Nearly all the agricultural land or woodland is rural land with the exception of smallholdings and horticultural enterprises within urban boundaries and which probably amount to a very small area. Ninety five percent of Scotland is agricultural land or woodland; and 87% of this land is privately owned. In addition, some of the 'other land' in Table 1 is rural land. A fair proportion of this land is probably in public ownership. However, the category 'other land' includes all housing and industrial land, roads, railways and so on, and therefore the extent of rural land in this category must be extremely small if compared to agricultural land and woodland.

1.7. The extent of private influence in the countryside is even more evident in terms of the occupancy of land. As well as the land which is privately owned, about 93% of the agricultural land in public ownership is let to farming tenants. This means that roughly 94% of agricultural land or woodland is occupied by private individuals, companies or trusts and is, therefore, private land as defined above.

1.8. This vast area of private rural land is made up of a large number of individual landholdings. Here and henceforth 'landholding' or 'holding' is used as a general term to refer to any unit of ownership or occupancy; that is to say, any smallholding, croft, farm or estate (these four types of holding

* For example, those rural parts of Nature Reserves, Forestry Commission land (inaccessible or about to be planted), Ministry of Defence land or areas owned by the Electricity Boards or water undertakings, which are not let out for grazing or other agricultural use. Also some of this land may be owned by local authorities - for instance rural land pending development. In 1973/74 local authorities in Scotland also owned four Country Parks, set up under Section 48 of the Countryside (Scotland) Act 1967 (H.M.S.O., 1967) for the purposes of providing for countryside recreation - these however covered a very small area.
will be defined in Chapter Three). The same principle applies to the term 'landholder'. This use in no way reflects any specific use of the terms 'landholding' or 'landholder' in statutes. It is estimated, using figures from the official Agricultural Census and from the extensive postal survey carried out for this thesis, that there are roughly 46,600 individual private landholdings in Scotland plus 850 grazings held in common by crofters (see 3.26. to 3.30., 3.37.).

2. Recreation and tourism in Scotland

1.9. The characteristics of recreation and tourism in Scotland can be identified by turning to the results of the Scottish Tourism and Recreation Study (S.T.A.R.S.).* The results of this study by the Tourism and Recreation Research Unit (T.R.R.U.) were published in 1976, but they relate to the year 1973 when the field work was carried out. The figures given in the next three paragraphs are taken from this study.

1.10. A basic measure of the extent of tourism is the sum of all nights spent by people on holiday. In Scotland in mid-May to mid-October 1973, this amounted to:

| Holidays of 4 nights or more (of which 62% were spent by visitors to Scotland and 38% by residents) | 34.5 m. person-nights |
| Holidays of 1 to 3 nights | 3.5 m. person-nights |

In July and August alone, the total number of person-nights spent by holidaymakers was 23.4 million. As many as 31% of these nights were spent in self-catering or simple serviced accommodation (Bed and Breakfast, rented house, cottage or flat, static caravan, touring caravan, caravanette or tent) in rural areas away from all urban tourism centres.* Forty percent of holiday groups (visitors and residents) indicated that the attraction of Scotland which motivated them to take a holiday there was the Scottish countryside. Despite the wide range of attractions identified by S.T.A.R.S., this feature was of overwhelming importance.

1.11. The countryside is important for the recreational pursuits of holidaymakers but the majority enjoy it in a relatively passive way. Twenty-six percent of holiday groups engaged in some land or water based active pursuits while on holiday (e.g. fishing, pony trekking, sailing) while 63% said they had walked or picnicked in the countryside.

1.12. The countryside is also extremely important for the recreational activities of Scottish residents who are not on holiday. For example, of Scottish residents over sixteen years old, 775,000 (20%) had been hill or country walking in the previous year, while 240,000 had been game fishing, 160,000 had engaged in field sports and 90,000 in pony trekking. As with holiday-makers, more Scottish residents take their recreation in a non-active way than in some form of sport. As spectators,

* i.e. towns with over 2,500 inhabitants and receiving over 15,000 person nights. This figure was obtained direct from the S.T.A.R.S. raw data.
rather than walkers, 1,180,000 (31%) adults had made a trip to a loch in the past year, 888,000 had visited the hills or mountains, 570,000 had made a trip to woodland and 400,000 to farmland.

3. **The interrelationship to be studied**

1.13. The supreme importance of the Scottish countryside for tourism and recreation is most striking in the above figures. Earlier, the supreme importance of private landownership and occupancy within the Scottish countryside was shown. Therefore it seems axiomatic that there is an interrelationship between private rural landholders and tourism and recreation. The object of this thesis is to elucidate this interrelationship.

1.14. It is postulated that there are three major aspects of the interrelationship:

a) Independent action by landholders, aware or unaware of the implications for tourism and recreation.

The management of private land for agricultural and forestry enterprises has been partly responsible for creating the landscape which motivates tourists to take holidays in Scotland and which is responsible for many Scottish residents' enjoyment of recreation. Such enjoyment is vulnerable to changes in land management practice which alter the landscape.

b) Independent action by tourists or recreationists, aware or unaware of the implications for landholders.
This occurs when tourists or recreationists go onto landholdings apart from through the use of facilities provided by landholders. Landholders may object to access by the public onto their holdings and such access may be detrimental to their activities.

c) Action by landholders in response to the needs of tourists and recreationists.

The demand for simple accommodation by tourists in the countryside and for facilities for recreation creates the possibility of landholders providing facilities for them on their holdings. This has implications for tourism and recreation in increasing the opportunities for visitors to enjoy the countryside and for the landholders in a number of ways, not least the provision of additional income.

1.15. This study concentrates on 'b' and 'c', the more tangible and directly interactive aspects of the interrelationship. In these two aspects, tourists and recreationists are much less likely to be conscious of the landholder as a landholder than he is of them. The investigation could centre either on landholders or on tourists and recreationists and on an independent observation of landholdings. It was decided that the landholder should be used as the focal point for acquiring knowledge about the interrelationship as his experience and attitudes essentially dictate its dimensions and implications.
CHAPTER TWO

THE CONTEXT OF THE RESEARCH

1. AN INTERNATIONAL PHENOMENON

2.1. The use of private land for recreation and tourism and the provision of facilities by landholders are activities which take place throughout the world; probably wherever there is recreation in the countryside and a tenurial system which permits the private ownership of land or interests in the land. Evidence of the involvement of landholders in recreation and tourism is available from the richest and poorest countries. Of the U.S.A., for instance, Twardzie (1965)* writes: "There are (now) thousands of farmers and rural land owners throughout the country engaged in a wide variety of recreational enterprises". In Germany, 26,000 farms offered farmhouse holidays in 1971 (amounting to 2.2% of all farms and up to between 20% and 50% of farms in parts of South Germany) (Lehle, 1976; G.F.R., Statistisches Bundesamt, 1975). And Sherpa Tenzing (1971) has recently noted the opportunities which tourism is bringing to the valleys in the foothills of Everest, allowing Sherpa farmers to supplement their incomes through providing facilities for walkers and climbers and thereby enabling the farmers to "live on their farms with their families and look after the cattle and crops", rather than seeking work in Katmandu.

* As cited in Bull and Wibberley (1976).
2.2. This thesis is exclusive to Scotland and provides the first quantitative evidence at a national level of the involvement of private landholders in tourism and recreation in that country. By presenting this evidence, it prepares the ground for a further study, to compare the nature, extent and effect of the interrelationship between landholders and tourism and recreation in different countries with different land tenure and recreation patterns. Therefore, no further discussion of the world wide situation is presented here.

2.3. It is important, on the other hand, that this study of the involvement of private landholders in tourism and recreation is seen in the context of the literature on tourism and recreation in the U.K. To do so is the purpose of this chapter. The U.K. as a whole is looked at in this review because Scotland is so close an integral part of it, and in that sense has a special relationship which does not obtain with other countries. Not only are the geographical proximities and cultural affinities of the countries of the United Kingdom significant but there are near similarities between the countries, especially with Scotland, England and Wales: in the planning laws and procedures relating to rural land use. There is closeness also in the remits and policies of Government departments and statutory bodies, such as the Countryside Commissions and the Tourist Boards. The leisure time available to local residents is similar: brought about by the coincidence in Scotland and in the rest of the U.K. of statutory regulations on hours and earnings of employees, of U.K. firms with labour policies common to all their branches, and
of the activities of trade unions. Tourism in Scotland is greatly affected by the holiday activities of people from other parts of the U.K.: 35% of all holiday trips in Scotland are made by people from England or Wales (S.T.B., 1977a).

2. COUNTRYSIDE RECREATION IN BRITAIN: PUBLIC AWARENESS AND CONCERN

2.4. A number of writers have described the growth of public recreation and tourism in the British countryside, from an awareness kindled by the philosophy of such people as Rousseau and Ruskin and the inspiration of the English romantic poets, Coleridge and Wordsworth (Rossiter, 1972). In the nineteenth century, countryside recreation was largely the prerogative of the wealthy, especially through the enjoyment of rural estates for field sports. Tourism in the Victorian era was enjoyed mainly by the middle and upper classes. However, by the end of the century "more enlightened employers started giving annual holidays" and by the outbreak of the First World War some members of the 'working classes' were enjoying two weeks paid holiday (Young, 1973). "By the 1930's rising incomes, increased leisure time and paid holidays, and increased mobility, first by bus or cycle and later by car, allowed less wealthy people to explore the open countryside" (Gilg, 1978).

2.5. Public concern with the growing pressures of recreation on the countryside can be traced from this time through various committee reports to Government, advocating in particular the
creation of National Parks (viz. the Scott, Dower, Hobhouse and, for Scotland, Ramsey reports*). Legislation followed in the form of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act, 1949. However, the provisions in this Act for the creation of National Parks and the securing of access to open country did not apply to Scotland. In Scotland, "since access to the countryside was easy and apparently free, there was neither significant pressure from landowners about the extent of public access, nor agitation by recreational interests for a greater degree of access" (Countryside Commission for Scotland, 1974).

2.6. In the history of public interest in outdoor recreation, Patmore (1970) distinguished two phases: "The first, until the 1960's, was concerned primarily with effective conservation, the second with more positive provision of facilities for recreation; provision designed in part to alleviate pressure in areas of high amenity; in part to acknowledge the vastly increased demand". It was the awareness of the increased demand, identified in the early 1960's and forecast to develop widely and rapidly, which led to the 1966 White Paper "Leisure in the Countryside" (H.M.S.O., 1966) and the consequent Countryside Acts for England and Wales in 1968 and for Scotland in 1967. The latter Act set up the Countryside Commission for Scotland and gave it powers and responsibilities, some of which will be discussed later.

2.7. The 1960's also saw a growth in public awareness of tourism as a developing industry, needing careful promotion and control, and an important element in Britain's balance of payments. Recurring balance of payments crises led to the identification of Britain's profit and loss account from tourism, and the Development of Tourism Act, 1969 (Burkart and Medlik, 1974). This Act set up the British Tourist Authority and three national Tourist Boards. The powers and responsibilities of the Scottish Tourist Board are especially relevant to this study and will be discussed later.

2.8. During this period most of the research activity concerned with recreation and tourism concentrated on increasing demand. Three major surveys were carried out which showed the extent and nature of the use of people's leisure time for recreation: the Pilot National Recreation Survey (B.T.A., 1967); the Government Social Survey's Study, "Planning for Leisure" (Sillitoe, 1969); and a regional study in the north (North Regional Planning Committee, 1969). The relationships found between education and income level and, in particular, car ownership and the propensity to use leisure time for active outdoor recreation, led to much discussion on the ways and means of accommodating what would surely be a growing demand for recreation in the countryside (Dower, 1970a; Dower 1970b; Davidson and Hookway, 1970; Bonsey, 1970).

2.9. Turning to studies specifically of tourism, the British Travel Association (1969) found, in an assessment of the nature
of growth of British holidays, that the greatest rate of
growth among different kinds of holiday between 1951 and
1968 was in holidays for outdoor recreation.

2.10. National surveys of the demand for outdoor recreation
and of patterns of holidaymaking in Britain were by no means
the only research carried out in the 1960's and early 1970's
on the nature of demand for recreation. In an assessment of
trends in research, Greaves (1968) commented that "by far the
most popular approach to the problem of demand has been the
measurement of the nature of recreational use in a great variety
of countryside areas". These site surveys have been carried
out by various local authorities, research institutes and
universities as well as individual enquirers and it is not
proposed to list them here: a list containing 24 of the earlier
studies is provided by Fatmore (1970) who comments on the pro-
life ration of such studies since 1966 and, more recently,
Davidson and Wibberley (1977) give further examples of work
in the early 1970's, suggesting that "because of the plethora
of recent studies, the characteristics of weekend tripping seem
now to be especially well established".

2.11. Site surveys have been used to arrive at assessments of
the carrying capacity of different types of countryside; the
optimal level of use above which quantity leads to an undesirable
loss of quality. A number of existing research studies of
carrying capacity are mentioned in an article by Brotherton (1973)
which also outlines the potential for further research. An idea
of carrying capacity can help in exercises to assess suitable resources for countryside recreation and tourism; such exercises can constitute an important element of countryside planning. A review and discussion of recent work on the evaluation of recreation resources is given by Coppock and Duffield (1975).

2.12. In Scotland a particularly extensive planning exercise is being carried out by the regional authorities, following guidance from four national agencies,* to draw up regional strategies for recreation and tourism. This exercise is called the Scottish Tourism and Recreation Planning Studies (S.T.A.R.P.S.) programme. The programme entails the use of results from a major survey of demand in Scotland† and of various assessments of recreation resources and their carrying capacities, to identify shortfalls in the supply of facilities for recreation and tourism with respect to projected demand in 1986. These regional strategies, when complete, will form a very important element of public policy towards recreation and tourism development in Scotland. The manuals which were prepared to guide the authorities in this exercise (S.T.A.R.P.S. 1976a and 1976b) conclude with statements on the means of implementing the strategies. The need for "executive (action) through direct contact and the allocation of finance and other resources" by "private, commercial and voluntary interests" is spelt out. In completing their strategies, regional

---

* The Countryside Commission for Scotland, the Scottish Sports Council, the Scottish Tourist Board and the Forestry Commission.
† The Scottish Tourism and Recreation Survey, referred to in Chapter One (1.9†).
authorities are recommended to "demonstrate that the resources required are likely to be available, whether from public or private sector investment". Clearly, an appreciation of the response of the owners and occupiers of private land to the provision of facilities for tourism and recreation is important at this stage.

2.13. This point has been made by Coppock and Duffield (op.cit.). After their review of the evaluation of recreation resources, they state: "Whether these (potential resources) are in fact so used will depend .... on the attitudes and decisions of those who own or otherwise control the use of land. This latter consideration is of special significance in Great Britain where there is relatively little publicly owned or managed land available for outdoor recreation, and where much recreation in the countryside consequently takes place, with or without permission, on private land used primarily for other purposes. These attitudes are in part shaped by public policies ... but little systematic work has been done in Great Britain or elsewhere on the attitudes of those who determine policies for the recreational use of land, whether publicly or privately owned". The importance of the reaction of landholders to countryside recreation and tourism has, indeed, been receiving more official recognition of late: the Countryside Review Committee, set up by the Secretary of State for the Environment, completed its recent report on Leisure and the Countryside with the conclusion that "it is individuals and what they do, landowners, managers and visitors .... who really count".

* Countryside Review Committee (1977a)
3. **OPINION AND INFORMATION ON THE USE OF PRIVATE LANDHOLDINGS FOR RECREATION AND TOURISM**

2.14. The previous paragraphs have pointed towards the need to understand the nature of the interrelationship between landholders and countryside recreation and tourism. This section is concerned with existing knowledge and opinion in Britain about that interrelationship, and its consequences.

2.15. As an introduction, it is worth considering a theoretical explanation of access into the British countryside postulated by Thomson and Whitby. In a paper to the Agricultural Economics Society in 1976, these authors accepted that the power to decide between public access and competing uses of land depends on the possession of rights over the land in question. They contended that: "the access issue can be seen as the economic problem of allocating and exploiting the various rights over land among interested parties in such a way as to maximise social welfare". They suggested that rights may be combined to advantage (presumably the multiple land use solution) or, through competition, may lead to separate forms of land use; and that the 'correct allocation and exploitation' of the various rights is dependent on the nature of the ownership.

2.16. In an earlier paper, Thomson and Whitby (1975) suggested that some private landholders "enter into the spirit of the tourist market economy" by providing facilities for the public. They stated that these landholders: "see an unfilled demand waiting to be met by suppliers with the necessary skills, capital
and expertise, without diverting resources away from agriculture or imposing external effects on third parties. Prices are offered and taken and are varied to maximise profit. By stepping in to satisfy this fluctuating demand these landholders are contributing positively to social welfare". On the other hand, they suggest that "others in the farming community judge that it is not to their gain to incur the costs of accepting and welcoming the urban stranger". However, the pressure for access remains. Some landholders may incur costs in trying to prevent access; others may not. Either way, Thomson and Whitby argue that: "externalities may occur, since the tourist may move on to the neighbouring estate if frustrated, or conversely may tend to regard all farmland as equally accessible after having arrived on it without trouble". Thus the authors point to the importance of public bodies "as arbitrators in the passing on of costs and revenues .... to channel access beneficially .... and to arrange for the transfer, however indirect, of moneys from payers to providers".

2.17. These statements probably over simplify the situation but the theory does indicate the need to consider, first, the positive reaction of private landholders in providing facilities for recreation and tourism; secondly, public access into landholdings where facilities are not provided by landholders; and finally public policies to influence the interrelationship between landholders and recreation and tourism.
2.18. During the last two decades, amid the discussion and measurement of the demand for countryside recreation and tourism, comments and opinions have been expressed on the potential for and benefits of facility provision by landholders. In the main, these have centred on the benefits of recreation or tourism enterprises in bringing additional income and employment to landholdings, particularly marginal landholdings where the existing income from agriculture is low and where the potential for improving it is slight owing to the size of the holding and the nature of the land.

2.19. In the mid 1960's the official report of the Land Use Study Group on 'Forestry, Agriculture and the Multiple Use of Rural Land'* explicitly stated that: "it is the integration of multiple land use, with the aim of achieving injection of capital and possibilities of non-agricultural employment, that provides the best hope for marginal areas. Holiday accommodation, staging posts for pony-trekking, facilities for field studies, revenue from sport .... etc. offer possibilities for many farmers at present in these areas to achieve an acceptable standard of living on the size of holding they occupy". Since then these possibilities have been recognised repeatedly by Government committees set up to review countryside matters. For instance, the Countryside

---

Review Committee* has reported that: "to set against (damage to agricultural production caused by recreation), trippers and tourists can help farmers and landowners to top up incomes by providing a new market - for accommodation, camping and caravan sites, or recreational activities such as field sports, farm trails and farm open days"; and, most recent of all, the Advisory Council for Agriculture and Horticulture in England and Wales (1978) has stated that: "many farmers have been able to profit from the tourist inflow, mainly by providing holiday accommodation and the facilities for various recreational pursuits. Such activities play a useful - and, at times, critical - part in maintaining farm viability".

2.20. Statements about the potential for tourism and recreation enterprises to augment income on landholdings have not merely referred to the increment in the standard of living and employment opportunities which such enterprises can bring. The possibility that the traditional enterprises on the landholdings can be helped by this has been suggested. The Agricultural Economic Development Committee (1977), in a recent study of land use, drew attention to farmers' cash-flow problems when considering land improvements to benefit farm productivity and stated that: "one method to alleviate the cash-flow problem is appropriately to integrate agriculture with other activities, e.g. tourism". This possibility is also suggested by individual commentators (Hoyland, 1976; Scobie, 1976).

* Countryside Review Committee (1977a)
2.21. The economic benefits to landholders of tourism and recreation enterprises have been discussed not only with respect to small and marginal holdings. The Land Use Study Group (op. cit.) considered that certain estate owners would recognise the value of tourism. The Earl of March, himself an estate owner, in commenting on the involvement of large landowners in tourism and recreation, has pointed to economic reasons for their interest in that "the return on agricultural land is relatively very low compared with many other forms of investment, and if the landowner is going to make a more reasonable return he will have to consider making more intensive use of the land" (March, 1975). The Earl of March goes on to suggest other reasons for landholders' involvement in facility provision, namely their "moral responsibility" and the fact that facilities can help to reduce general public access to vulnerable parts of the landholding. Other writers have mentioned additional factors, such as "self satisfaction and pleasure produced by providing enjoyment and countryside appreciation" (Hubbard, 1973).

2.22. The potential for facilities provided by landholders to reduce the problems of public pressure on certain parts of the countryside has been cited as a reason for public concern for this activity. Wibberley (1970) writes: "the growing tide of outdoor recreation will disturb the good commercial farming areas and break down the solitude of wild hill country if it is not diverted into poorer, undulating parts of the country where an ever more mixed rural economy needs to be developed, that is,
mixed farming with small recreational enterprises such as camping, caravans, week-end cottages and farmhouse accommodation", and thereby implies, incidentally, that the potential for facility provision may be greater on certain types of agricultural holding.

2.23. In another sense, the Countryside Review Committee (op. cit.) considered that tourism and recreation facilities on farms could extend public knowledge of farming and respect for it and, thereby, "ease possible friction" with farmers generally.

2.24. The wide variety of tourism and recreation facilities which can be provided by landholders is described by a number of writers (e.g. Hubbard, Soobie, op. cit.). A carefully considered assessment of the possible enterprises which could be set up on farms in Wales was undertaken by the National Farmers' Union Council for Wales (1973). They concluded that the scope was wide and that: "although farming remains a production orientated industry and its primary function will remain the production of food ... we can see no fundamental objection to the provision of accommodation or recreational facilities on any farm".

2.25. Another outline of the opportunities open to farmers and landowners for the establishment of tourism or recreation enterprises was presented to the Agricultural Economics Society by Dower (1973). However, comments on this paper highlighted a number of reasons for scepticism about the potential for such enterprises. Professor Wibberley* considered that many farmers don't like people and

* These comments are published in conjunction with the paper by Dower.
therefore should steer clear of catering for them, that the revenue earned by tourism enterprises would vary very widely from holding to holding, and that planning policies would restrict developments in isolated areas, owing to the need to economise on physical and social services. Another issue was raised by Professor Ashton* who considered that farmers and landowners would continue to concentrate solely on agricultural enterprises because of the economic advantages and he implied that this would apply particularly to larger 'commercial' farmers and landowners who would want to make farming their livelihood.

2.26. Much of the discussion outlined above relates to Britain as a whole. In Scotland, the poverty of a high proportion of landholdings is described by Raeburn (1972) who states: "over half the holdings were considered incapable of giving full-time employment to at least one man, but only half of these were occupied by persons with any work other than farming." Thus ... to attempt to raise material incomes to commoner levels by agricultural activities alone would require major structural changes and much depopulation. What most need development are the job opportunities outside agriculture, and very careful thought about their type and location and training for them. Some at least may enable rural folk to remain in rural homes if they so wish".

* See footnote to previous page.

+ These figures were quoted by Raeburn from Dunn (1969).
2.27. It is this situation which has led much of the comment on the possibilities and consequences of tourism and recreation enterprises on landholdings in Scotland to relate to the problems of really small holdings and, in particular, to crofts.* In 1964, the Advisory Panel on the Highlands and Islands reported to the Secretary of State on land use. They emphasised the importance of the "use by crofters of their croft land for non-agricultural activities" in connection with tourism" and recognised this as "a fruitful form of land use". This reflects earlier enthusiasm for tourism on crofts expressed by the Crofters Commission who, in their Annual Report of 1959, described how an increasing number of crofters were "earning a substantial addition to their croft income from taking in summer visitors" and that tourism was providing cash for crofters to improve their agriculture. In subsequent Annual Reports the Commission has carefully reported developments of tourism and recreation on crofts.

2.28. Another body concerned with the crofting areas, the Highlands and Islands Development Board (of which more will be said in detail later) has made use of the potential for the provision of tourism facilities on crofts in proposed development

* 28% of landholdings in Scotland are crofts (see Table 3.1). These are occupied by crofters under crofting tenure as defined by specific statutes, although a few crofters actually own the croft land themselves. The Crofting Reform (Scotland) Act 1976 enabled crofters to seek to acquire an owner's title as of right.

+ Officially recognised under section 5 of the Crofters (Scotland) Act 1961.
schemes for particular areas. Of Mull, the Board spoke of "encouraging more crofters, who have spare bedroom capacity, to cater for tourists .... as .... there is a considerable market value in the idea of holidays on a croft" (H.I.D.B., 1973). To a large extent, similar recognition of tourism and recreation has been made by individual writers considering the need to augment income on crofts (e.g. Turnock, 1970).

2.29. Compared with crofts, the provision of facilities for public recreation and tourism on farms and estates in Scotland has received less attention. The report of the Select Committee on Scottish Affairs (1972a) on Land Resource Use in Scotland considered in some detail, the multiple use of rural land. However, although the report expounded on recreation and tourism on crofts as a means of augmenting crofting income, the aspects of the integration of land uses on other kinds of holding receiving particular comment, involved relationships between forestry, agriculture, amenity conservation, private sport and the control of general public access, rather than the actual provision of facilities by private landowners and farmers.

2.30. Nevertheless, a few studies have mentioned the potential for, or existence of, such activities on Scottish farms or estates. Examples can be found relating to different parts of Scotland. In the South West, the Galloway Project report (Strathclyde University, 1968) considered that the provision of accommodation by farmers in South West Scotland was not nearly so apparent as in Southern Britain although "an extension of such services would
be welcome" and some estates in the area were already providing well planned facilities. In the Highlands and Islands, Millman (1970) described how certain estates were providing accommodation facilities in addition to those providing traditional recreation facilities for the public, such as the selling of fishing permits. And, in the east of Scotland, Ray (1976) has considered the possibilities of a further expansion of tourism in farms in that area; mentioning the need to establish how many farmers are interested in the subject and their characteristics. In addition, as in England and Wales, certain landowners and managers have themselves written or spoken about the subject (e.g. Carr, 1974).

2.31. The discussion and comments on the provision of facilities for tourism and recreation on landholdings so far described have, in part, been fuelled by certain research exercises which have provided original data on this activity. The next few paragraphs are devoted to a short description of these data based studies.

2.32. The earliest study which provides information specifically on the provision of recreation and tourism facilities on farms was by Burton (1967). This was based on the premise that ways of bringing low income levels in certain rural areas into line with national averages should be considered. The potential role of tourism enterprises in doing this was assessed by investigating the economics of ten touring caravan sites, five camping sites and nine horse riding establishments. Some of these case studies were probably on farms but this was not disclosed. However, in a chapter devoted to farm based enterprises, Burton considered
some examples of camping sites, horse riding establishments and
bed and breakfast on farms and discussed their relationship
with agricultural enterprises. He found that the economic
results of facility provision varied considerably between
farms, especially with respect to the revenues earned, owing
to different levels of tourism demand throughout Britain.
Where farmers were able to develop enterprises with little
capital outlay the risk of fluctuation in demand was mini-
mised. Burton concluded that: "when operated as supplementary
enterprises to farming activities, (tourism enterprises) can
provide a very useful addition to farm incomes in return for
a minimal outlay". Only one of Burton's case studies was in
Scotland.

2.33. In three areas of England and Wales surveys have been
carried out with a primary aim of measuring the extent of
the involvement of farmers in facility provision. One of
these areas is the South West of England. Davies has presented
three reports on farm based recreation and tourism in that area.
The first report (Davies, 1969) established that 18% of Cornish
farms were providing accommodation for tourists, a very high
proportion of which was bed and breakfast accommodation. There
appeared to be a large variation throughout Cornwall in the
extent of the involvement: in one very popular tourist area
75% of farmers provided accommodation. The second report by
Davies (1971) revealed that in another area, the Teign Valley,
the proportional involvement by farmers in facility provision
was, again, 18%. A brief economic survey of 15 accommodation
enterprises showed gross margins varying from £80 to £2,400. The final report (Davies, 1973) covered areas on the north and south coasts of Devon. A postal survey indicated that as many as 31% of farmers in these areas provided facilities for tourism: again mainly bed and breakfast but self-catering cottages and flats were almost as prevalent and many farmers provided caravan sites. Recreation facilities were not studied; apart from the fact that one in ten of the farmers with accommodation provided some ancillary facilities for the entertainment of their guests.

2.34. A number of farmers were able to provide financial information. From this Davies indicated average price, revenue and expenditure figures for bed and breakfast, self-catering cottages and touring caravan site enterprises. The variation between enterprises in these respects is reported to be high but little description of the causes of the variation is given. There was a very great deal of variation in the economic impact of the enterprises in terms of total income. On two fifths of the farms giving information, the ratio of tourism receipts to farm output was under 4%, while on 1 in 10 of the farms this ratio was over 50%. Davies found in his three surveys that medium sized farms were the most involved in facility provision. The many farms with less than 50 acres, which may be in most need of supplementary income, were, proportionally, less involved in tourism. Reasons for non-involvement were, in the main, attributed to lack of time and the unsuitable nature of the farm.
2.35. A study by Jacobs (1973) in upland Denbighshire was particularly concerned to ascertain farmers' attitudes to the provision of facilities for tourism. Again, lack of time and of space on the farm or in the house were found to be the most important reasons for farmers not engaging in tourism enterprises, although a shortage of funds to make the initial investment was an important concern of the smaller farmer. Only a few farmers were worried about tourists causing damage to the farm and to amenity generally. A postal survey revealed that 13% of farmers did provide accommodation for tourists, three quarters of which was in the form of farmhouse bed and breakfast. The extent of involvement was found to be fairly similar across various farm size classes.

2.36. Another study in an upland area was carried out by Capstick (1972) in the Westmorland Lake District. She found that in one area studied 30% of farmers provided facilities, while in another area, away from the main tourist concentrations, the proportion was down to 8%. Medium-sized farms were more likely to have facilities than smaller farms. The labour input required to carry on a farm guest house received particular comment and it was reported that such guest houses could sometimes produce an income equivalent to the profit of a small hill farm.

2.37. A study by Bull and Wibberley (1976) contrasts with those previously mentioned in that it was carried out in Kent, Surrey and Sussex, a lowland area with much prosperous farming and close to a major conurbation. In this area, rather than
accommodation predominating, it was found that recreation facilities (horse riding and shooting) were most commonly provided, together with caravan or camping sites. A postal survey showed that just under 10% of farms had facilities but many of these were small, or selective in who they served (e.g. syndicate shoots or camps for Scouts only). The study investigated the relationship between facility provision and a variety of characteristics of the farms, concluding that "recreational enterprises do not display many common distributional characteristics". An investigation of reasons why facilities had been provided suggested that farmers were as much motivated by factors of personal interest in the activity as by profit incentives. However, looking at reasons for not providing facilities, concern that to do so would not be profitable was more prevalent in the South East than in the other areas studied, while lack of time or an unsuitable holding were less important factors. As elsewhere, concern about damage on the farm and amenity was relatively infrequently expressed. A particular problem identified on the South Coast concerned planning permission; many farms indicated that they would go ahead with providing facilities if they felt that they would be allowed to do so by the local authority. This referred to caravan sites in particular.

2.38. Bull and Wibberley also presented some information on the economics of four types of enterprise based on a few interviews. As found by Davies, there was considerable variation between enterprises. Investment varied from zero to 'several thousand
pounds. In general, it was found that most farmers made use of spare resources (land, buildings or labour) and so establishment cost was often low and return on investment high. The authors concluded that "although with some enterprises the amount of revenue is small, it is entirely satisfactory in relation to the amount of effort and money involved".

2.39. In response to the growing demand for recreation and tourism facilities in the countryside and a feeling that farmers could benefit more by supplying such facilities, the Countryside Commission and the Tourist Boards commissioned a national study of farm recreation and tourism in England and Wales which was carried out by Dartington Amenity Research Trust (D.A.R.T.) in 1974 (D.A.R.T., 1974a). It was stated that the study concluded holdings which could be "more accurately described as an estate rather than a farm", but no clear distinction was given. This national study did not include any national survey to ascertain the extent of recreation or tourism facilities on farms. Rather, an estimate was arrived at using the Farm Holiday Guide, an advertising publication used by many farms to market their facilities. Davies's figures for Devon were used to give a ratio between actual provision and entries in the Guide for that county. This ratio was applied to the Guide's total coverage to give an estimate of national provision. The resulting estimate was that between 10 and 15 thousand farms in England and Wales provide facilities for recreation and tourism; that is between 4% and 6% of all farms. The authors estimate that these may attract a total of between £40m. and £50m. in gross spending by visitors.
2.40. D.A.R.T. visited 50 farms in order to investigate the economics of facility provision. It was found that the extent of a purely economic motive in management varied considerably between farms where recreation or tourism was a "business in its own right and success was measured in terms of net income or return on capital invested" and those where the enterprises were merely required to show some revenue margin over direct expenditure, benefit being gained from other factors such as companionship or altruistic satisfaction. Certain aspects of the characteristics of farms were mentioned with respect to their suitability for tourism and recreation. However, no measurements were undertaken to show the incidence of enterprises on different types of farm. The main financial results of the study are presented as a series of model accounts for a number of facilities. It is difficult to see how these models relate to the case studies and no descriptions or explanations of variations between different enterprises found in the field are presented. The approach appears to be one of presenting hypothetical guides to potential developers rather than reporting existing situations. However, the study concludes that "most types of recreation and tourism enterprise can carry both an interest on capital and a 'normal' wage but the reality of these returns for each particular enterprise will depend on many factors (scale, capital cost, charges, expenditure, occupancy, etc.)." Advice on developing enterprises and comparing this with the existing farming "must be related to the specific circumstances of each case".
2.41. All told, "most farmers were very pleased with the way their recreation and tourism enterprises had evolved and the financial and social rewards they provided". These enterprises were also reported to have provided "worthwhile employment for members of the farmer's family who might otherwise have had to leave the area, or for other local people on a full-time or part-time basis". Against these benefits, the study made a brief mention of landscape deterioration, traffic pressures and vandalism which could arise from the enterprises but stated that the impact on the environment was either "beneficial or neutral in most areas" and the adverse impacts could be avoided or minimised by forethought.

2.42. The impact of farm based tourism and recreation on the local environment was an issue of particular importance in the final study to be described. This is a study of the Hartsop Valley in the Lake District, an area about five miles square containing only eight farms, carried out for the Countryside Commission and the Lake District Special Planning Board in 1976 (Feist, et al, 1976). Part of the remit was "to examine the relationship between farming, landscape, recreation and the local community and to suggest the extent to which these are interdependent or in conflict". One of the major sources of income and employment in the valley is tourism and the study recommended an expansion of farm based accommodation, concluding that, although accommodation enterprises may not at first sight appear very remunerative, their value to farmers who are experiencing net farm income in the order of only £1,600 per year
make them well worthwhile. Six out of the eight farmers provided facilities already and, again, six had definite plans for further small developments (1 or 2 static caravans, a small camp site and the conversion of a barn to a holiday cottage) which could bring in a further £10,000 of income to the valley.

2.43. The study describes the considerable detriment to some of the farmers from damage to their farming enterprises from visitor pressure and reports that, although the Planning Board do try and manage visitors, the farmers' sentiment is that the Board "would assist them a lot more by permitting them to develop facilities for tourists on a small scale ... which, say the farmers, would at least help to compensate them for the disbenefits of tourism of which they are the chief sufferers." The farmers were restricted in implementing their plans because they felt that planning permission would not be granted on amenity grounds. However, each farmer could point to a site or building on his farm where he considered that recreation or tourism developments would be barely noticeable, and the research team, in assessing landscape aspects of developments, agreed that the valley could even accommodate 20 caravans or chalets without serious detriment to amenity.

2.44. All the studies described above, providing original data on the provision of tourism and recreation facilities on private landholdings, relate to England and Wales. The lack of data-based reports and of the research essential for them, on this subject in Scotland is most evident. There are none, either at a local or a national level.
2.45. Some studies do touch on the subject. The lengthy report by Millman (1970) on outdoor recreation in the Highland countryside contains a chapter on 'landowning attitudes'. He states that: "in several parts of the Highlands proprietors have begun to cater for the growing tourist demand by organising camping and caravan sites ... and a number of enlightened proprietors are trying to encourage the touring public to partake of fishing, boating, pony-trekking and certain other pursuits on their estates at reasonable charges, as part of a wider management plan involving the channelling of various forms of public recreation into the seasonal rhythm of activities on their properties". Millman's work concentrates very heavily on the existing pattern of general public access in the Highlands and no measurement is made of the supply of facilities by landowners. However, on two estates out of 10 case studies, the existence of one caravan site ("which does not make a profit but which is regarded by the proprietor as an investment in public health and in the amenity of the area") and proposals for another are described, together with pony-trekking. In an appendix, two further estates offering a range of tourism and recreation facilities (caravans, cottages, fishing, boating and pony-trekking) are described and the author writes that they "illustrate different types of recreation projects now being attempted by various landowners which may pave the way to larger schemes in the future".

2.46. A few local studies of tourism and recreation in certain parts of Scotland do mention the provision of facilities on landholdings. Invariably this is not quantified. However, a postal
survey of landowners and farmers in the Lanarkshire and the
Greater Edinburgh area by Duffield and Owen (1970, 1971),
which concentrated mainly on aspects of general public access,
revealed that only 8% of landowners were considering developing
facilities on their land, mainly in relation to improving fishing
and shooting for various purposes. The authors state that:
"the general lack of plans for recreation cannot easily be
explained and it is not clear whether it reflects a genuine
antipathy on the part of landholders". A further study which
provides some figures is that of the Royal Grampian Country
(Aberdeen University, 1969). This study shows that, of bed
and breakfast establishments in rural Deeside and rural Donside
about half are provided in farmhouses. However, the study
reports low occupancy rates in these enterprises for 1967 and
1968 and concludes that, in those years, excess income to farmers
from this source would be as low as £15 and only rarely reached
£150. It was considered that the impact of tourism on farm
incomes was likely to remain small.

2.47. Two final aspects of the literature on tourism and
recreation provision on landholdings should be mentioned.
First, quite frequently the press has carried articles describing
landholders who have set up enterprises; notable in this respect
is the Farmers Weekly. As well as individual articles appearing
over a number of years, this magazine recently produced a 30 page
supplement called 'Profit from Pleasure' (Farmers Weekly, 1977)
containing many detailed stories of successful enterprises.
Secondly, some publications have been produced specifically for
farmers and other landholders to provide them with basic
information on setting up and running recreation and tourism
enterprises. The Wales Tourist Board's booklet 'The Farmer's
Guide to Tourism' (1977)* describes a number of different enterprises
which the farmer may consider and gives guidance on technicalities like acquiring planning permission. Similarly, two
publications on farmhouse and self-catering accommodation and
on caravan and camping sites, have been produced by the Agri-
cultural Development and Advisory Service†, and Regional Tourist
Boards in England have produced short booklets on the subject
(e.g. Heart of England Tourist Board, 1976 and North West Tourist
Board, 1976). No such publications have been produced in
Scotland.

b) General public access onto private landholdings,
where the landholder has not provided facilities

2.43. General access by the public to private land in the
countryside for recreational purposes is a less precise subject
than the actual provision of facilities by private landholders
and it is not proposed to present here a detailed analysis of
literature.

2.49. The growth in demand for countryside recreation and the
public's awareness of this were described earlier in this chapter.

* Previously published as "More money from tourism, a practical
guide for Welsh farmers".
† Cottam (1976) and Vaughn (1976).
However, the need to "secure access to beautiful countryside for all members of the community" and to reverse the "assumption underlying current recreation planning orthodoxy that the main issue is how to protect the countryside from people rather than open it up to them" is still strongly argued (Shoard, 1976).  

2.50. The main way in which local authorities can secure rights of access over private land without acquiring the land themselves is through an access agreement under the two Countryside Acts* (see 2.58). Access agreements can secure for the landholder compensation for damage resulting from access, and the benefit of a warden service operating over the land in question. As access agreements can be clearly identified, they have formed the basis for certain research projects into public access on private land.  

2.51. Gibbs (1976) has measured the impact of public access on uplands in England over which access agreements are in operation. He found that over 80% of farmers with access agreements reported damage to walls and fences and trespass on in-bye land which was outwith the agreement. The worrying of stock by dogs and the straying of sheep causing more time to be spent in shepherding duties were also important. However, visitor access appeared not to have affected actual stocking rates. Certain areas were investigated where grouse shooting predominated. Here landowners

* The first Act of Parliament dealing with access agreements was the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act, 1949 (H.M.S.O., 1949).
reported that grouse bags were not greatly affected by access although access did cause vandalism, poaching and fires at times as well as a diversion of the gamekeeper’s time in order to control visitors.

2.52. Gibbs showed that most landowners and farmers did report an increase in most of these problems as a result of increased access brought about by the agreement but all of them did occur to some extent before the agreement. An attempt was made at assessing the cost to the landholder of nuisance and damage brought about by public access. It was found that very little quantitative information could be obtained from the landholders on this. Therefore the level of compensations paid as a result of the agreements was used as a guide. It was estimated that the costs to farming and grouse shooting were, respectively, in the order of £0.2 and £0.1 per hectare (1973/4 prices) and that, when compared with the returns from farming and grouse shooting, their impact was very small. However, 40% of the farms interviewed considered that the compensation paid was inadequate.

2.53. Although the compensation may often have been inadequate, one of the benefits received by landholders from access agreements is the warden service. Gibbs and Whiby (1975) reported that wardens are involved in helping and advising the public, litter clearing, repair work, reporting damage to the landholders and generally fostering good relationships between them and the users of the access lands. They estimated that the cost to the local authorities of warden services worked out on average at £2 per
hectare for upland areas and £11 per hectare on lowland sites. The advantage of warden services to landholders have been frequently expressed; for instance in evidence to the House of Lords Select Committee on Sport and Leisure* and by Rossiter (1972), who, in her study of access agreements, reported that where the local authorities were approached by landowners about access agreements, the desire to have a warden service operating over the land was usually given by the landowners as the reason for their interest.

2.54. Attitudes to the value of access agreements have been conflicting. Shoard (1974), in advocating access agreements, reports on the benefits to landowners and to the public of certain access agreements in Surrey. On the other hand, Rossiter, in concluding her study (op. cit.) writes: "The goodwill of farmers might reduce the need for the use of elaborate, cumbersome, and so far generally unpopular access agreements as a means of enabling the visiting public to have access to open country". This latter attitude is reflected in the attitude of certain agencies with powers to make agreements. The National Park Officer in the Lake District considers that: "De facto access over the open fell has been traditional in the Lake District. It is part of the friendly relationship and mutual respect and tolerance which has subsisted between sheep farmers and the climbers and walkers. It has always been thought unnecessary and unwise to seek to

* Select Committee on Sport and Leisure (1973) pages 412 to 414.
substitute for general mutual respect and tolerance a very legalistic system of access agreements, which, to achieve a state of affairs comparable with the present would have to extend over every acre of open fell irrespective of intensity of users". This statement is quoted in the report of the Hartsop Valley described earlier (2.42.), the authors of which suggest that, compared with access agreements, "UMEX offers better value in terms of expenditure and effectiveness".

2.55. UMEX refers to the Upland Management Experiments. These experiments took place in Snowdonia and in the Lake District, and were instigated by the Countryside Commission. Reports of the experiments* explain how the objective was to test a scheme to help to reconcile the interests of farmers and visitors by enabling a local project officer+ to liaise with farmers and make direct financial payments on the spot, with no bureaucratic delays, for small scale works, like repairing walls, creating stiles, signposting, etc., which would help in the management of access and recreation. These activities could be undertaken throughout the project areas, irrespective of the existence of legal rights of access. Generally the experiments met with a great deal of success, particularly in the Lake District, due to the goodwill that could be generated with the farming and landowning community by the project officer and the speed with which ideas could be put into action owing to the simplicity of the procedures. The experiment in


+ In the first stage of the experiments the officers were seconded to the project by the A.D.A.S. They had considerable experience of working with and advising farmers.
the Lake District has therefore been extended into an Upland Management Advisory Service which could play a major role in the interrelationship between farmers and tourism and recreation in that area. A similar project in an urban fringe area near Manchester was also successful (Countryside Commission, 1976b).

2.56. The Upland Management Experiments have shown how public money can be used to manage access on lands without entailing the transfer of rights. Access onto private land without access agreements can take place by right (de jure) where traditional rights of way exist over the land or by dually, where it occurs as a fact but not as a right. The feasibility of access taking place in this way depends on the nuisance and damage it causes to landholders and on their tolerance of it. Quantitative information on this is scarce, but various local studies have referred to the issues. The Hartsop Valley Study (Prest et al., op. cit.) lists problems experienced by farmers in that area — damage to property, damage to crops and livestock (especially by dogs), the deposition of litter and foul matter and the obstruction of gateways — and implies that attitudes reflect the extent of damage. Similarly, a report on the Pennine Uplands+ lists problems but states that they are caused by thoughtlessness and vandalism and not by inherent conflict between recreation and agriculture. The problems have also been acknowledged and listed in official reports (Countryside Review Committee, and Advisory Council for Agriculture and Horticulture — op. cit.).

* Occasionally new rights of way have been created through footpath agreements.
+ Yorkshire and Humberside Economic Planning Board (1975).
2.57. In Scotland it has been reported that: "much of the rural provision (for leisure) for the public at large is *de facto*, through tradition and the tolerance of landowners and occupiers, rather than *de jure*" (Coppock, 1974). In fact, until recently no access agreement had been secured in Scotland. One aspect of this unstructured form of access relates to the law of trespass. There has been a general public understanding that there is no law of trespass in Scotland and that the public have free right of access. However, there is little difference in the law of trespass between Scotland and England. The public does not have a right of access and anyone entering private property may be ordered to leave. The main practical difference between Scotland and England relates to the difficulty of securing damages against the trespasser as, in Scotland, there is no penalty against trespass itself and damages can only be secured if it is established that the trespasser has actually caused damage.*

2.58. Much opinion has been expressed in favour of access agreements in Scotland. This opinion was reflected by the Select Committee on Scottish Affairs in 1972 which reported that it was "sorry that such a promising development had got off to such a slow start". The Countryside Commission for Scotland has set store by access agreements, providing access land *is* within the regional and special parks they propose (Countryside Commission for Scotland, 1974). Recent years have seen a growth in access agreements in Scotland but still in the eleven years since the

* These facts have been laid out clearly in the report of Study Group 9 for the Countryside in 1970 Conference (Royal Society of Arts, 1965).
Countryside (Scotland) Act only nine have been signed and the Commission is still reporting difficulties (Countryside Commission for Scotland, 1978).

2.59. No experiments similar to 'UMEX' have been tried in Scotland. On the other hand, two experimental projects involving Countryside rangers have taken place, entailing activities similar to those of wardens operating over access lands in England, described above. In Speyside it was found that a ranger service provided by the Countryside Commission for Scotland met with considerable success in helping with visitor management and in liaison and co-ordination between individuals and organisations concerned with public access in the area (Countryside Commission for Scotland, 1975). However, the project could not continue owing to the "existing legislative restrictions" on the employment of rangers; that their area or areas of operation must relate primarily to land or water over which the employing authority has a legal interest, be it by ownership, lease or agreement (such as an access agreement).

2.60. Turning to the impact of public access in Scotland, two studies which provide information on the subject should be mentioned in particular. The studies by Duffield and Owen (1970, 1971) in Lanarkshire and Greater Edinburgh actually gave proportions of landholders experiencing different forms of access and different types of problems from it; although the postal survey

* Under the Countryside (Scotland) Act, 1967.
of landowners and farmers, on which it was based, achieved only a very low response rate. Car-parking and picnicking were reputed to occur on 34% and 37% of holdings respectively, and walking on 42%. Camping and caravanning occurred on 14% of holdings but other activities were very much less frequent. The most frequently mentioned problems from access were disturbance of stock, litter and gates being left open. In complete contrast, the study by Millman (1970) on recreation in the Highlands provides a great deal of detailed qualitative description of the extent, possibilities and possible consequences of public access in specific areas, off specific roads, on specific lochs and rivers, and so on, based on personal observations and interviews. However, it is almost impossible to bring together Millman's findings to obtain a clear overall picture of the extent and consequences of public access.

2.61. Apart from these two major studies, a number of local studies in Scotland have mentioned public access on private landholdings and some of these have listed the problems arising from access (for instance, Brown, 1972; Aberdeen University, 1969; Pentland Hills Technical Group, 1972). Summarising the situation for Scotland in 1972, the Select Committee on Scottish Affairs stated that: "the evidence presented to us does not indicate that agriculture is more than locally affected by recreational pressures ... There may be particular places where there is a clash, such as Glen Coe. On lower ground, cases of damage and litter arise, but these, though certainly annoying farmers and likely to colour their views of tourists, have not so far, in our assessment of the
evidence, amounted to a serious loss of amenity”.

c) The policies and activities of organisations in Scotland relating to recreation and tourism on private landholdings

2.62. The above investigation of discussion and comment on tourism and recreation on private landholdings has revealed a considerable amount of interest in the subject by government appointed committees and agencies. Further, individual writers concerned with the subject have paid much attention to the existing and potential activities of government agencies and other organisations and this aspect has been presented as an integral and important part of reviews and analyses (for instance: Dower, 1973; Coppock and Duffield, 1975; Thomson and Whitby, 1976). Therefore, it is considered to be important that the results of the research presented in this thesis should be seen against a background of the existing policies and activities of government bodies in Scotland concerning recreation and tourism on private land. These are described below, using information obtained from personal contact with the bodies and from certain publications they produce, such as their annual reports.

2.63. The Scottish Tourist Board (S.T.B.) provides advice and financial assistance to developers and potential developers of tourist facilities. Financial assistance is given by loan or grant up to the level of 50% of establishment cost. This proportion will vary from project to project. Loans are given at an interest rate which broadly follows commercial rates. In the 1976/77 financial year, 108 tourist development projects
received financial assistance, amounting to £1,213,891. Advice
was given to 604 establishments (including some of the above).
The level of assistance, and whether or not it is given, is
totally at the discretion of the Board.

2.64. The extent to which the Board's advice and assistance
is received by private landholders is difficult to assess.
However, it is estimated that this has amounted to about £500,000
of financial assistance since the Board's inception; equivalent
to about 12% of all assistance given, excluding assistance to
hotels under the Hotel Development Incentive Scheme. Turning
to advice, it is estimated that in the year 1976/77 about 50
landholders received advice from the Board's Advisory Service;
equivalent to about 3% of all enterprises receiving advice.

2.65. Recently the Board has emphasised a policy (following
Government guidelines on tourism) to encourage development in
areas of economic need ('fragile' areas) and has been considering
the locus of economic need and also tourism potential with the
help of the Scottish Economic Planning Department. The relative
ability of projects to enhance incomes and alleviate unemployment
in these areas, which include very many remote rural areas where
the population is largely engaged in agriculture, is an important
consideration. The need for collaboration with other agencies
is also being stressed at the moment.

2.66. The Highlands and Islands Development Board (H.I.D.B.)
is responsible for giving financial assistance and advice on
commercial tourism and recreation developments in the Highlands
and Islands area.* The Board also has limited funds to assist with the provision of non-commercial social and recreation facilities. These powers are part of the Board's wider powers to assist any undertaking which will contribute to the economic or social development of the area. Tourism (including recreation) projects accounted for 35% of all the Board's financial assistance in 1976, receiving £2.2m. over 181 projects.

2.67. Board assistance does not normally exceed 50% of the cost of establishing a project, although in exceptional cases a higher level of assistance can be considered. In every case, applications are assessed on their merit, and assistance can be by way of grant and/or loan, with interest rates at less than commercial rates. In the past, a special scheme was operated for chalet developments (latterly restricted to crofters) involving a 55% loan from the Royal Bank of Scotland at 'bank rate plus 4%' plus a 35% Board grant. This scheme had little impact.

2.68. Detailed figures on the amount of the Board's tourism assistance which has gone to farmers, crofters, and estate owners are not available, but statistics taken for one year at random (1975) show the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of projects</th>
<th>Total assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crofters</td>
<td>£27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>£47,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate owners</td>
<td>£66,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>£140,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The H.I.D.B. area covers the Highland Region, the Western Isles, Orkney and Shetland, Argyll and Bute, and Arran.
This compares with total Board assistance of about £1,650,000 to 150 tourism projects in 1975, i.e. assistance to crofters, farmers and estate owners amounted to 8.5% of total tourism assistance and the projects assisted amounted to 14.6% of all those assisted by the Board.

2.69. The Board also offers a range of advisory services to those engaged in tourism or considering a new development. Usually those seeking the Board's advice are considering a project for which they would also be seeking financial assistance. The Board now has development officers in Shetland, Stornoway, Wick, Lochgilphead, Mull, Orkney and Arran, with whom initial contact can be made at a local level.

2.70. The Board regards the maintenance of the population in the remoter rural parts of the Highlands and Islands, and the provision of new employment opportunities in these areas, as fundamentally important. Development emphasis is being placed on locations away from the growth areas associated with North Sea oil.

2.71. The **Countryside Commission for Scotland (C.C.S.)** gives grants to the private sector (usually 75%) for the provision of recreation facilities, under Section 7 of the Countryside (Scotland) Act, 1967. Normally such facilities are for informal countryside recreation (e.g. paths, car-parks, picnic sites, interpretative facilities, and toilets) and are non-commercial. Before a grant can be given, the Commission must be satisfied that it would not be preferable for the project to be carried out by a public body.
Grants to voluntary bodies and private individuals in 1975 amounted to £97,888 spread amongst 29 projects, the majority going to voluntary bodies. In 1973/4 not all the money allotted for grants under Section 7 was allocated, although recent promotion of opportunities to landowners has redressed this, and the amount of funds available has also increased. In addition, the Commission gives much advice to private landowners and farmers concerning informal recreation, amenity, conservation and countryside interpretation. The Commission has operated a grant aid scheme for small touring caravan sites on crofts, with applications channelled initially through the Crofters Commission. Only a very small number of caravan sites have been grant aided owing to the fact that many applications have not met the Countryside Commission's siting standards.

2.72. The Commission is concerned with the promotion of access agreements between landowners and local authorities. So far, only nine access agreements have been made in Scotland, and experience of these is therefore limited.

2.73. The Commission can assist ranger services provided by local authorities, under Section 67 of the Countryside (Scotland) Act, but such services must generally be in respect of land over which the authority has made, or has powers to make, byelaws - i.e. land owned by the local authority, country parks, or land over which access agreements have been made. Under Section 7 of the Act, private landowners can receive grants for the employment of rangers but the Commission will require to be satisfied that the landowner is managing the land primarily for
public access, comparable to byelaw areas managed by local authorities. Such grant aid has been provided for services on four estates owned by private individual landowners in different parts of Scotland.

2.74. The Commission is considerably involved in promoting education about countryside matters, through the Conservation Education branch.

2.75. The Commission may offer observations on commercial tourism and private recreation development through consultations under Sections 8 and 9 of the Act, in which advice is sought, mainly by local authorities, on proposed new development in the countryside. Many of these consultations relate to recreation, landscape and amenity issues.

2.76. The Department of Agriculture and Fisheries for Scotland (D.A.F.S.) provides grants and loans for crofters to assist in the improvement or extension of their houses or the building of new houses and the Department specifically states that allowance can be made for additional accommodation for tourists.* There are ceilings on grants and loans payable: £3,100 grant and £4,200 loan for a new house; £750 grant and £2,200 loan for improvements. Loans are available at the extremely favourable rate of 3½%. In 1976, £632,801 in grants and £1,074,821 in loans were paid towards 467 projects, three quarters of which were housing projects.

---

* If a crofter acquires his croft under the Crofting Reform (Scotland) Act 1976, he retains his entitlement to housing assistance for a period of seven years.
Many crofters use this assistance to provide bed and breakfast and sometimes self-catering accommodation in part of the house. In addition, a new house built under the scheme can allow the crofter to make available an old house, unsuitable for his own permanent occupation, for holiday letting. As the Department's function is to promote agriculture, with S.T.B., H.I.D.B. and C.C.C. being responsible for tourism and recreation, it does not regard itself as a body assisting tourism and recreation in any way. However, undoubtedly it does do just this. The financial assistance from D.A.F.S. available to crofters through the Housing Scheme is promoted specifically as one source of support for tourism and recreation development.

2.77. An important activity coming under the auspices of the Department is the provision of advice to the agricultural community through the three Agricultural Colleges. In 1976, 31,295 advisory visits were made to landholders. In the past, advice has officially been given on agricultural subjects only but recently a socio-economic advisor has been appointed to each college in compliance with E.E.C. Directive 72/161 on Agricultural Structure (E.E.C., 1972). The work of these socio-economic advisors usually entails following up landholders' enquiries identified initially by ordinary front-line agricultural advisors. Some enquiries are referred further to S.T.B. or H.I.D.B. etc. In the West and East Colleges, the advisor has been working on socio-economic work full-time. The East College advisor has reported that 'at least half' of his work has involved enquiries about tourism and recreation developments on landholdings while for the West College advisor, such
enquiries have constituted 'the vast majority' of requests for advice. The North College advisor has continued to work as an area agricultural advisor as well. His work on tourism and recreation matters has been less than the other advisors. This is partly because ordinary agricultural advisors in the area have been advising crofters on tourism in the past anyway and have simply continued with this without reference to the socio-economic advisor.

2.78. In addition to advice from college advisors and the socio-economic advisors, landholders often receive advice direct from the D.A.R.P.S. lands staff in the course of their agricultural administration work. Here again, these staff act as front-line agricultural advisors with close contact with individual farmers and crofters at a local level.

2.79. The main involvement of local authorities in tourism and recreation on private land is through the granting of planning permission for developments requiring it under the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1972. In the past, attitudes to tourism and recreational developments may have varied between areas and individual applications in a rather inconsistent way. Recently, various statutory bodies have promoted integrated planning studies (S.T.A.R.P.S.) for tourism and recreation to be drawn up by the Regional Planning Authorities (see 2.12.), which should help to clarify issues and lead to more rational and consistent policies with regard to developments on private land in rural areas. These policies should be reflected in the completion and appraisal of structure plans and local plans which
set out policies on development control.

2.80. Local authorities can assist tourism developments directly via grants for housing improvement, thereby enabling some farmers and crofters to provide bed and breakfast accommodation. In relation to general public access on private land, local authorities are responsible for litter disposal, rights of way, and those activities mentioned above under the Countryside Commission for Scotland.

2.81. There are many voluntary bodies in Scotland concerned with tourism and recreation on private land. Some organisations are primarily concerned with informal recreation, landscape and amenity; information on these is presented in the publication "Who does what for Scotland's countryside?" (Countryside Commission for Scotland, undated). Others exist whose activities only partly involve tourism and recreation. The Scottish Landowners Federation, which provides a representational and advisory service for landowners, has had a Recreation Committee for many years; the Association of Agriculture has done a considerable amount of work on farm interpretation; and the Highland Fund Ltd. provides small loans at very low interest rates for projects in the Highlands and Islands, notably to crofters, some of which have been tourism projects.

2.82. An organisation which is of special interest here is the Scottish Recreational Land Association (S.R.L.A.), since its aims and activities relate solely to tourism and recreation provision on private landholdings in Scotland. The establishment of the
Association has been cited as evidence of the growing interest by Scottish landowners in public recreation and tourism (Coppock and Duffield, 1975). The Association has 200 members, the vast majority of whom are proprietors of estates providing facilities on their land. Membership also includes a number of professional consultants. The Association was formed in 1972 with the aim of encouraging the owners and occupiers of Scottish land to provide greatly increased facilities for public recreation of the highest possible standards and on a sound revenue-earning basis.

2.83. Advice is given to members only and is mainly in the form of putting landowners in touch with specialists and with each other. This latter activity - one landowner learning directly from another landowner with experience - makes the Association unique: it is aided by a register of members willing to give free advice to others.

2.84. The Association provides a collective voice for landowners on matters specifically relating to tourism and recreation on private land. It has made representations to Government Departments and Bodies on a number of issues. Probably its voice would carry more weight if the membership was more representative of private rural landholders in general. Very significantly, the National Farmers Union of Scotland (N.F.U.S.) has decided to treat the Association as the body officially to be recommended to N.F.U.S. members seeking advice and assistance on recreational land use.

2.85. The Association is actively trying to promote membership to farmers. Before a farmer can make use of the advisory services (e.g. the register) he must pay the annual subscription of £15.
This could be restrictive. Financially, the Association depends on the subscription but it is supported by a lot of goodwill from members offering general help and some members have made generous donations. The Association may soon seek sponsorship, but it desires to remain totally independent in action, working for the benefit of its members.

2.86. It is worth comparing the S.R.L.A. with its sister organisation in England and Wales as this latter organisation operates quite differently and provides an example of a possible future development in Scotland. The organisation is called the Farm Based Recreation Information Centre (F.B.R.I.C.) and it obtains a small annual sponsorship from the Countryside Commission, the English Tourist Board and a number of other organisations. There is no membership. Any landholder can seek advice and the centre handles about 3,000 enquiries a year mainly about facility provision—sources of finance, planning, promotion, establishment, management, costings, etc. An enquiry is sometimes met by a visit to the landholding by one of a panel of 30 consultants operating independently in the recreational land use field. Initial visits are charged at a rate of £10 plus travelling expenses but if detailed advice is required, follow up visits are charged at commercial rates.

4. FUTURE DEMAND FOR RECREATION AND TOURISM IN SCOTLAND

2.87. Implicit in much of the comment, discussion and policy statements concerning countryside recreation and tourism is the acceptance of a growing demand.
2.88. It is extremely difficult to make forward predictions of the pattern and extent of future demand for recreation and tourism. Some of the difficulties are described by Rodgers (1969) who suggests that changing social attitudes may invalidate any application of previous trends and that "in the short term 'trend' may easily be disturbed by 'incident'". Rodgers argues that one should look to the longer term, but here the possibilities of radical changes in the structure of society can also make predictions very inaccurate.

2.89. Writers in the 1960's emphasised the probability of a continuing rapid growth in countryside recreation and tourism (Patmore, 1970). Comparing a number of recreation activities, Nicholls and Young (1968) conclude that "the greatest growth rates are likely to occur among those forms of recreation which take place in a rural setting. Social and economic changes are continuing both to remove constraints on going into the countryside and to increase the desire to do so". Rodgers, despite his apprehension, suggested that such activities as camping and open-country recreation would grow, in particular, in the short term and, indeed, informal countryside and water-based pursuits could continue to grow in popularity in the longer term as changes in society produce more leisure time for the young middle aged.

2.90. However, in the early 1970's there occurred one of those 'incidents' which disturb trends, referred to by Rodgers. This was the energy crisis and the increasing cost of motoring. This
factor, coupled with a stagnant economy, led writers to be less optimistic about the future growth in countryside recreation and tourism and more cautious in making predictions (Davidson and Wibberley, 1977). On the other hand, it is argued that the decline in the growth rate of recreation traffic flows in the mid-1970's brought on by the fuel crisis was merely a hiccup in well established trends rather than the beginnings of structural change (White, 1976). Thus, writers looking at the longer term are predicting considerable further growth: for instance, Coppock (1977) suggests that: "in the long run, it may be doubted if higher fuel prices will greatly affect recreational trips into the countryside, for more leisure and longer holidays will pull in the opposite direction".

2.91. Turning specifically to Scotland, certain forecasts have been made of the future growth of tourism and recreation. The Scottish Tourist Board commissioned the consultants 'Business and Economic Planning' (1975) to make a forecast of the demand for tourism. The result was a predicted growth of 22 million person-nights between 1973 and 1985. Considering the nature of this growth in tourism and also the pattern of further growth in outdoor recreation in Scotland, the S.T.A.R.P.S. team (see 2.12.) have suggested that both these activities will continue to grow but that, compared with the trends prior to 1973, there will be more emphasis on less expensive accommodation and recreation pursuits and, in particular, the growth in leisure motoring and touring holidays may be restricted, owing to fuel costs. However, these opinions were made with an eye to the short term only.
2.92. With respect to outdoor recreation, the S.T.A.R.P.S. team, looking further forward, suggest that: "although pleasure motoring may be somewhat inhibited in the next few years, eventually it is likely to extend throughout Scotland and make demands upon remote areas as well as places near the rain towns". This has considerable implications for private landholders. It is also arguable that tourism in Scotland will be much orientated towards rural areas in the future. Market research indicates that the greatest strength of Scotland in terms of its image amongst potential holiday makers lies in the ability of its natural resources to satisfy countryside holiday requirements (Social and Community Planning Research, 1974). The D.A.R.T. (1974a) study of Farm Recreation and Tourism in England and Wales stated that "demand for tourism of types relevant to farms could well grow faster than that for tourism as a whole". There is little to suggest that this premise should not apply at least as strongly in Scotland.

5. THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE PRESENT RESEARCH

2.93. The objective of this thesis, to elucidate the interrelationship between private rural landholders and tourism and recreation in Scotland, was stated at the end of Chapter One. In that chapter, two major aspects of the interrelationship were postulated; the occurrence of access by tourists and recreationists onto landholdings through independent action and the actual provision of facilities for them by landholders. It was stated that the
thesis would examine these aspects through the medium of the landholder.

2.94. The foregoing investigation of expressed concern and knowledge relating to tourism and recreation in the countryside has revealed an explicit or implicit identification by individual writers and, significantly, by authoritative committees of the importance of the interrelationship between landholders and tourism and recreation. However, although more work on the subject has been carried out in England and Wales, very little factual, research based, information is available for Scotland.

2.95. In the first instance, the question arises to what extent private landholders in Scotland are involved with tourism or recreation, either through the provision of facilities or through the experience of general public access. Further to this, are all types of landholder involved? The situation on crofts and estates has been the subject of particular comment and yet little information is available to show whether and how these landholdings differ from others with respect to their interrelationship with tourism and recreation. More specifically, tourism and recreation may be especially associated with landholdings exhibiting certain basic characteristics. As well as the extent and distribution of the interrelationship between landholders and tourism and recreation, questions also arise as to the inherent nature of this; in particular, the kinds of facilities which landholders are providing on their holdings.

2.96. Looking to the future, it is clearly important to understand landholders' attitudes to recreation and tourism on their land, as
they are the primary decision makers with respect to the accommodation or acceptance of this form of land use. Do landholders in Scotland have ideas for future facility provision? What are their reasons for providing facilities and what factors influence decisions against facility provision; also, how do they react to general public access on their land?

2.97. The evidence presented in this chapter shows up the interest and concern within Scotland about the implications of landholders' involvement with recreation and tourism; in particular the economic advantages to be gained from this. Therefore, some assessment of the effect of recreation and tourism on private land is clearly called for, both with respect to the landholders themselves and more widely.

2.98. This thesis sets out to answer the questions posed above and to go some way to provide the information which is lacking. In the main, this will be done through the presentation of results obtained from surveys of landholders throughout Scotland, carried out in the ways described in the next chapter. The points raised above are covered during the course of the thesis as results are set out in sequence. Therefore the final chapter is not written as a summary or conclusion, which would be repetitive, but rather suggests directions for policy using the results obtained. The concern and involvement of public agencies with tourism and recreation in rural Scotland has already been described. It is therefore considered important that this research should contribute to their policy making. This contribution is seen as an objective in
association with that of elucidating the interrelationship between tourism and recreation and private landholders in the aspects described above.
CHAPTER THREE

THE METHODS ADOPTED

3.1. Owing to the lack of published data on recreation and tourism on private landholdings in Scotland, it was clear that a great deal of original field work had to be carried out for this project. This chapter describes the surveys of landholders undertaken.

3.2. It was decided that information was required at two levels. First, detailed information was required on the ways in which recreation and tourism are provided for and managed on landholdings, the economics of this and so on. It was considered that the only way to obtain this detailed information was through conducting interviews with landholders. Secondly, it was important to obtain an indication of the extent of various types of involvement by landholders in recreation and tourism throughout Scotland. Here the over-riding objective was to obtain a wide coverage of landholders and so it was decided that a postal survey should be carried out of as wide a sample of landholders as possible, representative of the population.

3.3. If a survey is to be conducted effectively there is a need to start off with some initial knowledge or concept of the nature of the subject concerned within the population being studied. Therefore it was decided that, at the outset, discussions would be held with organisations in Scotland concerned with recreation and tourism and land use and then, most importantly, with agencies in
regular contact with individual landholders at a local level. This latter series of discussions led to the drawing up of a selection of landholders to be visited for interview, as described below. The postal survey was carried out after the interview survey. This meant that experience obtained from the interviews could be used in drafting questions for the postal survey. This is important, as a printed postal survey questionnaire is naturally inflexible and so a comprehension of the appropriate wording and content of questions at the outset is extremely valuable. Another reason for carrying out the postal survey after the interview survey was the order in which it was possible to arrange finance for the execution of the project.

3.4. In the end, the interview survey concentrated on landholders actually found to be providing facilities for recreation and tourism. Information was obtained from them on many aspects of this provision. General public access on landholdings was not used as a criterion for choosing landholders for interview as it was not easy to identify initially particular landholders with different types of access and problems arising from it (no access agreements had been made in Scotland at the time when the interview survey was carried out). Although this subject was discussed with landholders interviewed, much of the information on it was obtained from the postal survey. In addition, the postal survey was the primary medium for obtaining information on reasons why landholders are not engaged in the provision of facilities and, in general, this postal survey provided the quantitative information on the extent
of the interrelationship between landholders and tourism and recreation.

1. THE INTERVIEW SURVEY

3.5. It was mentioned above that holdings included in the interview survey were those which had some form of tourism or recreation facility and that the selection of holdings to visit was made after discussion with various agencies in contact with landholders at a local level. The main agency used for this purpose was the National Farmers Union of Scotland. Thirty six Area or Branch Secretaries of the Union were visited, throughout Scotland. In certain areas these visits were supported by visits to representatives of the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries for Scotland and the Crofters Commission. Another organisation contacted, the Scottish Recreational Land Association (see 2.82.) provided information on estates with facilities, in particular.

3.6. The officers contacted were asked to give names and addresses of landholders in their areas who were providing facilities for recreation or tourism. Sometimes information on facility types discovered on surveys in England (see Chapter Two) was used to prompt ideas. Frequently the officers could think of many examples of certain types of facility; these were discussed with the officers and a representative selection of names and addresses was finally recorded. A card index of names and addresses was produced, together with any other information about the holding which could be useful. The discussions with officers also served
to give an insight into the variation in activities and attitudes of landholders in different parts of Scotland.

Other methods of obtaining names and addresses of landholders with facilities might have entailed the use of literature or personnel concerned primarily with tourism and recreation facilities and not with the land. It was felt that this would put the emphasis in the wrong place and might lead one to include, by mistake, facilities not on landholdings.

3.7. In the end, the card index contained about 370 holdings (mainly farms and crofts) mentioned by the N.P.U.S. Secretaries or D.A.F.S. Officers. From these and about 100 full members of the S.R.L.A. (mainly estates) a selection of 120 holdings was made, comprising 30 crofts, 60 farms and 30 estates. The selection was governed by a desire to obtain a broadly representative collection of facility and landholding types, covering a number of different types of provision.

3.8. The first few visits were used to explore the methods of conducting the interviews and the questions which could most usefully or easily be answered. After this, a very lengthy and detailed questionnaire was drawn up but this was soon modified as it was found that landholders were much more able to provide information in an unstructured discussion. The questionnaire was converted into what amounted to a list of topics to be covered at some time in the discussion. It was considered to be important to obtain information about all the facilities.

* This type of list has been referred to as a Depth Interview Guide (Morton-Williams, 1978).
provided on the landholding so that a picture could be formed of the total involvement in recreation and tourism, and any relationship between one facility and another could be brought out. As well as investigating fully the provision of facilities, part of each interview was concerned with obtaining details of the holding and other enterprises on it.

3.9. The response to the interviews was varied. This was only to be expected. Indeed, if every landholder had been willing and able to answer all the questions fully and with confidence, then one would suspect that the chosen holdings were quite unrepresentative. Interviews varied in length from about one hour to a full day. Sometimes, the interview had to be concluded rapidly owing to the farmer's or landholder's busy time-table. Frequently answers to certain questions could not be provided. Very occasionally this was because the landholder did not wish to divulge the answer; despite assurances of confidentiality; or, more usually, it was because the information was just not known. The extent to which full financial data were available in a written form varied greatly. Usually financial data were collected by working through the various aspects of development and management with the landholder, stage by stage, with the help of records and accounts wherever these were available.

2. THE POSTAL SURVEY

3.10. The postal survey was carried out in three parts. The main survey is described in detail below, followed by short descriptions of two subsidiary surveys.
The sampling frame

3.11. A sampling frame was sought which covered all private rural landholdings in Scotland.

3.12. The possibility of using the National Farmers Union for Scotland's membership lists was investigated. However, it was found that the membership was too restricted for the purposes of the survey. Another possibility was a survey of ownership units carried out by Millman in 1969. This source was unsuitable in that the survey did not cover tenanted holdings and appeared to contain few holdings under 500 acres.* The sampling frame chosen for use was the official agricultural census of June 1974. This annual census covers all agricultural holdings with agricultural enterprises requiring over 40 standard man days+ of work per year. However, there are many landholdings in Scotland, notably crofts, with smaller agricultural enterprises than this. Such enterprises are classed by D.A.F.S. as 'statistically insignificant' (s.i.) and are recorded in a census held every three years. The s.i. census for 1973 was added to the main sampling frame. Some of these s.i. holdings may not be used regularly for agriculture but are still registered by D.A.F.S. as agricultural holdings; this applies to many crofts.

* Millman's work has been used by McEwen to determine the hierarchy of landlordism (McEwen, 1975, 1977). McEwen has drawn attention to the limited coverage of the survey - viz., of Renfrew: "This is one of the counties with quite large areas without boundaries of estates marked by Millman".

+ See Chapter Six, paragraph 6.19.
Sampling and response

3.13. One of the main advantages of using the agricultural census was that a considerable amount of information on each holding is kept by D.A.F.S. in computer storage. Therefore, with the help of the D.A.F.S. computer staff, it was possible to take an accurate stratified random sample of holdings from the census. A sample of 2,913 holdings was taken from the total of 50,228 holdings making census returns.

3.14. Even when a random sample is taken it is possible that the sample may be atypical of the population being studied, due to chance differences between the members of the population included in the sample and those not included. Such atypical samples are said to be subject to sampling error (Yates, 1960). Stratified sampling entails dividing the population into groups according to specific characteristics and taking a random sample containing the same proportion of units from each group. This ensures that each group is represented in the correct proportion in the sample and reduces the possibility of sampling error. This technique is most valuable if the choice of characteristics used in stratification are related to the subject of the survey (Moser and Kalton, 1971). It was felt that the commercial size of the holding and its location could be important factors in terms of an interrelationship with recreation and tourism and therefore holdings were grouped according to agricultural enterprise size and location within Scotland. The choice was also influenced

* Measured by standard man days, see paragraph 6.19. This information was supplied by D.A.F.S. for each holding.
by the fact that grouping by these characteristics could easily be carried out using the information held by D.A.F.S.

3.15. The stratification procedure ensured that the sample was fully representative of the population of holdings in Scotland according to enterprise size and location. Further information obtained from D.A.F.S. for each holding made it possible to check how representative the sample was in terms of three other characteristics. Using population data from Tables 19, 21 and 44 of Agricultural Statistics (Scotland) 1974 (D.A.F.S., 1975a) it was found that the proportion of sampled to total holdings was quite uniform between:

- agricultural type groups* (ranging from 5.6% to 6.1%)
- tenure groups (5.8% for both 'owned' and 'rented'), and
- acreage groups (ranging from 5.4% to 6.0%)

It is concluded that the sample taken successfully represented the population of holdings in Scotland.

3.16. Forty four of the sampled holdings were owned by local authorities or other public bodies and were removed from the sample. Most of these were small areas of land which were being held by local authorities prior to urban development but 15 were larger holdings, viz: 12 Forestry Commission estates, the Island of Rhum (Nature Conservancy Council), Glenforsa Estate (D.A.F.S.) and Dreghorn Estate (Ministry of Defence). It was

* Hill sheep, upland, etc. See 6.30.
found that a further 16 holdings no longer existed. Adjusting this latter figure for non-response (see below) and assuming that a response had been received from all publicly owned holdings, the effective sample size is reduced from 2,913 to 2,848.

3.17. A usable response was obtained from 2,226 holdings, which is a response rate of 75%. An unusable response was received from 104 holdings. Frequently this amounted to a note to say that the person to whom the questionnaire was addressed had gone away. When this happened a fresh questionnaire was sent addressed to 'the occupier' of that holding but, even so, 73 holdings had to be treated as non-respondents because of this, three quarters of these being statistically insignificant holdings. The remaining 31 unusable responses were either blank questionnaires or contained explanations of why the respondent did not wish to participate.

3.18. The 75% response rate was much higher than anticipated. This good result encourages belief that there should be little bias in the ensuing results due to non-response. The extent of non-response bias could be tested with respect to the characteristics of holdings recorded by D.A.F.S. The response rate varied only slightly between acreage groups, type of tenure, type of agriculture and region of location. Chi-squared tests indicated that the difference between respondents and non-respondents was insignificant* in each case. There was a slightly greater dissimilarity with respect to agricultural enterprise size. It was found that only

* at the 95% confidence level.
73% of statistically insignificant holdings had responded compared with an average of 77% for larger holdings. Many s.i. holdings may have not responded because of a change of occupier* (see above). It is not certain that such holdings should still be regarded as individual holdings and so no adjustment or weighting has been made to correct for this slightly lower response. It is concluded that there was little non-response bias with respect to the characteristics of the holdings on which information was available. As far as it is possible to tell, the respondents successfully represented the constructed sample. Thus, the resulting final sample - the usable questionnaires - appears to be representative of the population.

3.19. It is interesting to compare the 75% response rate obtained by this postal survey with that achieved by other postal surveys of landholders on the subject of recreation and tourism. The three postal surveys carried out in England and Wales on farm based tourism and recreation received the following response rates, depending on the parts of the various areas surveyed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Response Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denbighshire; Jacobs (1973)</td>
<td>61% and 67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon; Davies (1973)</td>
<td>54%, 57% and 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East England; Bull and Wibberley (1976)</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results are rather less satisfactory than that achieved for this study. However, the only comparable postal survey in Scotland,

* Remember that the s.i. sample was based on a 1973 Census.
carried out in Lanarkshire, the Lothians and Peebles by Duffield and Owen (1970) on a sample of National Farmers' Union, Scottish Landowners' Federation and Scottish Woodland Owners' Association members, received an even lower response: only 31%. Compared with this result, a 75% response rate to a survey of landholders throughout Scotland appears excellent. It may be that the result reflects the techniques used in carrying out the survey, which are described below.

Conducting the Survey

3.20. Two pilot surveys were carried out in December 1974. The aim was to test the length and nature of the questionnaire, to get an idea of response rate and to investigate the effect of a reminder post-card.

3.21. Both Pilots were based on samples of English farmers so that there would be no possible duplication with the main survey. Names and addresses were taken at random from lists of farmers in the yellow pages of telephone directories. In the first Pilot, 60 questionnaires were sent to farmers in Northumberland, Cumbria and Norfolk and in the second, 64 were sent to farmers in Yorkshire and Durham. The first Pilot achieved a 33% response in the first five days after which a reminder note was sent. The final response was 51%. The second Pilot achieved a 30% response in the first week, a reminder was then despatched and the overall response reached 56%. Half the questionnaires used in the second pilot survey were very short indeed: only five questions. The response
rate achieved by this short version was only very slightly
greater than that achieved by the full questionnaire. Few
landholders appeared to have difficulty in answering the
questions. The overall effect of the pilot surveys was to
confirm that the phrasing of questions was satisfactory, that
there was no need to reduce the length of the questionnaire and
that reminder notices were essential.

3.22. The survey proper was carried out between January and
March 1975. The time of the year was chosen because it is not
an especially busy period in the farming calendar. In a study
of the response to postal surveys by farmers, Davies and Hill
(1965) advocated "the timing of mail surveys at less busy
seasons, say December or January".

3.23. Each landholder was sent a questionnaire with a covering
letter and a return envelope with a stamp affixed. After one
week those landholders who had not responded were sent a reminder
post-card and if there was still no response in the following
fortnight a second copy of the questionnaire, with a different
covering letter and another stamped addressed envelope, was
despatched. The timing of these reminders and the response can
be seen in Figure 3.1. The extreme importance of the reminder
notes and the second questionnaire is clearly seen. A very
thorough assessment of the ways in which various research workers
have attempted to encourage response to postal surveys is to be
found in a paper by Scott (1961). Apart from the use of reminders
and the actual nature of the questionnaire, he suggests that the
Fig. 3.1 Main survey - daily response

No. of questionnaires returned

weeks after initial posting
following factors would help to encourage response:  

- statement of official sponsorship;  
- use of a stamp (as opposed to a frank) on the return envelope;  
- use of special (first class) mail;  
- handwritten postscript to the covering letter urging reply;  
- letter on the back of the questionnaire (as opposed to letter separate);  
- a monetary incentive.

The first four suggestions were adopted. The fact that the survey was sponsored by the Scottish Tourist Board and Highlands and Islands Development Board was made clear in the covering letter. Each return envelope was stamped individually with a first class stamp. The second covering letter, containing a further copy of the questionnaire, was addressed personally to the landholder and ended with a handwritten sentence making a special plea that the questionnaire be answered. This letter was kept short but explained clearly that a good response had already been achieved. The advantage of this, in suggesting to the recipient that he might be typical in not replying is pointed out by Brook (1976) in a review of postal survey procedures.

3.24. Turning to the questionnaire* itself, the design used was influenced by the desire to encourage response. Some of the questions were to be answered only by those landholders providing or thinking of providing facilities. These questions were placed on a separate blue sheet, folded independently, so as to reduce the initial impact of a lot of print. Also, this enabled recipients to be exhorted to answer the white sheet anyway! The order of questions on general public access, facility provision and the holding's characteristics (profile data) was planned. In any

* A copy of the main questionnaire used is presented in Appendix 3.
self-administered questionnaire it is important that the recipient's interest should be stimulated. This can be helped through a careful ordering of questions (Erdos, 1970). It was suspected that more landholders would be involved in tourism or recreation through general public access onto the land than through the provision of facilities and therefore questions on the former topic came first. Profile questions were split between the beginning and the end of the questionnaire to prevent the recipient becoming bored with what he might consider was irrelevant. A slightly shorter questionnaire was sent to crofters, excluding certain profile questions obviously not applicable to them. Also, the covering letter was slightly modified, expressing a specific interest in obtaining information on the situation on crofts.

3.25. The wording of the questions was kept very simple. Again, the main reason for this was to encourage a high response rate. As explained at the start of this chapter, the nature and content of many of the questions on recreation and tourism was guided by experience gained during the interview survey. It was considered important that the profile questions should be kept to a minimum but that sufficient information should be obtained to provide a basic description of the physical and management characteristics of the holding.

Total number and type of holdings in the sample and the population

3.26. Information on tenure, land use and the size of the holding was used to classify the holdings as smallholdings, crofts, farms
Crofts include all holdings, of any size, registered as crofts and coded as such by D.A.F.S. The identification of crofts was made possible by the information on each holding provided by D.A.F.S. in constructing the sample.

Estates. There is no standard definition of an estate. A classification was used which distinguished estates from farms as those holdings where some of the land was let by the landholder to agricultural tenants and/or there appeared to be a forestry or game sporting enterprise on the holding.+

Smallholdings were taken as all remaining holdings within the D.A.F.S. census which had agricultural enterprises of less than 40 standard man days, according to the information supplied by D.A.F.S. These are holdings classified as 'statistically insignificant' by D.A.F.S (see 3.12) but which are not crofts.

Farms. All the remaining holdings were classified as farms.

3.27. It was found, from answers to the question on the area of the holding, that some respondents had replied for much larger holdings than indicated by the information supplied by D.A.F.S. from their census. The most likely reason for this is that the

---

* Estates supplied information on the area of the complete holding and any land let. However, they were asked not to reply on behalf of tenants within the estate.

+ This latter criterion was judged by whether or not the landholder indicated the existence of commercial woodland of up to or over 10% of the total acreage or up to or over 20 acres, and/or 'heavy' or 'moderate' shooting or stalking on holdings with a total size of 2,000 acres or more.
sampled holding is occupied by the landholder of another holding and the whole is managed as one business. Where the respondent has treated these parts as one holding in his response to the questionnaire, they should be taken as one for the purpose of this survey.

3.28. This discrepancy arose particularly with statistically insignificant holdings. The characteristics of each of these holdings were investigated and where the discrepancy was large some were re-classified as farms (provided they did not qualify as crofts or estates).

3.29. The discrepancy affects conclusions on the total number of holdings in the sample and the population. Russell (1970) estimated that in 1968, 11% (or 6,000) holdings in the agricultural census were associated in (2,500) 'multiple-unit businesses'. The proportion of holdings sampled in the present survey which showed a definite discrepancy is about 11%. Russell's figures suggest that one 'multiple-unit business' accounts for an average of 2.4 holdings and so a reduction of the census total by 6.4% (11 - 11/2.4) might give a more accurate figure of the number of complete individual holdings.

3.30. The total number of holdings in the census was 50,228 (D.A.F.S., 1975a). Adjusting for publicly owned and occupied holdings and for those no longer existing, according to the proportion of such holdings identified by the survey, leaves a total of 49,095. Rather than reducing this total by 6.4% to take account of the multiple-unit business discrepancy it has been
reduced by only 5%, to give a final figure of 46,640 holdings. This is because the existence of multiple-unit businesses may not be the only cause of the size discrepancy identified amongst respondents and because some updating of the records held by D.A.F.S. has taken place since 1968 (the year of Russell’s research). Therefore it is taken that the 2126 usable questionnaires came from 45,640 holdings, i.e. from 4.6% of the population.

3.31. Returning to the definitions of smallholding, croft, farm and estate presented above, Table 3.1 shows the estimated total number of holdings of each type in Scotland, based on the proportions found in the sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holding Type</th>
<th>Estimated Total Number of Holdings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smallholdings</td>
<td>6,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crofts</td>
<td>13,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farms</td>
<td>24,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estates</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>46,640</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An additional sample of estates

3.32. The total number of estates in Scotland is low compared with farms, crofts and smallholdings and therefore, even though estates were sampled in the same proportion as other holdings, the number of estates in the main sample was inevitably low. In order to increase the accuracy of results relating to them, the number of estates was augmented by an additional sample.
3.33. A 16% sample was taken from the 1972 membership list of the Scottish Landowners' Federation (S.L.F.). This list was used because it was drawn up before the recent recruitment of many 'farming' members. This was supplemented by taking a similar sample of those members of the Scottish Woodland Owners' Association (S.W.O.A.) who are not also members of the S.L.F. The sample was constructed by taking every sixth member on the list. As the list was arranged in counties, there was automatic stratification by location but there could be no control over other characteristics. The total sample contained 376 S.L.F./S.W.O.A. members. A questionnaire was returned from 322 which is a response rate of 86%. This is an excellent response and leaves little fear of significant non-response bias.

3.34. Ninety-two of the respondents were classified as farms (using the definitions in 3.26) and so excluded. The 230 estates were compared with those sampled from the N.A.F.S. Agricultural Census. Their physical characteristics were similar. It was expected that the S.L.F./S.W.O.A. sample would contain estates without agriculture in hand, which would not be found in the main sample. This was one of the reasons for constructing the additional sample. In fact, small numbers of such estates were found in both samples and no adjustment has been made to the estimate of the total number of smallholdings, crofts, farms and estates. The data from S.L.F./S.W.O.A. estates sampled were combined with those from the main survey, thus increasing the sample size and therefore the accuracy of results relating to estates. Each estate was given a fractional weighting so as to avoid any bias in aggregate results resulting from the inclusion of a disproportionate number of estates.
3.35. Certain additional questions were asked of S.L.F./S.W.O.A. estates. These formed a third page of the questionnaire and a copy of this is presented in Appendix 3.

A sample of crofters' common grazings

3.36. It was felt that an investigation of the relationship between crofters and their activities and tourism and recreation could not be complete without consideration of the use of common grazings. The question of the recreation and tourism on the actual croft (the in-byre field) was covered in the main surveys: crofters were asked to exclude common grazings. However, most active crofters do use a (fixed) share of common grazing (usually hill ground) and consequently they are affected by the use of this land for recreation and tourism as well. It was considered unlikely that common grazings would be used actually for the provision of facilities but that the importance of general public access on the grazings would be sufficient to justify an extra survey to obtain information about this anyway.

3.37. A 20% sample was taken of all 845 common grazings in the seven crofting counties. This was a systematic sample in that every fifth grazing was taken from a complete list supplied by D.A.F.S. The list was arranged by counties, thus the sample was stratified and hence representative with respect to the number of grazings in each county. The list used contained the name and address of the Common Grazings Clerk and a questionnaire was sent to him. Eventually, eight-four percent of the clerks responded, hence the resulting usable sample amounted to about 17% of all common grazings.
Data preparation and computing

3.38. It was necessary to wait until the majority of questionnaires had been returned and read before codes could be constructed which accurately represented answers to questions. Variations in answering technique had to be deciphered and standardised and partially or especially fully answered questionnaires demanded special attention. The next stage was to prepare the data for the computer and to edit and correct the computing files once they had been set up. Only then could the analysis begin. The bulk of the computing was done on I.B.M. 370/158 and 168 machines, using a programme package - 'Statistical Package for the Social Sciences' (Nie, et al., 1975).
CHAPTER FOUR

THE DIMENSIONS OF INVOLVEMENT

4.1. This chapter is concerned with fundamental measures of the extent of the inter-relationship between private landholdings and public recreation and tourism in Scotland. Initially, the extent to which landholders are providing facilities for recreation or tourism or thinking of such provision in the future is investigated. The prevalence of certain specific facilities is examined. Finally, information is presented on the extent to which landholdings experience de facto public access. The quantitative data provided in this chapter was obtained from the postal survey which was carried out in 1975.

1. FACILITIES PROVIDED

4.2. The presence and absence of facilities was recorded for each holding in the postal survey sample, by reference to the answers to question 10 of the questionnaire. A list of facilities was set out in this question, guided by experience from the interview survey. The facilities in the list are given below, divided into three groups:

a) Accommodation -

B & B, holiday cottages, chalets, static caravans, touring caravan sites, camping sites, guest houses.
b) Facilities for active recreation -
fish, shooting, pony-trekking, boating,
motor sports.

c) Facilities for inactive recreation -
nature trails, car parks, picnic sites, museums,
buildings, shops, gardens, catering, farm open
days.

In addition, 2.4 per cent of respondent landholders wrote down
on the questionnaire other facilities which they were providing
or thinking of providing. These facilities included:

- recreation grounds
- garden centres
- craft displays
- guided tours
- farming activities
- horses at livery
- viewing wild life
- animal park
- youth hostels
- special recreation facilities, e.g. skiing, mountaineering.

These 'other' facilities were classified into the three groups
given above.

4.3. Landholders providing any one or more of the above facilities
were recorded as providers of facilities for tourism or recreation.
Details of the nature of facilities provided by landholders are
described in the next chapter.

2. LANDHOLDERS CONSIDERING FACILITIES

4.4. Question 10 of the postal questionnaire asked respondents
to indicate not only which facilities they were providing at
present, if any, but also which facilities they were thinking of providing in the future. The questionnaire returns show that some landholders are thinking of providing certain facilities while providing others already. These landholders do not stand to add to the total number of holdings providing facilities, but the fact that they are considering additional facilities does mean that they are moving in new directions in recreation and tourism. Of more interest, perhaps, are those landholders who are thinking of entering the field of facility provision for the first time. A greater emphasis has been placed on these landholders in the analyses in this chapter and Chapter 6. This is because the first step towards facility provision is the most difficult one to take. It represents a break with tradition and possibly a continuing commitment to recreation or tourism. An assessment of the kinds of landholder thinking of taking this step will help to show how the breadth of the inter-relationship between landholders and tourism and recreation will change in the future. Additionally, landholders entering the field of tourism and recreation for the first time are probably more likely to require and benefit from advice and support from government agencies and other organisations.

4.5. Almost all the tables and diagrams in this chapter and Chapter 6 indicate the extent of current facility provision and the extent to which landholders are thinking of facility provision for the first time. Frequently, these two measures are added together to show a potential future total for facility provision,
or the ratio between them is expressed as a percentage to show a potential proportional increase.

4.6. Naturally, landholders may not carry out their ideas in the end and there is no way of telling how quickly developments might take place. Therefore, these figures can only indicate the likely direction of change; for example, in comparisons between holding and facility types.

4.7. It is apparent that any future change in the existing pattern of facility provision is likely to be one of expansion, rather than one of contraction through landholders ceasing to provide facilities. The drop out rate has been insignificant in the past; only 0.5% of respondents indicated that they had once provided facilities but had now stopped.

3. THE EXTENT OF FACILITY PROVISION ON LANDHOLDINGS

4.8. This section is concerned with the number of smallholders, farmers, crofters* and estate proprietors providing or thinking of providing accommodation, facilities for active recreation or for inactive recreation. The results are based on numbers or percentages of holdings and are presented in the following sub-sections:

* The survey of crofters' common grazings revealed that no accommodation or recreation facilities were being actively provided by crofters on common grazings, so analysis of facility provision here is restricted to the four main types of holding. For a further comment on facility provision on common grazings, see Chapter 5, para. 5.20.
i) all holdings, all facilities;

ii) all holdings, facilities grouped into the three main categories;

iii) the four main types of holding, facilities taken firstly together and then in the three main categories.

a) All holdings, all facilities

4.9. Table 4.1. shows the number and percentage of holdings with facilities. Just over thirteen per cent of all landholders in Scotland are involved in the provision of facilities for public recreation or tourism in some way. This amounts to over six thousand landholders. Almost one third of all landholders with facilities at present are considering providing further new types of facility. This is an initial indication that tourism and recreation enterprises are regarded as worthwhile enterprises by many landholders engaged in them; otherwise why would further investment be considered? Finally, if those landholders who are thinking of providing facilities for the first time were to do so, the number of holdings with facilities would increase by over half.

b) All holdings, three main types of facility

4.10. Table 4.2. shows that accommodation is the type of facility most frequently found. For every two holdings providing facilities for active recreation, there are more than three providing accommodation. Holdings providing facilities for inactive recreation are
the least common. If landholders' ideas are carried out, this order will not alter in the future, but the number of holdings providing for active recreation is unlikely to increase as fast as for other facilities.

**TABLE 4.1  Number and percentage of holdings with facilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion of all landholders</th>
<th>Total number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landholders with facilities at present (A)</td>
<td>13.1% ± 1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landholders considering facilities: additional initial (B)</td>
<td>4.1% ± 0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8% ± 1.2%</td>
<td>3,600 ± 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future potential (A + B)</td>
<td>20.9% ± 1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential proportional increase in landholders with facilities (B/A)</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The limits given are 95% confidence limits)

4.11. Holdings providing only one of the three types of facility account for about three quarters of all holdings providing facilities at present. However, while accommodation is almost twice as likely to be provided alone (5.8%) than with other types of facility (3.0%), active and inactive recreation are each more likely to be provided along with other types of facility. In the future the probability of landholders having more than one type of facility is likely to be considerably increased.
TABLE 4.2. The provision of the three main types of facility

a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility type provided</th>
<th>Proportion of all landholders</th>
<th>Total number</th>
<th>Potential increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Now</td>
<td>Future potential</td>
<td>Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>4100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(+/-)</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Recn.</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>2600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(+/-)</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inactive Recn.</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(+/-)</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination of types</th>
<th>Proportion of all landholders</th>
<th>Potential increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Now</td>
<td>Future potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only accommodation</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only active recn.</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only inactive recn.</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accom. + active recn.</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accom. + inactive recn.</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All three</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.12. The difference between experienced and inexperienced landholders in the category of facilities being considered by them is shown in Table 4.3. Landholders with facilities at present are over three times more likely to be considering new facilities than are inexperienced landholders, although in actual numbers, landholders of the latter type are twice as prevalent (see Table 4.1). Those landholders with no previous experience of facility provision are very much more likely to choose accommodation than other types of facility, whereas those considering additional facilities are almost equally likely to choose facilities for inactive recreation.
TABLE 4.3. Facility types considered by experienced compared with inexperienced landholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility types considered</th>
<th>Proportion of landholders with no facilities at present</th>
<th>Proportion of landholders with facilities at present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Recreation</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inactive Recreation</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any facilities</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Facility provision on smallholdings, crofts, farms and estates considered separately

4.13. Results relating to the four main types of holding taken separately are presented in four histograms. Figure 4.1.(a) shows the percentage of holdings providing or considering facilities. The column widths have been drawn proportional to the total numbers of each type of holding in Scotland and so the areas of the column sections are proportional to the actual numbers of farms, crofts, etc. involved with facility provision in the way indicated by the type of shading.

4.14. Strikingly, estates appear four to five times more likely than farms to have facilities. The difference between crofts and farms in this respect is minute by comparison but the proportion of farmers providing facilities is significantly greater than the proportion of crofters doing so.*

* This has been tested using a difference of proportions test (Yeomans, 1968, p. 94). The test was set up on the hypothesis that the proportion of farmers providing facilities was greater than the proportion of crofters doing so. The hypothesis was shown to be true at the 95% confidence level.
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4.15. If ideas for the future are carried out, the number of farms with facilities could increase by about 60%. This potential increase is greatest for crofts (112%, i.e. more crofters in the sample were thinking of providing facilities than were actually doing so) but considerably less for estates (14%). The quite high proportion of crofters interested in providing facilities for the first time may well mean that in the future the proportion of crofters involved in recreation and tourism through facility provision will be about the same as the proportion of farmers involved. Turning to estates, although compared with other landholders the percentage of estate proprietors who are thinking of providing facilities is high, three quarters of these have some facilities already. Thus, there is a tendency for estates to be dynamic, in that they are considering new facilities, but also to be experienced, in that they have some facilities already. Smallholders appear similar to crofters in terms of the proportion of landholders providing facilities at present but a lower proportion of smallholders are considering new facility provision.

4.16. Figures 4.1.(b), 4.1.(c) and 4.1.(d) relate to accommodation, inactive recreation and active recreation respectively. The difference between estates and the other types of holding is most pronounced with respect to the provision of facilities for active recreation. In fact, more estates provide this kind of facility than accommodation, whereas on other types of holding, accommodation is very much the most frequently provided facility type. Even so, the proportion of estates providing accommodation remains considerably greater than the proportion of other holdings doing so.
4.17. Looking at ideas for future provision, the potential for increase in the number of crofters providing facilities is high for all facility types. There appears to be an especially large number of crofters considering the provision of accommodation. Indeed, the provision of accommodation may become relatively more prevalent amongst crofters than farmers in the future.

4.18. The information discussed so far has related to the proportion of all landholders of each type who are involved in facility provision. These proportions are initial measures of the importance of recreation and tourism to each group of landholders.

4.19. Another use of basic data on the extent to which landholders are involved with facility provision lies, conversely, in an initial assessment of the relative importance of different holding types to the overall provision of facilities for tourism and recreation in Scotland. Here, it is the numbers rather than the proportion of landholders providing facilities which is important. As explained earlier, the relative total numbers of landholdings is indicated in Figures 4.1(a) to (d) by the area of columns. However, a clearer indication of the overall situation is provided by Table 4.4, which shows the numbers and distribution of the four main types of landholding involved in the provision of facilities.

4.20. The importance of farmers is clear and they are likely to maintain this relative importance if landholders' ideas are carried out in the future. However, it is important to bear in mind that
about half the landholders involved in the provision of facilities for tourism and recreation are not in fact farmers, using the definition given in para. 3.26. In the future it appears that the relative importance of estates may diminish slightly, while the importance of crofts increases.

TABLE 4.4. Number of holdings with facilities: four holding types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holding Type</th>
<th>Current provision</th>
<th>Future potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of holdings</td>
<td>% Distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smallholdings</td>
<td>600 ± 200</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crofts</td>
<td>1200 ± 300</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farms</td>
<td>2900 ± 500</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estates</td>
<td>1400 ± 100</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>6100</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The levels given are 95% confidence limits)

4.21. This assessment of the relative importance of different types of landholding can be taken a stage further by looking at the total number of individual facilities provided by each landholder. A list of different facilities found on landholdings was given at the beginning of this chapter. The postal survey results indicate that landholders in Scotland are providing a total of 11,600 ± 1,600* facilities; it will be remembered that an estimated 6,100 holdings have facilities and so the average number of facilities on such holdings works out at about two.

* 95% confidence limits.
Table 4.5 shows the relative contribution of different types of landholding to this total of 11,600 facilities. Where estates have facilities, the number of different facilities provided tends to be greater than with other types of holding. Hence the relative importance of estates is shown to be considerably increased if the number of facilities provided is taken into account.

### Table 4.5. Number of facilities provided; four holding types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holding Type</th>
<th>Current provision</th>
<th>Future potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of facilities</td>
<td>Distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smallholdings</td>
<td>900 ± 400</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crofts</td>
<td>2400 ± 700</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farms</td>
<td>4600 ± 900</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estates</td>
<td>3700 ± 500</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11600</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.22. Looking more closely at the number of individual facilities provided, Table 4.6 shows how frequently respondent landholders indicated that they provided more than one facility. The provision
of just one facility was the most common situation but almost half the landholders with facilities provided two or more. Indeed, almost ten per cent of the estate proprietors involved in facility provision had six or more different facilities. However, many of these landholders with large numbers of facilities did not appear to consider that they had reached the limit in terms of the diversification of facilities provided. A further analysis of the returns showed that the greater the number of facilities provided, the greater the proportion of landholders considering further facilities for the future.

TABLE 4.6. Percentage distribution of sampled holdings providing facilities by the number of facilities provided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of facilities provided:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6-8</th>
<th>9-Max (13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>= 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smallholdings</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>= 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crofts</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>= 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farms</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>= 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estates</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>= 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All holdings</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>= 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smallholdings</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>= 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crofts</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>= 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farms</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>= 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estates</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>= 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All holdings</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4.7. Percentage of holdings with each type of facility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Crofts</th>
<th>Farms</th>
<th>Estates</th>
<th>Current provision</th>
<th>Future potential</th>
<th>Potential proportional increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accommodation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-catering</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Holiday cottages)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Static caravans)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Chalets)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>600%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B &amp; B or guest house</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B &amp; B, no meal)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B &amp; B, plus meal)</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touring caravans or</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>206%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>camping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Touring caravan site)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>231%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Camping site)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>146%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active recreation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing by permit</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooting by permit</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pony-trekking</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>260%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boating</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>114%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor sports</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inactive recreation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car-park, nature trail or picnic site</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>129%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop or cafe</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>163%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum, house or garden</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open day</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>143%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other facilities</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(includes less common accommodation and facilities for active and inactive recreation)
4.23. This description of the numbers of individual facilities provided has re-introduced the subject of individual facilities as listed at the beginning of the chapter. The next section follows this up by presenting information on the relative prevalence of specific facilities within the three main categories identified and discussed above.

4. THE PREVALENCE OF SPECIFIC FACILITY TYPES

4.24. Table 4.7 shows the percentages of crofts, farms and estates with each of the facilities listed down the left hand margin. The facilities included are those in the list in Question 10 of the questionnaire. The nature of each type of facility will be described in detail in the next chapter. Smallholdings have not been included as a separate group in the table for the sake of clarity but are obviously included, with the other holding types, in the final three columns which relate to the situation on all holdings taken together.

4.25. A number of spot tests have been carried out to show with what degree of confidence differences between these proportions can be said to represent differences between the relative prevalence of certain facilities on particular types of holdings throughout Scotland, rather than simply pointing to differences found within the sample of holdings taken. A difference of proportions test was used (Yeomans, op.cit.). The following examples show the levels of confidence for comparisons between certain facilities and can be used as indicators of the confidence which can be placed on other comparisons.
i. Crofts B & B provided by 4.2%, Cottages by 2.5%  
sample size 598  
difference = 1.7%

A statistical test comparing these two proportions suggests that one can say that B & B is more prevalent than cottages on crofts, with only 88% confidence.

ii. Farms Cottages by 2.9%, Static 'vans by 1.6%  
sample size 1112  
difference = 1.3%

A smaller difference than the crofts example, but the larger sample size means that one has 93% confidence that cottages are more frequently provided on farms than are static caravans.

iii. Estates Static 'vans by 2.0%, Camping by 5.2%  
sample size 344  
difference = 3.2%

A much larger difference but a smaller sample size. Confidence that camping is more frequent on estates than are static caravans is 95%.

iv. All holdings Static 'vans by 2.2%, Cottages by 3.5%  
sample size 2126  
difference = 1.3%

A difference of just 1.3% but a large sample size, gives a confidence that cottages are more frequent than static caravans of 98%, when all holdings are taken together.

4.26. The table indicates that the provision of self-catering accommodation is more prevalent than bed and breakfast. Holdings providing sites for camping or touring caravans are less numerous than those providing bed and breakfast or self-catering, except when estates are considered separately. A more detailed examination of the types of self-catering facility reveals that static caravans are especially important on crofts; crofters more frequently provide static caravans than touring caravan sites. Only on estates does the frequency of chalet provision approach that of static caravans. The difference between the high proportion of estates providing holiday cottages and the proportion providing other forms of accommodation is dramatic.
4.27. A notably large figure in Table 4.7. is the percentage of estates providing fishing by permit. The proportion of farms with fishing is not specially high. Shooting by permit is provided by under half the number of estates providing fishing but still is one of the more frequent facilities provided by estates.

4.28. Facilities for inactive recreation are provided less frequently than accommodation or active recreation, although relatively fairly large proportions of holdings provide car-parks or nature trails or picnic sites. Here again the dominance of estates is marked and is also evident in relation to museums, houses or gardens, which, collectively, are the next most prevalent kind of inactive recreation facility.

4.29. The final two columns in Table 4.7. relate, firstly, to the proportion of all holdings that will have the specified facility in the future, if ideas are carried out, and, secondly, to the percentage increase this represents with respect to the existing situation. The scarcity of chalet provision at the moment has already been mentioned. However, although fewer landholders are considering chalets than other forms of self-catering accommodation, chalets, of all facilities, show the potential for the greatest proportional increase over the current situation. Other forms of self-catering exhibit much less potential. Pony-trekking is another facility which is relatively scarce at the moment but which could show a marked tendency to increase. Camping and touring caravan sites are also likely to increase well with respect to current provision, as are most forms of inactive
recreation facility with the exception of 'Museum, house or garden'. Fishing, shooting and holiday cottages show the least sign of increase relative to their present position.

4.30. Table 4.8. shows the percentages of crofts, farms and estates considering the provision of certain facilities and the resultant potential growth rates. It suggests that the discussion above, based on all holdings, also applies, in the main, to all three of the principal types of holding when they are considered separately. The potential for growth in chalet provision in the future appears to be greatest amongst crofters.

**TABLE 4.8. Percentage of crofts, farms and estates considering certain facilities and the resulting potential increase**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>% considering</th>
<th>Potential potential</th>
<th>% considering</th>
<th>Potential potential</th>
<th>% considering</th>
<th>Potential potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holiday cottages</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static caravans</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>113%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>160%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalets</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1850%</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>200%</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>306%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B &amp; B/Guest house</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>140%</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touring van site</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>192%</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>309%</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>137%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping site</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>113%</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>200%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooting</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pony-trekking</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>217%</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>145%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(x = no existing provision)
Further analysis of the postal survey returns was undertaken to investigate the nature of combinations of facilities. It has already been shown that many landholdings have more than one facility. Certain facilities on the same holding may well inter-relate; some kinds of facility may be more likely to be provided along with others than alone.

Table 4.9 shows the average number of facilities per holding for those holdings providing the specified facility. Facilities such as picnic sites, car parks, shops and nature trails or walks are those most likely to be provided in combination with other facilities on landholdings. This is not surprising for these could well be service facilities ancillary to the main attraction. Active recreation facilities and the more extensive forms of accommodation, e.g. pony-trekking, fishing, camping and touring caravan site, are intermediate in this respect, while the facilities most likely to be found alone are the more permanent kinds of accommodation, i.e. holiday cottages, static caravans and bed and breakfast.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility type</th>
<th>Average number of facilities/holding</th>
<th>Facility type</th>
<th>Average number of facilities/holding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Picnic site</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Chalets</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car park</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail/walk</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Farm open day</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping site</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Pony-trekking</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touring 'van site</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Static 'vans</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catering</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Shooting</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boating</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Holiday cottages</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum/building</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>B &amp; B</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.33. It was found that the complete make up of combinations was not very often similar between one holding and the next. However, irrespective of any other facilities provided as well, certain pairs or triplets of facilities appeared to recur quite regularly. The recurrence of a number of pairs and triplets was measured and the results are given in Table 4.10. in six groups. These specific groups were chosen for measurement in groups (i) to (iii) for the following reasons: the facilities have similarities in the resources they require and some could indeed be provided in the same place; in groups (iv) and (v) the inactive recreation facilities on the right hand side might well be ancillary attractions or service facilities to the main facilities on the left hand side; and in group (vi) these three facilities stood out as being especially prevalent on estates. Each row of the table represents a combination of two or three facilities and the frequency of occurrence of the combination as a percentage of the total occurrence of each facility is given by the numbers in brackets.

4.34. The table suggests, in particular, that touring caravan and camping sites are often found together and quite often static caravans are provided in combination with these two facilities or either one of them. One would expect that these facilities often make up one 'caravan site'. Shops appear to be most frequently provided on holdings which have camping or touring caravan sites; such sites also appear frequently in combination with the provision of catering, picnic sites or car parks. Quite frequently fishing
and shooting occur on the same holding and one quarter of the holdings providing holiday cottages also provided fishing. Combinations of facilities on one holding will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter.

TABLE 4.10. Occurrence of certain combinations of facilities

The percentage of each facility found in combination with the other(s) in the same row is given by the numbers in brackets.

i. Camping site (38) Touring caravan site (38) Static caravans (23)
Camping site (64) Touring caravan site (64) Static caravans (27)
Camping site (46) Touring caravan site (41) Static caravans (24)

ii. Nature trail/walk (8) Picnic site (10) Car-park (7)
Nature trail/walk (17) Picnic site (20) Car-park (15)
Nature trail/walk (19) Picnic site (30) Car-park (20)

iii. Shop (13) Catering (16)

iv. Camping or touring caravan site (16) Shop (56)
    " " " " (6) Catering (25)
    " " " " (14) Nature trail/walk (40)
    " " " " (9) Picnic site (33)
    " " " " (10) Car-park (25)

v. Museum, building or garden (10) Shop (16)
    " " " " (8) Catering (16)
    " " " " (4) Nature trail/walk (5)
    " " " " (4) Picnic site (7)
    " " " " (10) Car-park (11)

vi. Fishing (9) Shooting (16) Holiday cottages (7)
    Fishing (25) Shooting (44) Holiday cottages (26)
    Fishing (34) Shooting (27) Holiday cottages (11)

5. FACILITY PROVISION IN THE PAST

4.35. So far, figures showing the prevalence of tourism and recreation facilities and of ideas for further facility provision have been presented. Information was obtained from the postal
survey which gives an indication of the nature and extent of facility provision in the past and its growth.

4.36. Landholders providing facilities were asked to give the date when each facility was set up. Unfortunately, many respondents did not do this: the question was left unanswered. A total of 60% of holdings with facilities recorded when they set them up. It is possible that one reason for data not being given is that the respondent could not remember the actual year in question. Thus results based on these dates may be biased towards more recent times.

4.37. The date of the first facility on each holding was taken to construct Table 4.11. The first half of the table shows the percentage of holdings providing facilities at the beginning of the nineteen-sixties, and then a decade later, compared with the beginning of 1975 (the date of the survey).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4.11. Extent of facility provision in the past</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of holdings with facilities at the start of:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smallholdings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crofts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All holdings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The calculation of the percentages shown in the table was based on the assumption that the number of holdings in Scotland has not changed. In fact there has been a decrease over the years, but
the effect is not sufficient to affect broad comparisons made from the table.

4.38. The table suggests that the involvement of landholders in facility provision has become important only in recent years. The proportion of landholders providing facilities in 1960 was small (although owing to the possible bias mentioned above it may not have been as small as the figures suggest). The importance of estates in the provision of facilities, relative to other holdings, appears to have been very much greater in 1960, when almost half the holdings providing facilities were estates. However, by 1970 this position had been taken by farms. Taking all holdings together, 5.8% have started to provide facilities in the last five years. This is an increase of about 80% on the 1970 figure and represents a growth rate of 12.5% a year.

4.39. Turning to the nature of facilities provided in the past, Table 4.12 shows the relative prevalence of certain facilities amongst those set up during the specified time periods. It seems that those facilities which are popular today also tended to dominate in the past as well. There is a close comparison between the types of facility started in the nineteen-sixties and those set up in the last five years. However, before 1959 fishing was clearly the most dominant facility; the only others of any note being, likewise, those which one might have assumed to be traditional — e.g., shooting, bed and breakfast, and camping sites. During the sixties, bed and breakfast and holiday cottages became especially important, as did a previously uncommon facility — static caravans.
### TABLE 4.12. Distribution of facility types by period of setting up facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of specified facilities set up in the period as % of all facilities set up then:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>Holiday cottages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B &amp; B</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>B &amp; B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooting</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Static caravans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping sites</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Touring 'van site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday cottages</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Fishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touring 'van sites</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Camping site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No other individual facilities over 4%</td>
<td>No other individual facilities over 4%</td>
<td>No other individual facilities over 4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
which is found to occur might be on Rights of Way and in that sense be de jure. Landholders were not asked to distinguish whether walking occurred on Rights of Way because:

a) Many landholders will probably not know which paths are Rights of Way and some will contend the existence of such rights – for example see the description of the situation on some West Highland estates given in the report of the Scottish Rights of Way Society, 1974.

b) Duffield and Owen (1971) found that, in Lanarkshire and the Edinburgh area, on only 12% of landholdings where walking occurred was it reported to be primarily on Rights of Way as distinct from other parts of the holding.

c) Walkers on Rights of Way will probably often stray off the path.

4.42. Table 4.13 expresses how much the universe of holdings involved in recreation and tourism has been expanded by now including those experiencing any de facto access as well as those where facilities are provided.

TABLE 4.13. The provision of facilities and the occurrence of de facto access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holdings with some facilities or none</th>
<th>SOME</th>
<th>NONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>4200 ± 600</td>
<td>13900 ± 900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>1900 ± 400</td>
<td>26600 ± 1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6100 ± 700</td>
<td>40500 ± 700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>13.1% ± 1.5%</td>
<td>86.9% ± 1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46600</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.13.(a) shows estimated total numbers of holdings in each category of presence or absence of facilities or access; the limits given are 95% confidence limits. Table 4.13.(b) shows, in parentheses, the proportion of holdings with or without access and, with no parentheses, the proportion with or without facilities. It has already been shown that 13% of landholders in Scotland are providing facilities for recreation or tourism. Table 4.13. indicates that, of the remaining 87%, one third are not without contact with recreation and tourism in that they experience de facto access on their land to some extent. Thus, roughly 20,000 landholders (about 43%) are involved with recreation or tourism either through de facto access or the provision of facilities. In total, about 18000 (39%) landholders experience access: a quarter of these actually provide facilities of some kind as well, while with the remaining three quarters (about 30% of all holdings) de facto access is the only contact with recreation or tourism. It is interesting that landholders who do experience access are between three and four times as likely to have facilities as those who do not.

4.43. The extent to which individual smallholdings, crofts, farms and estates are involved in tourism or recreation through de facto
Fig. 4.2 Percentage of holdings providing facilities and/or experiencing de facto access; four holding types

Percentage of holdings with facilities and/or de facto access

- Small holdings: 24.1%
- Crofts: 8.5%
- Farms: 45.8%
- Estates: 95.5%

- Small holdings providing facilities: 24.1%
- Crofts providing facilities: 5.3%
- Farms providing facilities: 9.4%
- Estates providing facilities: 12.1%

- Small holdings experiencing de facto access: 5.3%
- Crofts experiencing de facto access: 4.6%
- Farms experiencing de facto access: 3.6%
- Estates experiencing de facto access: 2.7%
access in addition to, or as well as, involvement through facility provision, is shown in diagrammatic form in Figure 4.2. This figure is drawn in the same way as Figure 4.1., which related solely to facility provision. The importance of de facto access, compared with facility provision, in terms of sheer numbers of holdings involved, is clearly seen for all holding types except that the proportion of estates with only de facto access is less than the proportion with facilities – the majority of estate proprietors both experience access and provide facilities. It is important to appreciate that Figure 4.2., as far as crofters are concerned, shows only de facto access on individual crofts. It is shown below that perhaps 58% of crofters may experience access through recreation on the common grazing, while it should be remembered that crofters were found not to be providing facilities on the grazings.

4.44. Landholders were asked to indicate the extent of the four types of public access on their land in high season. The proportion of holdings experiencing different frequencies of access are shown in Table 4.14. The activities are listed in order of prevalence. Caravanning occurred on very few holdings, while over one quarter experienced walking or climbing. Where camping or caravanning took place, this rarely occurred even as frequently as once a week. Also, the other two types of activity were most usually found to occur only occasionally.
Table 4.14. The prevalence of different frequencies of de facto access in high season (all holdings, four activity types)

(figure shows percentages of all holdings)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of occurrence</th>
<th>Almost every day</th>
<th>Once a week</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking/climbing</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car-parking/picnicking</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caravanning</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.45. Table 4.15.(a) shows the prevalence of different types of holding experiencing de facto access. As one might expect, the proportion of estates with de facto access of all types is much greater than for farms and crofts. Smallholdings experience little de facto access. The proportion of crofters experiencing access on their crofts is slightly lower than for farmers, but this excludes the fact that crofters are affected by access onto the common grazings. The first column of Table 4.15.(b) indicates results from the postal survey of common grazings clerks. De facto access occurs on about three quarters of common grazings. Making the assumption that all crofters using these grazings have experience of this access in some way at some time, one can calculate (by weighting the individual grazings by the number of crofters using them) that 83% (± 5.7%) of crofters using the grazings experience de facto access (second column Table 4.15.(b)). Using profile data from the survey, one can estimate that about 70% (± 17%) of crofters use the grazings.* Thus an estimated 83% x 70% = 58% (± 23%)

* The number of crofters using the common for livestock (really the only major use except for peat cutting) was obtained for each grazing in the sample. The average was 11.0 (median 6.7). Therefore, taking all 846 grazings in Scotland, the total number of users can be estimated to be 9300 ± 2300 (95% confidence limits). The total number of crofters is roughly 13,000, so that about 70% (± 17%) of crofters can be said to use the grazings for livestock.
of all crofters experience **de facto** access through its occurrence on common grazings (third column of Table 4.15.(b))

**TABLE 4.15.** The proportion of holdings with **de facto** access

(separate activities, different holding types)

(Unless otherwise stated, the figures show the percentage of holdings with each type of activity)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All holdings</th>
<th>Estates</th>
<th>Farms</th>
<th>Small holdings</th>
<th>Crofts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of holdings</td>
<td>18150</td>
<td>2350</td>
<td>10300</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>4250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of holdings</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(95% conf.limits)</td>
<td>±2.1%</td>
<td>±2.8%</td>
<td>±3.0%</td>
<td>±4.5%</td>
<td>±3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>climbing</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car-parking/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>picnicking</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caravanning</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**b)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Common grazings</th>
<th>Crofters experiencing access</th>
<th>Crofters experiencing access on common grazings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any access</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(95% conf.limits)</td>
<td>±6.6%</td>
<td>±5.7%</td>
<td>±23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking/</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>climbing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car-parking/</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>picnicking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caravanning</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.46. In Table 4.15., only the presence or absence of each activity is used: the frequency of occurrence is not distinguished, as it
was in Table 4.14, as this would make the presentation too unclear. However, analysis was carried out to see how different holding types varied according to the probability of access 'almost every day' versus 'once a week' or 'occasionally'. It was found that not only are estates and common grazings much more likely to receive all forms of de facto access than are other holdings, but also that the occurrence of this access tends to be more frequent. For example: over half the estates and common grazings with walking/climbing or car-parking/picnicking experienced these activities at least once per week, compared with farms where the equivalent fraction was under a third.
CHAPTER FIVE

THE NATURE OF RECREATION AND TOURISM ON LANDHOLDINGS

5.1. The previous chapter provided information showing the size of the inter-relationship between private landholders and tourism and recreation, using information obtained from the extensive postal surveys. This chapter presents information obtained mainly from the interviews carried out with landholders and which describes the nature of facilities provided and of de facto public access on holdings in Scotland. This qualitative material should be considered in conjunction with the quantitative data in the previous chapter, in order to obtain a more complete picture of tourism and recreation on landholdings.

5.2. The chapter is divided into three sections. The first section considers de facto access; the second introduces the concept of the margin of facility provision covering certain activities by landholders which relate to tourism and recreation on their land but do not really entail the provision of facilities for public recreation and tourism; and the third section is devoted to a description of the nature and variety of the facilities whose prevalence was measured in the previous chapter.

1. LANDHOLDERS' AWARENESS OF DE FACTO ACCESS

5.3 It can be difficult for landholders to provide much detailed information on the nature of de facto access on their land. Where a landholder is providing a facility, he knows in
detail what form of activity is taking place on his land and who is involved in it — he knows the nature and dimensions of the inter-relationship. With de facto access, he can judge the nature of the access only by what he sees. Landholders, obviously, can be aware of their own attitudes to de facto access and of the extent of nuisance or damage caused by such access; information on these topics is presented and discussed in later chapters.

5.4. Landholders visited during the interview survey were asked about de facto access. The most frequently mentioned activities observed were those which were eventually listed on the postal survey questionnaire — visit people moving across the holdings — walking or climbing; people stopping on the holdings — parking their cars or picnicking; or people spending a night on the holding — camping or caravanning. Although percentages of landholders experiencing these four different types of activity at different frequencies have been given in Table 4.14, no impression of the actual numbers of people on the land can be obtained from the postal survey. However, landholders interviewed explained that it was difficult to know how many people came onto their land. Their awareness of de facto access depended largely on the degree of concentration of people in small areas — for instance, many landholders could estimate numbers of people or cars on a specific stretch of road verge, loch shore or beach or visitors to a famous landmark, but were aware of people elsewhere only by the traces left behind. The degree of centrality of concentrated
activity also affects the landholder’s awareness - certain estate proprietors and factors said they were never quite sure of the numbers of people because they had to make a special trip across the estate (e.g. to the beach) to see what was happening. While bearing in mind this question of degree of awareness, it was still possible to appreciate a very large variation in the intensity of access between holdings visited for interview. Proximity to transit routes or coast or lochs near main roads, could mean that picnicking 'occurring every day' referred to two or three hundred picnickers (e.g. a holding visited on Loch Lomond side and another on the A9), while a holding without these attractions might have picnicking 'occurring every day' but experience only one or two cases (e.g. many crofts and Border farms).

5.5. Some landholders interviewed were conscious of the kinds of people coming onto their land, and frequently they stressed that the occasional walker with his dog or picnicker on the coast would be local and not a tourist, nor even a day visitor from another part of the region. Access by locals usually occurred for a specific purpose (e.g. walking between the village and the river, fishing or poaching) or at specific times (e.g. picnicking by the sea on Wednesday afternoons - early closing day), compared with general desire of the tourist or day tripper to find a place to stop or go for a walk.

5.6. Other landholders, especially estate proprietors or their factors, knew that certain people parking their cars on or walking across their land were involved in specific forms of
recreation. In this respect, fishing was very commonly mentioned varying from occasional use of lochs to regular uncontrollable fishing of lowland rivers. Shooting occurred much less frequently. Riding and pony trekking occurred on some holdings while one landholder visited observed regular skiing and canoeing. Once or twice, landholders commented on access by visitors going to or from their neighbours' recreational or tourist facility or using their own facility (e.g. toilets on the caravan site) without permission.

5.7. One particular aspect of the nature of access concerns the extent to which the public ask permission of the landholder to use his land. The main questionnaire used in the postal survey contained no questions on this subject, but S.L.P./S.W.O.A. estate proprietors and common grazings clerks were asked to indicate how frequently people asked permission. Table 5.1 shows that about one third of estate proprietors and common grazings clerks observing walking or climbing on their land reckoned that participants sometimes asked permission. With other activities the results suggest that permission is more frequently sought for access to grazings than for access to estates. This could be because, on some grazings, many crofts in the township will be close to the hill land, so that visitors see people to ask, while on many estates it is not at all clear where permission should be sought. The table does not refer to the number of people who ask permission as a percentage of all visitors. However, respondents' comments suggested that this percentage was very low with respect to walkers and picnickers, although a higher
percentage of caravanners and especially campers do ask.

5.8. The better showing of camping and caravanning was also evident from the interview survey. Here many smaller landholders (farmers and individual crofters) said that "we get the occasional camper or caravanner but they nearly always ask". In this respect there is probably a benefit in having a smaller holding.

TABLE 5.12. Prevalence of holdings where permission for access has been sought by individuals.

(Number of holdings where permission for access has been sought by individuals, % of holdings experiencing the respective type of access)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>S.L.F./S.W.O.A. estates</th>
<th>Crofters' common grazings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking/climbing</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car-parking/picnicking</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caravanning</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.9. Turning to other activities, 18% of common grazings clerks said that permission was sometimes sought for trout fishing. Thirty seven percent of S.L.F./S.W.O.A. estate proprietors said that people sometimes ask permission to fish and 8.4% mentioned riders asking permission.
5.10. A further aspect of permission for access concerns organisations. Thirty-five percent of S.L.F./S.W.O.A. estate proprietors had been asked by organisations for permission to camp and twenty-five percent for permission to walk or climb (most frequently this involved the services and also the Scouts or Boys Brigade). Riding routes were sometimes requested by organisations, but only very infrequently was it found that permission was sought for other activities.

5.11. A very large majority of landholders interviewed said that when asked, they did give permission for the activities to take place. They frequently directed people away from certain parts of their land and made requests concerning dogs, toilet arrangements etc. In the postal survey, only common grazing clerks were asked whether permission was granted; here again, about ninety percent said it was, some adding provisos.

5.12. The process of individuals and organisations asking permission for access, and the landholder consequently directing them to certain parts of their holding, is a rather different aspect of the inter-relationship between landholders and recreation and tourism than the landholder's mere awareness of general public access occurring de facto. The landholder is now explicitly sanctioning the use of a resource, land, for recreation or tourism, and it could be argued that he is thereby providing a facility. This is one aspect of the margin of facility provision, a concept introduced in the next section.
The previous chapter presented figures on the numbers and proportions of different types of landholders providing facilities, which were based on question 10 of the postal survey questionnaire asking landholders which facilities, if any, they provided for public recreation or tourism. In addition to answers to this question, some landholders (mainly estate proprietors) wrote in comments concerning activities on their holdings which relate to recreation or tourism but which do not really involve the active provision by landholders of facilities for the general public for such purposes. These activities were not included in the figures presented in the last chapter. However, they do constitute an interesting part of the inter-relationship between landholders and recreation and tourism. It is proposed that these activities be referred to as the margin of facility provision. Some of the activities relate to de facto access as described above. The extent of the margin is difficult to quantify. A number of examples of the margin of facility provision were found on landholdings in the main estates visited for interview. Some examples are given to describe the margin in the next few paragraphs.

The margin encompasses facility provision where:

1. the landholder has done very little, of a material nature, to encourage or provide for visitors, over and above allowing the use of his land; or

2. facilities are restricted to certain groups of people and are not provided directly for the general
the provision of the facilities specifically for 'recreation or tourism' is in doubt.

a) Situations where the landholder allows the use of his land for tourism or recreation but has done very little, of a material nature, to encourage or provide for visitors.

5.15. A specific question (Question 13) was asked in the SLF/SWCA survey to find out how many estates had in the words of the questionnaire, 'any particular areas which are managed or kept as areas for public access (apart from specific facilities mentioned in Question 10)'. This question was not included in the initial D.A.F.S. based survey, where it was felt to be extremely important that the questionnaire be kept as short as possible; it is in any case likely that such a question is considerably more relevant to estates than to other kinds of holding. Eighty percent of respondents did not indicate the existence of any such areas on their estates. Of the remaining twenty percent, one third indicated that the area managed or kept for public access was beside the sea or a loch; 'rough lowland', 'open hill', and 'amenity woodland' were less frequent (about 10% each) and 'arable or in-bye' hardly occurred at all.

5.16. This evidence tells us that areas managed for public access, as distinct from facility provision, do exist on estates, albeit on only about 20%, and indicates the type of
land involved but gives no information on what 'managed or kept for public access' might entail. However, the question was placed in the SLF/SWOA survey after discovering special areas identified by landholders as places for public access on estates visited during the interview survey. Some examples of these are given below.

1. Areas for public recreation or tourism created by public pressure with an implicit sanction on the part of the landholder.

5.17. On one estate, cars were often parked off the road at a point in the glen where there was a pool in the stream near the road side. Constant use made the ground hard, attracted a local authority litter bin and an angling association's 'No Fishing' notice; the place took on the appearance of a small car park. The estate is in an area where the number of tourists and day-trippers is extremely high and the estate factor is happy to regard this spot as a place for the public to have access to the land where he knows that it is happening and can do little damage. Two other special areas, one a quarry and the other an old woodland, exist on the estate and are regarded in the same way. The estate had taken no action to provide facilities for visitors at all.

5.18. Another example is on an estate in Galloway where campers and caravanners were using an area of rough land by the sea at the end of a long no through road (partly private and partly a local authority road). The estate were willing to accept
the situation, provided it did not get out of hand, and in a sense regarded it as a camping/caravanning facility provided free for the public.

ii. Areas for public recreation or tourism where the landholder does not provide facilities but allows activities by explicit sanction.

5.19. This is the situation mentioned earlier in the chapter under de facto access, whereby organisations or individuals ask the landholder for permission to engage in certain activities on his land and are directed to certain areas. These areas may well take on the role of 'facilities' even though the landholder makes no physical provision. Examples from written comments by postal survey respondents and from landholders visited include:

"We always send caravans and campers down to the field by the shepherd's cottage, when they ask, so that we can keep an eye on them"

"We provide free of charge camping sites and the use of land for adventurous activities for a number of youth organisations and schools"

"I allow flying of model aircraft"

One estate visited allowed a local sailing club to use the loch shore for their boats; no facilities were provided apart from the land. There were numerous other examples of this nature. Usually this involved infrequent use of certain areas of land or water but situations were found where a more permanent use was established; for example, one landholder had allowed Scouts to set up a hut on his land,
but again he provided only the land.

5.20. In the previous chapter it was noted that no active provision of facilities for recreation or tourism occurred on crofters' common grazings in the sample surveyed. In fact, 4% of grazings data indicated on their returns that recreation or tourism activities were directed to certain areas which, in a sense, were viewed as facilities; for example:

"Public toilets are provided by the local authority and try to get people to camp in this area"

"Excellent car parking and camping ground on the sands used extensively by tourists and all free. May charge so that the crofters benefit but heavy regulations and facilities required if planning permission is applied for"

It was felt that crofters may have considered that facility provision on common grazings should have been carried out by the landowner, possibly involving de-crofting a certain section of land, * since crofters themselves do not in fact have a statutory right to provide facilities on the grazings as they are restricted to using the land for agriculture. * On the questionnaire to grazings clerks an additional question was designed to find out whether crofters had followed up a desire for some kind of facility on the grazings via representations to the landowner; it was found that this had not occurred on any of the grazings in the sample.

*See Crofters Commission submission to Select Committee on Scottish Affairs (1972b).*
iii. Special natural sites on the holding to which the landholder allows access implicitly.

5.21. Some landholders mentioned certain sites on their holdings which by being unique or especially beautiful or of particular historic or other specialist interest attracted considerable public access. In a sense these were specific facilities which the farm or estate had to offer but no action had been taken by the landholder apart from allowing the access to occur. Examples included a Pictish fort, an old bridge, an area of standing stones, and an especially famous waterfall.

iv. Special sites or attractive uncultivated areas on the holding which are subject to special designations or agreements involving statutory bodies or local authorities.

5.22. One landholder's comment on the postal survey questionnaire indicated that owing to the designation of part of his land by the Nature Conservancy Council as a Site of Special Scientific Interest, he felt obliged to facilitate public access to the area, e.g.:

"Part of the land is scheduled as of special scientific interest; due to the flora thereon; I wish to give facilities for those with a real interest to go on the land."

However this sort of designation does not involve the landholder in any legal obligation or restriction. It is interesting to note that an obligation can be assumed informally from such a designation.
There are other classifications of land which do involve formal agreements, entailing certain obligations between bodies and the landholders concerned. One landholder mentioned a Nature Reserve Agreement as affecting his attitude to certain types of access on part of his estate. The system of Access Agreement between landholders and local authorities, which is promoted by the Countryside Commission for Scotland, in accordance with the Countryside Scotland Act, 1967, was mentioned in Chapter 2. Although Access Agreements involve landholders in a statutory obligation to allow access over specified land this need not necessarily involve him in any specific physical provision of facilities. According to the Model Access Agreement published by the Commission, (Countryside Commission for Scotland, 1971), the authority is responsible for considering what works are necessary to secure and maintain access and, depending on the individual agreement, may be responsible for undertaking such works. One estate surveyed had entered into an Access Agreement covering access to a fine stretch of coast. Another landholding was in the process of arriving at an agreement with the Department of the Environment concerning access to ancient monuments at lambing and cropping time.

b) **Situations where facilities are restricted to certain groups of people and are not provided directly for the general public.**
5.24. There are situations where the landholder is not himself seen to be providing for the general public but merely enters into private arrangements. In the main these situations relate to Sport — fishing and shooting. Private estates in Scotland have a long tradition of providing recreation, but such recreation was for the proprietor and his friends in the form of fishing and shooting (including stalking). Today, private fishing and shooting is a very important element in the land use of estates. Much of this sport is let to private tenants, individuals, syndicates or associations.

5.25. Some quantitative information on sport, let or kept in hand for the landholder's own use, is available from the postal surveys. The percentages of farms and estates which indicated in question 10 that fishing or shooting were provided for the public on a permit basis were given in Table 4.7. Table 5.2 below shows the proportions of farms and estates not providing fishing or shooting in this way but where private fishing or shooting takes place on the holding. For estates one can estimate how this is broken down further between sport in hand and sport let, since respondents to the SLF/SWOA survey were asked to differentiate between the two for both fishing and shooting. For both sports, the results show that sport is more frequently kept in-hand than let but, even so, if one treated the sporting lets as facilities, this would add considerably to the stock of recreation facilities provided
on holdings, notably on estates.

TABLE 5.2. Holdings where sporting occurs, but not for the public via permits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Farms</th>
<th>Estates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Holdings with fishing but not providing fishing for the public via permits, as % of all holdings.</strong></td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>31.1%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-hand</td>
<td>Let</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Holdings with shooting but not providing shooting for the public via permits, as % of all holdings.</strong></td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>70.3%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-hand</td>
<td>Let</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.26. Fishing or shooting provided on a permit or ticket basis caters for a general public. These will be further described, later in the chapter. However, sporting lets, although providing recreation for people other than the landholder, are so restrictive that they do not really constitute facilities for public recreation - they form an element of the margin of facility provision. Details of all sporting activities were obtained from the majority of holdings visited in the interview survey. There were many examples where the fishing or shooting was kept totally in-hand or was all rented out on long lets. However, a common situation was for the

* 'In-hand and 'let' percentages do not add up to the total shown because some holdings indicated both 'in-hand' and 'let'. 
use of a river or loch, grouse moor, forest or woodland to be divided, either on a location basis or on a temporal basis, between family use and use by various tenants. Where there was spare capacity on certain parts of the holding or at certain times of the year, an attempt was usually made to find a tenant who would take as much of it for as long as possible at a good price; short lets occurred only where it was necessary to fill gaps. On the other hand, a number of estates have turned to regularly letting sport by the week or fortnight, sometimes through an agency. Even in these circumstances, sport is offered to a very restricted and exclusive market with many clients returning year after year, and it is doubtful whether this could be said to constitute the provision of facilities for public recreation and tourism.

5.27. Quite frequently tenants are syndicates, associations or hotels. Very many angling associations exist in Scotland which lease waters from farms and estates. On talking to some landholders who let fishing to associations, it was ascertained that many associations are very restrictive in their membership. On the other hand other associations operate a system of selling permits to visitors. Likewise many hotels provide fishing or shooting for staying guests. In this way the facility is eventually made available to the general public, but the landholders involvement is indirect through a lease to the third party.
c) **Situations where the provision of facilities as specifically for recreation or tourism is in doubt**

5.28. A number of examples were found of situations where the landholder was actively providing a facility for people but where the facility only has a marginal recreation or tourism element. A few of the respondents to the postal survey mentioned farm visits which were really occasions to display techniques to other farmers rather than putting farming on show for the pleasure and instruction of the public; viz.-

"Anyone who comes to look at cereal grown on a large scale is very welcome, also the grain drying plant, but it is rather uninteresting for the public unless they are farmers"

"Rather than Farm Open Days, we get requests from farming groups to see the farms which, if possible, we arrange. These are highly professional occasions..."

Many farmers are involved through the N.F.U. with schools, for visits by classes; some schools adopt a particular farm and prepare a special project report about it. These facilities which may be better described as 'educational' rather than for recreation or tourism may also involve activities other than farming. Two estates indicated that they provided centres for 'field studies'.

5.29. Another kind of activity which may not be accurately described as provision for recreation or tourism is where the landholder provides a service for the general public which is
only of special benefit to tourists and recreationists at certain times of the year. Examples are:

"Garage, calor gas service and minibus and car hire"

"The island's grocer's shop"

"One wayside pump has been operated since we took over the farm"

3. THE NATURE AND VARIETY OF FACILITIES FOR PUBLIC RECREATION AND TOURISM PROVIDED BY LANDHOLDERS

5.30. There now follows a series of descriptions of the nature of the facilities provided by landholders visited during the interview survey. The descriptions relate to the facilities whose prevalence was measured in the previous chapter (Table 4.7). It was considered to be important that these descriptions should be given in some detail in order that the considerable variation in the nature of the provision of any one facility type should be appreciated.

a) Accommodation

i. Bed and Breakfast

5.31. Accommodation where a meal or meals are prepared for the visitors, rather than where facilities are provided for them to do their own catering, was described or advertised by landholders as 'Bed and Breakfast', 'Dinner, bed and breakfast', 'Guest House', 'Farm House Accommodation', or 'Farm Hotel'.

5.32. One would expect these various names to reflect differ-
ences between the establishments; for example with respect to the accommodation provided for longer stays such as dining-rooms and sitting rooms, the offering of full-board arrangements and the regularity of meals and possibly their standard. However, it was found that the advertising name did not necessarily reflect what was provided. Consequently, in this thesis, small enterprises providing accommodation with breakfast are considered as a whole and referred to as Bed and Breakfast (B & B) establishments. The only distinction which is made depends on whether or not an evening meal was provided. Establishments providing bed and breakfast only (B.B.O.) averaged 5.5 beds (range 2 to 9) and those providing dinner, bed and breakfast (D.B.B.) averaged 10.2 beds (range 4 to 20). Some of the latter concentrated on weekly guests but primarily trade was casual. Some offered snacks rather than an evening meal.

5.33. Holdings were visited where a new house had been specially built to a design and dimensions making it suitable for B & B use and as a residence. Other landholders had erected new chalets or static caravans, not as independent self-catering units, but to act as annexes to the B and B enterprise or as accommodation for the landholder's family. Sometimes internal partitioning had been done to separate the family from the guests but more often internal work involved merely redecoration or new bathrooms or washhand basins or kitchen alterations. However,
the majority of enterprises visited were not based on these new or converted buildings and accommodation consisted of rooms which had simply been redecorated or which had remained unchanged from their previous state, except possibly for new beds. Rooms with three beds, let as 'family rooms', or with bunk beds were quite common.

5.34. Some landholders were able to offer visitors a little more than the usual accommodation either in the form of special amenities such as "putting and croquet in the garden" or through other facilities provided on the same holding. Farms were visited where fishing permits were given free to staying guests and one farmer reserved the early morning as a time when his artificial trout loch was available only to residents. Many landholders informed visitors of recreational facilities available in the locality and sometimes special arrangements were made with neighbours who had, for example, fishing or pony trekking; this being an instance of cooperation between landholders in facility provision to their mutual benefit. However, the number of landholders with bed and breakfast enterprises who offer other facilities for guests is low, both in total numbers and relative to those offering other forms of accommodation (e.g. cottages or caravan sites). This appeared to be so from those interviewed and was borne out by the data shown in Table 4.9.
5.35. The first kind of self-catering accommodation to be described was referred to variously as 'holiday cottages', 'holiday houses' or 'holiday flats'. The difference between facilities taking each of these names does tend to reflect the nature of the buildings being let. The distinction was made particularly clear on one estate visited where 'holiday cottages', small semi-detached buildings sleeping 4 to 5 people, were advertised in one leaflet while 'holiday houses', larger buildings and old farm houses, were advertised in a second document. On the other hand, many holdings were found to call quite large buildings 'holiday cottages' and this phrase could be used generally to refer to old buildings used for short stay self-catering holiday lets. All the holiday cottages were let by the week or fortnight although sometimes longer periods could be arranged e.g. out of season.

5.36. It is interesting to consider the variation in the kinds of building that are provided. Taking the number and size of buildings first, most crofts with cottages had only one cottage available; the average number per farm with cottages was nearer two; and on estates the variation was between one and ten with an average of around three. Cottages usually slept 6 to 8 people, although this often involved the use of divans in the sitting-room and three-bedded rooms; the largest building accommodated fourteen. Most of the buildings were found to be old labourers' cottages converted, where necessary, by re-
decoration, refitting and refurbishing, new plumbing and electricity metering and other small alterations. Labourers' cottages tend to be quite small but where disused farm houses are let, as was not uncommon on estates, the building was usually larger. Two farms were visited where the farm house was very large but was still being lived in by the farmer, and just part of it was let in the form of a flat with its own entrance and living-rooms; this involved some internal alterations. An alternative form of structural alteration is the building on of extensions to the main house - two holdings were visited where this had happened, one being where an extension was added to a small croft house. Croft houses are most frequently let complete and on their own, either being the crofter's own home vacated by him during the summer (while he and his family may move into a caravan or relative's house) or being old houses left after the crofter has built a new one or as the result of amalgamations of crofts under one tenant. The succession of houses on crofts is important in this respect. One interesting idea which carries this to an extreme and would need sympathetic implementation was expressed by a respondent to the postal survey:

"I would like to rebuild an old style black house on the croft, weather proof and fully furnished with box-bed, dresser, bench, chairs, table and stool etc. Have got the raw materials for construction on the croft viz. stone, heather, turf, timber and clay + a well for water. I think tourists would gladly pay so that they can say that they have slept a night in a black house, but asking for a grant to build a black house would rock the establishment to its foundations"
At the other end of the scale, some estates were visited which had very large houses available for holiday lets, such as lodges and dower houses.

5.37. Generally cottages varied little in terms of what they contained and how they were furnished. One understandable difference is between cottages furnished specially for holiday-makers and those being lived in as a home except during the summer months. The former tended to be quite spartan and to contain strong, simple or old furniture suitable for family use. A few cottages had off-peak central heating, washing machines and deep freezers; many had televisions. Services such as linen and towels for hire and groceries delivered before the visitors' arrival were occasionally available but only when a holding had a number of cottages to let.

5.38. A few holdings were visited where holiday cottages were just part of a larger enterprise concerned with letting self-catering units. Two crofts and one farm were visited where one or two cottages and two or three static caravans were let and advertised together, clients being given the option to choose a cottage or a caravan. Certain holdings with actual caravan sites containing static caravans did have cottages as well and here, although the sense of a combined self-catering enterprise was not so strong, instances of joint advertising were found. Other combinations, encountered on estates, involved the joint letting and advertising of cottages and purpose built chalets. Where this occurred, certain communal
amenities were provided for guests such as tennis court, putting green, games room and so on. On the whole, holiday cottage provision tended to be less embellished with such frills than accommodation provided in the form of large caravan/camping sites.

5.39. Turning to other facilities available on holdings with holiday cottages, a number of estates visited let cottages (occasionally called 'fishing cottages') with free fishing permits and sometimes with boats, and the postal survey indicated that a quarter of the holdings providing cottages also provide fishing. (Table 4.10) The link between cottages and other facilities is not so great: Table 4.9 indicated that, in the postal survey sample, 'holiday cottages' is the second least likely of facility types to be found along with others on the same holding. One interesting combination found on crofts was B and B and Holiday cottages, where the crofter had built a new large house specially with the idea of doing B and B and this consequently had made available the old house for letting as a holiday cottage.

iii. Chalets

5.40. 'Chalets' refers to self-catering units which are purpose built for letting to holiday-makers for short stays, weeks or fortnights, but are not in any way moveable (unlike static caravans). The average number of chalets provided per holding visited was high, being about 4 (the maximum was 12), compared
with holiday cottages. However, chalets tended to be smaller, usually sleeping from 4 to 6 persons compared with the normal range of 6 to 8 for holiday cottages. Furniture and fitments were of a type suitable for use in a confined space: shower units rather than bathrooms, kitchenettes, fitted cupboards, bunk beds etc. are common in chalets. The exterior design often varied quite markedly - two holdings were visited where the landholder had designed his own chalets because he didn't like those offered by firms on a ready-built or construction-kit basis, which are normally used by landholders and do themselves vary in design quite a lot. Generally the chalets inspected were made of wood panels and were simple box-shaped buildings often with large picture windows. It seemed that the use of logs or acute angled sloping roofs or similar features to make the appearance more rustic was relatively uncommon.

5.41. A variation on letting a chalet to holiday makers on a weekly or fortnightly basis is to offer the property on a long (e.g. 99 year) lease. This may involve making over the use of the chalet for continual occupation or for only fixed weeks or months recurring each year. The landholder may still be actively involved with the visitors through the provision of recreational facilities or through maintaining the chalet site or administering the sub-letting and charging a fee for these services. Large chalet sites where such arrangements were being considered were only at the planning stage on
iv. **Static Caravans**

5.42. The third form of self-catering accommodation to be considered is static caravans. Static caravans are caravans which are fixed to the ground in a semi-permanent way and are not moved from their sites unless under special circumstances. Thus people travel to and from the caravan and make use of it only in one location. Landholders visited with static caravans let them for weeks or fortnights, as with chalets or holiday cottages. The caravans did not vary very much in themselves, although where landholders had bought them recently they tended to have six berths with the possibility of sleeping eight, while older caravans were smaller. More variation was found with respect to gas, electricity and sanitation; viz. internal chemical toilets, toilets outside or caravans with plumbing; caravans with electric light or without and so on.

5.43. The greatest difference between static caravan enterprises is in whether the caravans are located on large sites containing static caravans and pitches for touring caravans or camping, or occur separately or in a small group in a suitable place on the holding. Combined sites for static caravans and touring caravan/camping pitches will be described below. The postal survey results suggest that about three quarters of holdings with static caravans do not also provide for touring caravans or camping (Table 4.10.) and further investigation indicated that this situation
was most frequently found on crofts. Thirteen holdings were visited during the interview survey which had static caravans but no touring caravans or camping pitches. Three holdings had groups of 6 or 7 caravans. The remaining holdings (mainly crofts) provided just one, two or three caravans, and here the services were generally rough, viz: toilets consisting of only a chemical lavatory inside the caravan or in a tent or shed outside, simple huts with flush lavatories and possibly a cold water basin, or arrangements for visitors to use the toilets inside the house. On the other hand, one holding was visited where although only one caravan was provided, it was connected to piped water and electricity.

5.44. Of the holdings visited or responding to the postal survey which were providing static caravans but not pitches for touring caravans or camping, very few provided recreational facilities. However, combinations such as one or two static caravans plus one holiday cottage or a B and B enterprise were found to be quite common.

v. Caravan Sites

5.45. Table 4.1C indicated that about a quarter of respondents to the postal survey providing static caravans were also providing sites for touring caravans, while, conversely, about 40% of those with touring caravan sites were also providing static caravans. It is probable that in most of these cases the touring caravan pitches and the static caravans
occurred on the same site.

5.46. A few of the landholders interviewed provided pitches on which visitors could place their own static caravans for a seasonal rent. In these cases mutual purchase and transport of the caravan was sometimes arranged by the landholder and he might organise sub-letting of the caravan for periods when it was not being used by its owner. Most touring caravan sites also allowed camping. Total site size varied from \( \frac{1}{4} \) to 84 acres and from 10 overall pitches to 380. Mostly land used was in-bye grazing or rough low ground, still grazed in winter. Sites were often near the farm steading, making use of existing services laid on there. In general the size and standard of toilet and washing facilities matched the capacity of the sites, partly owing to the licensing regulations, brought in under the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act, 1960 (H.M.S.O., 1960).

5.47. However, a few holdings were visited where very many touring caravans used the site but it was equipped only with rough toilet blocks. In these cases the landholders seemed to recognise the problem and were making plans to rectify it. Small basic toilet facilities in the form of wooden shods with one or two lavatories and cold water sinks appeared to be quite adequate when found on small touring caravan sites. Almost all the larger sites visited and some of the smaller ones had
concrete toilet blocks, usually central to the site or divided into two or three blocks placed to serve different areas. Inside, the standard of facilities tended to reflect the age of construction - most modern toilet blocks or conversions had hot and cold water for showers and wash-hand basins, with the hot water sometimes operated by a coin-in-the-slot meter; older ones were found with only cold water.

5.48. Other features of some sites included well placed waste disposal points and taps, and many larger sites had small offices for site administration; these were frequently static caravans or prefabricated huts and sometimes disused farm buildings. Sites varied between those where cars and caravans were driven in and out on grass and those where gravel, or (occasionally) tarmac roads had been made. Some sites contained special areas for children to play in, including swings, sandpits etc. Indoor amenities were found on some sites such as laundrettes, games rooms, TV rooms; one site had a swimming pool. The existence and extent of these indoor and outdoor amenities did tend to reflect the size of the site although there were some exceptions.

5.49. Amenities on the site such as play areas and games rooms are, on the other hand, simply embellishments for the use of campers and caravanners. Some facilities were found on or adjacent to sites which were ancillary to them, provided for
the caravanners' and campers' benefit and also for the benefit of day visitors coming to the site from outside. These include shops, picnic sites, nature trails and, on one holding, a small golf course. The prevalence of combinations of such facilities with caravan sites was mentioned in the last chapter. A few sites were visited where fishing permits were available for guests and fishing was advertised with the sites (as with B and B and Holiday Cottages); one site was located next to the stables, and caravanners were encouraged to become involved with the estate's riding enterprise.

vi. Camping sites

5.50. Table 4.10 showed that in the postal survey sample 64% of holdings with touring caravan sites also provided camping sites and vice versa. It is very likely that on such holdings the camping and touring caravan sites are combined. About 80% of those touring caravan sites visited also accommodated tents. Thus, the descriptions above are relevant to camping as well. Apart from this, five holdings were visited which had sites which catered really for camping alone, although all but one allowed the occasional touring caravan to use the site. All but one of these camping sites had very basic facilities. One had a small rough building containing lavatories and basins with cold running water, one had chemical toilets located in an old static caravan and one had no separate toilet facilities but campers used a w.c.
in a farm outhouse. Two of the sites could accommodate over 100 tents, the others only about 20. The sites were mainly in fenced fields although one was on dunes and machair with rather vague boundaries.

b) Facilities for Recreation

i. Fishing by Permit

5.51. The fishing enterprises visited varied between those based on locks and those based on rivers. The holdings with river fishing were nearly all estates. Lengths of beat varied from \( \frac{3}{4} \) to 7 miles. Only a few offered reasonable quality salmon fishing, the rest catering for trout fishers with the outside chance of a salmon or sea-trout. Generally better stretches were kept in-hand or let to private tenants. Two landholders suggested that the excitement of fishing in their spate rivers in beautiful surroundings made up for the potential quality of the catch.

Lochs varied between natural lochs and those artificially created by the landholder by the excavation of boggy areas. On the smaller lochs the fishing was managed, in the sense of feeding and re-stocking with rainbow trout. Boats were available on some of the lochs.

5.52. The lochs were mainly provided on a day permit basis—printed permits being sold at the farm or at workers' cottages.
although one farmer offered fishing by the hour and another on a morning, afternoon and evening basis. River fishing was also offered mainly by the day or half day although some landholders provided special terms for those requesting weekly or half-season tickets. The provision of fishing on holdings also providing accommodation and the consequent benefit to some visitors has been mentioned already. Another interesting possibility for fishing being provided with another kind of facility was recognised by the landholders who had created artificial lochs. They considered that the duck population would continue to increase because of the new lochs and were thinking of offering duck shooting by permit.

ii. **Shooting by Permit**

5.53. Arrangements for shooting for the general public on a permit basis as distinct from shooting lets covered a wide variety of activities. No holdings were visited where this form of shooting was operated as a major enterprise. Frequently shoots were only occasional or one-off events and, advertised locally, often provided recreation for people in the local rural area or nearby towns rather than tourists. Activities included informal rough upland shoots, wild fowling, low ground pheasant shooting and so on. Some landholders were considering the operation of roe deer stalking on a permit basis. Some estates made rough shooting available to guests staying in their holiday cottages. One farm
was visited where a clay pigeon "ball-shoot" dispenser was situated in an acre field of permanent grass, containing an old railway van for equipment. Shooting took place on one day per month, catering for up to 70 guns.

iii. Pony Trekking

5.54. The size of pony trekking enterprises might be measured by the number of ponies. However, most enterprises visited kept more ponies than they would actually use on any one outing. The number of ponies kept on enterprises interviewed varied from 5 to 18. Another aspect of the size of the enterprise is the amount of land taken up for grazing. This is difficult to assess in some cases owing to grazing being used for cattle as well as ponies. The smallest amount of grazing used was 10 acres on croft in-bye land although here the beasts were sometimes grazed on the hill land of the common-grazing. One farm used 40 acres of permanent grass for the ponies. Hay for feeding was obtained from the agricultural enterprise on all but two holdings visited. Half the enterprises obtained all their hay in this way. Buildings used varied considerably between enterprises. Estates visited were better off than farms - old stables being large and arranged round a courtyard thereby providing good accommodation for the animals, the tack and the offices. Some farmers used smaller stables or converted cattle sheds; one had constructed basic wooden stalls. One estate had a new outdoor area and another a large old barn used as an indoor
school.

5.55. All of the enterprises visited offered pony trekking mainly by the hour with possibilities for two hour treks. A few catered for whole or half day outings. One estate offered six one hour hacks ('riding' rather than 'trekking') for the price of five (using a book of vouchers), gave individual or class lessons, and hired out a riding school. Almost half of the enterprises visited used routes only on their own land. Comments on routes included: "we just go up the hill", "through the Forestry Commission woodland and onto the moor" and "a different route is used for each day in the week so that clients can come back regularly without doing the same thing twice". Fifty percent of the pony trekking enterprises visited were on holdings providing some form of accommodation, including B and B, chalets and two caravan sites. The accommodation was always separate from and incidental to the trekking but was often mentioned in advertising. Two other enterprises were close neighbours of hotels with whom they had formed good working relationships.

iv. Boating, including sea angling

5.56. One farmer and three crofters were visited who provided sea-angling trips. These contained a considerable pleasure-boating element, but the sea angling aspects will be described first. One crofter only provided trips occasionally in the evening for one hour, combining fishing and pleasure boating mainly for the benefit of guests staying at his B and B or
static caravan. He just took them out in his own boat, used during the day for collecting seaweed. A second (retired) crofter went out for longer periods (3-5 hours) and visited excellent haddock and mackerel grounds also rich in other species. He went fishing himself every day with his friends and sometimes took visitors if given one or two days notice; he could hire out hand lines but no rods. The third crofter, also retired, took fishing parties out more regularly — again to some of the best fishing grounds in Britain — going out with visitors about every afternoon in the season. In the mornings he used his boats to take larger parties for pleasure cruises lasting about one hour, to see seals and other wild life. The farmer visited used his boats for commercial sea fishing. He took parties out in the larger boat at some weekends in the summer for a day’s fishing and the smaller boat was sometimes used for smaller groups seeking a few hours sea angling.

5.57. Only one landholding was visited which provided boat trips without sea-angling as well. This was an estate operating short boat trips in the bay. Generally very little of this kind of activity was mentioned during enquiries about holdings to interview, nor did there seem to be many landholders just hiring out their boats to visitors. An example was found where four boats were available for hire from a large coastal caravan site and occasionally it was found that boats
primarily used for fishing could be hired on inland lochs. None of this represented anything like a commercially run enterprise with a number of boats let regularly and advertised; the processes were found to be particularly informal.

v. Motor Sports

5.58. Three farms were visited which provided facilities for motor sports. It was found in all cases that events were arranged by clubs. However, the farmers had provided areas of hill and rough pasture (about 20 acres) with fencing, scarring of the ground and rough corrugated iron toilet blocks and judges' stands forming permanent features. Autocross, motor rallies and cycle events took place on these farms from 2 to 5 times per year, as arranged by the motor clubs. These activities attracted large numbers of spectators from a wide general public. One farmer also had a milk bar and a café and was involved with catering for visitors to the rallies; on other farms this was all done by the club. One estate was visited which provided a hill-climb for motor events. Here the estate was concerned with the instigation and administration of the facility to a greater extent. The climb was purpose built; a 900 yard steep tarmac road. This facility was integrated with catering and other inactive recreation facilities provided by the estate on the same site.

c) Facilities for Inactive Recreation

i. Castles, Houses, Museums, Gardens
5.59. The variation in the nature of facilities provided under this heading seems to be great, as witnessed by holdings visited in the interview survey. Five estates were visited which had houses or castles open to the public. Three were still the residences of the landowner, the fourth was an old castle furnished with antiques which had been let out on a yearly basis before opening to the public, and the fifth was the ruined ancient seat of the clan, previously open only to those members of the public who requested the key. Four of these houses were open full-time during the summer, the remaining one restricting opening to three hours on three days of the week.

5.60. One croft was visited which had a museum of old crofting implements and furniture and other relics in a reconstructed black house. The crofter had opened to the public another ancient building some distance away: this was an old grain mill which had been brought back to working order. Another larger museum specialising in a contrasting subject was created in an old farm building and contained the landowner's collection of about 20 vintage motor cars.

5.61. Some landholders were involved in the infrequent opening of gardens under Scotland's Gardens Scheme. Three estates were visited where the gardens were open every day. Although none of them were especially grand, one consisted of five acres round a small house and contained mainly lawns and roses,
another featured many flowering shrubs in a fairly wild glen.

5.62. These various houses, museums and gardens have to be serviced by admission systems and toilets. The former varied between honesty-boxes and a sophisticated system of tickets sold at a kiosk serving a variety of inactive recreation facilities in close proximity. Most holdings sold pamphlets describing the houses, museums, etc. Toilets were either provided in the house or museum itself, in separate toilet blocks, or there were notices pointing to nearby public conveniences; in some cases there was no provision at all.

5.63. Other services provided for visitors to houses and gardens included cafes or restaurants. Table 4.10 indicated that in fact, only a small percent of those holdings in the postal survey sample which had museums, houses or gardens were providing catering as well. On holdings visited, provision varied from a tea-room or cafe provided at the house for the benefit of visitors, to the restaurant being a major facility in its own right with the house, castle, museum etc. providing an extra special attraction bringing people to it. The size and standard of cafes or restaurants reflected this varying emphasis. The notion of the castle or house being of special importance in attracting people affected other kinds of facilities. On three estates the castle acted as a kind of focal point for
diverse recreation and tourism enterprises like caravan sites or nature trails. Another interesting associated activity took place on the three estates with gardens opening regularly. This was the occasional sale of produce, flowers and vegetables from the garden, to visitors.

ii. Catering

5.64. Catering facilities connected with houses or museums have been mentioned already. Only a few holdings were visited which had cafes or restaurants which were not merely appendages to houses or gardens open to the public. One cafe was provided for caravanners on a site, offering tea and snacks at a small counter in a room with four tables, connected with a caravan site shop. The remaining catering enterprises visited included: an afternoon tea house on a croft boasting fine home baking and plenty of it; a newly built restaurant offering light meals, salads and snacks from 10 a.m. to 6 p.m.; part of an old croft house converted into a small restaurant specialising in high quality sea-food and providing lunch and evening meals as well as coffee etc. during the day; and a farm milk bar serving tea, coffee, milk shakes, ice cream, biscuits etc. mainly to people on the road. Buildings used ranged between a farmer's dining room, an old school-room furnished with trestle-tables covered with white table-cloths and new buildings of wood and glass.
iii. **Shops**

5.65. The existence of shops as service facilities for caravan sites has already been mentioned. Table 4.10 showed that in the postal survey sample over half those holdings with shops had camping or caravan sites as well. A number of shops on caravan sites were investigated in the interview survey. They were mainly run by the site warden and often were combined with the admissions office. They concentrated on basic groceries and were open at times convenient to campers and caravanners although some were used by locals or other tourists as well. Table 4.10. showed that the link between holdings with shops and with catering was not very great in the postal survey sample. However, in addition to the caravan site shop providing teas mentioned in the last paragraph, two further shops were run in conjunction with tea-rooms. These two shops were run by crofters' wives and consisted of small display tables containing a few local hand-made crafts; some of which they had made themselves.

Two other shops visited sold crafts. These were larger buildings with more to offer but selling goods which were not necessarily locally produced, ranging from cheap souvenirs to skins and Caithness glass. One of these shops was run in conjunction with a museum (visitors had to pass through it to get to the museum) but again Table 4.10. showed that only a small percentage of postal survey respondents with shops
had museums, houses or gardens as well.

iv. Nature trails, Walks, Picnic sites, Car-parks

5.66. Nature trails and walks differ in that nature trails include signs or literature drawing the walker's attention to interesting features on or near the path. Two estates were visited which had nature trails based on paths with numbered posts and leaflets describing objects near each post. One of the estates had two trails within the policies which involved descriptions of wild-life, amenity trees and estate buildings. The other estate's trails were still at the development stage; they were paths passing through woodland and beside a stream. Four more estates were visited where footpaths had been made or reconstructed. Three of these walks were traditional routes favoured by past generations of landowners and their families, and consisted of paths and steps leading up small wooded glens. All these trails and walks are available to the general public although half of them were located near caravan sites and also acted as additional amenities for campers and caravanners. Table 4.10 showed that in the postal survey sample 40% of trails and walks were provided on holdings with camping or caravan sites.

5.67. A few picnic sites on estates were examined in the interview survey, varying from small areas of grass marked with a notice to gravel-based plots furnished with wooden tables and benches. One rather special site included toilets but these
served also a footpath and a small cafe. No sites were very big, most catering for no more than three or four groups, although half the estates with any at all provided more than one site.

5.68. Car-parks are difficult to describe. Almost all forms of facility for recreation or tourism have to allow provision for visitors to park their cars. Occasionally, however, holdings were visited where special car parks had been provided as ends in themselves. An especially notable example was found where one estate had undertaken the construction, simply by bulldozing and flattening, of a dozen small pull-off points shaped like cloverleaves.

vi. Involvement of visitors in countryside activities

5.69. This final heading covers 'farm open days' and a number of other activities which might involve the visitor with farming and land management. A few landholdings were visited where the landholder or the staff had been involved in showing the public around their farm or estate. Such events were usually arranged initially by outside organisations such as the National Trust for Scotland or locally based groups. A small percentage of the respondents to the postal survey indicated that they provided 'farm open days' and it is felt that these landholders are probably involved in the kinds of events described above.
From conversations with the National Farmers Union of Scotland and the Countryside Commission for Scotland it appeared that very few, if any, fully fledged farm open days of the kind described in a recent publication by the Countryside Commission (England and Wales), (D.A.R.T. 1974b) involving farmers in providing display material and any extensive facilities for visitors and 'selling' the open day themselves, were provided in Scotland. No holdings were visited where this happened.

5.70. Some of the nature trails mentioned in the previous sub-section are partly concerned with estate management (i.e. use of buildings, woodland and wildlife conservation) and hence display countryside activities as well as natural phenomena. Another type of facility, again in a sense related to the idea of displaying farming and countryside activities, is a museum for old agricultural implements, which was provided by a postal survey respondent and was being considered by one of the estates visited. Another unique idea of combining 'museums', 'nature trails' and 'farm or estate activities' was mentioned by one estate - namely to drive visitors round the estate on ancient horse-drawn vehicles on roads which "... themselves form a nature trail, in a sense, and experience of an archaic form of transport could be combined with a pleasant way of viewing wild life". This could be described
as a rather special form of wild life safari. There are some well known private wild life parks in Scotland, one of which, together with a complex of inactive recreation facilities, occurred on one estate sampled in the postal survey.

5.71. Provision of facilities which involve tourists and recreationists in countryside activities need not be restricted to open days or displays. One of the benefits of all facilities provided on farms, crofts and estates is that merely by their location they bring people into close contact with the countryside and activities therein. Some landholders make a point of emphasising that the facility is on a 'working farm' in their advertisements. Holdings were visited where Jacobs sheep or Highland cattle had been placed in fields near the facilities or the main road to act as attractions. One farmer visited made a special issue of this and really his farming activities were largely for the benefit of his caravan site visitors. He was considering setting up a lecture room for talks about farming and wild life and possibly using his own farm for displays to the general public. On the other hand, active involvement by visitors in farming was found to be very scarce indeed. One crofter providing accommodation and recreation facilities said:

"In the brochure the place is described as a working croft so I get help from the guests doing a certain amount of harvest work."

d) A note on ideas about the future
5.72. Most of the above descriptions of accommodation and recreation facilities relate to facilities actually occurring at present on farms, crofts or estates visited in the interview survey, although examples of a few interesting facilities at the development stage or only under consideration were given as well. Nevertheless, information was obtained during the interviews on the nature of expansion plans for all existing facilities and on all ideas for additional ones, however common place these facilities may be. Therefore, it was possible to obtain an idea of how the nature of specific facilities might change in the future.

5.73. Generally it seems that landholders considering the expansion of their facilities are as keen to increase the amenity and standards of what they offer as to increase the capacity. For example, many caravan site operators talked of more landscaping, providing sitting-rooms, connecting caravans to electricity and mains water, increasing and improving toilet facilities etc. before increasing the number of caravans. Likewise, those landholders considering new facilities, who were able to describe their ideas, appeared to be keen on high standards, e.g.,

"... conversion of stables and old mill... and developing the land for amenity afforestation, tourist information, shop (antiques, pottery), coffee shop, camping site, picnic areas etc... the plans for the development are models of how conservation should be done."

Ideas generally entailed quite large, well appointed, developments, i.e. serviced caravan sites and man-made trout
lochs and not just one or two caravans or fishing permits for one rod on the burn.

5.74. This interest in the quality of facilities to be offered is paralleled by an explicit or implicit awareness of the potential for integrating different facilities. This includes, for example, landholders with caravan sites considering providing a shop or bar or nature trails, or fishing and boats being provided for holiday cottage guests, or tea-rooms to help provide income for the museum and, vice versa, displays of farm animals to attract customers to the tea-room or caravan site. One estate clearly expounded the philosophy of bringing people to the holding, providing them with a chalet and entertaining them by providing for their recreational needs and facilitating their enjoyment of the amenity of the holding, thereby involving them in the place more completely.
6.1. In the same way that the previous chapter considered in detail one side of the inter-relationship between landholdings and recreation and tourism, namely, the nature of public access and of facilities provided for recreation or tourism, this chapter is concerned with investigating in detail the other side of the inter-relationship, namely, the nature of holdings involved with recreation or tourism.

6.2. In Chapter Four, the classification of landholdings as smallholdings, crofts, farms or estates was used to provide initial information about the nature of landholdings providing facilities or experiencing de facto access. This classification reflects the main kinds of holding in Scotland in terms of tradition, legal distinction and scope of activity. However, it cuts across a number of basic technical, physical, social and economic characteristics of landholdings and landholders.

6.3. It is the purpose of this chapter to examine to what extent the presence or absence of facilities or de facto access is related to some of these basic characteristics. Analyses were carried out on the postal survey returns for the complete sample of holdings in Scotland and also, as appropriate, for crofts, farms and estates taken separately. Smallholdings were always included in analyses relating to all holdings but, in the interests of time, they were frequently not examined separately. The results of
these analyses are presented in this chapter. It is divided into two parts. The first and major part covers facility provision and the second part, consisting of a few pages at the end of the chapter, is concerned with de facto access.

I. CHARACTERISTICS OF HOLDINGS PROVIDING FACILITIES

6.4. Initially, analyses were carried out using eight basic characteristics:

- the total area;
- the size of the agricultural enterprise;
- the amount of labour used;
- the type of farming;
- the extent of sporting use;
- the presence or absence of commercial forestry;
- the type of tenure; and
- the landholder's age.

These characteristics were considered to be fundamental in describing the nature of landholdings and reflected the profile questions on the postal survey questionnaire and the information obtained on each holding from D.A.F.S. First, a univariate analysis was undertaken. Each characteristic was taken separately and the relationship between facility provision and the characteristic was investigated. Secondly, a multivariate analysis was carried out to see to what extent, and in what combination, the characteristics could act together to distinguish clearly between the types of holdings involved in facility provision and the types of holding without facilities.

6.5. In the third section of this part of the chapter, the relationship between facility provision and the location of holdings within Scotland is investigated.
a) Size of holding

6.6. Area, agricultural enterprise size and the amount of labour employed are all measures of the size of holdings. These three characteristics are significantly correlated. Taking the sampled farms, acreage explains 30% of the variation in farm enterprise size and 30% of the variation in labour.

6.7. There are a number of factors affecting initial assumptions about the relationship between facility provision and holding size, as follows:

A. Physical resources. A holding which is large in terms of land is more likely to be able to absorb a recreational or tourism enterprise than is a small holding, and is also more likely to have buildings available for such purposes or space in the farmhouse. One would expect, therefore, that the proportion of landholders providing facilities would be greatest amongst holdings large in area. However, this might only be so for facilities which are particularly demanding in terms of physical resource requirements.

B. Economic resources. Landholders with holdings large in terms of enterprise size are more likely to be able to raise the capital for recreational or tourism developments. One might assume that there will be a positive relationship between the proportion of holdings with facilities and agricultural enterprise size.
C. Economic need. Conversely, there is the question of need. Net income from agriculture is less where agricultural enterprises are small and one would expect that these landholders would be more likely to be attracted by tourism and recreation as means of supplementing income than those with larger agricultural enterprises. On the other hand, many of these landholders may already be supplementing their income through other jobs outwith agriculture.

D. Available time. The relationship between labour, including the landholder, on holdings and the enterprise size is also important. One should consider how busy the landholder and his employees are. Where the number of full-time employees appears less than average, considering the enterprise size, it would well be difficult to fit in additional activities, and so one would expect the proportion of these holdings with facilities to be less. In particular, one might assume that holdings with full-time agricultural enterprises worked as 'family farms' without employed labour would be less likely to be providing facilities than others. On many landholdings, other factors will affect the time available for facility provision. Any existing work by the landholder outwith agriculture and, especially, the amount of spare time available to his wife and family, could be of overriding importance.

6.8. The relationship between the provision of facilities and the size of holdings was investigated taking separately area, the size of the agricultural enterprise and labour.
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Area of the holding

6.9. The median acreage of holdings was calculated for groups of holdings at different stages of facility provision. The results are presented in Table 6.1. The median is a more appropriate descriptive statistic of the area of holdings than is the mean, because of the distorting influence of a few very large holdings. The significance of the difference between certain medians in the table, at 95% confidence, was measured by the median test,* based on the chi-squared distribution. Holdings with facilities are significantly larger than the overall average. However, holdings where the landlord is thinking of facilities for the first time are not significantly different from average. The result is that the predominance of large holdings in the provision of facilities is decreasing. On the other hand, of holdings with facilities already, those which are considering more facilities are significantly larger than those which are not doing so.

---

**TABLE 6.1 MEDIAN ACRES OF HOLDINGS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All holdings</th>
<th>Farms</th>
<th>Estates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall median</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>2549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holdings with no facilities</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holdings with facilities</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>4408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holdings considering:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>additional facilities</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>6250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>initial facilities</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential future providers of facilities</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>3963</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In this test, observations above and below the combined group median are enumerated, the sampling distribution of which approximate to chi-squared (Yates, op. cit., p. 294).
6.10. The relationship between facility provision and the holding's area was investigated in more detail by grouping holdings by area. The proportion of holdings in each group, providing facilities for recreation or tourism is shown in Figures 6.1 and 6.2. Initially, an attempt was made to place holdings into acreage groups defined by rounded numbers, e.g. 100, 200, 300 acres, etc. The widely divergent size of holdings meant that if a constant acreage change between each group was used, or if the same scale was used for crofts, farms and estates, the number of holdings in each group would vary tremendously. This would have produced an inconsistency in the amount of accuracy to be placed on the results for each group.

It was decided that the groups should be constructed so that there was an equal number (10%) of holdings in each. Thus the first column in each histogram represents that 10% of holdings which are the smallest; the second column contains a further 10% of holdings larger than the previous 10% but smaller than the remaining 80% of holdings, and so on.† The acreage limits of each group are dictated by this procedure and an indication of them, for every second one, is shown below the histograms.

6.11. It is arguable that the groups so formed provide a size scale that more realistically represents the change between a 'small' holding and a 'large' holding, than do the actual acreages, in that it is based on a holding's size with respect to others.

† The first 80% of holdings were grouped into eight 10-percentile groups as described but the top 20% were divided later into four 5-percentile groups as changes occurring at this end of the scale were of particular interest. The degree of accuracy of the results for the 5-percentile group is less.
Fig. 6.1 Percentage of landholders providing facilities within 10%ile acreage groups (all holdings, all facilities)
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Fig. 6.2 Percentage of landholders providing facilities within 10%-ile acreage groups (4 holding types, all facilities)
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6.12. In Figure 6.1, it can be seen that for the smallest 85% of holdings, the area has little effect on the proportion of holdings providing or considering facilities. However, holdings over about 450 acres exhibit a pronounced increase in facility provision and there is a steep rise in this between the final three groups. Therefore the result presented above that the median size of holdings with facilities is greater than the overall median is due to the high proportion of really large holdings which have facilities and not to a particularly low participation by small holdings.

6.13. The greater extent of facility provision amongst extremely sizeable holdings largely reflects the presence of estates in this category. However, Figure 6.2.c indicates that the largest 5 to 10 per cent of farms are also markedly more involved in facility provision than are other farms. Therefore, perhaps one can say that especially prevalent facility provision is a function of holding size irrespective of whether the holding is a farm or an estate. Farms and estates can be compared directly only within a limited acreage range. The results of a comparison are shown in Table 6.2, which indicates that, within the sample taken, estates up to 1000 acres were quite considerably more involved in facility provision than farms. This suggests the importance of other characteristics in addition to size, such as land use and tenure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 6.2</th>
<th>Comparison of farms and estates of similar area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100-350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>FARM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage providing facilities</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage considering facilities (initial or additions)</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.14. Certain possible trends between acreage groups were investigated for the four main holding types and the results are presented in Table 6.3. A statistical test was used which gives a value for chi-squared for any trends in results and so enables one to affirm the existence of trends with a stated degree of confidence.* A statistic 'phi' (chi-squared/number of holdings involved) was also calculated and can be used to compare the strengths of different trends relating to different types of holding.

6.15. Estates taken separately display a fairly consistent upward trend in the proportion of estates providing facilities (existing and potential) as area increases. This trend is considerably stronger than that shown by the majority (90%) of farms, although facility provision does increase as the size of farm increases over this range. No consistent trend exists for crofts or smallholdings.

### Table 6.3: Trends in results between acreage groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Existing situation</th>
<th>Potential future situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chi²</td>
<td>Phi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crofts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Insig.</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smallholdings</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Insig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluding top 10%</td>
<td>Sig. at .007</td>
<td>Slight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Sig. at .172</td>
<td>Upward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Maxwell (1951) Chapter 4.
6.16. The prevalence of holdings with facilities amongst really large holdings suggests the influence of factor A 'physical resources', as described in 6.7, possibly supported by factor B, 'econmic resources'. The importance of the existence of suitable physical resources on holdings is made more apparent when the provision of different facility types is investigated. Suitable resources for recreation, e.g. shooting, fishing, pony-trekking, picnic sites, etc., are more likely to occur on large holdings, and Figures 6.3 and 6.4 show that the importance of holdings over about 500 acres is especially pronounced with respect to recreation provision. As far as accommodation is concerned, Figure 6.5 shows that the largest 20% of holdings are considerably more likely to be providing self-catering accommodation than are smaller holdings. This could well reflect the availability of cottages on large holdings.

6.17. It is only the largest 5% of holdings which show any greater tendency than other holdings to provide caravan or camping sites. This special prevalence might reflect the relatively greater availability of suitable land on the largest of holdings. Bed and breakfast provision appear to be unaffected by the size of the holding. This could either mean that the size of the landholder's house tends not to be related to the overall size of the holding or that the size of the house is not related to the provision of bed and breakfast. The relative prevalence of, and interest in, the provision of bed and breakfast by crofters,* who

* See Table 4.3.
**Fig. 6.3** Percentage of landholders providing facilities within 10%-ile acreage groups (all holdings, accommodation)
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 6.4** Percentage of landholders providing facilities within 10%-ile acreage groups (all holdings, recreation facilities)
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Fig. 6.5 Percentage of landholders providing particular facilities within 10%-ile acreage groups (all holdings, specified facilities)

(a) Bed and breakfast

(b) Self catering accommodation (holiday cottages, chalets, static caravans)

(c) Sites for camping or touring caravans
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on average tend to have quite small houses, suggests that the latter explanation may well be true.

6.18. Figure 6.6 suggests that the relationships between specific facility provision and holding size outlined above remain roughly the same if farms are considered on their own, so the pattern described above cannot be said merely to reflect the influence of estates. It is worth noting finally that, although large holdings tend to be more heavily involved than small and medium sized holdings in the provision of recreation and the more extensive forms of accommodation, quite a few holdings in every size group are providing these facilities.

ii. Agricultural enterprise size

6.19. The size of a farming enterprise is frequently measured by the total number of standard man days required to operate the enterprise for one year. One standard man day represents eight hours of work by an adult male worker and tables are available showing the number of s.m.d.'s per year per unit of production (e.g. per cow) required for all common farming activities (e.g. Norman and Coote, 1971, p. 18). Agricultural holdings are classified by D.A.F.S.* into six categories according to enterprise size, viz:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enterprise Size</th>
<th>S.M.D.'s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statistically insignificant</td>
<td>under 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spare time</td>
<td>40 - 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time</td>
<td>100 - 249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time: small</td>
<td>250 - 599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>600 - 1199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>1200 and over</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Agricultural Statistics (Scotland) 1974, p. 83 (D.A.F.S., 1975a)
Fig. 6.6 Percentage of landholders providing particular facilities within 10% ile acreage groups (farms, specified facilities)
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These categories were used to group the holdings, using s.m.d. figures for each holding in the sample which were provided by D.A.F.S. when the sample was drawn up. The percentage of holdings providing facilities within each category is shown in Figure 6.7.

6.20. The results indicate an upward trend in the proportion of holdings with facilities as agricultural enterprise size increases, suggesting that an existing commercial base had proved an attractive environment for additional enterprises (see factor B above, 'economic resources'), although the existence of physical resources may still influence the situation.

6.21. Looking to the future, the proportion of holdings where the landholder is considering facility provision for the first time appears not to vary very much between agricultural enterprise size groups. It may be that the factor of economic need (factor C above) counterbalances that of economic resources (factor B) when it comes to landholders' desire to develop a new income earning enterprise. Table 6.4 shows how the distribution between size groups of landholders considering facilities for the first time compares with the distribution of landholders with facilities at present. The apparent shift towards the involvement of economically smaller enterprises can be seen in the table.

iii. Labour

6.22. A figure for the amount of labour employed on landholdings was calculated by adding together the total number of full-time
Figs. 6.7  Percentage of landholders providing facilities within agricultural enterprise size groups (all holdings, farms; all facilities)

(a) all holdings

(b) farms

existing provision

potential new provision
employees and the proportion of the landholder's time spent in farming. The way in which facility provision varies between holdings with different amounts of labour is shown in Figure 6.8. In general, the proportion of landholders providing facilities increases as the amount of labour available increases. The pattern of variation reflects elements of the variations found between both area and enterprise size groups.

**TABLE 6.4** Distribution of landholders with facilities and with ideas for future provision between agricultural enterprise size groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agricultural enterprise size</th>
<th>Distribution of landholders providing facilities</th>
<th>Distribution of landholders considering facilities for the first time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statistically insignificant</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spare time</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.23. Looking at the proportion of landholders considering facility provision for the first time, this proportion appeared rather lower than average where one person only was employed but was working full time (this was presumably the landholder). This pattern also showed up when farms and crofts were investigated separately. It could be that these full time one man holdings are those with the greatest work load per head and the least available
Fig. 6.8 Percentage of landholders providing facilities within labour groups (4 holding types, all facilities)
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time to consider new enterprises — see factor D, 'available time', above.

6.24. The question of available time was investigated further. The ratio of agricultural enterprise size (measured in standard man days) and the actual amount of labour employed (including the landholder) was calculated for full time farms. This gives a crude measure of work load per man. Figure 6.9 shows farms grouped according to the size of this ratio. It appears that there was no tendency for holdings where this measure of work load per man was low to be more likely to have facilities or for the landholder to be considering provision for the first time. This result tends to refute factor D above, 'available time', but a high s.m.d. to labour ratio may reflect technical efficiency and not overworked labour, and also the situation is very greatly affected by landholders' families and wives. The latters' allocation of time between housework, farm work and spare time is likely to affect involvement in facility provision as much as the farmers' or crofters' time.

6.25. Farms alone were included in this last analysis and only if the farmer had said he was employed in farming full time. Where a landholder has declared that farming takes up less than all his time, a better indication of the amount of time he may have available to devote to other activities can be obtained by considering whether or not he has a job elsewhere and just what fraction of his time is spent farming. Many crofters are only part time agriculturalists and they are of special interest here.
Fig. 6.9  Percentage of landholders providing facilities within S.M.D.'s: labour ratio groups (farms, with farmer working full time; all facilities)

\[ \text{Ratio} = \frac{\text{S.M.D.'s}}{\text{labour x36}} \]
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6.26. Table 6.5 presents some data on the proportion of landholders with facilities now, or in the future if their ideas for further provision are carried out, according to the extent to which they are engaged in agriculture or in jobs elsewhere. The number of landholders in certain categories is small and these results can only be taken as representing the situation within the sample. For the holdings in the sample, landholders not fully engaged in agriculture and without a job elsewhere, were proportionally more involved in facility provision than other landholders and this might be explained by the 'economic need' and the 'available time' factors mentioned above (factors C and D). This involvement diminished, though, if the landholder's agricultural activities were really very limited - i.e. under half his time or not at all. The chances are that these barely employed people are retired and so less likely to be providing or considering facilities.

**TABLE 6.5** Facility provision where the landholder is not engaged in agriculture full-time (% holdings providing facilities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landholder not in agriculture full time and</th>
<th>Landholder in agriculture full time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no other job, agriculture takes up:</td>
<td>has job elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/3-2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;2/3 of his time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOW</strong></td>
<td><strong>FUTURE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%) of farms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.3 = 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROFTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOW</strong></td>
<td><strong>FUTURE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%) of crofts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.4 = 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.27. Where farmers had a job elsewhere, the percentage of farmers providing facilities was lower compared with farms where the landholder's time was fully taken up in agriculture. Crofters employed elsewhere were more involved in facility provision than those fully engaged in crofting but less involved than part-time crofters. Looking towards the future, a surprisingly high proportion of crofters with jobs elsewhere were considering the provision of facilities on their crofts for the first time. This could perhaps reflect a desire by those crofters working away from home during the day to find sources of income and employment actually on the croft, so enabling them to remain at home during the day working the croft and running the facility. Another possibility might be a desire to provide the crofter's wife with an activity during the day while the crofter was away at work.

6.28. The role of the estate proprietor tends to be rather different from that of the farmer or crofter. Estates grouped according to the proportion of his time that the proprietor spent in farming or administration showed little variation in the proportion with facilities.

b) Land use

6.29. Initial assumptions about the relationship between land use on the holdings and the provision of facilities for public recreation and tourism, might be made as described below.
A. Visitors' assessments of the attractions of an area are likely to be affected by the area's landscape and land form. Land form also has a strong influence on the type of land use which, in turn, affects the landscape. The unique attraction of the Scottish countryside can be found in the upland and coastal scenery of the Borders and the Highlands and Islands, which are popular tourist areas. These are areas of predominantly hill sheep and upland farming, where forestry and sporting are also prevalent. Therefore one might assume that holdings with this kind of land use are more likely than others to have facilities.

B. The nature of the land use affects the resources available for facility provision. For instance, intensive farms with horticulture or pig or poultry units could well not have suitable land for many types of facility. Obviously only holdings where sport is a form of land use will have facilities for public fishing or shooting.

6.30. Three characteristics of land use were investigated independently: agricultural type, sporting use and forestry.

iv. Type of agriculture

6.31. The answers to question 3 of the postal survey questionnaire were investigated, and on the basis of this seven categories of agricultural type were constructed. The categories are listed in
Fig. 6.10 Proportion of holdings in agricultural type categories

1 hill sheep
2 beef/sheep
3 dairy
4 beef/crops
5 cropping
6 intensive
7 no agriculture in hand at present
Figure 6.10., which shows the proportion of holdings with each type of agriculture within the four main holding types. D.A.F.S. classify farms into eight types,* and it was possible to compare their classification with the one made from the questionnaire, but only on full time farms which are a minority of the holdings in the survey. This indicated that the constructed categories 'Beef/Sheep', 'Beef/Crops' and 'Intensive' are equivalent respectively to D.A.F.S. categories 'Upland', 'Rearing with Arable' plus 'Arable, Rearing and Feeding', and 'Intensive' plus 'Rearing with Intensive livestock'. The remaining corresponding categories have been given the same nomenclature as is used by D.A.F.S.

6.32. The pie-charts in Figure 6.10. show that there is a considerable difference in the relative sizes of the agricultural type categories between farms, crofts, smallholdings and estates, particularly with respect to 'hill sheep' and 'no agriculture at present'. It was decided that the extent of facility provision on holdings with different farm types could best be illustrated with reference to farms only. The ratio between the percentage of farms providing facilities within each category and the percentage of all farms providing facilities is used in Figure 6.11. to create a step-like display of agricultural type categories in an order related to involvement in facility provision. The dotted line indicates how this order might change in the future if landholders carry out their ideas for facility provision.

* See Agricultural Statistics (Scotland) 1974, page 83 (D.A.F.S., 1975a)
Fig. 6.11  Variation in facility provision on farms between agricultural type categories (farms, all facilities)
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Livestock farms with upland grazing or dairy pasture land tend to be more involved in facility provision than cropping or intensive farms. This complies with the assumptions A and B above. The relatively low proportion of mixed farms (beef/crops) with facilities cannot be easily accounted for, but here again, assumption A may provide some explanation as these mixed farms are often found in lowland areas, such as North East Scotland, which are not popular tourist areas. Looking to the future, relatively few dairy farms were considering facility provision for the first time. This could be due to the fact that dairy farmers tend to have a regular heavy daily work load throughout the year.

ii. Sport

The presence or absence of sport (fishing, shooting or stalking) as a land use on holdings was recorded with reference to question 5 of the postal survey questionnaire. Both assumptions A and B above would suggest that holdings where one of the land uses is sport are more likely to have facilities for public recreation or tourism, both facilities for public sporting and other less specialist facilities. Sport is a form of land use in many upland and mountainous areas or in varied wooded lowland countryside attractive to visitors in general.

In Table 6.6 holdings are grouped into those with sport as a land use and those with no sport. The percentage of holdings within each category which are providing facilities is given.
This table makes a distinction between the provision of sport facilities for the public and the provision of other facilities. The figures in brackets represent the potential future situation and the results are presented for farms and estates separately.

### TABLE 6.6 Provision of facilities on holdings with and without sport as a land use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FARMS</th>
<th></th>
<th>ESTATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No sport</td>
<td>With sport</td>
<td>Chi squared*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Distribution of holdings)</td>
<td>66% : 34%</td>
<td>(Distribution of holdings)</td>
<td>7% : 93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% providing sport for the public</td>
<td>0.0 (0.0)</td>
<td>8.1 (11.8)</td>
<td>Sig.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% providing sport for the public but no other facilities</td>
<td>0.0 (0.0)</td>
<td>4.9 (4.2)</td>
<td>Sig.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% providing other (non sport) facilities</td>
<td>8.7 (14.7)</td>
<td>16.2 (27.6)</td>
<td>Just insig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total % with facilities</td>
<td>8.7 (14.7)</td>
<td>21.1 (31.8)</td>
<td>Sig.*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.36. The table shows that holdings with sport as a land use have an obvious advantage over other holdings, in their ability to provide the public with facilities for shooting and fishing. In addition, it appears that these holdings are also more involved in the provision of other types of facility than are holdings without any public or private sporting; i.e. holdings with sport as a land use characteristic are more likely than others to be involved in facility provision in general.

* Chi-squared test for significance in the difference between the categories at 95% confidence.
iii. Forestry

6.37. Forestry was the last land use characteristic to be studied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 6.7 Provision of facilities on holdings with and without forestry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FARMs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Distribution of holdings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% providing facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% considering facilities -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- additional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- initial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential % providing facilities in future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.7 indicates that holdings with forestry are more likely to be providing facilities than are those without. This is especially true of farms, where the number of holdings with forestry is low. These few farms with forestry tend to be very large and very large farms have already been shown to be more involved in facility provision than other sizes of farm.

c) Tenure

6.38. Holdings were classified as 'owned or mainly owned' and 'rented'. A comparison between these two groups with respect

* See footnote to Table 6.6.
to facility provision is shown in Table 6.8.

TABLE 6.8 Facility provision within tenure groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL HOLDINGS</th>
<th></th>
<th>FARMS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Owned</td>
<td>Rented</td>
<td>Chi-squared*</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% providing facilities</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>Sig.*</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% considering facilities - additional</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>Sig.*</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- initial</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Insig.*</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential % providing facilities in future</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>Sig.*</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the left hand side of the table, all holdings are taken together. The inclusion of estates, all of which are owned, and crofts, the vast majority of which are rented, means that the comparison shown here is strongly influenced by the difference between these two types of holding. Therefore, the second half of the table presents results relating to farms alone.

6.39. The influence of estates is clearly seen in that the percentage of holdings with facilities is significantly higher for owned holdings. A much greater similarity is found between owned and rented farms. Really this is quite surprising. One might have assumed that tenant farmers would be significantly less likely to be providing facilities than owner occupiers for two reasons. First, some tenants might be precluded from engaging in non-agricultural activities under the terms of their tenancy

* See footnote to Table 6.6.
agreement and would have to seek the landowner's permission for this to be changed. Secondly, certain types of facility involving fixed capital equipment could entail the tenant making a capital outlay which he could not fully recover at the termination of his tenancy.

6.40. Table 6.9 shows the proportion of owned as against rented holdings with different kinds of facility. It is interesting that certain types of accommodation such as chalets and static caravans, which may involve fixed equipment, were found, nevertheless, to be no less prevalent on rented holdings than on owned holdings. It is recreation facilities—shooting and fishing—which appear to be much more frequently provided by some occupiers than by tenants.

**TABLE 6.9** The percentage of owned as against rented holdings providing different kinds of facility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALL HOLDINGS</th>
<th>Owned</th>
<th>Rented</th>
<th>Chi squared</th>
<th>Owned</th>
<th>Rented</th>
<th>Chi squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holiday cottages</td>
<td>NOW</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FUTURE potential</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static 'Vans</td>
<td>NOW</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FUTURE potential</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalets</td>
<td>NOW</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FUTURE potential</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B &amp; B</td>
<td>NOW</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FUTURE potential</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touring 'Vans</td>
<td>NOW</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FUTURE potential</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>NOW</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FUTURE potential</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>NOW</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FUTURE potential</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooting</td>
<td>NOW</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FUTURE potential</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pony-trekking</td>
<td>NOW</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FUTURE potential</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>NOW</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>FUTURE potential</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(xx = 99% confidence that owned > rented, x = 95% confidence)

(yy = 99% confidence that rented > owned, y = 95% confidence)
d) **Age of the landholder**

6.41. Holdings were classified according to the three landholder age groups used on the questionnaire. The percentage of holdings providing facilities within each group is shown in Table 6.10. There is little difference between the age groups as far as the existing provision of facilities is concerned. It was expected that landholders considering new facilities would be most likely to be in the youngest age group. This is borne out, but it seems that, apart from on crofts, the major discrepancy lies between the '40-55' and the 'over 55' age groups rather than between the 'under 40' and the '40-55' groups. Crofts show the greatest difference between all age groups with respect to the proportion of holdings considering facilities.
TABLE 6.10 Provision of facilities on holdings within 'landholder's age' groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL HOLDINGS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>CROFTS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>FARMES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under 40</td>
<td>40-55</td>
<td>Over 55</td>
<td>Chi-squared+</td>
<td>Under 40</td>
<td>40-55</td>
<td>Over 55</td>
<td>Chi-squared+</td>
<td>Under 40</td>
<td>40-55</td>
<td>Over 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of holdings</td>
<td>19.5% + 35.9% + 44.6% = 100%</td>
<td>13.4% + 28.2% + 58.4% = 100%</td>
<td>23.7% + 42.3% + 34.1% = 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% providing facilities</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>Insig.</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>Insig.</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% considering facilities -</td>
<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>- Additional</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Initial</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential % providing facilities in future</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ See footnote to Table 4.14.

y Not measured.
A discriminant analysis was undertaken to find out to what extent the eight basic characteristics investigated independently above could be used together to forecast whether or not a holding would have a facility. Discriminant analysis is a form of multivariate analysis which determines what combinations of variables is best able to aid the distinction between two or more groups of cases, and also how accurately this distinction can be made. In this particular analysis, the holdings formed the cases and they were grouped according to whether or not a facility for recreation or tourism was provided. The variables were certain measures of the eight basic characteristics – as follows:

**Area** - the total acreage of the holding.

**Agricultural enterprise size** - the size of the agricultural enterprise measured in standard man days.

**Agricultural type** - six categories of farming type. In order to provide an interval scale and to avoid the cumbersome use of six dummy variables each category was given a score depending on the average % of hill land per holding within the equivalent D.A.F.S. farm type category. The % of hill land reflects a basic difference between the agricultural type.

**Labour** - the landholder, or the proportion of his time spent in farming, plus the total number of additional full time employees, if any.

**Tenure** - whether the holding is mainly owned or mainly rented.

**Forestry** - the presence or absence of commercial forestry.

* The value of these variables were converted to a logarithmic scale to adjust for a few very extreme values occurring on some holdings.

Sport - a measure of the use of the holding for sport was calculated from the answers to question 5 of the questionnaire. Fishing was weighted less highly than shooting as it usually requires the commitment of fewer resources.

Age - the age of the landholder based on the categories shown in question 12 of the questionnaire.

6.43. The analysis was carried out on all holdings and then on estates, farms and crofts separately. In a second analysis, holdings were not grouped by current facility provision but by the potential presence or absence of facilities if landholders' ideas for the future are carried out. Agricultural enterprise size was included only for farms and crofts, as with many estates it was uncertain whether the size measured related to the complete farming enterprise on the estate and no measurement was available from the S.L.F./S.W.O.A. survey. Frequently with estates, the age of the landholder was not recorded as the estate was owned by a trust or company. These two characteristics have not been used in the analysis when all holdings have been taken together. Sport and forestry were taken as zero for crofts, and tenure as 'owned' for estates and 'rented' for crofts.

6.44. The particular discriminant analysis programme used is part of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (S.P.S.S.) and the reference material used for guidance in the use and function of discriminant analysis was also provided by S.P.S.S. (Nie, et.al., 1975).

6.45. In discriminant analysis, a discriminant function is formed which represents the variables (characteristics) combined in such
a way that their overall ability to describe the distinction between the groups (holdings with and without facilities) is maximised. The Canonical Correlation is a measure of association between the discriminant function and the grouping factor (presence/absence of facilities). Its squared value is the proportion of the variance in the discriminant function explained by the groupings. It is equivalent to the $R^2$ value in multiple regression analysis and to eta in analysis of variance.

6.46. The squared Canonical Correlations presented in Table 6.11 are statistics measured on a scale between 0 and 1. High values would be most unlikely. If the Canonical Correlation was 1, it would mean that one could say that all holdings with certain characteristics (for instance, upland farms of 600 acres or more, without forestry) were facility providers and no holdings without these characteristics had facilities. Nevertheless, the values shown in Table 6.11 are very low. This result summarises the fact that, despite the various trends and differences in the extent to which holdings with different characteristics are involved in facility provision, which were shown and described earlier in this chapter, facility provision fairly well permeates all types of holding. There are no exclusive categories, one way or the other. This suggests that there are many other factors in addition to simply the outward characteristics of holdings which determine whether or not a landholder provides facilities. Landholders' motivations and attitudes for and against facility provision provide the subject of the next chapter.
Comparing estates, farms and crofts, it appears that estates show a stronger relationship between the eight basic characteristics and the presence or absence of facilities than do farms or crofts. Looking to the future, there is no indication that if landholders carry out their ideas for facility provision, the distinction between providers and non-providers of facilities will become any more closely related to holdings' characteristics.

### Table 6.11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Square of Canonical Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All holdings</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crofts</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farms</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estates</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the overall ability of the characteristics to distinguish or discriminate between the groups of holdings is poor, comparisons between individual characteristics in their ability to aid the discrimination cannot be made with confidence. However, it is still interesting to consider which characteristics contributed most to the discriminant analysis carried out on the holdings in the sample. One way of doing this is to look at the way the characteristics are combined in the discriminant function. The magnitudes of the standardised coefficients relating to each

+ These are analogous to partial regression coefficients in multiple regression analysis.
variable in the function are proportional to the relative contribution of each characteristic in discriminating between the groups. Rather than showing the actual coefficients, the percentage composition of each discriminant function is expressed in Table 6.12 by converting the coefficients to a percentage scale. The direction of action of the variables is shown by the sign.

**TABLE 6.12 Relative contribution of each characteristic to the discriminant function**

(the figures show the percentage contribution of each characteristic, which is proportional to the size of the respective standardised coefficients)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All holdings</th>
<th>Crofts</th>
<th>Farms</th>
<th>Estates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area</strong></td>
<td>2 (-)</td>
<td>6 (-)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agr. entpr. size</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>31(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agr. type</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>5(-)</td>
<td>8(-)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( y = \text{not measured} \quad x = \text{not relevant characteristic} \)

6.49. The contribution of each characteristic measured in this way is due to that one alone, isolated from the influence of the inter-relationship between characteristics. For example, labour availability may affect facility provision directly but this relationship will be confused by the fact that labour and acreage
are themselves related and acreage may, in turn, affect facility provision. If these inter-relationships are not adjusted for, then it is possible to pick just one characteristic which, through direct and indirect effects, will account for a high percentage of the total discriminating ability. Table 6.13 shows the percentage of the squared canonical correlation that can be accounted for by the multifarious action of the most powerful characteristic. The second percentage shown relates to the effect of the next most powerful characteristic, again acting directly or through other characteristics but not through its relationship with the first characteristic.

**TABLE 6.13 Overall effect of the most powerful characteristics**

(% of squared Canonical Correlation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present situation</th>
<th>All holdings</th>
<th>Crofts</th>
<th>Farms</th>
<th>Estates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most powerful</td>
<td>Sport 84%</td>
<td>Age 49%</td>
<td>Sport 52%</td>
<td>Area 88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd. most &quot;</td>
<td>Forestry 8%</td>
<td>Labour 26%</td>
<td>Area 21%</td>
<td>Sport 7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential situation</th>
<th>All holdings</th>
<th>Crofts</th>
<th>Farms</th>
<th>Estates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most powerful</td>
<td>Sport 84%</td>
<td>Enpr.</td>
<td>Sport 66%</td>
<td>Area 86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd. most &quot;</td>
<td>Forestry 5%</td>
<td>Age 36%</td>
<td>Agr.</td>
<td>Sport 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>type 13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.50. This 'most powerful characteristic' may not be especially useful or interesting if it is one which is not easily measured or recognised on holdings. To simplify this, a similar analysis

---

* The percentages shown in Table 6.12 are not percentages of (canonical correlation)^2 but merely permit a comparison between characteristics. Therefore, they should not be related to Table 6.13.
has been made, whereby characteristics are grouped into four types. The complete effect, direct and indirect, of 'size' of holding is measured first (area, agricultural enterprise size, labour), followed by any additional effect due to 'land use' not already accounted for (agricultural type, sport, forestry); 'tenure' and 'age' of landholder are treated in the same way. The results are shown in Table 6.14.

**TABLE 6.14 Effect of size, land use, tenure and age, taken in that order**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All holdings</th>
<th>Crofts</th>
<th>Farms</th>
<th>Estates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Present situation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential situation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* y = not measured  x = not relevant characteristic

6.51. The results presented in Tables 6.12 to 6.14 suggest that the most powerful variable in both its direct and total effect in discriminating between holdings with and without facilities is 'sport'. There are probably two reasons for this. First, the fact that
landholders with sport as a land use are in a position to provide the public with fishing or shooting - they have the resources for such provision directly to hand. Secondly, holdings with sport are often in attractive areas popular with visitors. Holdings with sport as a land use are involved with facility provision in general to an extent above the average. These factors were discussed in the course of the univariate analysis (paragraphs 6.34 to 6.36). In addition, taking all holdings, the presence of sport as a form of land use is a characteristic of large holdings. Earlier in the chapter, especially large holdings were shown to be relatively more heavily involved than other holdings in facility provision and reasons for this were discussed (paragraph 6.16). This explains why 'sport' and 'land use' are even more potent variables in the multivariate analysis when their indirect impact, through their relationship with other variables (Tables 6.13 and 6.14), is taken into account. The same argument applies to 'forestry'.

6.52. When estates are considered separately, the size of the holding is all important compared with other characteristics. Sport is common on a large majority of estates and this is no longer a particularly useful discriminating variable. The univariate analysis showed that there was a fairly regular upward trend in the proportion of estates with facilities as the size of the estate increased.
6.53. A special aspect of the distribution of facility provision between landholdings is the geographical spread. Has the provision of facilities on private landholdings occurred to the same extent throughout Scotland? The location of each landholding was recorded by reference to its parish code number provided by D.A.F.S. In addition, a grid reference for each farm, croft and estate in the sample (but not smallholdings) was obtained using Ordnance Survey maps at various scales, except for 4% of the holdings whose location could not be found.

6.54. Map 6.1. shows the location of sampled holdings based on the grid references, which was drawn by computer using a graph-plotting programme. Estates are shown by triangles, and farms and crofts by crosses. The fact that both the D.A.F.S. sample and the S.L.F./S.W.O.A. sample were stratified by location means that the density of crosses on Map 6.1. corresponds to the number of farms and crofts per unit area on the ground, while the same applies to the density of triangles and the number of estates per unit area. However, in comparing densities of farms and crofts against estates (i.e. crosses against triangles) it should be remembered that the number of estates has been inflated, relatively, in the ratio of about 3:1 owing to the inclusion of the S.L.F./S.W.O.A. survey.

6.55. A greater density of holdings is clearly seen in lowland areas: the central rift valley, Angus, Caithness and Orkney, the Solway area, and especially Banff, Buchan, Gordon and parts of
Map 6.1 Distribution of farms, crofts and estates responding to the postal survey

+ farm or croft
△ estate
Moray. Another notable feature is the very high density of holdings – the vast majority being crofts – in coastal areas of the Western Isles and Shetland. The dominance of coastal locations is shown also in crofting areas of the mainland and northern Skye. The relative importance of estates in inland upland areas is marked, even when allowance is made for the addition of S.L.F./S.W.O.A. holdings.

6.56. Table 6.15 shows the proportion of landholders providing or considering facilities within each local authority region. The table shows that one major lowland area, the North East of Scotland, and one crofting area, the Northern and Western Islands areas, are the places with the least facility provision with respect to the number of holdings. These areas contain many small landholdings and consequently affect the overall Scotland figure quite considerably. Regions which are predominantly upland – viz. Tayside, Borders, Highland – have the highest proportion of holdings providing facilities.

6.57. The results for the percentages of holdings providing facilities and considering provision for the first time are presented in map form in Maps 6.2. and 6.3. respectively. Here local authority districts* have been used since some regions (notably Highland and Strathclyde) are large and encompass areas

* Some districts have been amalgamated in the map so that each area marked contains a minimum of about 30 holdings. The amalgamations are:

1. Badenoch and Strathspey + Nairn + Inverness
2. Kincardine and Deeside + City of Aberdeen
3. Kilmarnock and Loudon + Cumnock and Doon Valley
4. Tweeddale + Ettrick and Lauderdale
5. West Lothian + Midlothian + City of Edinburgh
6. Angus + City of Dundee
7. Argyll and Bute + Dumbarton
8. Clackmannan + Falkirk
9. Urban districts around Glasgow
10. Kirkcaldy + Dunfermline
Map 6.2  Holdings providing facilities

Proportion of holdings in the District which have facilities as % of the equivalent national proportion

- under 75%
- 75% to 125%
- 125% to 175%
- over 175%
Map 6.3 Holdings considering provision for the first time

Proportion of holdings in the District which are considering facility provision as % of the equivalent national proportion:

- under 75%
- 75% to 125%
- 125% to 175%
- over 175%
of strongly varying character. The tendency for facility provision to be more likely in upland rather than lowland areas is given further support, since Caithness shows a low result and Argyll, Bute and Dumbarton score high relative to other parts of the Highland and Strathclyde regions respectively. In Map 6.2. the mid-Highland SW-NE belt of Argyll, Lochaber, Inverness and Badenoch forms one area of high provision, flanked by districts of decreasing importance. The Borders, and to a lesser extent Dumfries and Galloway, form the other pole of high provision.

TABLE 6.15  The proportion of holdings providing facilities by local authority region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>% of holdings with facs.</th>
<th>% of holdings considering facs.</th>
<th>Potential future provision</th>
<th>Potential proportional increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Borders</td>
<td>23.4**</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tayside</td>
<td>20.2**</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>19.4**</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>18.1**</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathclyde</td>
<td>15.8**</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumfries and Galloway</td>
<td>13.8*</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lothian</td>
<td>10.6*</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fife</td>
<td>8.9*</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grampian</td>
<td>8.5**</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orkney</td>
<td>8.1*</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shetland</td>
<td>8.1*</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Isles</td>
<td>3.4**</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100.0%

Significance of difference from all Scotland proportion (13.1%)

** = 99%, * = 95%, * = <95% confidence
Turning to Map 6.3., the districts which show the greatest increase in their relative position compared with Map 6.2. are the Islands Areas, including Skye. The high proportion of landholders considering facilities in the outer isles and the consequent extremely high potential proportional increase from the current low level of provision was shown in Table 6.15. The strong potential for growth in the proportion of crofters involved in tourism or recreation was shown in Chapter Four. However, if the islands are excluded, crofters show no greater tendency for growth than do other types of landholder. The potential is really an islands phenomenon rather than an overall crofting one. Officials visited in the islands backed up these figures – all felt that, although tourism was weak at present, there was a growing interest in it. This does not mean, of course, that there is little new interest in other crofting areas (10.9% of landholders in the Highland region are considering facilities for the first time), only that provision on the mainland is relatively great already.

Only Lochaber and Inverness/Badenoch maintain their dominant position in both Maps 6.2. and 6.3. Perhaps they constitute the heartland of Scotland with respect to facility provision on landholdings. The North East corner of Scotland shows a low level of involvement in facility provision on both maps.

Maps 6.4. and 6.5. present information on the percentage of holdings currently providing accommodation and recreation facilities (both active and inactive) respectively. Map 6.4. (accommodation) is similar to Map 6.2., where all holdings were taken together, but
Map 6.4 Holdings providing accommodation

Proportion of holdings in the District which provide accommodation as % of the equivalent national proportion

- under 75%
- 75% to 125%
- 125% to 175%
- over 175%
Proportion of holdings in the District which provide for recreation as % of the equivalent national proportion
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with an even greater tendency for bias towards the SW-NE Highland belt. In Map 6.5, the heartland has shifted south and east and is centred on the Tayside region and certain east coast districts, although the Highlands are still heavily involved in recreation provision. A comparison between Maps 6.4 and 6.5 suggests, also, that the proximity of districts to major urban areas has a greater positive influence on recreation provision than on the provision of accommodation. Both types of facility provision, at the moment, are least likely in the north-east corner (Banff, Buchan, Gordon) and in the Western and Northern Islands.

6.61. A better understanding of the causes of the regional variation in the provision of facilities might have been obtained by a regional analysis of all the landholders' stated reasons for and against facility provision. This has not been done as it would be a time consuming process and the large amount of data generated might just confuse the situation. Instead it is worth considering the distribution of facility provision in the light of qualitative information, obtained in another way. At an early stage in the project an awareness of the variation between different parts of the country was obtained from interviews with the majority of the Area and Branch Secretaries of the National Farmers Union of Scotland and with some D.A.F.S. Lands Officers. While it was not possible to collect information in this way which could be used to make any quantitative comparison between areas regarding the extent of facility provision, impressions were formed about this which broadly correspond to the figures obtained from the postal survey.
More usefully, ideas were gained on how landholders in different parts of Scotland view recreation and tourism, and are affected by it. These will be presented below but it should be remembered that they were obtained from the personal opinion of just a few people, and indeed, some of these opinions may not tally with the order of importance of factors affecting landholders' attitudes to facility provision as presented in the next chapter.

6.62. Discussion with officers in the outer isles (Shetland, Orkney and Lewis) brought up the questions of a short season, high transport costs and insufficient sailings - reflecting a postal survey respondent's comment:

"There is no demand from tourists up here. The cost of travelling takes up all their spare cash. Mostly relatives or friends that make the long trek north, i.e. non-paying guests." -

and traditions especially with respect to the Sabbath in Lewis. These factors were considered to be important in explaining the relatively low percentage of holdings with facilities in the islands. However, all officers thought that a change was coming - possibly seeded by those landholders returning to the islands from work on the mainland or abroad.

6.63. The situation in the Highland region was generally described as one of landholders having taken advantage of a high demand and continuing to do so as the demand increases. This relates to all types of facility provision. Lack of capital and laziness were mentioned as inhibitors. In east coast areas, e.g. Easter Ross and the Black Isle, the picture was quite different, with less demand
and supply. Oil and related developments were cited as absorbing landowners' and workers' time as well as causing potential holiday cottages to be taken as residences on long lets.

6.64. This effect on cottages and labour was also expressed in the Grampian region. The season was said to be very short here, affected by the Glasgow Fair Holiday, but facilities were full for a few weeks. Speyside, with quite a lot of provision, especially bed and breakfast, could be contrasted with coastal lowland areas. In the latter areas amalgamations of small farms, with reasonable quality land, have been common, causing an increased work load on family farms and also less need to supplement income. The fact that many farms are tenanted in this area was given as a possible explanation of the lack of facility provision.

6.65. Subjects brought up by officers in the Tayside, Central, Strathclyde and Fife regions tended to vary according to whether the area discussed was predominantly urban, coastal or inland and rural. Upland Perth and Stirling districts were said to be ones of high demand with only quite moderate, albeit increasing, response from farmers and landowners. The situation on the coast, e.g. Ayr, East Fife, Dumbarton, seemed to be one of just a few farmers going in for really large developments, notably caravan sites, to cater for the high demand for holiday accommodation. It appeared to be easier to generalise about urban dominated areas such as Dunfermline, Glasgow, Lanark, Renfrew. Here, landholders were said not to be involved in recreation or tourism to any great extent, partly because
of general lack of demand and partly for more specific reasons such as 'new motorways taking all the tourists through the area', or cottages being sold to commuters and not let for holidays. Most caravan sites were described as 'residential' sites. A demand for day recreation facilities was recognised, but some N.F.U.S. Secretaries said that sport was frequently let to syndicates or used by friends of the landholder.

6.66. N.F.U.S. Secretaries in Dumfries and Galloway explained that the West of this region, especially the Stewartry, contained good farms but this did not mean that there was not a response to the high and growing demand. A particular feature of facility provision mentioned here was the existence of large caravan sites, mainly coastal, with additional amenities such as shops. The difficulty in obtaining planning permission, especially on the coast, was given as a specific inhibitor to further development. Annandale and Eskdale district was said to be more traditional, with little provision except by holdings near the A74. The Borders region appeared to contain quite large holdings with a moderate response to demand, mainly in the form of catering for traffic passing through, but also in the provision of recreation facilities such as fishing. The large holdings, and consequent low density of them, may explain why the proportion of holdings with facilities in this region is seen to be quite high in Map 6.2.
6.67. When a landholder makes a decision to provide or not to provide facilities for recreation or tourism, he is aware of the nature of his holding and his enterprise. On the other hand, landholders' involvement with de facto access is passive, while the active party, the tourists or recreationists, are very unlikely to have any knowledge of the nature of the holding which they are using apart from its physical appearance. Therefore, as far as most of the characteristics analysed earlier in this chapter are concerned, there are no a priori reasons to suspect a relationship between them and the occurrence of de facto access. The analyses below have been restricted, accordingly, to an examination of the presence or absence of de facto access on holdings of different area, farm type and location in Scotland.

6.68. In general, the larger the holding, the greater is the opportunity for de facto access: one would expect, for this reason, that landholders with larger holdings would be more likely than other landholders to have some involvement with public recreation or tourism through de facto access. Figure 6.12, was drawn in the same way as Figures 6.1 and 6.2. It shows the proportion of all holdings, and then different holding types taken separately, which experience de facto access, within specified acreage groups. Where all holdings are taken together, there is, as expected, a marked increase in the proportion of holdings with access as size increases. This also applies when farms and crofts are considered separately. A large majority of estates and common grazings have some form of de facto access already and
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less size dependence is found here, except with the smallest holdings (e.g. between the smallest 30% of estates). Figure 6.13 shows the pattern for four separate types of access. De facto camping and caravanning were found generally not to be common on small and medium sized holdings (up to about 200 acres) but many larger holdings did experience camping and caravanning, the frequency increasing as size increased. A similar pattern was found with car-parking or picnicking and walking or climbing, except that quite a high proportion (20 to 30%) of medium sized holdings (roughly 15 to 200 acres) experienced these forms of access.

6.69. Holdings where the land is less intensively cultivated may appear to the visitor to be more suitable for walking, picnicking, camping and so on, and therefore be more likely than other holdings to receive de facto access. It was decided that the relationship between the presence of de facto access and agricultural type could best be shown if farms were examined alone. Table 6.16 shows the proportion of farms with different types of agriculture which receive some form of de facto access. As expected, there appeared to be some tendency for livestock farms, which involve rough grazing and pasture, to be more involved than arable farms with de facto access. In particular, de facto access was especially prevalent on hill sheep farms, which often contain large areas of hill and mountain side. Intensive farms, involving horticulture or pig or poultry units, were understandably the least prone to de facto access.
## TABLE 6.16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Hill sheep</th>
<th>Beef/sheep</th>
<th>Dairy</th>
<th>Beef/crops</th>
<th>Cropping</th>
<th>Intensive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farms receiving de facto access</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.70. Map 6.6 shows how the various local authority districts in Scotland differ from the national average in terms of the proportion of landholders experiencing de facto access. There appear to be four areas where the proportion of landholders involved with recreation and tourism through facility provision is high—namely, the mid Highlands, Lothian coastal districts, the Borders and the South West. A relatively low proportion of landholders in the North West Highlands and Islands, lower Strathclyde and the Grampian region, reported the occurrence of de facto access. The geographical distribution does reflect the acreage and agricultural type results given above.

6.71. The relative prevalence of different types of de facto access in different types of Scotland was investigated. Walking or climbing was found to be most common in districts where holdings were most likely to contain some hill land. Experience of car-parking or picnicking was more evenly distributed throughout Scotland than other types of access, but was found to be most prevalent in upland and coastal districts with relatively easy access to the central lowlands. De facto camping and caravanning was most frequently reported in Highland districts.
CHAPTER SEVEN

THE ATTITUDES OF LANDHOLDERS

7.1. In Chapter Six, measurements were made to investigate the extent to which landholders likely to be providing or considering facilities for recreation or tourism could be identified by the physical and land use characteristics of their holdings. It was discovered that, although some of these characteristics were related to facility provision in that the proportion of holdings with facilities increased or decreased in different categories of size or type, in general the policy of the landholders with respect to the presence or absence of facilities could not be explained fully by simple statements about the holdings and their characteristics (6.46.). This points to the need to investigate directly the reasons of landholders for and against providing facilities. The surveys did this and the results are the subject of this chapter. This chapter also deals with the attitude of landowners to de facto access and to the functions of certain statutory bodies.

1. REASONS FOR PROVIDING OR CONSIDERING FACILITIES

a) Prevalence of different reasons

7.2. It is frequently difficult for landholders to sort out in their minds the reasons for providing facilities or why they are thinking of doing so. When landholders were asked about this, it was apparent that there were certain factors which affected
their initial awareness of recreation and tourism and the possibility of providing facilities, and other factors which led to reasons for actually becoming involved or considering involvement. The first factors are referred to here as 'promptings'; and the second factors as 'reasons'.

7.3. In this section the relative prevalence of certain reasons and promptings for the provision of facilities on farms, crofts and estates and on all holdings together is presented and described, followed by an analysis of the reasons and promptings broken down between facility types. In the next section, the nature of these reasons and promptings is described in more detail, mainly using information from the interview survey.

7.4. Table 7.1. shows, for each reason listed in the questionnaire of the postal survey, the percentage of facilities whose provision was influenced by that reason. Percentages are shown in respect of the provision of facilities on crofts, farms and estates separately and on all holdings together; the final column gives, against the respective reasons, percentages of facilities not existing at present but which are being considered for the future. The lower half of the table is concerned with the percentages of facilities where the actual provision or thought of providing them was prompted initially by the action of other people or organisations.

7.5. With crofts and farms, increase in income was indicated as a reason twice as frequently as any other reason; but for estates, the first place was taken by a desire to make a gesture
of good intent towards those seeking recreation in the countryside. 

The importance of the desire to increase the annual income of 
crofters and farmers is not matched by the reaction to falling 
income from farming, a reason which was given for less than one 
third of the facilities on farms and crofts and for a very small 
percentage of those on estates.

7.6. Estate proprietors were found to be more likely than 
farmers or crofters to provide facilities for managerial reasons, 
such as the use of disused resources or the controlling of damage. 
While personal interest on estates is comparable on farms and crofts, 
on estates this interest may be less involved with the recreationists 
themselves; estates showed little response to a desire to enjoy the 
company (which was prevalent on crofts and moderately so on farms) 
and a greater interest in making a gesture of good intent to the 
recreationists.

7.7. Landholders who were thinking of having facilities were 
found to be doing so for reasons similar to those which brought 
about the existing facilities. However, future ideas seemed 
slightly more dictated by income and less by other reasons. 
When the reasons for existing facilities were compared with 
those for future considerations, taking farms, crofts and estates 
separately, it was found that this slight change towards economic 
motives was due mainly to the estate sector.

7.8. The influence of the possibility of obtaining support from 
statutory bodies was very slight, especially on farms. It should 
be remembered that a number of facilities were started before such
support was available. This was found to be a much more significant factor in its influence on landholders' ideas for new facilities and, in this respect, almost measures up with the two main promptings of visitors' requests and examples set by other landholders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons:</th>
<th>% of provision</th>
<th>% considered provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crofts Farms Estates</td>
<td>All holdings</td>
<td>All holdings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To increase annual income</td>
<td>72% 60% 45%</td>
<td>58% 67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falling income from farming</td>
<td>30% 28% 8%</td>
<td>20% 28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital investment</td>
<td>3% 7% 6%</td>
<td>5% 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To use disused resources</td>
<td>12% 17% 30%</td>
<td>18% 22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attract people to other fac.</td>
<td>13% 4% 15%</td>
<td>10% 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To control damage</td>
<td>2% 4% 16%</td>
<td>7% 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal interest in the fac.</td>
<td>37% 25% 28%</td>
<td>29% 26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy the company</td>
<td>35% 22% 5%</td>
<td>21% 19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gesture to recreationists</td>
<td>39% 33% 56%</td>
<td>38% 39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>21% 25% 30%</td>
<td>28% 22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promptings:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others doing the same</td>
<td>14% 20% 17%</td>
<td>17% 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from Stat. Bodies</td>
<td>5% 1% 3%</td>
<td>3% 16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Tourist Organisation</td>
<td>10% 2% 5%</td>
<td>5% 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors asking for it</td>
<td>38% 38% 37%</td>
<td>37% 27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fairly high frequencies given for many of the reasons in Table 7.1 suggest that landholders do, in fact, have a number of reasons for setting up any one facility. It is arguable that
those reasons which are usually just one of a number of influences affecting the landholder's decision are less important in determining facility provision than are those which tend more to be the sole reason. This underlines the importance of the desire to increase annual income for, as is seen in Table 7.2., this was the factor which was the least frequently diluted by other influences. However, when the results in Table 7.1. were adjusted to take into account the number of reasons given per facility provided or considered, the relative prevalence of the reasons remained the same.

**TABLE 7.2.** Average number of other reasons for providing facilities in addition to reason stated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason stated</th>
<th>Number of other reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To increase annual income</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falling income from farming</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital investment</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To use disused resources</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attract people to other facilities</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To control damage</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal interest in the facility</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy the company</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gesture to recreationists</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All reasons</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.10. The relative prevalences varied between different types of facility. Figures 7.1. and 7.2. are diagrams which illustrate the variation. By considering the distribution of large and small blocks in any row, one can obtain an impression of the kinds of reason which dominate in the provision (Figure 7.1.), or the
Fig. 7.1 Percentage of specified existing facilities related to reasons and promptings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REASONS</th>
<th>PROMPTINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To increase annual income by raising income from farming</td>
<td>Others doing the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHALET INVESTMENT</td>
<td>Possibility of financial benefits from visitors to area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO USE DISUSED RESOURCES</td>
<td>The local tourist organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO PROVIDE OTHER FACILITIES</td>
<td>VISITORS PAYING FOR IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO CONTROL DAMAGE</td>
<td>OTHER REASONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL INTEREST IN THE FACILITY</td>
<td>A GUIDE TO PEOPLE SEEKING DIFFERENT REGIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENJOY THE COMPANY</td>
<td>THE LOCAL TOURIST ORGANIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A GESTURE TO OTHER REGIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BED & BREAKFAST
STATIC CARAVANS
CHALETS
HOLIDAY COTTAGES
TOURING CARAVAN SITES
CAMPING SITES
FISHING
SHOOTING
HUNTING
TREKKING
BOATING
CATERING
SHOPS
MUSEUMS/BUILDINGS
GARDENS
FARM OPEN DAYS
CAR PARKS
PICNIC SITES
NATURE TRAILS/WALKS

= 10% of the total provided
Fig. 7.2 Percentage of specified facilities being considered related to reasons and promptings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Promptings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To increase annual income</td>
<td>Others Don't think same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing income from farming</td>
<td>Possibility of employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital investment</td>
<td>The local community organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To use disused resources</td>
<td>Visitors using it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To attract people to other facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To control personal leisure facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy the company of others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A gesture to those seeking recreation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bed &amp; Breakfast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static Caravans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday Cottages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touring Caravan Sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping Sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Trekking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museums/Buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Open Days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car-Parks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Trails/Walks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10% of the total considered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
consideration (Figure 7.2.), of each type of facility. Alternatively, casting the eye down the columns gives an impression of which facilities relate most or least to each of the stated reasons for provision.

7.11. A clear distinction emerges between a group of facilities which are provided mainly for the reason of increasing annual income and another group where this is not the most important reason. The former group contains accommodation facilities and shops; if facilities which are only considered are looked at, this group is joined by all the active recreation facilities as well. Usually where the reasons for facility provision are not dominated by a desire to increase annual income, the desire to make a gesture to those seeking recreation in the countryside showed up strongly: as for inactive recreation facilities, such as car parks, picnic sites, trails or walks, and also camping sites and fishing.

7.12. The facility which stands out with regard to the use of disused resources is holiday cottages and the ones most clearly affected by there being a special interest in them are pony-trekking and gardens. Boating and shops are the facilities most strongly associated with a desire to attract people to other enterprises, presumably through combinations with fishing and caravan or camping sites. Capital investment was seldom given as a reason, whatever the facility, but this factor appears to be relatively more likely to affect landholders providing or thinking of chalets than any other facilities. Car parks, picnic sites and trails or walks are the only facilities for which the control of damage competes with other reasons for provision. One might have expected this to be
an important reason for providing touring caravan or camping sites but, relative to other reasons, this does not seem to be so. The facility most clearly associated with the enjoyment of the company provided by visitors is bed and breakfast, as one might expect, since this facility probably brings the greatest contact with visitors.

7.13. Turning to promptings, the most frequent of them was that visitors had asked for facilities, although it was never especially prevalent nor uncommon with any one facility. On the other hand, the prompting from other people providing facilities is most strongly associated with accommodation of various kinds. The facility most affected by a knowledge of the possibility of obtaining financial support from statutory bodies was chalets.

b) Detailed descriptions of reasons and variations in nuance

7.14. So far, the prevalence of different promptings and reasons for providing facilities has been presented and has been related to different types of holding and of facility. This section elaborates on the nature of the various reasons from information obtained during the interviews.

i. Financial reasons

7.15. The attitudes of landholders to facilities as means of earning income varied between holdings where:

A. the recreation or tourism enterprise was the major source of income for the landholder;
B. the recreation or tourism enterprise was set up to provide income to supplement that from other enterprises; and

C. the facility generated no income or income was regarded as unimportant.

7.16. Holdings under variation A can be sub-classified into two groups. The first group contains holdings where the landholder took the holding especially for the purpose of starting a recreation or tourism enterprise or where the holding contained such an enterprise on acquisition.* The second group includes holdings where the occurrence of a recreation or tourism enterprise providing the major source of income for the landholder has entailed his bringing about a change in the use of his land or his time. This only very infrequently entailed a running down of existing enterprises on the landholding (see 8.5*), although examples were found of crofters who had slowly retired from active crofting or from other jobs without reducing the tourism or recreation facilities. Most of the landholders with dominant recreation or tourism facilities provide them because it is their livelihood - with them, it is not so much a question of increasing annual income as obtaining and maintaining it. However, the dominance of the recreation or tourism enterprise may be a recent phenomenon brought about by the expansion of the facility. Here the facility may have

* Some respondents to the postal survey declared that their holding was primarily a caravan site or other tourism enterprise rather than a farm, croft or estate. Here some small pieces of land used for agriculture or horticultural produce qualifies the holding as an agricultural holding in the D.A.F.S. census.
been set up for the reason given in B above and described further in the next paragraphs.

7.17. The provision of facilities with the purpose of supplementing income should be seen in the light of the reasons why additional income is desired. An analysis of the use made of income from recreation or tourism facilities will be presented in Chapter 8 (para. 8.28.). In the main it was found that such income tended to be used for personal and household expenditure. Many landholders did not express their desire for increased income in terms of a previously recognised fundamental necessity. Even landholders whose very low incomes from agriculture left them considerably financially disadvantaged, tended not to talk of a need for more income but rather of "being able to spend more on items we would not be able to afford otherwise". Facility provision improved the quality of life rather than providing for its necessities.

7.18. Frequently, landholders mentioned specific costs which had to be met and so directly affected the decisions to provide facilities. Sometimes the specific costs were of a nature which made recreation or tourism especially suitable as means of meeting them. One landowner was faced with heavy rates on his salmon river and so decided to sell fishing permits. A farmer was visited who had stocked a loch with trout, enjoyed the fishing himself and also financed the sport by inviting the public to use the loch for certain periods of the day.

7.19. This expedient of making a resource pay for itself has a tax aspect where what would otherwise be personal expenditure is
set off against facility income. A tax advantage also manifests itself where maintenance expenditure on the landholding may be offset against income from the provision of recreation and amenity. This way of thinking is not especially common and was found mainly to occur on estates. Attitudes of landholders to these matters depended on the existence of other sources of income to provide for consumption, the character of the farm or estate and its ability to benefit from the arrangements.

7.20. The difference between income and capital is not absolute. Many landholders have not needed to work out the difference in any conscious way and this probably affected answers to the postal survey. The fact that desire to increase annual income scored so very much more highly than considerations of capital investment could reflect the impression gained from the interviews that enhancement of capital value tended to be regarded more as a consequential benefit rather than as a reason for starting the facility in the first place. Expenditure on development and maintenance tended to be carried to the extent considered necessary to ensure a satisfactory income from the facility at the time and, with most landholders, over a number of years in the future. Even where all or almost all of the income from a facility was ploughed back into developing it, landholders would talk of maximising income from the facility.

7.21. A third financial reason listed on the postal survey questionnaire was concern for declining income from farming. This was infrequent as compared with desire to increase income. This agrees with impressions from the interview survey that few landholders
had been obliged to turn to recreation and tourism because of an actual fall in income. On the other hand, many landholders considered that agriculture had declined relative to tourism or recreation with respect to the potential for income generation from resources and investments. One interesting form of decrease in the income earning potential of traditional land use or management activities was found on some estates with a high percentage of land let and where rent restrictions prevented rents from rising in accordance with rapidly inflating costs.

ii. Use of resources

7.22. Frequently landholders were visited whose explanation of why they had decided to provide facilities included a reason which centred on the existence of a certain piece of land, a building or a person already on the landholding. It may be that this resource was not being used or was considered to have characteristics making it especially suitable for use for a recreation or tourism facility.

7.23. Many landholders visited had cottages which had become empty owing to the farmer or crofter moving to a new house or where a worker was made redundant. Rather than keep the cottages empty, variously regarded as a waste, politically unwise or leading to rapid deterioration, the landholders had decided to let them as holiday cottages. A particular reason why cottages were let as holiday cottages rather than being let on long leases was because landholders wished to keep their options open on cottages rather than be subject to a sitting tenant situation. Holiday letting precludes
the visitor from security of tenure. This reason frequently dominated other reasons for the provision of cottages.

7.24. Labour availability on the holding can be another reason for setting up facilities. On a number of holdings with pony-trekking this enterprise was developed in order to give the landholder's daughter something to do. Landholders' wives at home all day in isolated areas often welcomed being able to cater for visitors as this provided them with a way of employing their time but which they could do at home.

7.25. Other reasons for having a facility were that the landholder wished to use certain resources, not necessarily disused, for recreation and tourism because he considered them to be especially suitable; examples include historic buildings, fields containing old roadways and concrete bases of army huts. On two holdings visited the landholders had observed *de facto* caravanning and camping in certain fields and had realised their potential for caravan sites.

iii. Control of activities

7.26. On some landholdings facility provision has occurred partly or wholly as a response to *de facto* access by the public. The landholder wanted to control this use or was prompted by the fear that if no facilities were provided the public would take them of their own accord. The desire of the landholder for control was mainly associated with considerations of prevention of damage to the holding and enterprises on it and of deterioration of
amenity. Frequently control amounted to directing activities to suitable places where it was possible to manage or, at least, keep an eye on them. Control applied to numbers as well as to place. One landholder had set up special rough camping and caravanning areas to control the numbers of campers and caravans using his land. An interesting way in which control can take place was described by two landholders who said that they had provided fishing permits with the idea that people with permits would police the river and discourage those without them.

Another aspect of control is not so much a desire to manage the use by the public of the land for recreation but to prevent facilities being developed by the local authority. A number of landholders visited emphasised the importance they placed on maintaining their prerogative as decision takers, managers and planners throughout the estate. On some holdings control was combined with a desire to benefit tourists and recreationists, as where an estate factor reported that:

"The owner has a personal desire to create some form of simple access - and his idea of a 'walk' has been developed. Considerable housing development is proposed nearby and unauthorised access will substantially increase. To control it, organised access and activities will be required."

iv. A gesture to tourists and recreationists

7.27. Many landholders visited appeared to have a genuine desire to help people and to facilitate their pleasure, the landholder being rewarded by seeing his visitors enjoying themselves. Certain landholders mentioned the need for the facilities they had set up. Among them were those who spoke of the need for catering facilities
as few were available locally, and of letting a holiday cottage "because this is what people want, and it increases the number of families who can enjoy the place". There was concern on some holdings that tourists' needs should be met by a high standard of facilities and provision was combined with a sense of pride in achieving this high standard.

7.28. Quite often facility provision was seen as a duty to the local or national public. This took the form sometimes of farmers and landholders wanting to be seen to be providing facilities and so to be accepting a national or local responsibility. This attitude was found on estates in particular and was quite prevalent, being a major reason for the provision of certain large accommodation enterprises as well as small recreation facilities. Many landowners visited were concerned about the popular image of private landownership and about the increasing publicity given to proposals for land nationalisation. They felt that by providing for recreation and tourism, and particularly by developing high quality facilities, they were creating tangible evidence to support arguments that private landholders are not reactionary and are aware of, and sympathetic to, alternative forms of land use to meet the nation’s requirements. Political expediency with respect to the local public and local authorities frequently played a part in reasons for providing facilities. One example of local diplomacy involved a landowner who created a touring caravan site and picnic sites (both facilities favoured by the Local Authority) partly to endear to the Planning Department his ideas for a large chalet development.
v. Attracting people to other facilities

7.29. Users of one facility sometimes take advantage of another on the same holding. On a few landholdings facilities (usually for recreation) had been set up especially with the purpose of attracting people to other facilities (usually accommodation). Another reason for the setting up of additional facilities was frequently one of benevolence — the landholder wanting to offer his visitors something extra. Where this reason was important, it was usually found that the first facility earned income while the second one may not even have been charged for. Conversely, situations were found where a facility was set up to earn income within a complex of non-income earning facilities. One landholder stated that he considered the main reason for providing his non-income earning, inactive recreation facilities was that they kept the public at large on his holding so that they had more opportunity to spend money at his shops and cafe.

vi. Enjoying the company

7.30. That a landholder enjoys the company of his visitors has been implied more or less by some of the other reasons discussed above; as, for example, where facilities have been provided to give the farmer's wife or daughter something to do in her spare time, or because the landholder has a benevolent desire to help tourists or recreationists. On the other hand, enjoyment was frequently acknowledged explicitly. Unless landholders had other facilities already this factor of enjoying the company was usually not a positive reaction; rather it tended to reflect an initial
lack of company, particularly for landholders' wives. A few farmers said that because of the farm they found it difficult to get out and meet people or have holidays themselves and so they welcomed people coming to them. Farming demands constant attention and can be a lonely activity in an isolated place. Landholders who had been providing facilities for some time more frequently mentioned the pleasure they got out of the company, explaining that visitors returning year after year had become their friends.

vii. Personal interest in the facility

7.31. The relative importance of having a personal interest in the facility as a reason for providing it was found to depend considerably on the kind of facility. This impression from the interviews is backed up by information from the postal survey; for instance, the special personal interest in horses and riding evident at all pony-trekking establishments visited shows up also in Figs. 7.1. and 7.2. There are certain other examples where the landholder, or his family, has really made a facility out of a hobby, as with the sea anglers, collectors of ancient farm implements and others. More common facilities such as caravan sites, bed and breakfast, are not unrelated to personal interest. At a less specific level a number of farmers and landowners had gone into the field of recreation and tourism because of a special interest in the integration of alternative forms of land use, and the general management of recreation.
7.32. Initial promptings influencing landholders in the provision of facilities usually concerned the various ways in which a landholder and the public became aware of each other. Firstly there is the situation where tourists or recreationists desire to find a facility to satisfy their needs - a bed for the night, land for their tent or caravan. They approach the landholder and ask him if he provides the facility they require. The postal survey results given in Table 7.1. indicated that quite frequently landholders were prompted to provide or consider facilities by visitors asking for them. Visitors asking for facilities includes the situation where some facilities are provided already and users of these suggest others - one farmer visited said that the idea of a stocked trout loch came from his Bed and Breakfast guests. The awareness of landholders of demand occurs in various ways less specific than an initial approach by tourists or recreationists. De facto access on his or another's holding, counting caravans on the road and the like were found to contribute to this. A very few landholders visited were aware of demand because the facilities existed on the holding when they acquired it.

7.33. Landholders may become aware of the possibilities of facility provision not so much through direct contact with the public but through the activities of other landholders or organisations. The influence of these third parties can occur at two stages; first as promptings (by direct approach, advertising or demonstration) and secondly in the imparting of advice and experience. Many landholders had got the idea for their facility from their neighbours' successful
enterprises. Ideas for more unusual facilities were sometimes generated by examples that the landholders had seen when travelling further afield, occasionally on holiday abroad. The fact that those involved were other farmers, crofters or landowners was especially important. Much less frequently, landholders were prompted initially to provide facilities by a knowledge of the activities of statutory bodies in providing financial assistance to projects. This could reflect a lack of initial awareness of these bodies' activities. A very few of the landholders visited had been approached by the local Tourist Organisation or Association to find out if they could help with the problem of accommodating tourists. This was usually done on a friendly basis - the landholder was known to the Tourist Officer.

ix. The mixture of reasons and changing emphasis

7.34. The previous paragraphs describe single reasons for providing facilities. As most facilities are provided for two or three reasons (see Table 7.2.), it is worth considering the nature of combinations of reasons. It was found that where income was important, it was most likely to dominate. A specific example relates to bed and breakfast: it is often especially desirable to augment income when there is a young family, but this is a period when resources (e.g. bedrooms) and spare time are scarce and there is little need for any company. On the other hand, income was sometimes considered to be only of equal importance to other benefits or merely a relevant factor but of secondary importance to them. For example: "We are providing fishing
permits to enable people to fish here while keeping a control on numbers and we will be glad of any money that comes in" or "I was bored, I enjoy cooking and I wondered whether I would obtain any financial return". Letting holiday cottages usually satisfied motives of using resources and earning income; the same was true of many fishing enterprises, frequently with the added reason of benefitting, or being seen to benefit, visitors or local fishermen.

7.35. A particular aspect of the combinations of reasons for providing a facility is a change in emphasis over time from one reason to another. One farmer's wife, for example, explained that the bed and breakfast enterprise had started when she needed the income to cover household expenses, although now the income from the farm was sufficient for her to take an allowance out of that. More frequently, however, the desire to increase income was found to have increased over time. Many a landholder had decided to 'start out in a small way and see how it goes' and the income had proved sufficient to encourage expansion. From a position of experiment, facility provision had become a source of income to be relied upon. Two fishing enterprises were visited where day permits had been sold for political reasons but now were found to bring in more income than a long private lease of the river. One estate had originally justified investment in a large caravan site on political grounds despite pessimistic budgets but was now able to regard the facility as a valuable source of income. The motive of meeting the needs of others can increase in relative importance over time - many
landholders said that they had built up a clientele of visitors who come back each year and that they felt they had a special duty to carry on providing that which these people had grown to rely on.

2. **REASONS FOR NOT PROVIDING FACILITIES**

a) **The main reason for not providing any or any more facilities**

7.36. Information on reasons against providing facilities for recreation or tourism was obtained from respondents to the postal survey, irrespective of whether or not they actually had, or were considering, any facilities. Landholders were asked to write down their main reason for having no facilities or for having no more. The length and content of statements varied a great deal. Ninety individual codes were used to classify these statements and these were later grouped under broad headings. Table 7.3 lists the groups, themselves arranged into six even broader categories. The table gives the percentage of 'all holdings' and then the percentages of small-holdings, crofts, farms and estates which stated the reasons falling within each group. The sum for each of the six larger categories is given as well. The percentages add up to more than 100 as some of the holdings gave main reasons which spanned two or more subjects.

7.37. The order of the main categories in the table has been chosen not with an eye to the frequencies but rather on the notion of decreasing reaction against the provision of facilities. Groups covering statements which imply that the landholder is not
### TABLE 7.3

Summary of expressed main reasons for not providing any (or more) facilities, with frequencies given as percentages of all holdings, small-holdings, crofts, farms and estates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>All Holdings</th>
<th>Small-Holdings</th>
<th>Crofts</th>
<th>Farms</th>
<th>Estates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% not giving a written reason</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not interested</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti tourism/recreation</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally not interested</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is not appropriate</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactionary</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditions of rural life</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers should farm etc.</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuisance and damage</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal circumstances</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age and health</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absentee landlord</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For sale/development</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of holding and enterprises on it</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General unsuitability</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of available time</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size or type of land</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuitable buildings</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties with providing a facility</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location/accessibility</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost and return</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning permission</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand and supply</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No demand</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No need for facilities</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
concerned with recreation and tourism or that he is against it on his land come first. These are followed by situations where there are positive reasons for not having facilities, to do with the landholder, his holding or his activities; and in the final two categories reasons relate to practical aspects of the facilities themselves. The ordering is quite subjective and often it was very difficult to decide whether a subject should go in one place rather than another.

7.38. The table shows that twenty per cent of respondents did not write in any main reason for not providing facilities. Probably most of these could be taken as being not interested in recreation or tourism; they could be added to the first group. This would increase the proportion of landholders not interested to 35%, and would tend to emphasise the already noticeable fact that estate proprietors are less likely to be uninterested than are farmers or crofters.

7.39. Seventeen per cent of landholders went further than an initial general reaction and mentioned specific reasons why they reacted against the idea of recreation or tourism. There are six groups in the category 'Reactionary' in Table 7.3. Estates appear relatively more frequently in this category than do other holdings, especially where amenity preservation and reaction to potential nuisance or damage is concerned. The desire to maintain privacy is a reason specific to the interests of the landholder and his family. Amenity preservation is likewise often personal but the landholder can be influenced by a more social outlook.
Attitudes such as:

"We wish to keep this place as private as possible"
may well be less readily accepted by the public than when the
same thing is expressed in a different way, explaining that
there are understandable reasons for this attitude, such as:

"We all work hard without holidays and value our privacy
for a few hours' quietness if ever possible".

7.40. Some people may interpret a landholder's concern for
amenity as meaning that he wants to keep the land for himself
and does not want other people around to disturb it. Most
statements about amenity, however, were expressed mainly by
estate proprietors in a way which emphasised a sense of duty
as custodians of the countryside, such as:

"We are aware that we have a duty to preserve, for as
long as possible, this part of an area of Southern
Scotland, so far unspoilt, and it is for this reason
that we will not provide facilities for tourists who
are well catered for elsewhere".

7.41. Concern about the traditions of local communities was
expressed infrequently and mainly by crofters, as shown in
Table 7.3., especially those in the Western Isles. The concern
was summarised by one crofter who wrote:

"The majority of outsiders won't recognise our way of
life and are not wanted when they try and force theirs".

More specifically, a number of crofters mentioned their anxiety
about sabbath desecration:

"One of the main things which islanders are anxious to
preserve is the sanctity of the Christian Sabbath, and
authorities when promoting tourism in the Hebrides should
emphasise this point. I am aware of course that this may
seem like archaic language to modern man, but I believe the
Sabbath is an integral part of the moral law, and that the
Fourth Commandment is as binding on society as the Eighth".
Some crofters blamed recreation and tourism for disrupting communities:

"No person wishes to see his generous neighbours turned into grasping tourist vultures - which is what all too often happens when the tourist trade becomes powerful in any community".

7.42. Some recreations by landholders laid emphasis on their occupation and role as farmers, or, in the case of estate proprietors, as farmers, foresters and land managers. Such comments as:

"I am a single minded farmer bent on making the most of my profession and producing as much food as possible for my country. Any of the foregoing (i.e. facilities) is merely a diversion which would detract from the purpose of my business and be a distraction from more important things"

are typical of the sentiment.

7.43. Table 7.3 showed that, apart from financial reasons, concern about nuisance and damage was the main reason most frequently expressed by estates. Comments were mainly not specific but statements about the sporting value of estates and about disturbance of game were common, and some woodland owners mentioned that their plantations were at a vulnerable stage. Many landowners and most farmers directed their comments towards damage to agriculture. Statements like:

"Tourists and Trippers have no respect for the Country Code. A considerable amount of time is spent clearing up, repairing damage, shutting gates; etc."

occurred frequently. Some comments were more specific: the danger of spreading disease was emphasised very strongly by the few farmers who mentioned it. A number of landholders said that
they would be prepared to consider facilities if only the public was well-behaved and treated the countryside with respect. This was sometimes extended with a comment on the need for education.

7.44. The third category in Table 7.3 concerns the personal circumstances of the landholder and his family. Some comments on this were purely specific to the individual. However, certain subjects recurred frequently. A factor of vital importance in understanding why the proportion of crofts with facilities is not higher than it is, is the age of crofters. Age (sometimes combined with health) was expressed more frequently by crofters than any other of the reasons listed in Table 7.3. Two other recurring circumstances occurred mainly on non-crofting small-holdings, first where the holding was a parcel of land away from the landholder's residence or centre of activity (he was an absentee landholder); and, secondly, where the holding was about to be developed or sold and so could not be considered for facility provision. Only a very few landholders giving statements about their personal circumstances expressed an inability to cope with providing facilities through lack of expertise.

7.45. Reasons concerning the nature of holdings or of enterprises on them which were explicitly expressed (as distinct from being implied from statements about potential damage) were found, when taken together, to be the most prevalent main reasons for not providing facilities. One third of all landholders gave reasons of this nature. Basically these kinds of reason can be divided between those concerned with the landholder's, and his employees',
time and the nature of the holding in terms of land and buildings. Farmers frequently stated that they simply did not have the time to turn their attention to anything but farming. Sometimes concern centred on demands on the landholder's or his family's own time or alternatively on the fact that facilities would require the employment of extra labour. Already overworked employees and the desire not to employ more (or occasionally the difficulty of obtaining labour) were prevalent in statements from estates about time. About one third of the crofters who mentioned time said that their time was taken up in employment other than crofting. Occasionally the type of agriculture and the farming season was mentioned to explain why time was particularly scarce.

7.46. The size or nature of the land is the subject most frequently given as a main reason for having no (or no more) facilities. It is interesting to note that crofters give this as a main reason less frequently than do farms or estates even though the median size of crofts in the sample was only about 10 acres. However the factor of size alone was more frequently expressed by crofters than by farmers or estate owners, as the latter two mainly commented on the suitability of their land. Occasionally statements about suitability referred to topography. More frequently landholders mentioned the existing land uses and the fact that they rendered the land unsuitable for recreation and utilised all available space on the holding. The question of size and suitability arose again with statements about buildings. Some farmers and crofters explained that their house was too small to take in guests, but just as frequently it was not so much a question of size as one
of primitiveness, especially with crofts. The lack of bathrooms was a recurring problem and the lack of mains electricity and running water was also mentioned. Occasionally landholders referred to a situation where water, piped or not, was in short supply especially in the summer season.

7.47. The next category of reasons for not having facilities covers situations where the landholder is concerned about practical aspects of providing them. These included the cost of setting them up; potential profitability; obtaining permission from superiors or the agreement of inferiors with interests in the holding; and obtaining planning permission without trouble. The location of the holding could be said to be more related to the previous category, to the general nature of the holding and not to practical facility provision, but it is included here because many landholders mentioned location in terms of physical access to the holdings. Isolation causing problems to the extent that it is difficult for visitors to get to the holding at all was mainly mentioned by crofters. Farmers were more concerned by distance from the main roads and many smallholders mentioned the unattractiveness of the situation owing to adjacent built up areas.

7.48. Financial factors given as main reasons for not providing facilities centred primarily on raising capital and concern about establishment costs. The occasional landholder would go on to say that he would be or would have been keen to overcome this problem if suitable assistance was given to him. Comments such as:
"Grants are offered on a percentage basis but we have not applied as we cannot provide the remainder. A long term loan at low interest rates, as a supplement to the grant, would be an advantage"

are indicative. Profitability of facilities was mentioned less frequently than capital and costs, although comments from estates often covered this.

7.49. More specific statements about reasons why it was not financially desirable to make investments in recreation and tourism just occasionally touched on aspects of government policy or the existing economic climate. Comments on this came most frequently from estate proprietors; such as:

"Our plans have been disrupted by the fiscal policies of the present government and the uncertainties they have created".

7.50. Aspects of land tenure were more frequently mentioned by farmers than by crofters as the main reason for not providing facilities. Nearly all the statements on this subject related to the rights of tenants, sometimes merely pointing them out, as when a farmer wrote:

"I am a tenant farmer and therefore I have no right to provide any facilities".

Less frequently it was frustration with the role of the supervisor and his activities, such as:

"The main problem stems from the fact that I rent the farm from an absentee landlord who specifically excludes us from catering for tourists because he personally runs the estate on a "hunting, shooting and fishing" basis to a syndicate of merchant bankers to the exclusion of normal tourists. This, apart from grossly under-using the local amenities for tourism, also precludes us from increasing our potential income from this quarter".

On the other hand, the number of interests held in the land affected some superiors who were concerned not to upset their tenants by
providing facilities.

7.51. Statements about problems of obtaining planning permission varied considerably. Some landholders mentioned they had applied for permission and been refused; others were put off by the increasingly strict standards imposed or by the time they felt it would take for permission to be granted.

7.52. The last category in Table 7.3. relates to the assessment by landholders of the demand for, and supply of, facilities. A few landholders did not simply say that there was no demand but more specifically explained that they had not provided facilities because they had never been asked. Turning to supply, the occasional landholder wrote that he did not provide facilities because there were facilities elsewhere, provided either by the landowner or the local authority.

b) The relative importance of certain influences against facility provision compared between holding types

7.53. As well as writing down in their own words their reasons for not providing facilities, landholders were asked to indicate which of a list of possible reasons were important influences against any, or further, facility provision. In this way information is obtained, not as before on the main over-riding reason why facilities are not provided, but rather on the relative importance of what may be secondary influences on any one landholder. Presenting the landholder with a given list of factors, ensures that each landholder must consider whether or not each factor was important to him. This enables a comparison to be
made between different types of landholder in terms of the relative importance of these factors. Table 7.4 presents the twelve reasons listed on the questionnaire in order of their importance* on all holdings and also shows their respective ranking when estates, farms, crofts and small-holdings are taken separately.

### Table 7.4. Listed reasons for not providing facilities ranked in order of importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>All Holdings</th>
<th>Small-holdings</th>
<th>Crofts</th>
<th>Farms</th>
<th>Estates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simply not interested</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No land</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value privacy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No capital</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage caused</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No demand</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not profitable</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic climate</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining landlord's</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>permission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining planning</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>permission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditions</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twenty eight per cent of respondents did not answer this question. These landholders either felt that none of the listed reasons were important to them or were too disinterested in recreation or tourism to decide which factors were important.

* Ticks were placed to indicate whether the reason was very, quite or of little importance. These three categories were given different weights in arriving at the rankings.
7.54. The table shows that capital was more frequently an influencing factor on crofts than on any other holdings; indeed it recurred more frequently on crofts than did any other reason although it took only fifth or sixth place elsewhere. All types of landholder tended to be affected by capital more frequently than uncertainties about profitability, the latter reason usually coming three-quarters of the way down the list. Taking all holdings together, and farms separately, 'simply not interested' was marked more frequently than other reasons. However, estates were more likely to be affected by consideration of potential damage, a reason not particularly important on other types of holding, and by maintenance of privacy, a factor that most landholders considered to be important. Lack of suitable land was the most frequently important reason for non-provision by non-crofting smallholders and it scored highly on other holdings as well, as did lack of time. The need to obtain planning permission and the landlord's permission were not important reasons generally; however, this might be explained by the fact that permission is required only for certain facilities and also that only tenants will need to obtain permission from the landlord. Concern about conflicts with tradition was the least frequently indicated reason; and 'lack of demand' or 'today's economic situation' were not important.

7.55. Using these results, it is possible to compare reasons for not providing facilities between holdings classified according to a variety of different characteristics. One particularly interesting comparison is the subject of Table 7.5., which compares the
order of importance of the twelve listed reasons between holdings with no investment in facility provision and those where the landholder is actually considering providing facilities or has some already and so is probably aware of the issues involved in further provision. The bars in between the two sides of the table show the displacement of those reasons whose rank differs between the two lists by more than one place. Generally, the picture is similar but where some facilities have already been provided, or considered, the relative importance of 'simply not interested' drops dramatically, as one might expect, while concern about capital, the economic climate and planning permission all rise in relative importance. It is important to appreciate the prominence of the financial constraint, the lack of capital, amongst landholders who are, or are in a good position to be, seriously considering the provision of new facilities.

TABLE 7.5. Reasons for not providing facilities by existing or considered provision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No existing or considered provision</th>
<th>Facilities already provided or considered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reasons in order of prevalence:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simply not interested</td>
<td>No capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No land</td>
<td>No time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No time</td>
<td>Value privacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value privacy</td>
<td>No land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage caused</td>
<td>Economic climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No capital</td>
<td>Damage caused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No demand</td>
<td>Not profitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not profitable</td>
<td>No demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining landlord's permission</td>
<td>Obtaining planning permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic climate</td>
<td>Obtaining landlord's permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditions</td>
<td>Simply not interested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining planning permission</td>
<td>Traditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.56. Some of the reasons for not providing facilities relate to the kinds of characteristics of holdings measured in Chapter Six. It has been suggested that it is the fact that landholders are influenced by many factors other than the characteristics of their holdings which caused no closer relationship to be found between the presence or absence of facilities and the characteristics of holdings (6.46.; 7.1.). The importance of these other influences has now been shown. However, it may be that even the prevalence of concern about the suitability of holdings may not be related to holdings' characteristics. Individual landholders may have different criteria for assessing the suitability of their holding for facility provision.

7.57. One of the reasons for not providing facilities was 'lack of suitable land'. One might expect that this reason would be more frequently indicated by smaller holdings than by larger ones. Figure 7.3., based on acreage groups,* shows that this is not so. The largest 10% of holdings are just as likely to indicate 'lack of suitable land' as are the smallest. This suggests that there may be special features of land which make it appear suitable for recreation or tourism developments and that even very large holdings may not necessarily contain such land. The suitability of land may depend on the type of agriculture. However, Table 7.6.† shows that the proportion of landholders concerned about the suitability

* See paragraph 6.10.
† The percentages given in Figures 7.3. and 7.4. and Table 7.6. show the proportion of all landholders answering the relevant question on the questionnaire who indicated that the respective reason was important.
**Fig. 7.3** Proportion of holdings indicating 'lack of suitable land' as a reason for not providing facilities, by acreage groups; all holdings

Percentage indicating 'lack of suitable land'

![Graph showing percentage indicating lack of suitable land by acreage groups.](image)

**Fig. 7.4** Proportion of farmers indicating 'lack of time' as a reason for not providing facilities, within S.M.O.'s labour ratio groups; farms, with farmer working full time

Percentage indicating 'lack of time'

![Graph showing percentage indicating lack of time by labour ratio groups.](image)
of their land did not vary greatly between farm types, although this factor was clearly, and understandably, of particular importance on intensive farms.

7.58. The second half of Table 7.6. relates agricultural type with the proportion of farms concerned about the damage which might be caused by facility provision. No particular farm type stands out one way or the other: all farmers were moderately concerned about damage to their holdings irrespective of the type of farming enterprise.

TABLE 7.6. Percentage of farms indicating 'lack of suitable land' and 'damage caused' as reasons for not providing facilities, by type of agriculture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of agriculture</th>
<th>% indicating 'lack of suitable land'</th>
<th>% indicating 'damage caused'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hill sheep</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upland</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beef/Crops</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cropping</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.59. Another example of relating reasons for not providing facilities with characteristics of holdings concerns tenure. Table 7.7. lists the twelve reasons in order of prevalence, for owned and then for rented holdings. The comparison shows that there is very little difference in the order except that, naturally, with rented holdings the problem of obtaining landlord's permission rises in importance.
TABLE 7.7. Reasons against facility provision on owned and rented holdings

Reasons in order of prevalence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owned</th>
<th>Rented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simply not interested</td>
<td>Simply not interested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No time</td>
<td>No time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value privacy</td>
<td>No land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No land</td>
<td>Value privacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No capital</td>
<td>No capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage caused</td>
<td>Obtaining landlord's permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No demand</td>
<td>Damage caused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not profitable</td>
<td>No demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic climate</td>
<td>Not profitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining planning permission</td>
<td>Economic climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditions</td>
<td>Obtaining planning permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Obtaining landlord's permission)</td>
<td>Traditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With crofts, the vast majority of which are rented, the need to obtain the landowner's permission was rarely regarded as a constraint (see Table 7.4.) reflecting the crofter's right to engage in 'subsidiary or auxiliary occupations' under Section 5 of the Crofters (Scotland) Act, 1961. However, when tenant farmers (about 57% of farms) were considered separately, it was found that, of the listed reasons for not providing facilities, the need to obtain the landlord's permission was the one most frequently indicated, apart from 'simply not interested'.

7.60. Finally, the factor of lack of time was considered. In paragraph 6.24. it was suggested that busy farmers are those with farms where the ratio of standard man days to labour is high. Figure 7.4. shows the percentage of farmers (full time) who
indicated a lack of time as a reason for not providing facilities. One would expect that farms with a high s.m.d./labour ratio would be more likely to indicate the importance of a lack of time as a reason for not providing facilities, than other farmers. This does not appear to be so, as, apart from the anomaly of one group, the graph shows an upward trend.

7.61. As a postscript to this section on the relationship between the type of holding and attitudes to facility provision, Table 7.8 shows the attitudes to facility provision on crofters' common grazings, expressed by grazings clerks sampled in the special postal survey of common grazings. Almost two thirds of grazing clerks were not keen on facility provision on their common grazings. Of these, under a quarter gave any specific reasons for their attitude. Where given, reasons mainly related to the nature of the land and livestock on it and to the lack of demand. Thirty-one per cent of the clerks indicated that they agreed with the idea of facilities on the grazings but about half of these stated that certain conditions should be met - namely that there should be no nuisance or damage caused, that there should be sufficient demand and that the crofters would benefit financially.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility provision is a good idea</th>
<th>% of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (conditional)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c) **Reasons for not providing facilities related to specific facility types**

7.62. So far, information on reasons against facility provision has been presented from the results of the postal survey. The landholders who were interviewed were able to give detailed explanations of why they had not provided certain facilities. Most landholders gave interesting and well reasoned arguments, reflecting the fact that they were already experienced in recreation or tourism provision in some form.

7.63. The provision of bed and breakfast was most frequently rejected because of the time, trouble and hard work involved. Also, the nature of the house and the lack of space were frequently mentioned. Both these factors of time and space often were the result of having a growing family to look after. A few landholders said that they were not the kind of people to put up with strangers in their home and another sentiment expressed was that 'we would really have to be in a bad way financially to stoop to doing bed and breakfast'. Comparing bed and breakfast with other forms of accommodation, landholders with caravans or holiday cottages frequently suggested that self-catering facilities provided them with just as good an income but without the work and trouble involved with bed and breakfast.

7.64. Naturally, the most common reason for not providing cottages was that none were available or they were being used for employees or the landholder was unable to obtain possession. The location of spare cottages which were isolated and with difficult access or
near valuable sporting areas was sometimes given as a reason for not letting them for holidays. Chalets were generally regarded as interesting, in that they are a form of high quality facility, sympathetic with the landscape and popular with tourists, but time and again landholders stressed the expense of establishing them, the lack of available capital and the cost of meeting interest payments on loans. Owing to the expense, many landholders were reluctant to risk investment in chalets - some suggesting that virtually an all the year round occupancy would be essential. Unlike static caravans, chalets are fixed and so cannot be easily disposed of.

7.65. Expense was one aspect of the provision for caravans (touring or static) mentioned as a disadvantage. Some landholders felt that if they were to provide successful caravan sites, these should be quite large and consequently they would be unable to afford the time or the money; also, the expense of meeting planning requirements was mentioned. Frequently, concern about the effect on the amenity of the holding was expressed - caravans were considered to be unsightly and to commercialise or cheapen farms or estates. The lack of suitable land was often mentioned, due to slopes, access or the desire not to give up good farmland. The possibility of refusal of permission by the landlord or planning authority was more commonly mentioned in connection with caravan sites than with other kinds of facility. Specific problems mentioned in relation to touring caravan sites concerned the distance from the road, poor entrances and potential damage; operators of exclusively static caravan sites suggested that touring caravans would spoil the quiet
and select atmosphere. Static caravans were often criticised for their short life; landholders felt that they represented a poor investment because of rapid depreciation. Some landholders said they did not provide for camping because people just used the hill or the beach anyway and it would be impossible to charge, others were concerned about pollution and damage to grassland.

7.66. Many landholders providing accommodation recognised the need for more cafes and restaurants in rural areas in Scotland. Nearly always the time involved and the need to employ extra staff was given as a reason for not providing such facilities.

7.67. The reason most frequently given for not providing pony-trekking was that such an enterprise would not pay. Sometimes landholders also emphasised the establishment costs and the feeling that there was only a short season for pony-trekking. Lack of expertise was sometimes mentioned, although just as frequently landholders said that their daughter or wife had the know-how and the interest but that pony-trekking was a form of dabbling in recreation and tourism and could never be commercially justified. A few landholders said that routes were not available or were worried about grazing ponies alongside cattle.

7.68. Turning to other forms of active recreation, the main reason for not providing boating, especially on the sea, was that it was dangerous. Landholders had stories to tell, sometimes based on personal experience, of how boats had run aground or had been beached in the wrong place. The work of pulling boats in, due to the lack of jetties, was mentioned as well. Generally it was felt
that there was a demand for boating but it was too risky and income from escorted outings would not make the effort worthwhile. Danger to the public and to animals was a very common reason given for not providing shooting by permit. The problems of coping with inexperienced shots were stressed and one postal survey respondent wrote, succinctly:

"Permit shooting produces too many cowboys".

Naturally, the lack of suitable lochs or rivers was the main reason why landholders did not provide fishing. Some said that the quality of sport was too unpredictable. Certain landholders said that people had come to fish, de facto, for years and that it would be difficult to introduce more formal arrangements. The fact that people can walk or picnic anywhere without formal paths or sites was very often given as a reason for not setting up nature trails or picnic sites. Landholders said such things were 'phoney'. Some explained that the provision of such facilities, which could not yield any income, was out of the question on farms or estates trying to keep financially viable.

3. ATTITUDES TO DE FACTO ACCESS

7.69. This section investigates the attitudes of landholders to de facto access. Much of the analysis is based on answers to the postal survey questionnaire, in which respondents were asked to indicate whether they objected to, were indifferent to or welcomed four types of activity on their land. Naturally this is a great simplification and so, before presenting the results from that question, it is worth considering the variation in attitudes
as expressed by landholders interviewed and those from the postal survey who wrote in their own comments.

7.70. Undoubtedly there are landholders who are absolutely antagonistic towards all form of public access on their land; comments like 'I hate the lot of them' were found written on some postal survey questionnaires. Some landholders qualified their general objections to access with reasons - for example, a desire to maintain privacy or the amenity of a landscape free from despoilation by people, cars, tents, caravans, etc. Much more frequently, however, these reasons for objection related to concern about nuisance or damage caused by the public. Some landholders were only concerned about this but had no experience, while others based their objections on what had actually occurred on their holdings. A comparison in attitudes between landholders who have experienced access and those who have not is presented later in this section.

7.71. There appear to be a large number of landholders who don't actually approve of public access but realise that it is there to stay, that it is politically expedient for them to accept it and that they should adopt policies to control and direct it as best they can. Another group of landholders may adopt the same practical policy of trying to direct and control access, but generally welcome it as a means of recreation for townsfolk, provided it occurs in the right place at the right time and causes no nuisance or damage. These are the landholders who discriminate in their attitude between those who respect the countryside and those who don't. Frequently such landholders stressed the need for education.
As well as displaying correct and incorrect behaviour, there are right and wrong places for access. Landholders often said access was acceptable provided it occurred in places where they could keep an eye on it. Some landholders mentioned a right and a wrong time for access, especially with respect to the sporting calendar. These conditional reactions were given by a large number of landholders whose knowledge of past or potential nuisance or damage had led not to a general objection to, and rejection of, access but to a specific objection to certain activities and not to others. In between a general rejection and objections to specific activities of the public, lie the attitudes of a few estate proprietors, such as the laird who was:

"...keen on disciplined or educational access (scouts, geologists, ornithologists) but not on access by the general public".

7.72. Scotland is not without landholders who are really keen on public access, who enjoy seeing people on their land. Sometimes this attitude was found to be combined with a keenness on tourism generally, notably by landholders providing their own facilities.

7.73. It was impracticable for the postal survey questionnaire and its analysis to cater for the variety of attitudes described above. It was felt to be justified and valuable to ask the respondent simply to declare whether he objected to or welcomed the main kinds of de facto activity, with the escape option of expressing indifference or simply not answering the question. The words 'in moderation' were added to the option 'welcome', so that landholders whose attitude was on the whole to welcome access would not be reluctant to declare it. In Table 7.9, the figures in parentheses show the percentage of landholders who committed
themselves to either welcoming or objecting, and the positive or negative scores indicate the ratio of welcoming to objecting landholders and vice versa.

TABLE 7.9. Relative welcoming of, or objecting to, different types of access on different types of holding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Walking/ Climbing</th>
<th>Car-parking/ Picnicking</th>
<th>Camping</th>
<th>Caravanning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All holdings</td>
<td>+1.2 (48)</td>
<td>-1.5 (46)</td>
<td>-2.0 (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farms</td>
<td>-1.1 (51)</td>
<td>-2.0 (50)</td>
<td>-3.0 (48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estates</td>
<td>+2.7 (61)</td>
<td>+1.1 (64)</td>
<td>+2.0 (63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crofts</td>
<td>+2.3 (45)</td>
<td>+1.1 (40)</td>
<td>+1.1 (50)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(-) figure: No. of times the % of landholders objecting greater than the % welcoming

(+) figure: No. of times the % of landholders welcoming greater than the % objecting

Figures in brackets: % of landholders either welcoming or objecting – i.e. not indicating 'indifferent' or no attitude

The order of activities from left to right in the table approximates to the order of increasing objection to the activities – thus, caravanning is the activity where the ratio of objecting to welcoming was highest. Comparing different holding types, estate proprietors appeared to be the most discriminating in their attitude – the ratio of objecting to welcoming differing markedly between walking/climbing and caravanning. Farmers were more likely to object to all types of activity than to welcome them, whereas crofters, including representatives of common grazings, displayed a generally more welcoming attitude than did other types of landholder.
Almost all landholders experiencing de facto access either indicated that they welcomed it, were indifferent or objected to it. Also about half the landholders with no experience of the relevant access did indicate an attitude towards it. Table 7.10 shows the difference in attitude found between landholders who have had experience of de facto access and those who have not.

**TABLE 7.10. Attitude of landholders by experience of de facto access** (% of landholders)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience of access</th>
<th>No attitude</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Welcome</th>
<th>Attitude ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car-parking/picnicking</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caravanning</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking/climbing</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inexperienced landholders who did express an attitude were much more likely to object to access than to welcome it. On the other hand, landholders who knew about de facto access from direct experience were just as likely to welcome it as to object.

Walking/climbing displays the most extreme divergence: where it occurred, 52% of landholders welcomed it and only 19% objected; where it had not occurred landholders were more likely to object than to welcome it. The results from this table are optimistic, the presence of access appearing to be related to a welcoming rather than an objecting attitude. The more welcoming attitude of

* Attitude ratio as for Table 7.9. — see note below that table.
experienced landholders suggests that worry about probable
nuisance or damage is worse than is justified in practice.

7.75. Turning back to Chapter Four (4.43.) one finds that many
landholders experienced in facility provision are also experienced
with respect to the occurrence of de facto access. It is worth
considering whether attitudes to de facto access differ between
those landholders who provide facilities or are thinking of doing
so, and those who have nothing to do with facilities. Table 7.11
indicates that landholders who are providing facilities for recreation
or tourism are more likely to welcome de facto access than are those
who have no professional experience of catering for the public;
incidentally, it seems that landholders considering new facility
provision are even more likely to welcome de facto access. This
attitude is surprising, in that one might have felt that landholders
active in providing a controlled facility would not welcome uncontrolled
use of their land for recreation.

TABLE 7.11. Relative welcoming of, or objecting to, de facto access
on holdings with or without facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Walking/ Climbing</th>
<th>Car-parking/ Picnicking</th>
<th>Camping</th>
<th>Caravanning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No facilities existing or considered</td>
<td>+1.2</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing facilities</td>
<td>+2.9</td>
<td>+1.3</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities considered</td>
<td>+3.7</td>
<td>+1.7</td>
<td>+1.1</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Attitude ratio as for Table 7.9. – see note below that table.
b) Specific facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1) Camping</th>
<th></th>
<th>(2) Caravanning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% holdings with Attitude</td>
<td>de facto camping ratio</td>
<td>% holdings with Attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No existing or considered camping (1) or caravan (2) sites</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing camping (1) or caravan (2) sites</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping (1) or caravan (2) sites considered</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>+2.5</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It would be even more surprising if those specifically providing or considering caravan or camping sites were found to welcome rather than object to de facto camping or caravanning. Nevertheless, Table 7.11.(b) shows that this is so. One might partially explain this by recalling that the control motive in facility provision was found to be relatively unimportant (see Table 7.1). One can conclude that facility providers display a more welcoming attitude to recreation and tourism in general than do other landholders. All the landholders in the interview survey provided some form of facility for tourism or recreation. Discussions with them about de facto access did tend to confirm that any general attitude would be one of welcome or acceptance, in principle, rather than of rejection; with objections expressed in terms of specific issues. One reason for this attitude may be that a large number of landholders are pleasantly surprised by the lack of nuisance or damage caused by their own guests using the facilities they provide.

7.76. Turning to the relationship between landholders' attitudes to de facto access and their awareness of any detrimental results from
it, Table 7.12, shows that, as one might expect, landholders were more likely to object to access if the holding had suffered nuisance or damage than if it had not. This is supported by discussions with landholders interviewed, who suggested that the occurrence of nuisance or damage did tend to generate specific objections. However, it is interesting that as many as 28% and 20% of landholders still welcome walking/climbing and car-parking/picnicking, respectively, even on holdings where these activities have been detrimental in some way. Camping and caravanning are activities which engender more of an objecting attitude (see 7.73), but, even so, only two-thirds of landholders who have suffered nuisance or damage from these activities registered a definite objection to them.

TABLE 7.12. Landholders' attitude to de facto access on holdings where it occurs. Comparison between holdings where it does and does not cause nuisance or damage. (% of holdings)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occurrence of nuisance or damage</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Welcome</th>
<th>Attitude ratio*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking/climbing</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car-parking/picnicking</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caravanning</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Attitude ratio as for Table 7.9. - see note below that Table.
ATTITUDES TO STATUTORY BODIES

7.77. Information was obtained on the reactions of landholders to the activities of the statutory bodies and local authorities. It should be emphasised that the descriptions reflect opinions of landholders about the activities of the various bodies, whether or not they are correct. However, the perceptions of landholders should be clearly understood as they fundamentally affect the impact of policies. Where there are inconsistencies between the perceived and real situations, better information and improved public relations are called for.

7.78. No question on reactions to the activities of the statutory bodies and local authorities was included in the questionnaire used for the main postal survey and therefore the general reaction of all types of landholder was not recorded. However, estates sampled in the Scottish Landowners Federation/Scottish Woodland Owners Association survey were asked to comment. Mostly statements concerned de facto access rather than facility provision. Bodies, especially the Countryside Commission for Scotland, were exhorted to encourage education about the countryside and behaviour therein. Some landholders specifically mentioned local education authorities in this respect. Local information services (e.g. Tourist Organisations) liaising with landowners and telling visitors about areas particularly susceptible to damage, were suggested. Generally, bodies were praised in their attempts to undertake the difficult task of controlling and yet not reducing access. However, sometimes they were criticised for not thinking seriously enough about the environmental consequences of certain developments which they
assisted and for encouraging larger scale developments when small schemes would better suit the area. Knowledge of the fields of activity of the various bodies was sound but conceptions of details of policy were often false. Landowners were surprisingly reticent to suggest alternative bodies or types of assistance for facility provision; reaction was generally conservative and negative.

7.79. Those landholders interviewed provided more detailed information on their attitude to bodies. One must remember that all were involved in providing facilities. Because of this, most had become knowledgeable about assistance available but some thought landholders in general should receive more information on possible developments and sources of finance (see 7.8.). The feeling that landholders should 'go it alone' and not put public money at risk was quite prevalent amongst those who had not applied for assistance. These landholders also valued their independence from conditions attached to aid, such as the continued use of holiday cottages for holiday letting for 10 years. Landholders receiving grants from the Scottish Tourist Board were very happy with the service given, especially the advice, but generally the S.T.B. was criticised for giving grants which were too few and too large. There were not enough small grants and loans for simple developments. The tendency for the S.T.B. to press for 'commercialised' and very high quality facilities was criticised, even by one landholder whom they had assisted. "They just help the large developers" was also a common criticism of the Highlands and Islands Development Board amongst crofters. The H.I.D.B. was often criticised for being too slow to appraise and process grant and loan applications. Landholders who had experienced this, and also many who had heard
about it by reputation, mentioned this fact. Time and again crofters (and some farmers in other areas) stressed their desire for low interest loans covering a high percentage of establishment cost, rather than grants. The difficulty of finding the rest of the capital after the H.I.D.B. grant had been paid concerned many crofters. Nevertheless those whom H.I.D.B. had helped were most grateful for it.

7.80. Generally both the S.T.B. and the H.I.D.B. were criticised for being too remote from the needs of landholders and for not setting out their advisory and financial assistance schemes in a way which was suitable for agricultural holdings and small developers. The bureaucratic process was thought to be too complex. Many had been put off by having to submit detailed plans.

7.81. The D.A.F.S. Crofters' Housing Scheme received a lot of praise. The low interest loan was extremely popular. The only criticism was the somewhat low ceilings for total assistance available. The lack of many conditions attached to their grants and loans was also well received. Crofters are used to receiving financial assistance and advice from D.A.F.S. and the bureaucratic process was not criticised here. It was felt by some that this scheme should be developed beyond housing.

7.82. Far fewer landholders had contact with C.C.S. than with the other bodies but where this had occurred landholders had greatly valued the speedy advice given. Some criticised their rather too elaborate ideas regarding picnic sites and arrangements for access. A few landholders who had had contact with C.C.S. were unhappy with
them. Usually this was where a landholder had sought advice on commercial tourism or recreation facilities and the Commission's attitudes to landscape and amenity had conflicted with his own development ideas.

7.83. Turning to de facto access, many landholders were critical of local authorities for not providing a better refuse collection service so that the litter bins they provided were regularly emptied. The need for less strict control over caravan site development, especially for small sites for touring caravans, was mentioned by some, while others considered that site standards were low and that the local authority should be more concerned to ensure that planning conditions are adhered to. Education was called for once again — especially in relation to the work of C.C.S. Generally, access agreements were not welcomed because they would bring more people and were unnecessary, whereas it was felt that the present de facto access only causes the occasional problem.
This chapter considers first the economic and other benefits and costs obtained and incurred by private landholders through tourism and recreation - 'private' benefit and costs. Secondly, social benefits and costs will be discussed but not as a formal cost-benefit analysis. Social benefits include private benefits and additional "gains accruing to the community as a consequence of the establishment of an industry, factory or facility, although the new development may not have taken place with that aim or purpose" (Gilpin, 1970). Likewise social costs include additional costs to the community. Finally, some factors affecting variations in costs and benefits will be discussed.

1. PRIVATE BENEFITS AND COSTS

a) Non-economic benefits accruing from the provision of facilities

An idea of the benefits gained by landholders from facilities for tourism and recreation may be obtained by considering landholders' reasons for providing the facilities, which were described in the last chapter. There it was shown that certain non-economic factors, such as the desire to make a gesture of good will to visitors, the enjoyment of the company which visitors provide and a personal interest in the facility, were important. The satisfaction gained
from these factors must be borne in mind in any assessment of the benefits of facility provision. Various aspects of these factors have been described and it is not proposed to say more about them here.

b) **Financial results of facility provision**

i. **Per unit measures**

8.3. The finances and management of facilities were analysed in detail using data from the interviews with landholders. The results produced a mass of information, so detailed that it would encumber the main text of the thesis if it were presented here. Nevertheless, the information is foundational to the general theme of this chapter. Consequently the details from the studies have been set out on Facts Sheets which are assigned to Appendix A. Each Facts Sheet refers to a particular facility and presents information set out in a common format, covering the use of resources, establishment costs, labour, running costs, advertising, prices, occupancy rates and aggregated financial results.

8.4. The financial results presented per unit of facility (i.e. per bed, per cottage, per caravan and so on) are summarised in Table 8.1. It is extremely important that the variation in the results in Table 8.1 is appreciated. The figures given are average results only. The individual results recorded for each enterprise varied considerably between enterprises. This is
TABLE 8.1. Comparison of annual financial results for eight facility types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility type</th>
<th>Unit type</th>
<th>No. of units</th>
<th>Per unit average</th>
<th>Estab. M &amp; I Income</th>
<th>Profit</th>
<th>Yield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>type</td>
<td>per enterprise</td>
<td></td>
<td>Estab. M &amp; I Income</td>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>Yield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Median Average</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday cottages</td>
<td>Cottages</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>178£</td>
<td>284£</td>
<td>79£</td>
<td>37£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalets</td>
<td>Chalets</td>
<td>3 4</td>
<td>3540£</td>
<td>330£</td>
<td>-51£</td>
<td>10£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed &amp; breakfast only (BBO)</td>
<td>Beds</td>
<td>5 6</td>
<td>149£</td>
<td>54£</td>
<td>37£</td>
<td>25£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinner, bed &amp; breakfast (DBB)</td>
<td>Beds</td>
<td>10 10</td>
<td>203£</td>
<td>117£</td>
<td>95£</td>
<td>31£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static caravans</td>
<td>Caravans</td>
<td>2.5 3</td>
<td>73£</td>
<td>173£</td>
<td>93£</td>
<td>24£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static touring only</td>
<td>Pitches</td>
<td>20 73</td>
<td>107£</td>
<td>47£</td>
<td>35£</td>
<td>95£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pony-trekking</td>
<td>Ponies</td>
<td>8 10</td>
<td>342£</td>
<td>23£</td>
<td>-14£</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing - rivers</td>
<td>Rods</td>
<td>6 8</td>
<td>0£</td>
<td>32£</td>
<td>32£</td>
<td>0£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caravan sites (mixed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;35% static</td>
<td>Pitches</td>
<td>28 74</td>
<td>275£</td>
<td>32£</td>
<td>2£</td>
<td>14£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;35% static</td>
<td>Pitches</td>
<td>16 25</td>
<td>610£</td>
<td>57£</td>
<td>1£</td>
<td>11£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static stances</td>
<td>Pitches</td>
<td>150 137</td>
<td>175£</td>
<td>23£</td>
<td>4£</td>
<td>25£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing - managed lochs</td>
<td>Rods</td>
<td>3 7</td>
<td>340£</td>
<td>62£</td>
<td>25£</td>
<td>26£</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Establishment cost: Cost of setting up the facility adjusted to 1973 prices (see paragraphs 8.5 and 8.6). No adjustments are made for grants or loans.
2. Management and Investment Income (M & I Income): Annual revenue less running cost less an allowance for family labour (see paragraph 8.7). No charge has been made for the depreciation of equipment (see paragraph 8.12).
3. Profit: M & I income less a charge for capital invested at 10.85% of the establishment cost (see paragraph 8.8).
4. **Yield**: N & I income as a percentage of establishment cost.

5. The coefficient of variation (standard deviation as a % of the mean and thus a comparative measure of the variation in the results) is indicated by super-scripts as follows:

- Blank: under 50%
- x: 50% to 75%
- y: 75% to 100%
- z: over 100%

No super-scripts appear in the bottom half of the table. The number of holdings visited with these facilities was five or less and no coefficients of variation were measured.

6. (A) Half the pony-trekking enterprises had negative N & I income and no negative yield. Those with positive yield averaged 35%.

7. Caravan site sizes refer to number of licensed pitches.

---

shown by the high coefficients of variation indicated by the super-scripts (see footnote 5). The coefficient of variation is a comparative measure of the variation in the results. Where it is over 100%, the range of results between enterprises is extremely high (for example, pony-trekking N & I income per pony ranged from £57 to £434) and even when it is under 50% the range can still be considerable (for example, 'bed and breakfast only' M & I income per bed ranged from £25 to £88). The causes of the variations between enterprises visited are summarised in paragraphs 8.95. to 8.103. and these should be read in conjunction with Table 8.1. In addition, the next few paragraphs describe in detail the various economic measures presented in the table and bring out certain economic issues of particular importance when assessing facility provision on private landholdings.
8.5. Establishment cost. The results in Table 8.1. are for the 1973 season. Establishment costs were recorded as historic costs but have been adjusted to 1973 prices using relevant indexes. They include only the money spent on the conversion of existing resources or on new purchases or construction. The value of existing land and buildings and the landholder's and his family’s own labour in establishing a facility have not been included. If such values had been included, they should have reflected the opportunity cost of resources — the income foregone through not putting them to the next best alternative use. The main reason for their exclusion is that, in the majority of situations on holdings visited for interview, such opportunity costs were arguably zero on the following grounds:

a) Previous use of resources. Often resources were disused (e.g. empty cottages, rough patches of land, spare bedrooms). Elsewhere, a little reorganisation usually rendered slight the effect of a change of use. Agricultural production was seldom adversely affected. Only 14% of farmers and crofters interviewed had been reducing their agricultural activities while being involved in tourism or recreation and this reduction may not have been the result of a redistribution of resources.

b) Potential use of resources. Often alternative uses of the resources were impracticable. For example: renting
cottages on long lets would give tenants security of tenure; sale or lease of small areas of land central to the holding would be disruptive. In addition, most landholders did not perceive alternative uses for the resources. They did not make conscious decisions between recreation or tourism developments and the sale or lease of land and from their viewpoint there was little or no opportunity foregone.

c) Labour. Although the majority of facilities were set up by the landholders themselves using their own or their family's labour, work tended not to be on a regular basis and certainly other commitments on the holding really precluded the landholders from selling their labour for a wage elsewhere, even had they desired to. The work tended to be a substitute for leisure time and, indeed, there was often an element of recreational benefit from it.

8.6. Naturally, it is difficult to generalise about opportunity cost. The availability of existing resources to private landholders at zero opportunity cost, as they see it, is one of the main reasons why provision by them can give high yields. It is what puts them in a unique position compared with other, non-indigenous, developers of tourism or recreation enterprises. To a lesser extent, running costs may be kept down owing to the fact that the enterprises are on farms, crofts or estates - this could be due to landholders having
special maintenance skills, knowledge of cheap sources of materials, and so on; and also the opportunity to deploy labour efficiently from other activities.

8.7. **Income.** Net income was calculated as simply the difference between annual revenue and running cost. From this balance was subtracted a sum for the opportunity cost of the landholder's (or his family's) labour in running the enterprise, to give Management and Investment (M & I) income. This opportunity cost should reflect the wage foregone through not being in alternative employment. But again there is also some argument that it might often be zero, as when a farmer's wife doing B & B has to be at home anyway looking after the family and so cannot work elsewhere. Likewise, a farmer committed to his agricultural enterprise most of the day but finding odd moments to deal with a small caravan site could have difficulty filling these irregular periods with other temporary work. However, a charge was made for the opportunity cost of labour for each facility, based on a knowledge of wages paid to employees for equivalent tasks, the standard agricultural wage and the average wage for employed women.*

8.8. **Profit.** The profit figure given in Table 8.1. is based on M & I income less 10.85% (the average yield from 2\% Consul\textsuperscript{+} in 1973) of establishment cost. Thus it is what an enterprise earns annually in excess of the annual income foregone through not investing.

---

Similar charges were used by Davies (1973).
+ A Government non-dated stock commonly used in comparisons of returns on investment.
in a risk-free alternative medium. It could be argued that really the income foregone is greater than this since a landholder might have the particular opportunity to invest the money in improving his existing agricultural or other enterprises and receive a better return than 10.85%. However, half the farmers and crofters (and 60% of the estates) had been improving and building up their traditional enterprises anyway, to the extent that they considered justified, during the two to three years prior to interview, that is in the period when most facilities were being set up. Where this had not been happening, many landholders considered that agricultural and other enterprises had been operating at full capacity, owing to the limits of the size of holdings and labour availability and, facilities or no, they would not have invested in them further. Thus, it appears that in terms of financial investment, as well as in terms of the use of existing resources, tourism and recreation enterprise are most often not in competition with agriculture and other traditional land uses.

8.9. The foregoing discussion suggests that the profit figure is a reasonable measure of net economic benefit. Table 8.1 permits some comparison between similar facility types in terms of economic benefit obtained. Of the three types of self-catering facility, static caravans showed a marginally greater profit on average than did cottages, while the average profit from chalets was negative. Interestingly, the respective order of the three self-catering types is reversed if M & I income is compared without
taking establishment cost into account. Fishing enterprises based on managed loch fisheries showed a higher M & I income per rod than did those based on rivers. However, the former were costly to establish and the profit figures were lower.

8.10. Grants and loans. The effects of grants and loans have not been taken into account in arriving at the figures presented in Table 8.1. Each situation had been treated as though the landholder were able to meet the establishment cost from his own liquid financial resources, whereas, in reality, many landholders visited used loans or grants. Of the facilities covered in Table 8.1., hardly any fishing, pony-trekking or static caravan developers had obtained bank loans. On the other hand, for cottages, chalets, bed and breakfast and caravan sites, the proportion of landholders who received financial assistance varied from a quarter to a half.

8.11. Bank loans were quite common and some crofters had received low interest rate loans from D.A.F.S. The activities of D.A.F.S. and other bodies in providing financial assistance were described in Chapter Two. A few landholders visited had received local authority improvement grants and a few had received grants from the S.T.B. or the H.I.D.B. Landholders who received grants or low interest rate loans tended to be those whose developments entailed a greater than average establishment cost. Therefore the effect of this form of financial assistance is to reduce considerably the variation in overall establishment cost met by
the landholder. It is established later (8.102) that variations in profit are, in the main, the consequence of variations in N & I income and so the effect of this levelling of establishment costs might be only marginal, relative to other factors like price and occupancy, on the overall variation in profit between enterprises. On the other hand, price and occupancy may be factors which the landholder could find difficult to alter. Undoubtedly, many of the landholders interviewed would not have entered into facility provision had the grant or loan assistance not been available.

8.12. Depreciation. In the financial analyses no depreciation element was included in annual costs and consequently this factor has not been taken into consideration in the results in Table 8.1. A figure for general maintenance and also repairs and replacement of small capital items (e.g. kitchen equipment in holiday cottages) was included in the costs, but allowance for the eventual replacement of larger items was not included. This means that the figures relate to the short term only.

8.13. The effect of taking depreciation into account naturally varies between facility types according to the amount of relatively non-durable capital items each entails. Much of the establishment cost of holiday cottages and bed and breakfast enterprises and caravan sites is tied up with work on the buildings, and here depreciation is not really relevant. On the other hand, there is an argument for charging depreciation on chalets, as some types tend to deteriorate over time. The enterprises most greatly
affected by a depreciation element in cost would be static caravans and pony-trekking: the former because of the caravan itself, which is a large item which can deteriorate quite rapidly, and the latter because of the ponies and tack.

8.14. Adjustment for inflation. One final issue relating to the results given in Table 8.1. is inflation. The figures given in the table refer to the situation in 1973 at 1973 prices, as most of the financial information collected from landholders was for that year. Table 8.2., below, shows how tariffs have increased between 1973 and 1977. This table was constructed by comparing tariff levels of a random sample of enterprises listed in various Scottish Tourist Board marketing publications, which were providing the same size and standard of accommodation in both years. For most facilities, tariffs have almost doubled. This is especially pronounced for touring caravan and camping sites, and also bed and breakfast.

TABLE 8.2. Price index of facility tariffs, 1973-77

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>1973</th>
<th>1977</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base 1973 = 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottages</td>
<td></td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static caravans</td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touring caravan site</td>
<td>229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping site</td>
<td>246</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB0</td>
<td>222</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBB</td>
<td>229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* There were not enough chalet or pony-trekking enterprises occurring in both the 1973 and 1977 lists to give sufficiently accurate indices.
8.15. Turning to running costs, the Retail Price Index* shows an overall average increase in the ratio of 100 to 196 between 1973 and 1977, and wage rates* rose in the ratio of 100 to 199 in that period. Comparing these figures with those in Table 8.2., it appears that, due to price inflation alone, the tourism and recreation enterprises are doing rather better in real terms than they were in 1973, with the exception of fishing and static caravans. However, certain goods and services went up in price by a considerably greater amount than is indicated by the average shown for the Retail Price Index. The cost of undertaking maintenance and repair work rose in the ratio of 100 to 225, fuel rose from 100 to 227 and food from 100 to 211. Some of these items are especially important as inputs to tourism and recreation enterprises; in particular to those showing the highest tariff increases, namely bed and breakfast and caravan site enterprises. Therefore, in conclusion, it is probable that the pattern of inflation has left landholders only slightly better off in real terms in 1977 compared with 1973.

ii. Profit per enterprise

8.16. An indication of the average total profit derived by landholders may be obtained by multiplying the average size of the enterprises by the per unit figure given in Table 8.1. The results are shown in Table 8.3.

TABLE 8.3. Comparison of annual profit for 12 facilities —
average results per enterprise — 1973 prices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Average Profit (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holiday cottages</td>
<td>£158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalets</td>
<td>£204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBO</td>
<td>£222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBB</td>
<td>£950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static caravans</td>
<td>£279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pony-trekking</td>
<td>£-140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caravan sites:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tourists only</td>
<td>£2555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixed — &lt;35% static</td>
<td>£148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;35% static</td>
<td>£125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>static stances</td>
<td>£548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>managed lochs</td>
<td>£175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rivers</td>
<td>£256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The per unit profit figures were shown to vary greatly between enterprises. Also, the number of units per enterprise was quite varied, especially for caravan sites. Therefore, although the enterprise results given in Table 8.3 are average results for the holdings visited, the chances of them reflecting the actual situation on any randomly selected individual enterprise are low. The high profit figure for touring caravans reflects the fact that a few of the sites visited were very large indeed.

8.17. Comparing Tables 8.1. and 8.3. one can see the effects of enterprise size: for instance, the good showing of DDB and especially sites for touring caravans which tended to be much larger than sites exclusively for static caravans even though the latter gave a much better profit per pitch. The poor showing of mixed caravan sites, in terms of profit, was largely due to the fact that establishment cost was high relative to the M & I income. DDB enterprises showed, on average, a better profit per bed than did enterprises providing bed and breakfast only and the superior results of DDB enterprises appears even more pronounced when the size of enterprises is taken into account since meals tended to be provided by large establishments.
8.18. Tests were carried out on the relationship between the per unit results and the number of units per enterprise. With each facility type it was found that neither M & I income per unit nor profit per unit were significantly correlated with enterprise size. That is to say, neither economies nor diseconomies of scale could be discerned.

iii. Economic effect on the entire holding

8.19. This section considers the total income and profit to landholders, from the one or more tourism facilities they may provide, compared with other income from the landholdings. First, farms and crofts are discussed, followed by estates; finally mention is made of the use of income from recreation and tourism.

8.20. The calculation of total income and profit per landholding from recreation and tourism was made by simply adding together the results from each enterprise provided. Only a very small proportion of the farms and crofts visited provided facilities other than those which are shown in Table 8.1, and for which full financial results were analysed and presented in the Facts Sheets in Appendix 1. However, many estates visited did have other kinds of facilities (e.g. gardens, museums, etc.) and general financial results for these facilities were obtained during the interviews where possible or were estimated on the basis of the information obtained from the proprietors or factors. These figures have not been presented with the 'per unit' or 'per enterprise' results earlier in this chapter as the facilities they relate to are generally less common.
8.21. Financial information was sought on the agricultural enterprises on landholdings. There was a considerable variation between landholdings in the amount and nature of such information which could be obtained. Some landholders were unable or unwilling to provide figures, and the enterprises were too large and complicated to work out estimated results with the landholder. This frequently applied to farms and crofts with full-time agricultural enterprises.* However, average economic results for full-time agricultural enterprises in different size and type classes are published by D.A.F.S., derived from accounting data provided by the three Scottish Agricultural Colleges from their survey of 495 holdings in Scotland. Therefore the full-time crofts and farms visited were classified into equivalent size and type groups using physical information on their agricultural enterprises collected during the interviews and certain standard coefficients.† The appropriate D.A.F.S. average figures were then applied. Naturally, these averages may not accurately represent the actual agricultural enterprise on many holdings. However, discrepancies have an equal chance of being positive or negative and the results averaged over all holdings in a size group should not be unreasonable. Discussions with landholders provided brief pictures of equipment, methods, lambing ratios, etc., on each holding and there did not appear to be any reason why average results should be unsuitable indices. Table 8.4.(a) shows average total net

---

* Those with 250 standard man days or more (see 6.19.).
† See 6.19.
= Results for the year 1973/74 were used, as published in Scottish Agricultural Economics (D.A.F.S., 1975b).
income from recreation and tourism compared with that from agriculture for the full-time farms and crofts visited, within the three agricultural enterprise size groups used by D.A.F.S. (see 6.19.). In addition, average percentage yields are given; those for agriculture being calculated on average tenant's capital figures again obtained from the D.A.F.S. farm accounts data. Table 8.4.(b) shows what proportion of combined total net income and profit* is due to the recreation and tourism enterprises.

TABLE 8.4. Full-time farms and crofts. Income and profit from tourism and recreation compared with agriculture (1973 prices)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Recreation and tourism</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Net income</td>
<td>Yield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>£1,618</td>
<td>(£38 to £9,895)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>£1,147</td>
<td>(£35 to £2,524)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>£1,650</td>
<td>(£63 to £3,598)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Average percentage of combined net income coming from recreation and tourism</th>
<th>Average percentage of combined profit coming from recreation and tourism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>(0.5% to 53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>(1% to 30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>(2% to 74%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For agriculture this is calculated as management and investment income less tenant’s capital charged at 10.85% interest, the 'Consul' rate used for recreation and tourism enterprises (see 8.8.).
8.22. Farms and crofts with smaller agricultural enterprises could not be treated in this way as the D.A.F.S. farm accounts data do not cover such enterprises. However, owing to the simple nature of the agricultural activities it was not difficult to obtain financial information from the landholders visited and this, together with a consideration of average gross margins per unit output calculated by the North of Scotland College of Agriculture (1971), was used to estimate net income from agriculture on each holding. As with full-time holdings, Table 8.5. presents results comparing recreation and tourism with agriculture for smaller farms and crofts, again within three agricultural enterprise size groups (see 6.19.). No estimate was made of tenant's capital, so average yields and profits are not compared.

TABLE 8.5. Farms and crofts without full-time agricultural enterprises. Income from tourism and recreation compared with agriculture

(1973 prices)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agricultural enterprise size</th>
<th>Recreation and tourism</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Average % of combined net income coming from recreation and tourism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part-time (50% crofts)</td>
<td>£1,463 (£135 to £4,829)</td>
<td>£935</td>
<td>54% (14% to 82%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spare-time or stat. insigni-</td>
<td>£485 (£98 to £1,136)</td>
<td>£184</td>
<td>68% (32% to 84%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ficant (almost all crofts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No agriculture (all crofts)</td>
<td>£1,421 (£853 to £3,167)</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.23. Tables 8.4. and 8.5. together show that the average net income from recreation and tourism did not vary much between agricultural enterprise size groups, except for the lower figure for spare-time holdings.* Commercially small farms or crofts with recreation or tourism enterprises were likely to be earning just as much from these enterprises as large holdings. Therefore relatively recreation and tourism enterprises were considerably more important on smaller holdings than larger ones. Income from recreation and tourism was, on average, greater than income from agriculture, on farms and crofts visited without full-time agricultural enterprises, whereas its proportional contribution to combined income averaged only 12% on farms with 'large' agricultural enterprises. It should be noted, however, that the variation in the relative importance of recreation and tourism between individual holdings in each group was very great. Table 8.4. indicates higher yields from recreation and tourism than from agriculture. Consequently the relative contribution of facilities to combined profit was greater than the relative contribution in terms of net income.

8.24. A factor which tempers the difference in the relative importance of recreation and tourism between enterprise size groups, is that very few full-time farmers and crofters were engaged in activities other than recreation or tourism and agriculture and the combined income from these enterprises

* This could be because, for these landholders, recreation and tourism was often the tertiary activity, after agriculture and a job away from home, and because many of the holdings were in the islands, with lower occupancy rates and prices.
might reasonably be considered to be the total income of the farmer or crofter and his family. On the other hand, over a quarter of landholders in the part-time category and all landholders with smaller agricultural enterprises were engaged in other income earning activities in addition to agriculture and recreation or tourism, or were pensioners. Sometimes these activities, such as weaving or shop keeping, were based on the holding but more usually the landholder went away to work - for example, as a builder, bus driver, distillery worker or administrator.

8.25. The economies of estates visited were much more complex. As well as having agricultural enterprises in hand, most were engaged in forestry, sport and the management of tenanted land and buildings. A great variation was found in the relative importance of income from tourism and recreation to estate economies; from situations where the estate relied totally on such income, owing to no agriculture in hand, non-commercial woodland and low rental income not matching maintenance costs, to situations where only one or two cottages or river fishing were provided on quite large estates with prosperous traditional enterprises - here tourism and recreation was a sideline to make use of certain resources, and income from it was under 10% of the total estate income. The latter situation appeared to be fairly common on estates.

8.26. On many estates visited it was extremely difficult to obtain financial information on the traditional enterprises, therefore no quantitative results are given here. However, in Appendix Two the relative importance of recreation and tourism within the economies of 12 estates is described, to show the variation mentioned above.
8.27. Compared with the farms and crofts visited, recreation and tourism enterprises on estates tended to be bringing in more net income absolutely but the profit figures were not so high owing to considerable establishment costs per unit or estates. It was also found that estates tended to have a greater gross turnover from recreation and tourism than farms and crofts but running costs per unit turnover were also much greater on estates. So, in general, estates had relatively high cost enterprises while farmers and crofters tended to do things as cheaply as possible without necessarily reducing quality.

8.28. How do landholders benefit from income from tourism or recreation? Generally, the use of such income reflected its relative magnitude. On holdings where it was only a small part of total income, it was often earmarked for specific expenditures, sometimes on luxuries which the landholder had not been able to afford before, such as holidays, certain household goods and the like. Where income from tourism and recreation constituted a greater share of the landholder's total income, it was used more generally as an aid to meeting household expenditure, or landholders would say "we live off the joint income from the facility and the farm". It is true that income from recreation and tourism is seasonal but landholders pointed out that agricultural income is seasonal also, fluctuating according to the months when stock and crops are sold and Government subsidies paid. Recreation and tourism can provide welcome income in the summer months before the autumn sales. On a few landholdings visited, income from the facilities was kept, in total or in part, for expenditure during the winter months on expanding the facilities.

8.29. On estates, income from facilities tended to be treated as just another item in the overall income of the estate. Frequently certain traditional activities on estates were run at a loss. This may be regularly so year after year or reflect the nature of
8.27. Compared with the farms and crofts visited, recreation and tourism enterprises on estates tended to be bringing in more net income absolutely but the profit figures were not so high owing to considerable establishment costs per unit on estates. It was also found that estates tended to have a greater gross turnover from recreation and tourism than farms and crofts but running costs per unit turnover were also much greater on estates. So, in general, estates had relatively high cost enterprises while farmers and crofters tended to do things as cheaply as possible without necessarily reducing quality.

8.28. How do landholders benefit from income from tourism or recreation? Generally, the use of such income reflected its relative magnitude. On holdings where it was only a small part of total income, it was often earmarked for specific expenditures, sometimes on luxuries which the landholder had not been able to afford before, such as holidays, certain household goods and the like. Where income from tourism and recreation constituted a greater share of the landholder's total income, it was used more generally as an aid to meeting household expenditure, or landholders would say "we live off the joint income from the facility and the farm". It is true that income from recreation and tourism is seasonal also, fluctuating according to the months when stock and crops are sold and Government subsidies paid. Recreation and tourism can provide welcome income in the summer months before the autumn sales. On a few landholdings visited, income from the facilities was kept, in total or in part, for expenditure during the winter months on expanding the facilities.

8.29. On estates, income from facilities tended to be treated as just another item in the overall income of the estate. Frequently certain traditional activities on estates were run at a loss. This may be regularly so year after year or reflect the nature of
the enterprise in one particular year — e.g. forestry, with its long cycle of production. Tourism and recreation provide landowners with a more regular source of positive income.

8.30. On all types of holdings, agriculture and recreation or tourism were nearly always regarded by the landholders as financially separate. After the establishment of facilities, landholders tended not to have engaged in or to be considering direct cross-subsidisation between enterprises. On the other hand, indirect support of one by the other was not uncommon — such as where landholders said they lived mainly off the income from tourism and recreation while agricultural income was being ploughed back so as to expand the agricultural enterprise. Occasionally income from the facilities was used towards paying off debts or loans affecting agriculture.

8.31. Another indirect relationship between tourism and recreation and traditional enterprises concerns maintenance. Well maintained holdings, and indeed the very presence of agricultural enterprises, provide an attractive backcloth and environment for facilities. If general maintenance is charged against agriculture then tourism or recreation enterprises are receiving an indirect subsidy. On the other hand, many estate proprietors said that positive income from recreation and tourism enabled them to continue with heavy maintenance expenditure on the estate as a whole and yet relieve agriculture of the burden.

8.32. Naturally, increased maintenance activity enhances the capital value of holdings. However, the benefits of increasing
capital value of holdings, either in this indirect way or simply through the very presence of tourism or recreational facilities, appeared not to be an important reason for providing facilities in the first place. Farmers and crofters tended to think in straight income terms, and the factor of enhanced capital value was an important consideration only on certain kinds of estate.

8.33. There can be certain tax advantages to landholders who operate recreation and tourism enterprises as well as agriculture but this depends on the particular situation on each holding and with each landholder. Some landholders clearly benefited from being able to write off against income from the facilities certain expenditures which could not so easily be placed amongst agricultural costs - examples are private sporting costs and some more common items like food in the case of F & B enterprises. Sometimes the landholder could enhance the capital value of the holding by certain development expenditure on recreation which could be classified as maintenance and set off against income for tax purposes. Very frequently the facilities provided an income for the family which was clearly earned by the wife and so, as such, was only taxable beyond the limit of the wife's earned income allowance. One particular advantage of having two, or more, enterprises covered by one account occurs where the first enterprise (e.g. agriculture) makes a loss which can be used to offset profit from the other (e.g. recreation) so reducing the taxable income below what it would have been had the enterprises been accounted separately.

8.34. One final, and rather different, aspect of the interrelationship between recreation and tourism enterprises and agriculture at the
landholding level concerns nuisance and damage to the landholding generally caused by visitors to the facilities. Only 31% of landholders interviewed reported any nuisance and damage at all and on half of the holdings this was only very slight indeed. On two thirds of holdings where nuisance or damage did occur, it affected the facility only and not the rest of the holding. Generally nuisance or damage were isolated events caused by the careless few.

iv. **Total direct economic benefit throughout Scotland**

8.35. So far, economic benefits have been expressed only in terms of individual holdings. The number of holdings in Scotland with facilities, as determined by the postal survey, can be combined with economic data obtained from the interviews to give an estimate of the total revenues, income and profit to landholders from the provision of tourism or recreation facilities. Such an estimate can be treated only as a very broad indication of an order of magnitude since there is such a large variation in the amount of income from recreation and tourism per holding and because the holdings interviewed were based on a selection and not a random sample. If the economic results are inflated from 1973 to 1975 prices (the year of the postal survey), a broad estimate of the total revenue received by smallholdings, farms and crofts from the provision of facilities in 1975 is £11m., leaving a net income of £8m., a M & I income of £6.5m. and a profit of £3.5m. Estimates for estates can be made with even less certainty since the number of estates providing figures was small and the variation in the nature and extent of facility provision on estates was very great.
However, an assessment of the information that was obtained for estates suggests that they contribute a further 50% to 75% to the total net income figure but rather less to profits owing to generally high establishment costs on estates. A very rough estimate of the total net income from tourism and recreation on private landholdings in Scotland is therefore £10m. to £15m.

8.36. In order to get an idea of the relative size of these tourism and recreation estimates it is interesting to compare them with the financial results of Scottish agriculture. The tourism and recreation figures given in the last paragraph are for 1975. Economic information on agriculture is calculated from June to May each year; so really two sets of agricultural results are relevant—viz. 1974/75 and 1975/76. 1974/75 was a poor year for Scottish agriculture, especially because of poor returns to dairy farming, and total agricultural output amounted to £484m., while 1975/76 was a reasonably good year, output amounting to £646m. Total output (i.e. total revenue) from recreation and tourism was roughly between 3% and 4% of agricultural output taking the poor year and between 2% and 3% taking the good.

8.37. No figures are published for total net income from agriculture for Scotland as a whole. However, two sets of published data can be used to give a rough estimate of the ratio between net income and total output, expressed as a percentage. First, from the D.A.F.S. farm accounts data (D.A.F.S. (1977)), an average of the ratios at the farm enterprise level can be calculated—as 25% (1974/75) and 34% (1975/76). Secondly, results for U.K.
agriculture as a whole, but not separated between countries, appear in the Annual Review of Agriculture*; the ratios there are 30% (1974/75) and 32% (1975/76). Turning to tourism and recreation, the ratio between net income and output (revenue) is much higher. Financial data from the enterprises visited showed that this ratio, although naturally varying considerably, averaged around 70%.

8.38. Using the estimates for net income from tourism mentioned in paragraph 8.35 and the estimates of net income from agriculture, which can be obtained from the ratios described above, one can compare the two activities. Net income from tourism and recreation on landholdings could be as much as 8% to 11% of net income from agriculture, taking the poor agricultural year 1974/75, or between 5% and 7%, taking the reasonably good year 1975/76.

8.39. The following points should be borne in mind when considering the ratios between the net incomes:

i. Even though the figures are given only in the form of a broad range, the ranges in themselves are subject to quite a wide range of error, owing to the variation in types of facility provision, the small number of holdings visited for interview and the estimation process for agricultural net income.

ii. One of the costs charged against output in estimating the net income from agriculture is farm rent (or equivalent rent on owned holdings). It could be argued that a more

just comparison between agriculture and tourism and recreation would be made if this rent factor were disregarded, as no rent factor was included in estimating income from tourism and recreation. The comparison could now be seen as being between the alternative income earning activities, given the common basis of the existence of landholders with land. If the adjustment is made, the figure for net income from tourism and recreation as a percentage of net income from agriculture given in the previous paragraph is lower by about one percentage point.

c) De facto access

8.40. The occurrence of de facto access is an important element of the private costs of tourism and recreation on landholdings. Are there any benefits from it? Some landholders interviewed and others writing comments explained that they were keen on public access and enjoyed seeing people on their land (see 7.72.). Interestingly, the postal survey results indicated that landholders who have not experienced access, but who express an attitude to it, are much more likely to object to it than welcome it, while those who know about access from direct experience are just as likely to welcome it as to object (7.74.). It is possible that the occurrence of de facto access has benefited landholders in the sense of dispelling a worry about the unknown. Certainly, the numbers of landholders in a position of welcoming de facto access is much greater where access has actually occurred.

8.41. While there may be an indirect psychological benefit of this
kind from de facto access, it is certain that a cost is suffered by many landholders where de facto access causes nuisance or damage. To measure the prevalence of this, landholders were asked about it in the postal survey. The general picture of the results of the enquiry is given in Table 8.6. In general about half the 18,000 landholders who experience de facto access (see 4.42.) suffer nuisance or damage. Thus about 9,000 landholders are affected. There appeared not to be a great deal of difference between the four types of access in the extent to which they caused nuisance or damage.

TABLE 8.6. Holdings where access causes nuisance or damage, as a percentage of all holdings experiencing access (specified holding types)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All holdings</th>
<th>Farms</th>
<th>Estates</th>
<th>Crofts</th>
<th>Common grazings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any access</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking/climbing</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car—parking/picnicking</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caravanning</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.42. A more complete understanding of nuisance and damage arising from public access on landholdings can be obtained by considering the kinds of problem which most concern landholders. Information on this subject arises from an analysis of the answers to question 9 of the postal survey questionnaire. In this question, landholders were asked to rank in order of importance the four
problems which most concerned them out of a given list of eight.*

The list included:

- Litter
- Gates left open
- Parking in gateways
- Vandalism
- Damage to crops
- Disturbance of farming livestock by dogs
- Disturbance of farming livestock by people
- Disturbance of sporting

It was found that some landholders did not rank these problems as requested but merely ticked them. It is quite likely that they could not decide which of the problems they ticked was the most important. Consequently, in the analysis of the answers to this question, problems have been given scores dependent on the respondent's ranking or the number and distribution of his ticks. The total scores accruing to each problem were used to list them in overall order of importance. This was done for different types of holding, and the results are displayed in Table 3.7.

8.43. In Table 3.7, the relative scores of each problem are expressed in percentage form in column 1. Column 2 shows the proportion of all landholders who consider the specified problem is important (i.e., among the 'four most important problems') and column 3 shows the percentage of these landholders who indicate that the specified problem is definitely the most important one for them. The column 2 figures closely follow those in column 1, but do enable statements to be made based on proportions of landholders - a more easily conceptualised basis than the 'relative total score'. The reason for presenting column 3 is that it was felt that some problems might not occur frequently but might have the characteristics of usually being more important than other problems when they do occur. In fact, the results show that the

* A ninth option 'other problems' was included. In fact, most respondents did not rank 'other problems' but merely wrote in comments describing them - many of these comments simply elaborated on one of the eight subjects listed on the questionnaire.
TABLE 8.7. Concern about specific problems arising from de facto public access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Holdings</th>
<th>Farms</th>
<th>Estates</th>
<th>Crofts</th>
<th>Common Grazings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gates open</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock (dogs)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cars in gates</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage crops</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock (man)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disturb sport</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Column 1 = % of total 'score' (according to ranking or ticking) contributed by each problem
Column 2 = number of holdings including the specific problem as among the four most important, expressed as a % of all holdings
Column 3 = % of above (Col. 2) holdings where the problem is unequivocally the most important one
problems with this characteristic tend to be those most frequently mentioned anyway.

8.44. The three most frequently mentioned problems on all types of holding were litter, gates being left open and disturbance of stock by dogs, usually in that order: other problems were mentioned only half as frequently as these. The exception is found with estates: here 'disturbance of sport' was very important - on other holdings this problem was negligible. Another interesting result relating to estates is that litter appeared to be of extreme importance - three quarters of the estates sampled mentioned litter, and half of these indicated that litter was the most important problem. The problem of people disturbing stock was not nearly as prevalent as that involving dogs. Care parking in gateways appeared to be a moderately prevalent problem on all kinds of holding.

8.45. Many landholders wrote comments on the questionnaire describing in more detail their concern or problems relating to public access. Some of these comments related to problems included in the printed list described above; others concerned new aspects of the consequences of de facto access. Landholders did not mention any of these new subjects as frequently as they ranked or ticked problems in the printed list, but this may be partly because it is easier for respondents to mark off suggested answers than to think up alternatives and write them down. These comments written in by postal survey respondents, together with information from discussions with the landholders visited, provide useful material for describing the harmful consequences of de facto access in more detail in the following paragraphs.
8.46. Before describing different problems faced by landholders, it is worth considering the kinds of people who cause them. Mostly, landholders did not specify who was involved, so tacitly implying that they did not know or that it was tourists or recreationists in general. However, some landholders commented that nuisance or damage were caused mainly by local people. In particular, local inhabitants were blamed for leaving litter and for vandalism, the latter relating more to urban than to remote rural communities, especially on land close to housing schemes.

8.47. A few postal survey respondents mentioned that de facto access and its harmful consequences arose from neighbours' recreation or tourism enterprises. A further category of person specifically mentioned by landholders as causing problems is the sportsman. Fishermen were mentioned in particular. Three landholders interviewed, who had holdings in southern Perth, Stirling and east Argyll, described being descended on by bus loads of fishermen from the conurbation who disturbed stock, burnt fences, left large quantities of rubbish, and would not listen to complaints. De facto access by other sportsmen was less frequently mentioned as causing problems, although a few comments related to canoeists, horse riders and skiers (the latter causing erosion).

8.48. In the next few paragraphs, the problems quantified in Table 8.7 will be described in more detail. Certain aspects of the litter problem emerged from comments by landholders.
First, the greatest concentration of litter is found by the roadside and especially near lay-bys, but this is not so harmful to the farmer as when it is deposited in fields. Secondly, certain types of litter are especially dangerous to livestock; notably broken bottles, cans (especially the pull-off rings on cans which are frequently eaten, with nasty results), and plastic bags. A number of landholders reported that "broken bottles and polythene bags have caused death to animals and damage to machinery". Thirdly, litter from campers or caravanners who also had no form of sanitary arrangements was frequently of concern.

8.49. The problem listed as 'gates left open' really speaks for itself and needs no further description. However, one landholder interestingly mentioned the converse problem of tourists unwittingly shutting gates that were meant to be left open. An associated problem (in that it can affect the movement of stock), which was one of those most frequently described in comments written on the questionnaire, concerns damage to fences and especially to drystone dykes.

8.50. A more directly obvious cause of nuisance to livestock is the badly controlled dog. Many landholders, especially clerks of crofters' common grazings, considered that all dogs must be kept on the lead. Some landholders visited explained the type of damage dogs could cause to sheep. Chasing sheep can cause depletion of the fleece and it is very difficult to assess the amount of abortion loss brought about by dogs. Lambing is certainly the time when sheep are most vulnerable and many
landholders report lambs killed by dogs.

8.51. Cars parking in gateways is again a fairly self-explanatory problem; the following comment was typical of many: "We have lost hours of production through people parking cars in gateways, locking them, then going for a walk". Written comments and discussions brought up a number of other problems with cars in general. Some landholders had had sheep killed by motorists on public roads. More generally, landholders complained of tourists parking in passing places and of caravans blocking roads, especially side roads, because the drivers were so incompetent at reversing them. A few landholders complained of visitors' cars on private roads. It was not so much their presence as the fact that soft roads suffered wear and tear and frequently visitors' cars blocked the way. Occasionally landholders mentioned cars being parked on crops, especially grass for silage. Some crofters and grazings clerks were troubled by vehicular access to beaches, across soft machair land, which caused erosion. Many of the problems faced by crofters appeared to result from access to beaches and subsequent erosion, litter and nuisance to livestock.

8.52. Vehicles parking in grass is one example of the damage that the public can cause to crops. However, very few written comments or points brought up by landholders in discussions related to crop problems. The one exception was damage to woodland especially by fire. Fire tended to be more of a worry than an actuality. Fires were mainly attributed to picnickers and
occasionally to campers. Another, but lesser, concern of the forest owners was damage to young plantations by walkers. Walkers were also blamed for fires in heather. A number of landholders reported moorland fires. Some felt that fires could have been started by visitors leaving bottles which focus the sun's rays or by cigarette ends thrown from passing cars.

8.53. The problem of people disturbing farming livestock was less prevalent than disturbance by dogs. Walkers causing the movement of sheep tended to be seen more as a nuisance — hindering management and sometimes impeding the rescue of stranded animals — than as a cause of death to sheep or lambs. Quite a number of landholders were concerned about disease, especially those who had experienced loss from brucellosis and had built up a new accredited herd.

8.54. Vandalism refers to wilful damage to property. Much of the damage described above is done in ignorance and it was felt that tourists were infrequently vandals, most of the wilful damage being done by locals. Examples of vandalism varied from structural damage — breaking into derelict houses and bothies, removal of fences, defacing or burning notices — to damage to the natural environment. Some landholders experienced wilful acts against their property in the form of theft rather than vandalism. One landholder said that tourists were not responsible for the theft of his sheep but that their presence on the hills helped as a cover for the criminals.

8.55. The landholders who expressed the strongest concern about
disturbance of sport by tourists or recreationists, and who argued the most strongly against public access in the sporting season, were those with grouse shooting or deer stalking. However, interference with pheasant cover and upsetting nesting birds were serious problems on a number of lowland estates.

8.56. The problem of hill walkers disturbing shooting and stalking is frequently described as a seasonal one. One estate proprietor said simply that game was shot in the autumn after most walkers had left the hills, while many others found that hill walking and the sporting season coincided. Some landowners explained that game management took place throughout the year, and so hill walkers were not a nuisance only in the shooting season. The story from a West Highland landowner highlights the problems. He emphasised that venison production was the major enterprise on his estate, and that managing the deer efficiently was vital and the best way to achieve a reasonable yield from the land. The coincidence of this enterprise and his favourite sport was an added bonus. He explained that all the effort put in to achieve maximum output could be wasted if walkers went to certain parts of his land at the wrong time. Knowing where the deer are is extremely important and the estate staff spend weeks trying to obtain a reasonably accurate count — almost every attempt is thwarted by walkers shifting deer from ridges and corries. Another problem is that continual disturbance of deer harms their growth. Finally, this landowner reckoned that one out of two stalks had to be abandoned because of walkers — one or two people entering a corrie could clear the place of deer.
completely. Even though the bulk of stalking was done in late August and September, there were sufficient people on the hills to cause havoc in this way.

8.57. A consideration of all reports of nuisance and damage on landholdings visited together with written comments from landholders, leads to the general conclusion that problems, in the main, relate to specific isolated events and usually concern the actions of a few people who don't understand the consequences rather than the general problem of numbers.

8.58. One might expect that holdings with different kinds of agriculture would vary in the nuisance and damage experienced. The extent and nature of nuisance and damage was investigated on farms with different types of agricultural enterprises; the results are shown in Table 8.8.

**TABLE 8.8. Extent and nature of nuisance and damage from de facto access on farms, by agricultural type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Farms suffering nuisance and damage as % of all farms with access</th>
<th>Hill sheep</th>
<th>Beef/sheep</th>
<th>Dairy</th>
<th>Beef/crops</th>
<th>Cropping</th>
<th>Intensive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Problems concerning farmers in order of importance: (ranks)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Litter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gates open</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock (dogs)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cars in gates</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage crops</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock (man)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disturb sport</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There was little variation between types in the proportion of farms experiencing problems. However, the nature of problems was related to the nature of activities on farms. Dogs and then gates being left open form the most serious problems on hill sheep and beef/sheep farms. Damage to crops assumes third place on cropping farms but is low on the list for most other types. The occurrence of nuisance and damage was also investigated with respect to location. There is little variation between districts except for the striking result, shown clearly in Map 8.1., that holdings in the central lowlands and in districts bordering thereon, are more likely to suffer nuisance or damage from access than are those located elsewhere.

2. **SOCIAL BENEFITS AND COSTS**

   a) **Rural development**

8.59. The reasons for wanting to encourage economic development in rural areas or at least to prevent further economic decline centre on the facts that the level of income per head is low and the unemployment and depopulation rates are high in these areas. The private economic benefits to rural landholders from economic development through recreation and tourism enterprises have been outlined in the previous section. This section considers the extent to which further social benefits accrue from this form of economic development.

8.60. There is some debate as to the extent and nature of social gains from encouraging economic development in remote rural areas.
Proportion of those holdings in the District having de facto access which experience nuisance or damage from it, as a percentage of the equivalent national proportion.

Map 8.1  Holdings with nuisance or damage from de facto access

- under 75%
- 75% to 125%
- 125% to 175%
The 1966 report of the Land Use Study Group, in listing certain 'national objectives' for rural land use, claimed that: "we believe that regional development is a worthwhile goal, and indeed that it is essential in order to achieve the best results in terms of the development of landscape amenities and, in the long run, the social fabric of the countryside". In more detail, Gilg* has listed the arguments for rural economic development as follows:

- unequal standards of living give rise to rifts and divisions in society;
- the existing primary activities cannot support economically efficient communities;
- a continuous exodus of people and jobs from the remote to the already overcrowded urban areas could lead to further congestion in these areas;
- rural areas contain a good deal of social capital which it would be expensive to redistribute;
- many people in these areas do not want to leave and others would return if given the chance.

This last point, reflecting a concern for the desires of the existing inhabitants of rural areas, was neglected (presumably as it is only of 'local' significance) in one of the few official investigations of the costs and benefits of development in rural areas - an H.M. Treasury (1974) study of rural depopulation. That study concluded that: "the purely economic arguments for devoting more resources to preventing depopulation are not on

* Gilg (1976)*
balance very strong" and, in considering any balancing social arguments, brought up such factors as the "psychological value for townspeople" of the knowledge that rural communities and cultures continue to exist. The Countryside Review Committee* reporting in 1977 accepted the need to maintain rural communities in order to satisfy "three major policy objectives": the production of food and timber (but see 8.80 below); the conservation of natural beauty and amenity (since "a weak local economy can mean a down-at-heel countryside"); and, the provision of facilities for recreation and tourism. One of the major social cost factors in maintaining rural communities and encouraging development is the high per capita cost of providing public services such as schools, hospitals, etc., in remote areas. However, it has been argued (Burton, 1967) that this factor "should not affect the primary objective of raising income levels within the rural area to a level comparable with those that exist in the remainder of the economy".

8.61. In the light of the potential increase in tourism and recreation demand discussed in Chapter Two (2.87 to 2.92), it seems clear that further development of facilities must take place. Tourism has been shown, in general, to be an industry whose expansion may contribute relatively little to the economy compared with other industries. In a recent analysis of the Scottish Input-Output Table, the Scottish Council Research Institute (1978) has shown that tourism is ranked fairly low amongst different industries in

---

* Countryside Review Committee, 1977b.*
terms of the total direct and indirect benefits which its
dexpansion would confer on the Scottish economy. The Institute
states, though, that it would be unwise to conclude from this
that efforts towards tourism development should be redirected
and that "one particularly valuable feature of the tourist
industry is the opportunities for its development in parts of
the country where it is difficult to develop other industries".

8.62. Further to this, Brownrigg and Greig (1976) have expressed,
within a context of concern for rural development in Scotland,
considerable scepticism of the potential of tourism as a tool
for economic development even in rural areas. However, they
state that: "in some more remote rural areas it is unlikely that
there will be any real alternative means of economic recovery
apart from tourism ... but we would argue that (policy makers)
should place greater emphasis on achieving a spread, rather than
a concentration, of tourist flows". The characteristic of tourism
as an industry where considerable dispersal is possible is affirmed
in the R.M. Treasury Study (op.cit.) which, while concluding in
general that economic development in rural areas should take
place in certain growth centres, points to tourism as a way of
"preventing depopulation with less need to concentrate people".

8.63. In an overview of tourism as a means of development in
rural areas, again within a Scottish context, Adams (1977)
emphasises the need to ensure that tourism development programmes
should encourage those forms of tourism which employ a high
proportion of local people. A similar point is made by
Capstick (1972) and by Davidson and Wibberley (1977), in that "large scale, capital intensive tourist facilities may, in the long term, be less effective than low cost schemes ... for farm holidays, which allow more income to be retained locally".

8.64. The preceding paragraphs do suggest that there are, arguably, social benefits to be gained from rural development and, accepting this, that the kinds of tourism and recreation enterprises on private landholdings described in preceding chapters can contribute significantly to these benefits. Recent unpublished work by the Scottish Economic Planning Department has identified those areas of Scotland which can be described as economically 'fragile' in terms of unemployment and depopulation. Many of these areas correspond to those with a high proportion of landholders providing facilities and, more especially, with a high proportion of landholders interested in further provision (see 6.56 to 6.59).

8.65. The benefit of tourism and recreation development taking place through the particular medium of facility provision by existing private landholders is that, in the vast majority of cases, any surplus earned by these facilities in excess of running costs (i.e. both profits and returns to labour) goes directly to an indigenous population. The beneficiaries are the landholder, his family and employees. It is true that some estate proprietors, unlike farmers or crofters, do not live on their estates full-time and a proportion may spend profits from tourism or recreation on consumption or investment mainly outwith the local areas. However,
they are probably relatively small in number. Amongst the postal survey respondents, only 20% of estate proprietors were not involved in the farming or management of their land and, generally, the proportion of estate proprietors interviewed who used profits for further investment on the estate was quite high. Full-time employees on holdings visited nearly always lived in the local area; albeit some were new to the area and had only recently set up home there. A very large majority of part-time employees were local people—especially wives of farm or estate labourers.

8.66. A particular feature of the enterprises visited was the relatively high proportion of visitor spending which ended up as personal income to the landholder or his staff. It was found that running costs usually absorbed only a small proportion of revenue. This income constitutes a direct economic benefit. Certain aspects of the social benefit to be derived from this are discussed further in (i) and (ii) below, followed by a comment on the extent of indirect and induced, second-round, economic benefit from tourism and recreation.

i. Distribution of income and profit amongst landholders

8.67. The private costs and benefits of tourism and recreation accruing to individual landholders, discussed earlier in the chapter, combine to provide a total net benefit to the nation. It is arguable that the nation stands to benefit more from tourism and recreation if the private benefits of facility
provision are well distributed amongst many landholders, especially those with less profitable holdings. Earlier it was shown (Tables 8.4. and 8.5.) that facility provision contributes an important proportion of income on holdings without full-time agricultural enterprises and it was suggested that it is especially valuable on holdings where the landholder has no additional employment in other activities.

8.68. Turning back to Chapter Six, Figure 6.7., one finds that the incidence of facility provision is not evenly distributed between holdings of different agricultural enterprise size: a higher proportion of larger holdings are reaping the benefits of this activity. Also in that chapter, Table 6.5., it was suggested that where landholders are without full-time agricultural enterprises, those without other employment elsewhere are only slightly more likely to have facilities than are those with some other employment. Therefore it appears that landholders who might most need the benefits of facility provision have not become as involved in this activity as have some other landholders, and so, in this respect, social gain from private benefits has, so far, not been as great as it might have been.

8.69. On the other hand, Table 6.4. showed clearly a shift towards economically smaller landholdings when the proportion of landholders thinking of providing facilities is considered. Thus it appears that there is potential to gain greater social benefits than in the past by encouraging and enabling landholders to carry out their ideas for facility provision, since such developments could well benefit landholders with less viable holdings.
ii. Employment generated on the holdings

8.70. The annual labour requirements of different facilities are summarised in Table 8.9. Pony-trekking and DBB are especially demanding of labour, although with the latter enterprises, the landholder's wife usually has to carry out many of the tasks for the household anyway. These figures relate only to running the facilities; in addition labour will have been required for establishing them.

### Table 8.9: Labour required for running specific facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Labour Required (S.M.D./Unit)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holiday cottages</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed and breakfast</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinner, B &amp; B</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static 'vans</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touring 'van' site</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pony-trekking</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The figures given show the number of standard man days (8 hours) per year equivalent to the total labour required. The figures in brackets show the median size of enterprises visited in terms of the stated units. Static 'vans' here refers to static caravans in small groups, not on a caravan site.

8.71. For almost all facility types, on the majority of holdings visited, the tasks of running the enterprises involved the landholder and his family alone – see Table 8.10. Wives of landholders were especially important for B & B, cleaning cottages, chalets and static caravans, and conducting pony treks. In addition, often establishment work is done by the landholder, with only advice or brief assistance required from a local contractor. Thus the benefits derived from employment largely accrue to the landholder and his family and are absorbed in the private benefits discussed in the previous section.
TABLE 8.10. Proportion of facilities visited where regular labour involved only the landholder or his family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holiday cottages</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed and breakfast only</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinner, bed and breakfast</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static caravans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touring caravan sites</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pony-trekking</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.72. On the other hand, it is especially important to appreciate that some landholders specifically indicate that the combination of the private economic benefits and an employment commitment did serve to keep them and their families on their landholdings, while, had it not been for the tourism or recreation enterprise, they would have been tempted, and might have been forced, to move elsewhere.

8.73. The employment of paid labour for running and establishing facilities is most prevalent on estates. In fact, although many large landholdings may not be so much in need of the economic benefits of facility provision as are small landholdings, they do tend to be better in providing employment for other people and so spreading the benefits of tourism or recreation in that way. Unfortunately, much of this employment is part-time or seasonal. The use of the wives of estate employees for certain tasks is common. Caravan site wardens provide some of the few examples of full-time permanent posts created. The social benefits of tourism and recreation on private landholdings are low in this respect but a combination of part-time jobs is better than no employment at all, which is often the alternative in many rural areas. Looking to the future, a high proportion of estates and large holdings are considering further expansion of an existing
involvement in tourism and recreation (see 4.15 and Fig. 6.1.). This could well bring about more employment for full-time staff working wholly within tourism or recreation, as distinct from jobs being part-time or filled by deployment of estate labour.

iii. Indirect benefits

8.74. Although benefits from facility provision occur through the provision of both recreation and accommodation, the latter is concentrated on below.

8.75. The very presence of an accommodation enterprise bringing tourists to a local area produces many benefits for that area in addition to those accruing to the facility providers. The provision of accommodation by landholders can bring these benefits to areas which might not easily receive them otherwise. In some areas (e.g. certain crofting townships and Highland glens) the only feasible possibility for tourism provision may be through the involvement of farmers, crofters or landowners, owing to their control over resources. Tourists will spend money on enterprises (shops, restaurants, garages), other than for accommodation, which will generate a substantial amount of direct income and employment in the local area. In addition, landholders, together with these non-accommodation enterprises, will purchase goods from businesses not directly in contact with the tourists; purchases which will create further local income and employment. Finally, the 'direct' and 'indirect' income so created will lead to a second round of spending in the area and so on, in a multiplying action.
8.76. These effects have been analysed in a number of 'tourist multiplier' studies in Britain. In Scotland, there have been two major studies – in Tayside (T.R.R.U., 1975b) and Skye (Brownrigg and Greig, 1974). The Tayside study figures are broken down sufficiently to enable direct income and employment generation within accommodation enterprises (e.g. farms, crofts and estates) to be separated from other effects. From this information, Table 8.11 is drawn up. The first half shows, for the kinds of

TABLE 8.11. Income and employment created in other enterprises per unit expenditure or per person-night in accommodation enterprises – Local Area analysis
(pounds and number of full-time job equivalent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income created per £1 spent on accom.</th>
<th>Employment created per £1000 spent on accom.</th>
<th>Income created per one person-night</th>
<th>Employment created per one person-night</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£1</td>
<td>£1000</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£1</td>
<td>£1000</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bed and breakfast</th>
<th>0.49</th>
<th>0.35</th>
<th>0.70</th>
<th>0.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Touring caravan site</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static caravan</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented accomm. (e.g. holiday cottage)</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


accommodation found on landholdings, the amount of income, in addition to that from the accommodation enterprise, likely to be created in a local area, from £1 (for income) or £1000 (for employment) of revenue received by the farmer, crofter or landowner. Thus, campers who pay a farmer £1 are likely to be creating £2.5 of income in the local area which his camp-site has enabled them to stay in, in addition to the income which the
farmer and his employees gain from the £1. However, one must appreciate that for a farmer to receive £1 he would need more campers per night than, say, bed and breakfast guests. The left hand side of Table 8.11. shows the result per person night. A bed provided in a B & B house creates more income and employment in other local enterprises than a bed in a holiday cottage, which, in turn, has a greater effect than a berth in a touring or static caravan or tent.

8.77. Taking all types of accommodation, the Tayside study found that accommodation provided in major towns, Highland centres, seaside towns, or special activity centres was, in each case, better at generating income and employment within the respective local community than was accommodation provided in the rural area studied (Loch Tay-side). This is largely because of the limited commercial facilities in rural areas; tourists resident there tend to travel to towns or other centres for certain goods and services. It is a vicious circle. Thus a comprehensive programme for development might be better than concentration purely on accommodation provision.

b) Recreation, tourism and agriculture

8.78. If a landholder reduces his agricultural output in order to provide for tourism and recreation, there is a private (opportunity) cost to him which must be set against the benefits of facility provision. It is arguable that there will be additional social costs to the nation from such a change of use of resources in that, by satisfying recreation or tourism the landholder is providing a luxury for only a small
section of society while food production is a universal necessity.

8.79. Earlier in the chapter (8.5.) it was pointed out that only 14% of farmers and crofters visited had been reducing their agricultural activities in the two to three years prior to interview (the period when most facilities were being set up) and indeed half of them (and 60% of estates) had been improving or expanding their traditional enterprises during that period. Thus the loss to agriculture from the provision of tourism and recreation facilities is apparently small. Indeed some landholders found that, by living off their recreation or tourism income they were able to plough back agricultural income and build up their enterprises, or pay off debts; in this way, recreation and tourism can actually benefit agriculture. Another way in which this happened was through the recreation or tourism enterprises providing a further source of income which enabled the landholder to spend his time on the holding rather than having to go away during the day to earn additional income from another source. This time could be used in tending the agricultural enterprise which otherwise might have become rundown.

8.80. There could be an argument to the effect that the financial opportunities offered by recreation and tourism are partly responsible for maintaining small scale inefficient farmers who might otherwise

* In some instances, this reduction may have occurred anyway, irrespective of recreation or tourism provision.
quit farming altogether. Thereby they are preventing natural amalgamation of holdings and the consequent improvement in the efficiency of agricultural production. This in the face of Government policy, expressed in the White Paper "Food from our Own Resources" (H.M.S.O., 1975), seeking to increase the productivity of British agriculture. Conversely, recreation and tourism facilities, if developed into reasonably large enterprises, could provide the landholder with a sufficient livelihood to enable him to sell or lease his agricultural land to his neighbour. However, evidence from the interviews with landholders suggested that a large majority of them were extremely keen to remain on their holdings and to continue to farm the land in any case, irrespective of recreation and tourism, and so these longer-term structural implications for agriculture may not be so relevant as more immediate relationships between the two forms of activity.

c) Contribution to stock of facilities available - benefits to users

8.81. The revenue received by suppliers of facilities and which provides the private and social benefits described above, represents a cost to tourist or recreationists. However, the benefit gained by them will be considerably in excess of its cost equivalent. As most people's time for holidays is limited to only two or three weeks per year, the value they place on them is likely to be considerably greater than the expenditure incurred. Health and relaxation enhanced by holidays and recreation enables people to work more efficiently with consequent advantages to the national economy. It is arguable that farms, crofts and estates, providing
a form of tourism or recreation that involves peace and quiet and fresh air, can play an especially valuable role in this respect.

8.82. The extent of this benefit depends on the number of facilities provided. It will be remembered that an estimated 11,600 facilities are provided on landholdings in Scotland (4.21.). About 6000 of these are accommodation facilities. If the average size of the enterprises visited in the interview survey is taken, one can estimate that these facilities provide about 200,000 bed-spaces.

This is based on the assumption that a holiday cottage sleeps 6 people, a touring caravan 4, a static caravan 5 and a tent 2.5 people. The number of nights per year spent in these bed-spaces can be estimated using the occupancy rates found on holdings visited and figures for the average size of parties using cottages and chalets, static and touring caravans and tents.* In this way, it is estimated that as many as 9.5 million bed-nights per year are spent on private landholdings. This is almost 20% of all holiday bed-nights in Scotland in 1976 (Scottish Tourist Board, 1977a).

8.83. This high percentage is largely due to the fact that a large number of caravan sites occur on farms and estates and these sites can cater for many people per night; a site for 30 touring caravans sounds somewhat modest but it is equivalent, at least, to a 70-bedroomed hotel. 1.75 times as many holidaymakers in Scotland stay in static caravans, touring caravans or tents as in hotels or guest houses (T.R.R.U., 1976a).

* Average party size figures were obtained from the British Home Tourism Survey carried out annually on behalf of the Tourist Boards and the British Tourist Authority.
8.84. The figure is subject to very considerable sampling errors, both in the landholding figures and those from the S.T.B. The holdings interviewed, providing averages for enterprise size and occupancy, were a selection and not a statistical sample. Still, it does indicate the considerable importance of the contribution from private landholders to the overall provision for tourism.

8.85. In general, the social benefit of facility provision on farms, crofts and estates would be more clearly manifest if the facilities provided were in some way unique and offered the public an experience they could not get elsewhere. This is not really the case with accommodation: the 'farming' environment did not stand out particularly on the holdings visited. Nevertheless, simply by providing accommodation which is, first, inexpensive, and secondly, in the countryside, landholders are considerably enhancing opportunities for tourists. Recreation opportunities on private landholdings, such as fishing, pony-trekking, shooting, are more peculiar to them and, in this sense, the social benefits of such provision are great.

8.86. Here one should mention that, although de facto public access may occur at a cost to the landholder, obviously many people do benefit from this form of recreation.

d) Social interaction

8.87. The private benefit of landholders meeting tourists and recreationists and enjoying their company has already been mentioned. In addition, tourists and recreationists enjoy contact
with the farming community and crofters, as is frequently possible through most facilities. The S.T.A.R.S. study suggests that 'the people' was the fourth most commonly mentioned attraction of Scotland, after such attractions as 'the countryside', 'visiting friends' and 'peace and quiet' (T.R.R.U., 1976a) Small scale enterprises on private landholdings probably provide the visitor with a greater chance of meeting local people than most forms of tourism facilities.

8.88. Such social interaction could be helpful in breaking down prejudices between town and country. Also, this kind of contact and mutual understanding could help to reduce the problems faced by landholders from de facto access, although most visitors to facilities were reported to be not the type to cause a nuisance.

8.89. Little research has been done on the social impact of tourism on host populations (Ge:z., 1977). However, tourism has come in for a considerable amount of criticism as being an industry which can destroy community life and culture. Brownrigg and Greig (1976) write of cultural debasement and that "real Highland culture was driven underground by the tourist season, to re-emerge only in the winter". Hugh MacDiarmid (1973) expresses concern that a tourist based economy "is characterised by an absence of genuine creativity in favour of the questionable philosophy of the fast buck". On the other hand, the Wales Tourist Board (1977) has suggested that tourism's role in checking depopulation can

* See 1.9.

+ This point is made by a number of writers, e.g. Hoyland (1976), Scobie (1976).
help to "preserve the traditions, customs and culture of the Welsh rural community". It is probably true that tourism on farms, crofts and estates, by developing from within local communities rather than being imposed on them by developers moving in from outside, is less likely to damage rural community life than some other forms of tourism enterprise.

e) Amenity

8.90. Maintenance expenditure has already been mentioned, as a cost which can be shared between recreation and tourism enterprises and traditional enterprises. Some landholders were able to step up maintenance expenditure on holdings, owing to the presence of facilities. This benefits not only visitors to the facilities but the landscape in general and hence a wider public. Given sensitive conversion, the use of derelict land and buildings for facilities can enhance the landscape directly. A few landholdings were visited where the appearance of outbuildings had been considerably improved by conversion to recreational use.

8.91. The provision of facilities by landholders is often condemned owing to the intrusion on the landscape that it causes. This largely relates to caravan sites and to a lesser extent to camping and chalets. Many caravan sites visited were unsightly and little attempt at screening them had been made. This applied especially to older sites: planning restrictions on caravan sites have become stricter recently. It emerged during the interviews that many farmers and crofters were unaware of the visual intrusion of their sites. There certainly seemed to be a need for more advice on screening and landscaping at the development stage.
However, it is difficult to be objective about the nature of the impact.

f) Pressure on the countryside

8.92. The provision of facilities by landholders in rural areas will undoubtedly lead to increased use of the countryside, especially de facto access for walking, car-parking and picnicking. However, almost all landholders visited said that they had surprisingly few complaints from neighbours about this. Adverse reaction was an expression of scepticism that farmers should become involved in such things. The attitudes of landholders to de facto access, the problems associated with this, and so on, have been considered as private costs to landholders earlier (8.49 to 8.58).

8.93. A particular social cost arising from increasing visitors to remote rural areas is the congestion of narrow roads, especially by caravans. On the positive side, deliberate provision of touring caravan and camping sites should serve to reduce de facto access for these activities.

3. FACTORS AFFECTING VARIATIONS IN COSTS AND BENEFITS

a) Private benefits and costs

i. Facility provision

8.94. Non-economic benefits accruing to the landholder largely depend on his personal attitudes to facility provision and so are not affected by external factors. Economic benefits, on the
other hand, are affected by circumstances both within and without the landholder's control.

8.95. It has already been shown that the variation in net income and profit from recreation and tourism between enterprises visited was very great (Tables 8.4., 8.5.). To a large extent, this variation depended on the type of facility provided (differences between average results for facility types were shown in Tables 8.1. and 8.3.) and also on the size of facility. However, Table 8.1. showed that there were also considerable differences in per unit results between landholdings providing the same facility. The factors affecting these differences were investigated and this is described in detail in the Facts Sheets in Appendix 1. The results are summarised in the next few paragraphs.

8.96. Generally, running costs were considerably lower than revenue and varied less between enterprises. Apart from the employment of paid labour on some holdings and not on others (later compensated for by charging for family labour to get M & I income), the factor which mostly dictated variation in running cost was the repairs and maintenance bill in the year in question. This variation, however, was small on all types of enterprise in comparison with the variation in revenue. It was the level of revenue which determined success or failure in terms of the size of net income or M & I income. That is to say, very few enterprises were discovered which achieved either an extremely high or an extremely low income per unit due to
clever cost reductions or crippling running costs; rather, successful or unsuccessful enterprises were those with, respectively, high or low revenue.

8.97. Generally, revenue was closely related to both price and occupancy level. However, occupancy tended to be marginally more varied and more important in determining relative success. Occupancy was not closely related to the quality of facilities, except possibly with fishing. Location of the holding appeared vitally important for occupancy. Overall success of accommodation enterprises was largely dictated by a holding's situation in a particular tourist area, like the western Highlands. Enterprises in the Western Isles, Orkney and Shetland fared badly due largely to low occupancy, reportedly resulting from inaccessibility and high ferry charges. Pony-trekking enterprises achieved better than the average fairly low occupancy levels where there was local demand; out of season, as well as demand by tourists - hence proximity to urban areas was important, provided such areas had a reasonable amount of tourist traffic. Location least affected occupancy with fishing enterprises. General location within Scotland appeared to be more important than location with respect to roads, public transport, and so on, except possibly for B & B.

8.98. Another important factor was that new enterprises visited had not built up a regular clientele. The majority of well established accommodation enterprises reported that visitors returning year after year constituted most of their custom. Location and the establishment of a clientele rather overshadowed the effect of differing advertising efforts, though some enterprises outwith popular tourist areas did not fall below average occupancy.
owing to greater advertising (such as using many newspapers and printing a brochure).

8.99. Price and occupancy were either unrelated or showed a positive correlation, seemingly due to the effect of location on both (e.g. with cottages, static caravans). No holding was visited where a low price was associated with a particularly high occupancy rate or a high price with a low one. The demand for facilities appeared to be inelastic within the price ranges found. Price, like occupancy, appeared more affected by location than other factors, but location appeared not to affect the price of touring caravan sites, pony-trekking or fishing. High quality of facilities offered tended to be connected with high prices for touring caravan sites and river fishing and static caravans, and to a lesser extent for DBB; cottages and chalets varied little in quality anyway.

8.100. The nature and causes of variation in price reflect the pricing policy adopted by most landholders. Landholders tended to fix prices by looking at what others charged in the neighbourhood. Sometimes price increases from then on were related to rising costs. The human factor was also important. Some landholders initially kept prices low in order to attract custom and then did not want to increase the price because they had built up a friendly relationship with their visitors. Where the facilities were set up for reasons other than purely enhancing income, price was sometimes deliberately kept low from the start. Some facilities, such as picnic sites, are unpriced.

8.101. This human side of the picture arises from the fact that
the facilities are on farms, crofts and estates, where other enterprises provide the main source of income. This fact can also affect occupancy: some landholders could have advertised out of season to try and bring in trade throughout the year but did not do so as they wanted some period of the year to themselves and for concentrated farm work.

8.102. Management and Investment income, dictated by revenue (and hence occupancy and price as explained) did, in the main, explain the variation in profits. However, with some facility types (cottages, chalets, pony-trekking, B&B) establishment cost had sufficient variation and magnitude in relation to income to make it important in explaining differences in profits. This worked in different ways. Some holiday cottages cost a lot to establish owing to extension and improvements while others cost almost nothing. This large variation affected profit margins. All chalets were expensive to establish and so relatively small variations in establishment cost could alter profits considerably. Establishment costs for pony-trekking were not especially high in themselves but they were high in relation to income, so again small variations could dictate profits. B&B income per bed varied little between enterprises while establishment cost, although low, varied considerably so affecting variations in profit.

8.103. If financial success is expressed in terms of a percentage yield on establishment cost, the variation between holdings is very great. Yields can be wildly high owing to many near zero establishment costs due to the existence of available resources
without feasible alternative uses. Such extreme yields were never found with chalets, static caravans, pony-trekking, or managed loch fishing because there was always a need for the landholder to purchase specific and expensive items of equipment.

ii. De facto access

8.104. The extent of de facto access and the problems it causes can be controlled by landholders to some extent. The landholders most involved with de facto access are estate proprietors and crofters using common grazing (4.43). Information was sought from these landholders on measures of control used through the postal surveys of common grazings clerks and members of the Scottish Landowners' Federation. Only 13% of common grazings clerks reported the use of control measures; half referred to crofters asking people to move or directing them to specific parts of the grazings. Fifty percent of estates adopted some measures to control access. The extent of the use of different measures and their effectiveness are shown in Table 8.12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>% of estates</th>
<th>Totally ineffective</th>
<th>Degree of success</th>
<th>Almost totally effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No measures</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notices</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fences or gates</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal contact</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All three of the main measures used achieved varying results but the proportion of respondents who indicated reasonable or almost total success was relatively greater for personal contact with the public (by the proprietor or game keeper or other estate worker asking people to move or not to light fires, etc.), than for the others. Some inter-estate co-operation does occur with relation to patrols.

8.105. Personal contact occasionally occurs in the other direction. 37% of estates experiencing de facto walking or climbing had been occasionally approached for permission; the percentage was less (25%) for car-parking/picnicking but greater for camping (53%) and caravanning (43%). However, all proprietors said that the vast majority of the public did not ask permission. Almost all proprietors considered that those who ask permission cause less nuisance or damage — either because the people who ask respect the countryside anyway or because people can be directed to where they can do no harm. However, one proprietor realistically commented: "Yes, those who ask permission cause less damage in the long run, but it would be quite impossible if every individual asked or had to ask permission".

b) Social benefits and costs

8.106. Factors influencing social costs and benefits are, in the main, self evident from the discussion of these costs and benefits in the previous section.

8.107. Social benefits and costs can be influenced by the enactment
of policies in the name of society to influence the decisions of landholders concerning the provision of facilities on their land. These policies may seek to influence the actual distribution of facilities and overall involvement of landholders in tourism and recreation; for instance, landholders may be encouraged to provide facilities. Further, policies may seek to influence the costs and benefits arising from facilities when they are provided. No more will be said on the subject here, since the next chapter is specifically concerned with policy making to influence the involvement of private landholders with tourism and recreation.
CHAPTER NINE

CONTRIBUTION TO POLICY

9.1. At the end of Chapter Two it was stated that the objective of the thesis was to elucidate the interrelationship between private rural landholders in Scotland and tourism and recreation. Certain broad questions were posed as to the extent, nature and distribution of landholders' involvement in tourism and recreation, their attitudes to it and the effect of any such involvement on the landholding and more generally. It is considered that, by the presentation of the detailed information in Chapters Four to Eight, this objective has been satisfied. It was also stated in Chapter Two that, owing to the expressed interest and activities of public agencies in Scotland in influencing tourism and recreation and rural development, an associated objective of the thesis was to use the results to contribute to policy making. This is the purpose of this final chapter. In this way some of the results presented earlier will be summarised and drawn together, but with a particular purpose in mind.

9.2. Initially, some general suggestions are made of ways in which policy makers might take note of the evidence, as a basis from which policies may be framed. This is followed by more specific suggestions for the carrying out of policies, which may be considered by government agencies.
The benefits of the provision of facilities for tourism and recreation by private landholders deserve special consideration

9.3. These benefits were discussed in Chapter Eight. Private benefits to landholders from facility provision are partly non-economic. These include, in particular, the satisfaction of altruistic motivations; the indulgence of a personal interest in the activity; enjoyment from the company provided and the satisfaction obtained from making use of spare resources (8.2., 7.4.). Although the attainment of these benefits is important as a reason for landholders providing facilities, of most concern to landholders are the consequent economic benefits from facility provision. Net income from facilities varies very considerably between holdings but is frequently very important to landholders. On part-time and spare-time holdings, often a very high proportion of total net income comes from tourism or recreation (8.23.). At the other end of the scale, such activities sometimes provide a high proportion of income to estates (8.25. and Appendix 2). In addition, yield on capital invested in facility provision is often very high owing to the use of existing resources at essentially zero opportunity cost (8.5.).

9.4. The social benefits come from a number of different directions. With respect to rural development objectives, the provision of facilities specifically by landholders can bring economic benefit to rural areas where such benefit is badly needed (8.64.). The
interest of landholders with low agricultural incomes is
growing, in particular (8.69., 6.21.). In the main, where
facilities are provided by private landholders, direct income
and employment created by the enterprises stay within the local
area (8.65.). Further to this, indirectly generated income and
employment can benefit remote areas where such spin-offs from
increased tourism may not be possible unless landholders provide
facilities (8.75.). The considerable interest in the experience
of existing enterprises through further facility provision can
create full-time jobs where only part-time opportunities were
available previously (8.73.).

9.5. Agriculture appears to be seldom adversely affected by
formal facility provision on landholdings, neither through physical
impact nor in terms of a redistribution of resources (8.34., 8.79.).
Indeed, agricultural activities on individual landholdings can
benefit from facility provision through indirect subsidisation
and through landholders being able to stay on their holdings
full-time rather than seeking additional employment elsewhere
to enhance income.

9.6. Landholders contribute considerably to the stock of
facilities available for tourists which are inexpensive and in
the countryside, and can greatly affect the availability of certain
specific recreational opportunities (8.85.). Facility provision
by landholders promotes sound interaction between town and country
which could have beneficial consequences (8.88.). Although tourism
can damage cultural identity, most facilities on landholdings are
provided on the decision of members of indigenous communities (8.89.).
Finally, facility provision can benefit amenity through enabling better maintenance of property (8.31., 8.90.).

9.7. Against these benefits must be set the important social costs of possible landscape deterioration related to new development, and increased pressure on the countryside (8.91., 8.92.).

b) Policy makers should take note of the considerable involvement, both current and potential, of private landholders in tourism and recreation

i. Landholders' contribution to the stock of tourism and recreation facilities

9.8. Government agencies concerned with tourism and recreation should take note of the considerable contribution made by landholders to the tourism and recreation industry. Over eleven thousand individual facilities are being provided on smallholdings, farms, crofts and estates (4.21.). Taking accommodation alone, as many as 20% of all holiday bed nights in Scotland may be spent on private rural landholdings (8.62.). In addition, landholders are expressing an interest in the provision of a further 11,000 new facilities (4.21.).

9.9. In comparison with this figure, the proportion of aid to tourism and recreation which goes to private landholders should be considered. The S.T.B. estimates that about 12% (2.64.) of its financial assistance to tourism projects has been given to landholders and the H.I.D.B. reckon that, in recent years, the proportion of its tourism assistance so deployed is between 8% and
9% (2.68.). In addition, a considerable amount of Government money is used to benefit tourism through the D.A.F.S. Crofters' Housing Scheme (2.76.). The proportion of the total amount paid out through the scheme which goes towards tourism cannot be assessed and it is restricted to crofters providing bed and breakfast or, indirectly, holiday cottages.

ii. The contribution which facility provision makes to landholders' incomes

9.10. Government agencies concerned with agriculture, land use, the rural economy and rural development should take note of the considerable involvement of landholders in facility provision and the contribution which this makes to the rural economy. Over 13% of all landholders in Scotland are actively involved in the provision of facilities for tourism and recreation (4.9.) and a further 8% are considering such involvement. Taking all landholdings throughout Scotland, the total net income accruing to landholders from recreation and tourism through direct involvement is estimated to be between about £10m. and £15m. (8.35.). This is quite an impressive sum and indeed is equivalent to between about 5% and 11% of net income to landholders from agriculture (8.38.).

9.11. The fact that tourism and recreation have already made a considerable contribution to landholders' incomes, coupled with the fact that a large number of landholders have ideas for further facility provision in the future, is evidence of an important role for tourism and recreation on farms, crofts and estates in developing
the economy of rural areas. Whereas Government support to agriculture on landholdings in Scotland in 1976/7 amounted to as much as £53m.*, this financial support is aimed at increasing and maintaining agricultural production and the social element is but incidental. Government support for recreation and tourism on landholdings provides a means for aid to be more specifically linked with rural development aims, stimulating the growth of income and employment. Information given in Chapter Two (2.63. - 2.86.) suggests that the existing amount of annual financial aid to tourism and recreation on landholdings through S.T.B., H.I.D.B. and the D.A.F.S. Crofters' Housing Scheme, is considerably under £2m. It is arguable that the existing financial aid schemes and advisory services, and the amount of aid provided, could be increased in the future in order to take full advantage of the value to the development of the rural economy of the provision of recreation and tourism facilities on private landholdings.

iii. Types of landholding involved with facility provision

9.12. It is important that policy makers should be aware of the extent to which facility provision on private landholdings is an activity which pervades all types of landholding.

9.13. There is a tendency for a higher percentage of larger holdings and those with a larger commercial base in agriculture to be engaged in facility provision at present (6.12., 6.20.), suggesting that the existence of physical and economic resources

is important in this respect. However, smaller holdings, which may have the need but not the resources, exhibit a considerable interest in facility provision and a greater potential growth rate (6.21.). Facility provision is more commonly associated with upland agriculture (6.33.) and, in particular, is prevalent where sport is a form of land use (6.36.). However, in general, it must be accepted that the provision of facilities fairly well permeates all types of holding (6.46.).

9.14. The proportion of estates providing facilities is considerably greater than the proportion of farms and crofts doing so (4.14.). This involvement has caused the land agency and chartered surveying profession, landowners' organisations, and so on to promote the cause of tourism and recreation on estates and lobby government agencies accordingly. Policy makers may therefore have tended to link the subject of tourism and recreation on private land with private estates. However, they must appreciate that, although the situation has been different in the past (4.30.), farms and crofts are now numerically more important than estates in terms of their involvement in facility provision (4.19.), although they have less of a collective voice. Also, in particular, the growth of new interest in tourism and recreation is important amongst farmers and, especially, crofters (4.17.).

iv. The extent and effect of de facto access on landholdings

9.15. Government agencies concerned with informal countryside recreation should appreciate that 39% of landholdings in Scotland
experience some form of de facto access by the public for recreation (4.42.). It is important that the implications of this access to landholders be understood. In general, it appears that the actual fact of access does not generate objections from landholders, it is rather the specific effect of the access. The ratio of landholders generally objecting to de facto access to those welcoming it is greater on holdings where access has not occurred (7.74.). About half the landholdings experiencing de facto access do not suffer nuisance or damage from it (8.41.): many of these landholders welcome access (7.76.). Where nuisance or damage has occurred, it has tended to dictate attitudes, but problems arising in the main relate to specific, isolated, unthinking actions by the few, rather than from the sheer presence of people on the land (8.57.). De facto access should be recognised as contributing, in an important way, to the recreational benefits obtained by the public from the countryside.

2. SUGGESTIONS FOR POLICY

9.16. Two fundamental suggestions for the basis of future policies emerge from the previous section. In light of the private and social benefits which can arise from facility provision by landholders, and of the presumption in Chapter Two, that there will be a long term growth in demand for tourism and recreation on private landholdings in Scotland (2.92.), it is suggested that policy makers should encourage the growth of facility provision by landholders. The second suggestion arises from characteristics
of landholders' attitudes to de facto access, and the nature of
nuisance and damage arising from this access, as outlined in the
previous paragraph, and from the fact that, despite the considerable
amount of de facto access in Scotland, few access agreements have
been made to formalise access and little interest has been shown
in such agreements (2.72., 7.83.). The suggestion is that govern-
ment agencies and local authorities should concentrate their efforts
not so much on trying to reduce de facto access by formalising it,
but rather on managing it and on vigorously pursuing educational
policies, especially aimed at schools and children, to reduce the
occurrence of specific types of nuisance and damage.

9.17. The rest of this section is concerned with ways of increasing
the benefits and decreasing the costs of tourism and recreation on
landholdings; with ways of encouraging landholders to provide
facilities and with making a few recommendations for further
research work.

a) Increasing the benefits and decreasing the costs of
facility provision

i. Marketing

9.18. The main factor determining the relative financial success
or failure of enterprises was occupancy. Government agencies may
therefore wish to consider carefully ways of enhancing occupancy
rates. Some important issues are discussed below.

9.19. The location of an enterprise with respect to popular
tourist areas was especially important in determining occupancy (8.97.). The location factor tended to overshadow variations in individual landholder's advertising efforts (8.98.). Therefore government agencies have an important role to play in generally promoting less frequented parts of Scotland and in improving the public image of certain areas. This has been a major aspect of the marketing policy of the S.T.B. and the H.I.D.B. for some time and this research merely emphasises the importance of such policies to tourism on private landholdings. The Western Isles is an example of an area where occupancy rates are low but where there is a growing interest in facility provision amongst landholders (6.58.).

9.20. It is probable that landholders would benefit from pooling marketing resources with neighbours in a particular area, thereby promoting the area and their facilities more widely. Also, marketing agencies for facilities on farms, crofts and estates could play a beneficial role. The problem here is that tourism in rural areas in Scotland is exceptionally seasonal. Most landholders hardly need to advertise at all for certain months of the year and may be reluctant to pay an agent's commission for bookings in this period. Commercial agents do really need year round business to ensure viability. An additional problem which agencies might face is that return bookings are especially prevalent in respect of accommodation on farms, crofts and estates (8.98.) - a landholder could rapidly build up a clientele and then cease to use the agency.
9.21. In the light of these problems, the onus may remain with the S.T.B. and the H.I.D.B. in their own promotions of off-season holidays in rural areas of Scotland. However, these bodies might consider in detail the potential of commercial agencies and joint marketing schemes in relation to tourism and recreation on landholdings and their own role in encouraging and aiding such activities.

9.22. The 'farming' element of many of the facilities visited was strictly limited. The marketing of much of what landholders have to offer as farm based tourism or recreation could be misleading. There is a problem of product identity here.

ii. Advice to landholders

9.23. The form of advice needed. The considerable variation in the economic benefits gained from recreation and tourism on landholdings (8.4.) suggests the potential for enhancing benefits if advice is available to the landholder on the financial and managerial aspects of facility provision and the potential of his holding. This would entail advice on resources required and resources available, establishment cost estimates, sources of finance, planning permission, potential labour requirements, items of running cost, pricing, advertising, potential occupancy and local demand forecasts, integration with farm life and so on. In particular such advice is needed by farmers and crofters who usually have neither a resident factor nor a tradition of referring to professional land management services.

9.24. It is suggested that there are a number of particular factors
to be borne in mind in relation to advice to landholders. Landholders can obtain considerable non-economic benefits from facility provision (8.2.). It is frequently the non-economic benefits which stimulate a particular landholder to consider facility provision in the first place (7.4. to 7.6.) and to give advice geared purely to maximising commercial return may not satisfy him and indeed may kill his interest.

9.25. Landholders can receive high yields on investment from facility provision by using spare resources which have no or few possible alternative uses — e.g. cottages, small parcels of land (8.103.). At the outset, landholders should be advised on assessing what suitable resources they have available. It is important that landholdings should be considered in their entirety rather than specific developments being analysed in isolation. The presence of one enterprise can indirectly help another and vice versa (8.79.) and there are also taxation questions to consider (8.33.).

9.26. Landholders in the past have relied on a knowledge of other people's charges in assessing price (8.100.). These may not give suitable guidance for the particular enterprise. Advice on pricing is necessary; price is important in determining the success or failure of enterprises (8.99.) and many private landholders may have been under-pricing in the past. If landholders could obtain a better return by increasing price, then this should be pointed out to them. A landholder would probably be happier to raise his price if he had knowledge that other landholders in
Scotland are doing the same — widespread advice to landholders on this could certainly help. However, there is another side to the argument. Advisors must realise that often landholders do get some benefit from feeling that they are providing inexpensive enjoyment and do not like charging above what they judge the facilities to be worth. Such attitude reflects rather a special quality, in keeping with the traditions of many rural communities and it could be directly to the detriment of tourism and recreation in Scotland if insensitive commercial advice undermined this.

9.27. Most landholders visited had become well versed in methods of keeping running costs down. Variation in net income was far more closely associated with variation in revenue (8.96.). Therefore it is more important that advice is given on demand and, when such advice is given, it is vital that it relates to the specific areas in question. Recreational facilities (e.g. pony-trekking, fishing) did well where there was a considerable element of demand from local residents (8.97.). Landholders need advice on residents' demands for recreation, specific to local areas. In addition, landholders could well benefit from hints on how to assess markets and on influencing demand through marketing.

9.28. It is fair that, in giving advice which does not entail financial assistance, considerations of private costs and benefits should override. Many social benefits tend to follow from private benefits anyway. One particular social cost involved with facility provision concerns landscape deterioration and other environmental amenity factors (8.91.). It is up to the local authorities through
their planning procedures to ensure that these costs are mini-
mised and it is vital that they should do so. Advisors should be well informed of the policies of the relevant local authorities before giving advice; they could advise landholders against ideas which would not obtain planning permission, and generally ensure that facilities complied with good standards of amenity.

9.29. Alternative advisory services. The preceding paragraphs make it clear that advisors should be able to see potential for tourism and recreation developments within the total context of the landholding and to appreciate the landholder's perception of his proposals. Knowledge of the economics of facility provision and of markets and simple marketing is also important.

9.30. Looking at existing advisory services, it may be difficult for the S.T.B. and the H.I.D.B. tourism staff, who certainly have the necessary expertise in tourism, to take the 'whole landholding' viewpoint. Besides, much of the contact between the S.T.B. and H.I.D.B. and potential developers involves applications for fin-
ancial assistance. It is possible that advisors would, consciously or sub-consciously, always consider facilities in relation to their Board's policy on financial assistance and landholders may also be affected by such considerations when asking for advice from these bodies. All in all, existing services offered by S.T.B. and H.I.D.B. do not appear entirely suitable for giving simple advisory work on the ground involving close contact with, and knowledge of, a landholder's technical problems. The recent policy of H.I.D.B. to provide area development officers could, however, be of value here (2.69.).
9.31. The socio-economic advisors in the Agricultural Colleges (2.77.) have the advantage of being part of a service and an industry with long traditions of advising landholders. This means that landholders should not be reticent in seeking advice from this quarter. Many landholders have close contact already with area agricultural advisors, who can then put them in touch with the socio-economic advisors as necessary. In addition, the socio-economic advisors have experience in all aspects of economic developments on landholdings and can help landholders compare possible tourism or recreation enterprises with agriculture, and assess the use of resources available. This is particularly important. However, although much of their work has been in this field, the existing socio-economic advisors are not experts in recreation and tourism.

9.32. Three alternative ways of increasing advisory services to landholders might be considered. The first is developing the work of the socio-economic advisors. Contact between the socio-economic advisors and STB, HIDB, CCS and other relevant bodies has been inadequate. It is suggested that formal regular meetings (perhaps once a quarter) are held between the advisors and these bodies to liaise on policy and to discuss specific developments and the line of general enquiries which are coming in. Training (under Article 4 of Directive 72/161/EEC) of the Scottish advisors with relation to tourism and recreation matters has taken place in England. It is recommended that informal seminars are held for them in Scotland.

9.33. It is felt that a higher level of expertise in the tourism and recreation aspects of land management on all types of holding would be beneficial. With such expertise, socio-economic advisors
could see tasks through completely, rather than acting only as links in a chain. At present, although much of the work of the advisors in Scotland has concerned tourism and recreation, they probably cannot afford the time to become specialists in the subject. This is because, under the EEC Directive, the socio-economic advisor's work must cover all aspects of economic and human problems on landholdings and the potential for various kinds of development. Therefore it is suggested that the socio-economic advisory service should be expanded and, indeed, it could include specialist advisors on tourism and recreation in relation to farms, crofts and estates.

9.34. A second alternative could be an advisory centre, supported by government agencies, for tourism and recreation on farms, crofts and estates in Scotland. This would be a way in which various agencies concerned with tourism and recreation could jointly contribute to increasing the amount of advice available to landholders without the burden being borne by any one agency alone. The centre could be similar to the Farm-based Recreation Information Centre in England (2.86). The advantage of such a centre over reliance on socio-economic advisors is that it would enable comprehensive information to be collected and analysed by one organisation thus rationalising and enhancing the growth of expertise on the subject. The relative disadvantage is that landholders might be sceptical about it as 'yet another organisation', whereas the agricultural advisory service is already well established. In addition, the centre would need to have field staff and they might duplicate in some respects the work of the socio-economic advisors. The staff, however, could be private consultants, as with FBRIC, but it is doubtful whether sufficient consultants
exist in Scotland who are prepared to travel very long distances
to deal with small scale developments (for example on crofts) for
a small fee. The centre could certainly do a lot of good as a
postal and telephone enquiry point.

9.35. The third possibility is the appointment of new tourism and
recreation development staff by STB or HIDB with sufficient
agricultural and land management experience to deal specifically
with advice to landholders. The advantages would be that new overhead
costs could be kept down and that a major concentration of tourism
and recreation information and experience exists within these bodies.
The disadvantage is that landholders would be unlikely to see
the advisory service as anything different from the existing work
of the bodies concerned, and its impact could be slight. The
advantage over the present situation might be limited to the
agricultural and land management experience of the advisor appointed.

9.36. From an initial consideration, it seems that the relative
merits of these three alternatives correspond to the order in which
they were presented above. The major advantage of the socio-economic
advisors is the traditional links between the landholders and
the agricultural advisory service.

iii. Financial assistance to landholders

9.37. The main benefit of the grants and loans provided by
government agencies is that they enable those landholders to
invest in facilities who might otherwise not have the means to
do so, thereby encouraging the growth of tourism and recreation
on farms, crofts and estates. This will be discussed in the next
section. A word is offered here about financial assistance in
relation to the costs and benefits of facility provision.

9.38. It is suggested that government agencies should in their general policies take into account the factors pertaining to advice to landholders described above. It is considered important that policy on financial assistance should, in addition, take careful account of the potential social costs and benefits of facility provision on farms, crofts and estates. Government agencies, in considering their response to applications for financial assistance may therefore wish to take account of the following criteria.

9.39. Landholders might be favoured who propose facilities which contribute in a less common way to the stock of facilities available to the public generally (8.85). Consideration of existing provision on landholdings (4.24 - 4.28; Chapter 5) suggests a lack of: accommodation with the possibility of some involvement with agriculture (e.g. fruit picking, helping on the farm or croft); facilities for indoor (wet weather) recreation (e.g. museums); countryside interpretation facilities (e.g. farm trails and open days); and catering (e.g. farmhouse teas, general catering, milk bars, evening meals in areas with large numbers of "Bed and Breakfast only" enterprises). It is felt that there is a demand for such facilities but data is not available and this needs further assessment. In particular, proposals might be encouraged which make use of existing resources on landholdings (e.g. derelict buildings, waste land) in a way which will positively enhance the environment or conserve otherwise deteriorating property (8.90).

9.40. Turning to rural development aims (8.59 to 8.66), priority might be given to landholders who are receiving a poor income from marginal agricultural enterprises. In particular, assistance should be given where it is likely that a landholder will give up
his holding unless another source of income is available to him.

Policy makers should realise that this is as important as the creation of new employment on the holding, if not more so. In addition, it is important that the presence of the facility should not cause agricultural output and incomes to diminish. It should be considered whether the landholder could earn an equivalent return from a similar investment in agriculture - at least so that the opportunity costs are recognised if they exist. Special consideration should be given to landholders who propose the kinds of facilities which are most likely to create indirect additional income and employment in the local area, especially in fragile areas (8.76, 8.64).

iv. Attitudes to specific facilities

9.41. It is not intended here to suggest in detail policies for specific facilities. However, government agencies might bear in mind when considering their policies on advice and support for different types of facility, the results presented earlier in the thesis (8.4, 8.9, 8.16, 8.17), whilst remembering the considerable variation between enterprises. Take, for example, chalets, pony trekking and bed and breakfast.

Chalets. The high establishment cost per chalet has meant that on average they show negative profits. Government agencies have tended to favour chalets in preference to static caravans to provide for the growing demand for self catering accommodation, since chalets offer better quality accommodation and are usually environmentally more acceptable. The above results suggest that, in pursuing this policy, a higher rate of financial assistance may be called for.
Pony trekking. Income per pony is low and sometimes negative. Landholders considering pony-trekking should be made aware of this. However, non-economic benefits can be high, especially with respect to personal interest (7.12).

Bed and breakfast. Contrary to an often expressed notion, management and investment income per bed from enterprises providing an evening meal was found to be greater, on average, than from enterprises providing no meal (8.17, Facts Sheet 3).

v. Reducing the costs of de facto access.

9.42. At the beginning of this section, as a general direction for policy, it was recommended that government agencies should concentrate their efforts on education on the use of the countryside in order to reduce the occurrence of specific types of nuisance and damage. In particular, they should concentrate on the reduction of the following types of nuisance and damage, as they were found to be the most serious on private landholdings (8.44):

Litter — the danger of certain types of litter and the squalor of other types have often been stressed in the past, but still it is the most common problem faced by landholders.

Gates left open.

Disturbance of stock by dogs.

9.43. The policy of managing de facto access rather than formalising access was also suggested above. Estate proprietors trying to reduce nuisance and damage through personal contact with visitors found this contact had better success than other measures (8.104).
Similarly, visitors who ask permission for access cause less nuisance and damage (8.105). However, many landholders were unable to find time for such personal contact. These facts suggest that there should be more liaison between landholders and the public through the agency of third parties. It is suggested that the following two proposals should be considered.

9.44. In popular tourist areas, landholders should be encouraged to supply to tourism information centres details of those areas and times where there is a particular risk from nuisance and damage. This applies especially to estates and common grazings as large landholdings with considerable de facto access (4.45). However, landholders should appreciate that the aim is to reduce nuisance and damage, not access as such, and that information centres can take no responsibility for the results. The onus for providing the information lies with the landholder, while the task of finding effective ways of disseminating it, and of interesting the public in it, should lie with those responsible for the information centres.

9.45. In areas where de facto access is heavy, it should be made possible for ranger services to receive grant aid, irrespective of whether or not the land is being managed primarily for public access (2.73). Landholders may be unwilling to have formal access agreements or to set aside land primarily for access but rather would welcome, or at least accept, de facto access coupled with measures to combat nuisance and damage (9.15). In particular, a collection of neighbouring estate proprietors and farmers may agree together to provide a ranger service.
operation over their properties. Such joint action and concern should encourage and should receive financial support. There may be scope for services providing direct financial aid for visitor management projects as part of the ranger services. These could be similar to the series of Upland Management Experiments and the new Upland Management Advisory Service which were restricted to England and Wales (2.55., 2.56.).

b) Encouraging landholders to provide facilities for tourism and recreation

i. Pursuing interest and counteracting constraints

Government agencies are most likely to have success in promoting tourism and recreation to landholders where an initial interest has been expressed. The results in Chapters Four and Six of this thesis suggest that such an interest is well distributed amongst all types of landholder; therefore efforts should likewise be well distributed. It should be appreciated that a large proportion of landholders with facilities at present are considering expansion and that these landholders tend to have larger holdings (4.4., 4.12., 6.9.). However, as they already have experience of the subject, it is felt that promotional effort need not be directed to them in particular. The growth in new interest in facility provision relative to existing provision was especially marked with smaller holdings, notably crofts in the outer islands, and government agencies should take note of the considerable potential for the promotion of interest here (4.15., 6.58.).
9.47. The same principle can be applied to facility types. The facilities which landholders most frequently mentioned in relation to ideas for future provision are bed and breakfast, touring caravan and camping sites, static caravans, holiday cottages and simple informal recreation facilities (car parks, picnic sites) in that order. Therefore, promotion of these facilities is most likely to meet initial success. However, there are other facilities where there is an especially marked growth in interest when compared with existing provision. Government agencies should consider concentrating promotion on these facilities; namely chalets, pony-trekking, again touring caravan and camping sites, shops, cafes, farm open days, and simple informal recreation facilities (4.29.).

9.48. Contact with landholders is especially important. The provision of more recreation and tourism-conscious agricultural advisors would be valuable and has been mentioned above. The front-line agricultural advisors have an important role to play - some have been playing it in the past, especially amongst crofters. Whilst one should not expect agricultural advisors actively to promote tourism, they should be ready to recognise interest and the situations where new developments might benefit the landholder, and encourage the initial contact with the socio-economic advisors or advisory centre or S.T.B./H.I.D.B. staff as recommended in the previous section.

9.49. Information in Chapter Seven provides valuable clues as to reasons why landholders are not providing any, or any more facilities (7.36. to 7.68.). In attempting to promote the
provision of facilities on landholdings, government agencies should consider which constraints are prevalent and which could be most readily overcome. The results have certain implications for action, which are described in the next few paragraphs.

9.50. Probably as many as 50% of landholders are simply not interested in recreation or tourism, value their privacy or do not think agriculturalists should be involved in such activities (7.38 to 7.43). No promotional policy can be recommended here, and probably none should be, for such landholders would not benefit from facilities nor provide them well. In addition, about 15% of landholders (26% of crofters) consider themselves too old or infirm to become involved (7.44).

9.51. The high proportion (33%) of landholders concerned about lack of suitable land and lack of time (7.45, 7.46) gives weight to the importance of having an advisory service based on agricultural expertise, as recommended earlier. Should these landholders consider tourism or recreation, they will need advisors who can explain to them how facilities can fit in with agricultural and other traditional enterprises, both physically and in the time schedule of the landholder, his family and his employees. In this way, such an advisory service would play an important role in promoting tourism and recreation provision amongst landholders.

9.52. Publication and open discussion of information about existing provision on private landholdings might help to
stimulate initial interest. The results presented in Chapter Six do show that provision has been possible on all types of holdings - large and small, busy and with time to spare, upland and arable. This fact could encourage the 33% of landholders concerned about lack of time or suitable land to consider the matter further and perhaps seek advice from someone who can assess the situation on their holdings. The fact that facility provision in the past has caused little nuisance or damage on the holding itself (8.34.) is worth publicising, especially amongst estate proprietors, as this was mentioned as an important constraint on estates (7.39.). Likewise, there could be more discussion, with figures, of the profitability of enterprises, although concern about enterprise profitability was not frequently mentioned as an initial constraint. If this kind of information was disseminated to landholders, and the advisability of this must be considered carefully, then it would be essential to point out at the same time that situations do vary considerably from holding to holding (8.4., 8.23.) and to refer to the non-economic benefits experienced by some (8.2.).

9.53. The disadvantage of promotional literature based on current experience is that it might discourage new ideas. The Wales Tourist Board's booklet "The Farmers' Guide to Tourism" (Wales Tourist Board, 1977) lists certain less usual facilities which readers might consider. In general, in the interests of flexibility and of encouraging the best kinds of developments in each case, it is suggested that literature should aim to instil interest in tourism and recreation and then to recommend that
the landholder seeks further advice — rather than promoting individual facility types. Simply worded booklets, attractively presented and widely distributed which, in particular, mention the available advisory services might be the answer. Advisors could use more detailed development guides on particular facility types where appropriate. Such guides could be produced by the S.T.B. for certain facilities, covering such issues as planning permission and marketing. These could be for general use and not restricted to landholders.

9.54. The importance of the perceived problem of obtaining landlord's permission as a constraining factor on tenanted farms (7.59.) should be seen in the light of the fact that as many tenanted farms as owner occupied farms are providing facilities (6.39.). This suggests that possibly much of the concern is unfounded. Government agencies should encourage a wider liaison between estate owners and tenants on recreation and tourism issues, possibly through the Scottish Landowners' Federation and the National Farmers' Union of Scotland.

9.55. Lack of capital was relatively important on most holdings but especially so on crofts (7.54.). This has implications for financial assistance which is the subject of the next few paragraphs.

ii. Financial assistance

9.56. In the light of much of what has been stated above, it is suggested that consideration should be given to expanding financial assistance to landholders. Information from the research and a
consideration of existing aid schemes, leads to the suggestion that three possibilities should be considered by policy makers. These are outlined below.

9.57. First, it is suggested that Article 10.2. of the E.E.C. Directive 75/268 on mountain and hill farming in certain less favoured areas needs to be implemented. This Article relates to the Farm and Horticulture Development Scheme (F.H.D.S.) whereby landholders whose earned income is below a certain minimum* but yet who have been in agriculture for 5 years (or have a recognised qualification) and who earn at least 50% of their income from agriculture and spend over 50% of their time in it, can draw up a 6 year development plan for investment with grant aid from the Scheme, provided such a plan will bring the total earned income per labour unit (i.e. 1 man's work) over the minimum.* In less favoured areas - much of Scotland qualifies as this - landholders can include recreation and tourism enterprises in the plan to enable them to achieve the final total income per labour unit to meet the required minimum, provided that at least one labour unit of agricultural work is carried out after the development, and still half the total income comes from agriculture. However, tourism and recreation projects are not eligible for grant under the Scheme in the U.K. as Article 10.2. of the Directive has not been implemented. As this is so, it is recommended that the Article should be implemented now, and for the following reasons:

the interest of the holders of small farms in tourism and recreation shows considerable potential growth (6.9. to 6.21.);

* £3,300 for 1977.
the social benefits of tourism and recreation developments are probably high where these activities are directly contributing to enhancing income on the poorer landholdings (8.60, 8.67);

tourism and recreation facilities would be established on holdings where agriculture is also being developed, so that it is unlikely that they would use financial, physical or labour resources with high opportunity costs in terms of potential alternative use in agriculture;

landholders previously have been well able to integrate facilities with developing agricultural enterprises (8.79);

socio-economic advisors have had considerable experience with the F.H.D.S. and it has been recommended that their tourism and recreation advisory activities be enhanced (9.31. to 9.33., 9.36); and

such a step would involve new grants for tourism and recreation, with a different emphasis, within a structure which exists already.

9.58. If the Article is implemented, investment in tourism up to a maximum of about 10,000 units of account (equivalent to about £6,000 in early 1977) per landholding could qualify for grant aid. Many of the recreation or tourism enterprises surveyed entailed investment within this limit. The special nature of, and social benefits from, grants offered through the F.H.D.S.
in this way make them of special value in their own right. Indeed, landholders considering the overall development of their holdings may well favour receiving help through the Scheme rather than making individual approaches to a variety of government agencies. The Scheme should not be compared directly with existing grants available from other government agencies.

9.59. The second suggestion is that more financial assistance should be made available to crofters and similar landholders to cover a substantial amount of the establishment cost of small scale developments, and that low interest rate loans should be considered. The requirements of the F.H.D.S. programme that half of the landholder's initial income and time spent should involve agriculture and that the six year plan should provide at least one labour unit of agricultural work, will preclude many crofters from taking advantage of it. However, the interest in facility provision by crofters is growing considerably (4.15.). Many need extra income and lack of capital is a major constraint on crofts (7.54.). Therefore it is proposed that more financial assistance should be made available to crofters covering a substantial amount of the establishment cost of small scale developments.

9.60. Considering the success of the D.A.F.S. Crofters' Housing Scheme, and crofters' keenness on low interest loans (2.76., 7.81.), finance of this nature is suggested for consideration. The main suggestion is that such finance should be made available irrespective
of which of the bodies (S.T.B., H.I.D.B., D.A.F.S.) will ultimately be responsible for it. However, it is suggested that the expansion of the Crofters' Housing Scheme itself should be considered as one method of bringing this about. The Scheme itself could cover small scale tourism and recreation facilities (e.g. chalets, touring caravan sites, small craft workshops and/or craft shops) in addition to the provision of accommodation in the house; also, it could be extended to cover small marginal holdings similar to crofts but outwith crofting tenure.

9.61. There are a number of reasons for this suggestion. It seems divisive that only crofters should be eligible for this assistance and not other landholders with very small marginal holdings - an area and standard man day criterion is recommended instead. This is especially relevant in the light of the Crofting Reform (Scotland) Act, 1976. This would bring the Scheme outside the H.I.D.B. area and so preclude that Board from exclusive operation. It would probably not be a good idea to involve the S.T.B. in the Scheme as they have little experience of work with this kind of holding. D.A.F.S. would be able both to define the needy holdings and to administer the Scheme throughout Scotland. S.T.B. and H.I.D.B. might find it difficult to justify this preferential treatment of small landholders within their general tourism and recreation development schemes. The D.A.F.S. agricultural and socio-economic advisors would again be important here. They could give advice and directly administer the financial assistance.
9.62. Finally, it is suggested that general finance for tourism and recreation through the S.T.B. and the H.I.D.B. is likely to remain the major source of financial assistance for facility provision on landholdings. The two schemes outlined above would provide means of increasing the amount of financial assistance available to landholders but would be restricted to those who are specifically concerned with agricultural development on their holding and who qualify for assistance for less favoured areas under the F.H.D.S., or have very small marginal landholdings. Therefore it is suggested that S.T.B. and H.I.D.B. might seek to increase their financial assistance to landholders in general. This will be necessary in order to enable the whole range of social and private benefits from facility provision to be brought out. These bodies should, in particular, pay careful attention to each of the criteria for the giving of financial assistance outlined earlier in the chapter. No particular change in the nature of assistance given by the S.T.B. and H.I.D.B. is suggested, provided that the schemes outlined above come into effect. However, it is recommended that S.T.B. and H.I.D.B. should simplify application procedures and give a prompter appraisal of applications, if at all possible. The reputation of these bodies in this respect has been poor (7.80.) and probably more developments could have taken place with their assistance had this not been so. The H.I.D.B. has recently simplified its procedure for processing small applications and their new use of local development officers may help here.
c) **Recommended further research**

9.63. The results of the research, and especially the discussion in this chapter, point to the following areas where further research is needed; research which should be considered by the research departments of government agencies and by Universities.

9.64. The suggestions made in this chapter need to be studied in the light of knowledge about future demand for tourism and recreation in rural areas. In particular, investigations might enquire of visitors' (including overseas visitors') concepts of what recreation and tourism on farms, crofts and estates is or should be.

9.65. Further studies of the economics of specific facilities, with possible output as development manuals, would be valuable. In particular, pony-trekking might be studied, as there appears to be a growing interest amongst landholders in this facility (4.29.) and yet financial results seem poor (8.4.).

9.66. No U.K. study of European and American farm tourism and recreation exists, relating experience in these places to the situation here (2.2.). A better knowledge of the support systems operated (notably within the E.E.C.) is needed. Information is also required on the kinds of facility provided abroad.

9.67. Further work on facilities on private landholdings in Scotland might entail monitoring the changes over time in a few case study enterprises. This monitoring could fit in with the work of the advisory services discussed above.
3. SOME THOUGHTS ON THE ROLES OF INDIVIDUAL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

9.68. The policy suggestions made in this chapter have been put forward mainly for consideration by government agencies in general. Certain of these could, if desired, be implemented by particular agencies on their own initiative. However, it is realised that some of the issues might mean new directives to specific agencies from the Secretary of State. Further, it may be that some of the suggestions are not practicable or possible within the existing statutory framework. Where this is so, the suggestions might be considered as pointers to possible changes in legislation. These final paragraphs discuss the implications of the suggestions made in this chapter for the general roles of certain government agencies.

9.69. Most of the suggestions relating to de facto access concern the Countryside Commission for Scotland and the local authorities. They may involve some changes in, or underlining of, emphasis in the Commission's work, especially with respect to education and the management of de facto recreation.

9.70. The suggestions relating to the provision of facilities on private land are more numerous and far reaching. They cover issues relating to tourism and recreation, agriculture and rural economic development. The Highlands and Islands Development Board is uniquely placed to respond to developments affected by all three fields and their inter-relationship. The Board has a general development remit but also has specific divisions concerned with tourism and development and with land use (including agriculture).
There are two main factors which limit the scope for policy implementation by the Board: first, as an agency its area of operation is restricted to the Highlands and Islands; and, secondly, the Board does not have the direct links on the ground with agricultural landholders in the way that D.A.F.S. has, although changes are being made, especially through the employment of some locally based staff. However, the Board is considerably implicated by the general suggestions for policy which have been put forward. In addition, some of the specific suggestions mentioned below as particularly concerning the S.T.B. may also concern the H.I.D.B. within the Highlands and Islands.

9.71. The Scottish Tourist Board is especially implicated by the suggestions relating to increasing the stock of tourism facilities and to the nature of such facilities. The Board's role in encouraging economic growth through tourism development has been emphasised recently. In its Preliminary National Strategy (S.T.B., 1975) the Board identifies the creation of new jobs and the raising of incomes as two of the major objectives for tourism. Recently, the Board has been paying special attention to development in areas ('fragile' areas) identified as having economic need; many of these are rural areas. Therefore, the Board is certainly in a position to follow the general suggestions for the encouragement of tourism on private landholdings, argued on the grounds of rural economic development. Indeed, tourism of this kind can help to fulfill other policies of the Board - for example the encouragement of developments with local character.
Many of the specific suggestions which have been made implicate the S.T.B.: in particular, support to the expanding advisory services (in whatever form they take), the development of new literature, marketing and financial assistance.

9.72. The S.T.B. (following a directive from the Secretary of State) is now aiming to "stimulate appropriate product development in areas of greatest economic and social need, and identify opportunities for public sector/private sector partnership schemes in achieving this" (S.T.B., 1977). The Board proposes direct participation in certain schemes. So far, plans have involved only major developments such as holiday villages. It may be that the S.T.B. can play this direct role in relation to stimulating smaller scale developments on farms, crofts and estates. In paragraph 9.62. it was recommended that S.T.B. and H.I.D.B. should pay special attention to the whole range of criteria for granting financial assistance suggested in paragraphs 9.38. to 9.40. The S.T.B. could seek to set up particularly good examples of facilities which meet these criteria. By becoming involved in facility provision at a smaller scale, they may be able to bring more widespread benefit than through involvement in major developments.

9.73. The final government agency to be considered is a government department, the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries for Scotland. Some of the policy ideas presented in this chapter concern D.A.F.S. specifically; notably, the role of the socio-economic advisors and the suggestions for the expansion of financial assistance available to landholders. The role of the Department in Scotland
is to promote agriculture. No major new role for the
Department is suggested, but rather the suggestions made
do imply that the Department should accept the full implications
of the position it holds and the resources which it controls.

9.74. Certain results in this thesis point to the considerable
effect of recreation and tourism on landholders' incomes.
Some of the existing work of D.A.F.S. explicitly relates to
economic and social conditions on landholdings. The objectives
of the E.E.C. less favoured areas Directive (E.E.C., 1975), ad-
ministered by D.A.F.S., specifically refer to landholders' incomes
and rural depopulation, in the following passage: "Whereas the
steady decline in agricultural incomes in these areas ... is
causing large scale depopulation of farming and rural areas ... 
jeopardising the viability and continued habitation of those areas,
the population of which is predominantly dependent on an agricultural
economy". Also, the existing Crofters' Housing Scheme serves a
social function. Further, with respect to the remit of D.A.F.S.
to promote agricultural production, the economic circumstances and
activities of farmers, crofters and private landholders must
surely have implications for agriculture. Some of the implications
have been suggested in this thesis. Therefore, through its concern
with agriculture, the Department should be able to develop and
promote policies relating to recreation and tourism on landholdings
on the lines suggested above. It is accepted that this might
require intervention by the Secretary of State or further legislation
to give D.A.F.S. a slightly wider remit to recognise and respond to
non-agricultural developments or potential developments affecting
agriculture and agricultural landholders.
9.75. Interestingly, an expansion in the outlook and activities of the Ministry of Agriculture (M.A.F.F.) covering wider agricultural and rural issues has been the subject of recommendations and discussions in England and Wales. The Countryside Review Committee of the Department of the Environment has recommended a wider role for M.A.F.F.'s Agricultural Development and Advisory Service concerning developments and controls in the countryside, and in a submission to that Committee the National Farmers Union (1976) wrote: "If agriculture did exist entirely independently in the countryside then a Ministry of Agriculture solely concerned with the technology of food production would be valid. Patently such independence no longer exists, nor do we live in an agrarian society. We believe it essential that the debate on the future of the countryside and countryside policies should include detailed consideration of a positive role for the Ministry of Agriculture in the development of the countryside of the future". A strong argument for expanding the role of M.A.F.F. has been made by Wibberley (1976) based on the Ministry's "long history of contact with the farming industry".

9.76. In response, the Minister directed the Advisory Council for Agriculture and Horticulture to advise him on ways in which the Ministry could "best contribute towards reconciling the national requirement for economic, agricultural and horticultural production with the development of other national objectives in the countryside in the light of public interest in recreation and access and in conservation and amenity". The result, recently published,*

*Quote from the Minister's written statement, May 3rd 1977.
entailed a recommendation: "that the Minister should build up a stronger rural advisory capability within the Agricultural Development and Advisory Service". It is suggested that the same consideration should apply to Scotland.

9.77. In conclusion, it is suggested that all the agencies referred to in this chapter should give consideration to their potential individual response to issues raised arising from the research. However, careful consultation and liaison between the agencies is essential in order to agree on a coordinated approach. It is hoped that policy makers will thereby be able to ensure that benefits from recreation and tourism on private rural landholdings are fully available in Scotland.
APPENDIX ONE

DETAILED INFORMATION ON THE MANAGEMENT AND ECONOMICS OF CERTAIN COMMON FACILITIES

This appendix contains many detailed results obtained from interviews with landholders. The results are presented for seven facility types, set out as facts sheets, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facts sheet</th>
<th>Facility type</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Holiday cottages</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chalets</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bed and breakfast</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Static caravans</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Caravan sites</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pony-trekking</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Permit fishing</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The subjects covered are listed below; the numbering relates to a format common to each facts sheet.

1. **ESTABLISHMENT**
   a. Description
   b. Duration
   c. Available resources
   d. Labour
   e. Establishment cost
   f. Financing the establishment
   g. Planning permission
   h. Landowner's permission

2. **OPERATION**
   a. Labour
   b. Advertising
   c. Running costs
   d. Price
   e. Occupancy
3. **FINANCIAL RESULTS**

a. Revenue  
b. Net income  
c. Management and investment income  
d. Profit  
e. Yield  

**NOTES**

i. The economic results relate to 1973 prices.

ii. Yield has been calculated on the actual establishment expenditure (see 8.5.).

iii. The 10.85% interest rate used in the calculation of profit is the yield on 2 1/8% Consols in 1973 (see 8.8.).
FACTS SHEET NO. 1

HOLIDAY COTTAGES

This Facts Sheet covers existing cottages let for holiday purposes. Chalets, purpose built units, are dealt with in Facts Sheet No. 2, which compares chalets with holiday cottages; Facts Sheet No. 2 should therefore be read in conjunction with this Facts Sheet No. 1.

23 holdings with holiday cottages were visited.

The numbers of cottages on the holdings visited were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of cottages</th>
<th>No. of holdings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average number of cottages per holding was 2.

6 of the holdings were crofts, 8 farms and 9 estates.

1. ESTABLISHMENT

a) Description

The cottages included in this Facts Sheet were all existing buildings. Many were extended, altered or refurbished before letting them as holiday cottages, although a large number were merely redecorated or hardly touched at all. The latter included cottages used by the landholder himself as his residence out of season - this was quite common on crofts. Mostly, furniture used was already in the cottage, or solid second-hand furniture was bought along with inexpensive crockery, blankets and other effects. A very few landholders had provided new furniture or had built in cupboards or shelves. TV was provided by about 25%.

b) Duration

Half the landholders visited who had more than one cottage had set them up at the same time. Others had let first one and then, some 2 years or so later, another; timing being due more to availability of cottages than to a policy of starting with one and seeing how that went.

Nearly always a cottage was made completely ready for letting in just one season; all the major investment was made in one stage. One landholder visited did internal repairs to start with and then built a new access road two years later.
c) **Available resources**

Usually the buildings used were labourers' old cottages and sometimes old croft houses. A few were part of the farm house or the landholder's own dwelling house. No conversions from farm buildings were found.

Almost all enterprises had some furniture already in the building.

d) **Labour**

30% of enterprises involved local contractors
20% of enterprises involved farm or estate employees
35% of enterprises involved the landholder's own labour (or family) only, sometimes with friendly advice from a local builder, plumber or other expert
15% of enterprises needed little, if any, labour

e) **Establishment cost**

**Average establishment cost per cottage**
(including new items of furniture): £1,782

**Variation in establishment cost**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>% of enterprises</th>
<th>Explanation of variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>£12(min) - 300</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>Usually involved a little decorating. Cottages were either quite new or very recently lived in or were the landholder's own house out of season.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>£300 - 1000</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>Usually involved major repairs, e.g. roof, floors or water system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>£1000 - 2000</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>Usually involved internal improvements, e.g. new bathroom or new kitchen or damp proofing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>£2000 - 9075 (max)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>Usually involved rebuilding, e.g. building on bathroom, heightening roof.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Furnishing cost had less effect on the variation in total establishment cost than did work on the building, since in almost all cases furnishing was not lavish. Items like new refrigerators or TV obviously have some effect.
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f) Financing the establishment:

Nature of financial resources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Financial Resources</th>
<th>Percentage of Landholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsupported</td>
<td>65% of landholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemented by grant</td>
<td>25% of landholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grants were mainly local authority grants towards new kitchens, bathrooms, re-wiring; but one landholder had received a 50% grant from the STB and another had obtained a 70% Agricultural Improvements Grant just prior to letting the cottage to holiday makers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemented by loan</td>
<td>17% of landholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most had obtained a bank loan but one crofter had received a DAFS 38% loan for building a new wing for her house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7% of landholders had received both a grant and a loan)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average establishment cost per cottage where the landholder used his own financial resources alone, or supplemented by a bank loan, was £885. However, where another type of loan or a grant was involved, the average cost was £3,209, but the effect of the financial support reduced the landholder's share to £2,512.

g) Planning permission

A few landholders building on extensions to cottages required planning permission and had no trouble in obtaining it.

h) Landowner's permission

Only one of the crofters had felt it necessary to contact the landowner regarding the holiday letting. This was over a new extension to the house and there was no disagreement. Three of the farmers were tenants. One of these farmers had been contacted by the owner over the use of farm cottages for holiday purposes. The farmer explained that, by this use, he was maintaining the cottage; something which the estate would not have been bothered with and the matter was pursued no further.
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2. OPERATION

a) Labour

Time spent on:

regular work -

cleaning:
average time per cottage per change of tenant: \(1\frac{1}{2}\) hours

Multiplying by number of changes of tenant gives total standard man days per year spent on cleaning of: 3.2 smd

Variation - this is due to the cleanliness of tenants; sometimes cleaning may take all day and sometimes it may mean a quick inspection.

taking bookings:
average time/cottage per day in spring: 12 mins.

With an average booking season of Jan., Feb., March, this roughly equals per year: 2.3 smd.

Variation - there was a large variation, depending on popularity of the location of the cottage; also on advertising. Less time was spent per cottage where there were a number of cottages or other self-catering facilities on the holding.

Estimated total average smd's for regular work: 5.5 smd per year

irregular work -

maintenance work per cottage varies year by year. No data collected but reasonable allowance per cottage: 4.0 smd per year

Estimated total average smd's (all work): 9.5 smd

Personnel involved in:

regular work -

54% of holdings - family labour, as where wife of farmer or crofter does cleaning, husband and wife share bookings

* Standard Man Day (8 hours work)
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17% of holdings - mixed, as where farmer's wife does bookings or shepherd's wife cleans
29% of holdings - non-family labour, as where forester's wife cleans and factor does bookings as part of his duties

irregular work -
maintenance usually done by farmer or crofter on farms or crofts and by maintenance staff on estates.

b) Advertising

All the landholders visited advertised their cottages in some way; the preference of outlets being shown by the following percentages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advertising outlet</th>
<th>% of landholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STB or HIDB booklets</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Tourist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Centre</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers &amp; magazines</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Holiday Guide</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own leaflet</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent's leaflet</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign board</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Newspapers were either used regularly or just to fill gaps at the start of the season. Landholders seem to be very satisfied with results from the Farm Holiday Guide (Farm Holiday Guide, 1973 et sub) and with the service provided by the local tourist information centres. Few complaints were heard about any advertising outlet.

c) Running costs

i) Basic items

Average costs per cottage per year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rates</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs and replacements</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning and other materials</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£98</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Variation in total running cost per cottage

Coefficient of variation: 54%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range of cost:</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of cottages:</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation of variation

Rates. Most cottages' rates were near the average given but there were a few extremes:

Examples of very low rates include a cottage lived in by the crofter himself for all but two months and so the proportion of rates to be met from holiday use is small; and, a cottage sublet by a tenant farmer whose rates are paid by the estate and are not adjusted to reflect the use of the cottage;

Examples of high rates include a nearly new bungalow (rates £60). New or large buildings with high rates explain the presence of some cottages in groups C or D.

Advertising costs varied considerably. Maximum cost was over £60 and minimum was zero. The large variation is explained by whether or not newspaper advertisements were used and their frequency and length. High cost advertising sometimes involved printed brochures, although a pile of duplicated sheets for local distribution was inexpensive.

Running repairs. This is the most variable item. Groups A and B incurred no repair costs, or just a little painting each year. Group C landholders undertook a few repairs and some decorating each year. Groups D and E emphasised heavy repair and decorating costs each year, e.g. on old cottages or when there is a long season or a lot of wear and tear. Replacement of furniture can affect the situation slightly in any one year and does explain some cottages' placement in Groups D or E.

Cleaning expenses. These were never very high; there was little variation between cottages.

Additional items

Fuel. Almost all cottages had electricity metered, with guests paying directly for this by coins in a slot or by a separate bill calculated from reading the meter at the end of the stay. The few cottages where electricity was included in the overall tariff incurred an average cost for it of £47. Two cottages had calor gas cookers; the average cost of this was £5.
Labour. Holdings with paid labour (see above) spent an average of £36.80 on labour per cottage. This includes 20% of holdings where a charge was made for administration (bookings), either as a proportion of the secretary's time or as a commission (usually 10%) paid to an agent. This administration charge varied from £18 to £46 per cottage. All other holdings incurring a labour cost just paid for the cleaning of the cottages. Cleaning wages averaged £20 per cottage; usually cleaners were paid by the hour and earned £10-20/cottage, but a few holdings were visited where cleaners took a percentage of the revenue and thus earned more (on one estate, over £50 per cottage). The labour cost increases with the number of weeks let and the frequency of changeovers between tenants. One landholder paid an odd-job man £20/cottage for maintenance work but on all other holdings visited the landholder made no actual payment to maintenance staff specifically for work on cottages.

d) Price

The tariffs of one quarter of the cottages on holdings visited remained constant throughout the year, for the rest there was a gradation between peak and low months. Taking all cottages, the average charge per week for specific months was:

May (£21.3), June (£23.2), July and August (£27.3), September (£22.1)

The average weekly tariff for July/August: £27.3

Variation between cottages in July/August tariff
Coefficient of variation: 35%

Tariff range: £15 - 20 £20 - 25 £25 - 30 £30 - 35 £35 - 40 £40 - 65
% of cottages: 20% 20% 18% 16% 13% 13%

Explanation of the variation

Beds. Over 75% of cottages visited slept 6 to 8 people and in this range there appeared to be no relationship between beds and tariff. Two to four berth cottages had tariffs a little below average and two cottages found with ten beds were slightly above average in the peak months.

Quality. There was little price variation with quality except where the latter was especially high, e.g. almost new or renovated cottages with central heating, or low, e.g. cottages with no electric light.
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Location. Variations between broadly similar cottages are partly accounted for by locational differences. For example, cottages in popular tourist areas in the Highlands commanded relatively high prices (e.g. Kintail, Coigach) while tariffs for cottages in Shetland and the Western Isles were generally below average.

e) Occupancy

Considering together all cottages visited, the proportion of the total supply of weeks available let each month is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition 20% of the cottages visited had been let for short spells for tourist use during the winter months (e.g. over the New Year) and about 30% were let for certain periods in the winter for purposes other than holiday making (e.g. scientists, workmen, services personnel, house hunters, etc.)*

Average weeks occupied/cottage/year: 19.2

Variation in weeks occupied per year

Coefficient of variation: 29%

Explanation of variation

Many landholders said they could let their cottages many times over in July or August. Relative success depends on letting in out of season periods. Extent of advertising (even use of newspapers) did not seem to affect this greatly. Holdings' location (e.g. in accessible and picturesque parts of the Highlands) appeared to be the most important factor; also, whether cottage had been going for a number of years and a clientele had built up.

Occupancy was not lower where the tariff was high. In fact, prices tended to have been raised by landholders to reflect popularity and no instances were found of demand being checked by this. Thus price and occupancy are positively correlated:

Correlation of occupancy and price: $R^2 = 45\%$

* However, many landholders did not let cottages in the winter for fear of the occupiers gaining security of tenure.
3. FINANCIAL RESULTS

a) Revenue

Average revenue per cottage: £446

Variation

Coefficient of variation: 57%

Range: £150 (min) - 250 £250 - 500 £500 - 1038 (max)

% of holdings: 25% 40% 35%

Explanations: see price and occupancy.

b) Net income

Average net income per cottage: £314

Variation

Coefficient of variation: 78%

Range: £75 (min) - 150 £150 - 250 £250 - 500 £500 - 954 (max)

% of holdings: 25% 30% 20% 25%

Explanations

Variation in net income is much more closely related to variation in revenue than to variation in running cost.

% of explanation of variation in net income, based on simple correlation:

- with running cost: $R^2 = 0.7\%$
- with revenue: $R^2 = 92.0\%$

Net income relates well to both price ($R^2 = 68\%$) and occupancy ($R^2 = 55\%$).

Thus, relatively successful cottages tended to have the characteristics of high tariff or being let for a long period each year rather than especially low running costs.

c) Management and investment income

After charging for family labour at the rate of £0.70/hour for cleaning and booking (equivalent to wages paid to part-time staff for these duties on some holdings) and of £0.55/hour for maintenance work (equivalent to the average regular wage for general agricultural workers*), the

Average management and investment income/cottage: £284

* Obtained from DAFS (1975)b.
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Variation
Coefficient of variation: 89%

d) Profit

Allowing for the opportunity cost of capital improvements (establishment cost at 1973 prices) and using a 10.85% interest rate.

Average profit per cottage: £79

Very few landholders were financed by means of a loan for their cottages and so most will actually receive the net income and see the profit figure only as a guide to planning future investments.

Variation in profit:

Range: £-132 (negative profit) to £479 (positive profit)
% of holdings: 41% 59%

Explanation

The establishment cost varies greatly between cottages (see above). This variation is sufficient to prevent one from being able to explain profit in terms of revenue or management and investment income alone:

Correlation of profit with M & I income $R^2 = 12.4\%$
Revenue $R^2 = 8.4\%$
Establishment cost $R^2 = 10.9\%$
(all insignificant at 95% conf.)

e) Yield

Average yield on establishment cost: 36.7%

Variation
Coefficient of variation: 106%

Range: 2.2% (min) - 10% 10% - 50% over 50%
% of holdings: 39% 22% 39%

Explanation of variation

Yield is much more closely related to establishment cost than to management and investment income (relative $R^2$'s are 25% (sig. at 95% conf.) and 0.5%). Thus explanation can be found by turning back to the discussion of establishment costs. Many cottages require very little work done on them and so the yield on establishment capital is high, while others require over £2000 of capital expenditure and so the yield is under 5%.
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Chalets are compared below with holiday cottages. Therefore this Facts Sheet should be read in conjunction with Facts Sheet No. 1.

7 holdings with chalets were visited.

2 of the 7 holdings provided 2 chalets, the other 5 provided variously: 1, 3, 4, 5 and 12.

3 of the holdings were crofts, 3 were farms and 1 was an estate.

1. ESTABLISHMENT

a-d) Description of establishment, Duration, Available resources and Labour used

Chalets are purpose-built units for holiday letting and consequently the main difference between them and holiday cottages is in establishment. The chalets visited took longer to establish than holiday cottages but, once again, landholders used their own labour considerably. Often sectioned or all-in-one chalets were brought to the site by a dealer and erected by the landholder, with services connected by local contractors. Two crofters visited had designed and built their chalets entirely themselves.

e) Establishment cost

Average establishment cost per chalet (including furniture): £3,540

The furnishing element was considerably higher than for holiday cottages since the latter usually contained some furniture already, but the use of built-in units kept furniture costs to the quite low average of £400.

Variation in establishment cost

Coefficient of variation: 45%

Range: £1000 - 6712

Explanations of variation

The lowest establishment cost occurred where a landholder had made up a chalet himself out of an old hut. Some ready built chalets were quite cheap (e.g. £2000). Cost reflected space, furnishings and especially how substantial the building was, rather than the number of beds.
f) Financing the investment

On the holdings visited, chalets were more frequently assisted by grants or loans than were holiday cottages. Out of the seven landholders with chalets, 2 had STB grants (25% and 50%), 1 had an HIDB grant of 30% on the building cost and a HIDB 5½% loan on the furnishing cost, 1 had obtained finance through the HIDB chalet scheme* and 1 had obtained a DAPS 3½% loan on a chalet. Bank loans were used by three landholders, 1 in conjunction with an STB grant, 1 with a DAPS loan and 1 as part of the HIDB chalet scheme.

The average establishment cost per chalet where the landholder used his own financial resources alone, or was aided by a bank loan, was £2867. Where any other loan or a grant was involved, the average cost was £3809 but the effect of the grant or loan reduced the average landholder's share to £2694.

g) Planning permission

All landholders required planning permission for their chalets. This constituted development as defined by the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act**(HMSO, 1947b). Only one had special difficulties - due to an access road which had to be widened - but most were required to group chalets together and in an inconspicuous place. Chalets were favoured by planning authorities in that they did not constitute new housing in the countryside but provided more amenity than static caravans.

h) Landowner's permission

Two landholders were tenants. One had great problems in obtaining the landowner's permission and the Land Court had to make a judgement. The other had no trouble but was concerned about obtaining good compensation for his chalets if he resigned the tenancy.

* A scheme, initially open to all but later restricted to crofters, whereby the HIDB gave a 35% grant towards the cost of chalets and arranged for this to be met with a 55% loan from the Royal Bank of Scotland with interest of Bank Rate plus 4%.

** Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1972 (HMSO, 1972) for chalets developed after that date.
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2. OPERATION

The average number of chalets per holding was greater than for holiday cottages. Landholders were not restricted by existing buildings and often considered that initial effort would be better rewarded if a number of chalets were set up. The flexibility of chalets compared with holiday cottages enabled two landholders to expand their self-catering enterprise by adding chalets to holiday cottages, and one by adding chalets to static caravans. On these three holdings it was difficult to isolate the chalets when obtaining information on operation, but estimates were made.

a) Labour

Hours spent in cleaning, booking, etc. were similar to hours spent for holiday cottages but there was more tendency for chalet enterprises to employ outside labour owing to the larger number of units on some holdings.

b) Advertising

Landholders tended to make more effort to advertise chalets than holiday cottages, due to a more commercial motivation and a desire to achieve a good return on investment and also due to the scale of the enterprise. All but one used newspapers - the Sunday Times and the Scottish local papers (e.g. the Courier) were specially commended. All used the local tourist information centre and almost all advertised in the STB booklet (or HIBD where relevant). Two had printed brochures and one advertised through a specialist agency.

c) Running costs

i) Basic items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average costs per cottage per year:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs and replacements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning and other materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variation was less than for holiday cottages
Coefficient of variation: 40%

Range: £33 - 143
Explanation of variation

Rates varied little between chalets as there was no great diversification in size. Replacements and repairs varied less than for holiday cottages but advertising cost varied more.

ii) Additional items

Labour. Cleaning women (employed on three holdings) cost on average £15 per chalet. One landholder with 12 chalets employed a full time site maintenance man and consequently incurred heavy labour costs.

Fuel. Two out of 7 landholders included electricity in the rental price. The average cost per chalet to them was £40. One had chalets with only gas, costing him £9 per chalet.

d) Price

Average weekly tariff per chalet:
May £20, June £25, July £29.8, August £29.8, September £25.9

Variation in peak tariff

Range of peak tariff (July and August): £20 - 40

Explanation of variation

Similar to holiday cottages but the quality factor appeared more important, i.e. self-built, older or sparsely furnished chalets had lower tariffs. The average tariff was slightly higher than for holiday cottages, probably because cottages were more often provided for non-commercial reasons. However, on the two holdings with both chalets and holiday cottages, chalets were cheaper.

e) Occupancy

Average number of weeks occupied per chalet per year: 19.1

The variation in occupancy was similar to holiday cottages' occupancy but the effect of advertising was greater. Some landholders put a lot of effort into advertising and this reaped rewards. Chalets were more difficult to let than holiday cottages out of season. However, all but one of the chalet enterprises visited were in popular tourist areas (most considered this to be essential when deciding on the investment) and there was no difficulty in letting these between June and September.
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3. FINANCIAL RESULTS

Averages per chalet per holding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Coefficient of variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>£483</td>
<td>£140 - 880</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net income</td>
<td>£356</td>
<td>£78 - 783</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M and I income</td>
<td>£330</td>
<td>£78 - 720</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>£-51</td>
<td>£-301 - 242</td>
<td>(only 2 out of 7 had a positive profit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>4.5% - 22.4%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The revenue, net income and management and investment income are all a little higher but similar to the holiday cottage results. The factors affecting the variation are broadly the same. Chalet owners tended to be more commercially motivated - they had all set up chalets predominantly for income reasons rather than having cottages already which had to be used in some way. The profit figure is considerably lower than for holiday cottages. As with cottages, variation in establishment cost as well as variation in income explains variation in profit. Chalets generally cost more to establish than cottages, and also were never extremely cheap so no exceptionally high yields were achieved.
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BED AND BREAKFAST

23 holdings were visited with bed and breakfast (B & B) enterprises, of which 13 provided dinner, bed and breakfast (DBB) and 10 provided bed and breakfast only (BBO).

The numbers of beds per enterprise visited were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of beds</th>
<th>No. of holdings</th>
<th>No. of beds</th>
<th>No. of holdings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average beds per enterprise: 5.5 10.2

Holding types: 4 crofts, 6 farms 6 crofts, 7 farms

1. ESTABLISHMENT

a) Description of establishment

The main variation in the nature of the establishment of B & B enterprises related to whether or not alterations were carried out in the croft or farm house to accommodate guests. Three crofts were visited where the crofter had recently built a new house on his croft specifically for the dual purposes of residential use and bed and breakfast provision. A few landholders had carried out alterations or construction work on the existing house (e.g. new bathroom or bedrooms in a new extension) but the majority had either done only minor decoration or improvements (17%) or had not changed the house in any way before taking in guests (39%). Almost all the landholders visited used furniture which was previously in the house or in store. Sometimes this was enough but usually a few new pieces were added, e.g. beds.
b) Duration

Variation between holdings can be explained largely as above.

New houses - 9 months to 1 year.

Alterations or construction - a few months, either before the first season or after B & B has been going for some time.

Other landholders spent virtually no time in establishing B & B and if decoration or minor improvements are required these are carried out when desired.

c) Available resources

As described above, existing resources varied between:

- bare land suitable for building;
- a farm or croft house needing improvement or extension;
- a farm or croft house needing new furniture; and
- houses with existing accommodation and furniture suitable for a B & B enterprise.

d) Labour

Where crofters built new houses, 75% of labour input was family labour. One crofter was a professional builder. Contractors were used for plumbing and electricity.

Where alterations and construction work were done, work was mostly carried out by the landholder himself, except for certain building extensions and plumbing. Again, some landholders were professional builders.

e) Establishment cost

Usually work done on a croft or farm house towards the establishment of a B & B enterprise also benefits the landholder's own use of the building as a residence. It was difficult for landholders to say whether this work would have been done anyway had it not been for the B & B.

Taking the total expenditure, the average cost of establishment was £2435 per enterprise. If an adjustment* is made for the fact that work was carried out partly for the benefit of residential use, the average establishment per bed was £172, the average establishment cost per enterprise was £1623.

(This latter average is high because a few landholders incurred very heavy costs. The median establishment cost per enterprise is only £350).

* Adjustment made using ratio between rooms let to guests and total size of house.
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Variation in establishment cost per bed (adjusted as above)

Coefficient of variation: 122%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of enterprises:</td>
<td>Under £25</td>
<td>£25-100</td>
<td>£100-300</td>
<td>£300-755 (max)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation of variation:

Group A: No expenditure in establishment or minor decoration only and/or some furniture.

Group B: Decoration of bedrooms; mostly new furniture — possibly deep freeze or dish washer.

Groups C and D: Building works —

- a) small building works — e.g. sun lounge, new bathroom — or new house with only few rooms used by guests;
- b) complete modernisation — bathroom, basins in bedrooms, rewiring, etc.; chalets for B & B annexe or family use in summer; or, new house.

Cost per bed depends on whether (a) or (b) applies and also on the number of beds per enterprise — some large enterprises spent a lot on building work for communal facilities but had many bedrooms so cost per bed was not extreme.

f) Financing the investment

Nature of financial resources:

- Unsupported 78% of landholders. Cash in hand or profits ploughed back.
- Supplemented by grant 22% of landholders. Including: local authority grant for bathrooms; and crofters receiving a DAFS grant towards the building of a new house for residence and B & B on the croft.
- Supplemented by loan 17% of landholders. Including: DAFS loans to crofters @ 3½%; Highland Fund loans to crofters @ 4%.

Note: no landholders visited used bank loans; investments in B & B were curtailed rather than resorting to this form of finance.

(17% of landholders received both a grant and a loan)
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The average establishment cost per bed where the landholder was using his own financial resources alone was £85. Where a grant or loan was involved, the cost per bed was £521, but only £275 had to be met out of the landholder's own resources.

g) Planning permission

A few landholders complained that planning restrictions on sign boards - their size and especially their location on main roads in advance of turn-off points - were far too strict. Otherwise, only landholders building new houses or extensions were involved with the local authority over planning permission. None had any major problems, although one had to relocate the access point from the main road.

h) Landowner's permission

Half the farmers were tenants. Neither they nor the crofters had been bothered at all by the owners in relation to using the house for bed and breakfast.

2. OPERATION

a) Labour

Time spent on:

Regular work -

Housework and cleaning (includes cooking breakfast, serving it, washing up, making beds and washing sheets (if change of guest), cleaning and possibly cooking, serving and washing up an evening meal)

average hours of work per day per bed: BBO 0.7  DBB 1.5

equivalent figures per enterprise: BBO 3.4  DBB 15.6

Multiplying these figures by the number of days that the enterprises are regularly used gives the following estimate of smd's per year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BBO per bed</th>
<th>5.8 smd</th>
<th>BBO per enterprise</th>
<th>31.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DBB per bed</td>
<td>14.8 smd</td>
<td>DBB per enterprise</td>
<td>151.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variation. The effect of providing an evening meal on labour required is clearly very great. Many landholders provided no meal for this reason. Labour/bed is related to enterprise size, i.e. doubling the size (e.g. 2 to 4 beds) certainly does not mean doubling the labour input. Similarly sized enterprises vary because of factors like nature of meals, use of washing machines, dish washers, etc.
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Shopping. Time spent shopping again depends on whether or not dinner is provided. Many landholders made a weekly trip to the cash-and-carry in the nearest town and otherwise depended on delivery services — hence location is important. Eggs, milk and even bacon were provided by the farm in some cases. No figures were obtained on shopping time. A reasonable allowance per enterprise might be: BBO 4 hours per week, DBB 6 hours per week. Taking a 12 week season this gives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enterprise</th>
<th>BBO</th>
<th>DBB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hours per week</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taking bookings. The time spent taking bookings varies considerably between enterprises according to proportions of guests answering advertisements rather than coming off the road or making regular arrangements year after year. DBB enterprises tended to take more advanced bookings and therefore require more time for doing this. No figures were obtained on 'bookings' time. The following allowances might be reasonable considering holiday cottage results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enterprise</th>
<th>BBO</th>
<th>DBB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hours per week</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Irregular work —

Maintenance work. This varies year by year depending on the age of the house. On some holdings, two or three weeks in the winter were spent doing up the house. No figures obtained on maintenance time. A reasonable average might be:

| Hours per year | 4.0 |

Estimated total standard man days per year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enterprise</th>
<th>BBO</th>
<th>DBB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard man days per year</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>167.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Landholders emphasised that much of the work of cooking and cleaning, shopping and maintenance would be carried out anyway in order to keep the house and family going — e.g. one farmer's wife said, "I just buy a bit more and cook a bit more and then there's the beds on top of this". Thus the smd totals of 43.5 and 167.5 are most certainly not entirely due to the B and B enterprises.
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Personnel involved in:

Regular work -

Family labour only. 74% of holdings. Work was done by farmer’s or crofter’s wife except on one holding where the crofter was unmarried. Daughters or sons helped a little on two holdings visited.

Family and paid labour. 26% of holdings (50% of DBB enterprises). 13% had regular daily help/housekeepers, 4% had student help and 9% had both. Only large DBB enterprises were involved, i.e. with 6 or more bedrooms.

Irregular work -

Only farmer or crofter and his wife - work done out of season.

b) Advertising

Sign boards: 95% of enterprises. 17% used sign advertising and no other, the advantage being that the wife could remove the sign at weekends and when she felt she couldn’t cope with visitors. All signs were very successful in attracting custom.

HIDB or STB booklets: 48% of enterprises.

Local TIC* : 65% of enterprises.

Farm Holiday Guide: 22% of enterprises. Considered to be very good where used.

AA Guide: 13% of enterprises.

Newspapers: 9% of enterprises. Not considered successful in attracting B & B custom.

Own leaflet: 13% of enterprises. Sets out tariff and amenities. Only found with large enterprises, i.e. over 6 bedrooms.

c) Running costs

i) Basic items

Costs per head (i.e. per bed per night occupied)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BBO</th>
<th>DBB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average variable costs/head:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>£0.31</td>
<td>£0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel</td>
<td>£0.29</td>
<td>£0.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Tourist Information Centre.
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Annual costs per bed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BBO</th>
<th>DBB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average variable costs per bed:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>£16.0</td>
<td>£78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel</td>
<td>£3.0</td>
<td>£4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average fixed costs per bed:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>£1.0</td>
<td>£2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs, maintenance, replacements</td>
<td>£4.0</td>
<td>£8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates</td>
<td>£1.0</td>
<td>£2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>£0.5</td>
<td>£2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning and other overheads</td>
<td>£1.0</td>
<td>£2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total average costs per bed:</strong></td>
<td>£26.5</td>
<td>£98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(average no. of beds per enterprise)</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variation in running costs per bed

Coefficient of variation: BBO 30%; DBB 40%

**BBO**

Range: £13 (min) - 20

% of enterprises: 20% 50% 30%

**DBB**

Range: £31 (min) - 90

% of enterprises: 23% 46% 31%

Explanation of variation and notes on items of cost

Variable costs account for a high percentage of running costs and therefore variation can be explained by differences in the size and occupancy of enterprises to a large extent.

Correlation between running cost per bed and occupancy: $R^2 = 61\%$

(significant at 99% conf.)

This is particularly so with DBB enterprises.

Food. The cost of providing meals varied between 20 and 40 pence for breakfast and 35 and 90 pence for an evening meal. Naturally the cost varied with the size and quality of the meal provided, but it was also affected by bulk buying at wholesale outlets, availability of produce from the farm and regional price differentials (e.g. high island prices).

Some farmers' or crofters' wives would give their guests only 'the best'. Sometimes figures were difficult to obtain because food for the family would be bought in with guests' food and often was not separated in the accounts.*

* For this reason, figures obtained from landholders were compared with data from the National Food Survey (Central Statistical Office, 1974) and the Family Expenditure Survey (Department of Employment, 1974).
Fuel. Figures for fuel were even more difficult to separate from household totals*. Landholders were asked to consider what fuel was used for guests in addition to family use. There seemed little variation in the fuel cost per head.

Rates. The rates of half the enterprises were not affected by using the house for B & B and so no rates should be charged against the enterprise. Where a house was newly built or extended so that certain rooms existed only because of the B & B enterprise, a share of the new rates has been included.

Insurance. Some landholders increased their household cover to include new extensions, furnishings, etc. A greater impact on cost occurs where the B & B enterprise is declared to the insurance company and cover includes public liability. This occurred on only half the holdings, mostly doing DBB.

Advertising. No costs were incurred where only a sign was used. High costs were incurred where the enterprise's own leaflet was produced.

Repairs, maintenance and renewals. There was considerable variation here between holdings. A few landholders said they were slowly improving their accommodation by redecorating, adding wash basins, etc., each year and so incurred considerable maintenance expenses. Others did repairs only where necessary, spending nothing some years. Likewise, renewal of furniture occurred only exceptionally, as need arose, although most enterprises made regular payments on linen, towels, etc. Some repairs benefit both the B & B enterprise and the residence. It is incorrect to consider repairs which would have to be done anyway as costs to the enterprise.

ii) Additional items

Labour. Half the DBB enterprises employed paid labour. The average cost of this was £18 per bed (£251 per enterprise). Regular cleaners were paid at about 50p./hour and usually worked for a morning or the whole day, five days per week. Students received low wages, e.g. 25p./hour, and worked only part of the day but sometimes had board and lodging. No BBO enterprises employed paid labour.

*
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d) Price

All enterprises visited bar one kept their tariffs constant throughout the year. The average nightly charges were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BBO</th>
<th>DBB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>£1.64</td>
<td>£3.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variation

Coefficient of variation: BBO 13%; DBB 32%

Range: BBC £1.25 - 1.90 DBB £1.75 - 5.00

Explanation of variation

Quality. High DBB prices occurred where enterprises were well appointed, e.g. had a licence, provided new accommodation, etc. Price was found to reflect quality less with BBO enterprises.

Location. Prices (especially for DBB) did reflect location - e.g. low prices in the islands, Borders, Grampian; high prices in popular Highland locations, especially west coast.

e) Occupancy

Occupancy can be presented as the percentage ratio of the actual number of bed-nights to the potential in a given period (e.g. potential per month = No. of beds x 30; per year = No. of beds x 365).

Taking all enterprises, monthly average occupancy percentages were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average yearly occupancy percentages: all enterprises 12%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yearly Percentage</th>
<th>BBO</th>
<th>DBB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BBO</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBB</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variation in yearly occupancy percentages:

Range: BBO 8% - 21% DBB 13% - 32%

Explanation of variation

Human factor. The occupancy of B & B enterprises is seasonal. While some landholders were keen to lengthen the season, others were happy to have few guests outwith July and August, because of overwork, relatives' visits, privacy, farm work (e.g. harvest), etc. and so did not make efforts to increase trade (e.g. took down their sign).
Advertising and location. Enterprises with high occupancy rates did not necessarily advertise much but rather depended on location to bring their trade (e.g. West Highlands or tourist roads). However, no enterprise where a lot was spent on advertising fell below average to high occupancy, even though some were not in tourist areas.

Goodwill. New enterprises with no established clientele showed lower occupancy rates.

Occupancy rates were found to be unrelated to price, both for BBO and DBB enterprises. (Correlations insignificant, \( R^2 \) under 15\%)

3. FINANCIAL RESULTS

a) Revenue

Average revenue per bed: all enterprises £177
BBO £91
DBB £243

Variation
Coefficient of variation: all enterprises 68\%; BBO 34\%; DBB 50\%

Range: BBO £45 – 141 DBB £54 – 422

Explanation of variation

See price and occupancy explanations. For BBO enterprises, price varied little and revenue was more closely related to occupancy (\( R^2 = 81\% \)), but for DBB both price and occupancy were important (\( R^2 = 75\% \) and 67\% respectively).

b) Net income

Average net income per bed: all enterprises £109
BBO £64
DBB £144

Variation
Coefficient of variation: all enterprises 77\%; BBO 43\%; DBB 67\%

BBO
Range: £32 (min) – 45 £45 – 80 £80 – 108 (max)
% of enterprises: 40\% 30\% 30\%

DBB
Range: £24 (min) – 120 £150 – 200 £200 – 319 (max)
% of enterprises: 54\% 23\% 23\%
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Explanation of variation:

With BBO and DBB enterprises, variation in net income was dictated by variation in revenue and barely related to variation in running costs.

Correlation of net income and revenue: \( R^2 = 94\% \) for BBO and \( R^2 = 93\% \) for DBB.

Extremes of net income were due to a very high price charged by one DBB operator and to the low occupancy of one BBO establishment, i.e. not due to any crippling items of cost or extra cutting of corners.

c) Management and investment income

Family labour charged at the rate of 55p./hour (equivalent to average wage rate for women). Hours of work per enterprise were discussed above. In calculating M & I income, 4 hours per enterprise per day for DBB and 2 hours per enterprise per day for BBO have been excluded, as this time would probably have to be spent cooking for the family and cleaning anyway (see 'labour' above).

Average M & I income per bed: all enterprises £89
   BBO  £54
   DBB  £117

Variation

Coefficient of variation: all enterprises 82%; BBO 49%; DBB 74%

Range: BBO £25 - 88   DBB £8 - 264

Adjusting for family labour has reduced the income from DBB more than from BBO since the family labour input into the former enterprises was considerable. Nevertheless, DBB enterprises still bring in considerably more than BBO enterprises.

Comparing the two in terms of income per head (i.e. removing the occupancy effect) one finds:

Average M & I income per head: BBO  £0.96
   DBB  £1.40

Thus one can see that the benefit of DBB enterprises is partly due to occupancy rates achieved, but, even so, DBB is still financially advantageous per unit output.

d) Profit

Allowing for opportunity cost of capital improvements (establishment cost at 1973 prices) using a 10.85% rate of interest:

Average profit per bed: all enterprises £70
   BBO  £37
   DBB  £95
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Variation
Coefficient of variation: all enterprises 97%; BBO 106%; DBB 79%

BBO
Range: \( £-42 \text{ (min)} - 10 \) \( £10 - 40 \) \( £40 - 85 \text{ (max)} \)
% of enterprises: 20% 30% 50%

DBB
Range: \( £-9 \text{ (min)} - 50 \) \( £50 - 100 \) \( £100 - 218 \text{ (max)} \)
% of enterprises: 23% 31% 46%

Explanation of variation

With DBB enterprises, the levels of M & I income are high and varied enough for this, and consequently revenue, to dominate the variation in profit.

DBB: correlation of profit with M & I income \( R^2 = 92\% \)
revenue \( R^2 = 72\% \)
establishment cost \( R^2 = 9\% \)
(first two significant at 99% conf., third insignificant)

However, with BBO, the M & I income did not vary very greatly, while there was a considerable difference in establishment cost between holdings, so here both these factors were important.

BBO: correlation of profit with M & I income \( R^2 = 72\% \)
revenue \( R^2 = 37\% \)
establishment cost \( R^2 = 50\% \)
(first and third significant at 99% conf., second significant at 95% conf.)

e) Yield

Average yield on establishment cost: all enterprises 285%; BBO 251%; DBB 311%

Variation
Coefficient of variation: all enterprises 149%; BBO 130%; DBB 160%

BBO
Range: \( 4.5\% \text{ (min)} - 25\% \) \( 25\% - 40\% \) \( \text{over } 40\% \)
% of enterprises: 20% 30% 50%

DBB
Range: \( \text{negative (min)} - 25\% \) \( 25\% - 100\% \) \( \text{over } 100\% \)
% of enterprises: 31% 23% 46%

Explanation of variation

Very few enterprises achieved yields under 10.85% (the 2\( \frac{1}{2} \)% Consol rate). Generally, the low establishment costs compared with M & I incomes (with 40% of enterprises the annual M & I income was greater than the establishment cost at 1973 prices) caused yields to be extreme.
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STATIC CARAVANS

This Facts Sheet covers only holdings providing static caravans with no sites for towing caravans, camping or the parking of clients' static caravans. Sites for the latter activities, which may include some static caravans as well, are considered in Facts Sheet No. 5.

13 holdings were visited with just static caravans owned by the landholder.

The number of caravans on the holdings visited was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of caravans</th>
<th>No. of holdings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average number of caravans per holding was 3.1.

Nine of the holdings were crofts and four were farms.

1. ESTABLISHMENT

a) Description of establishment

The main feature of establishment was the purchase of the caravans. This was followed by furnishing and equipping them and the provision of toilets. 54% had built small toilet blocks; otherwise chemical toilets were provided in the vans or in a tent. On one holding the van had a plumbed w.c. and for two enterprises the bathroom of the farm or croft house was used by visitors. Sometimes work was carried out on the land round the caravans (e.g. landscaping or initial draining) but this was restricted to the enterprises with 6 or 7 caravans.

b) Duration

The length of time the landholders took to set up their enterprises depended on the number of caravans. Any site preparation or toilet construction occurred during a few weeks in the winter before the first letting season. Because caravans are independent and moveable units, static caravan enterprises are very suited to a staggered
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development. No landholder with more than one caravan bought all his vans right away. The maximum development period encountered stretched from 1965 to 1973.

For example: a landholder might start with two second hand caravans with chemical toilets or with visitors using the bathroom in the croft house. Demand is found to be high and so four more caravans are bought, planning permission having been obtained, and a small toilet block built. Later the first vans are scrapped and the other four traded in for six new larger ones.

c) Available resources

Apart from two holdings where the existing bathroom in the landholder's house was used by static caravan guests, land was the only resource already available. The amount of land used varied from a few square yards round just one van to one and a half acres occupied by six vans. The average acreage per caravan was 0.15 acres.

Most landholders benefited in that they had land which was already suitable for caravans - e.g. flat, easy access for visitors' cars, well drained and near a water supply - and so needing little preparation.

d) Labour

On two holdings contractors were used for plumbing in the toilet block. Otherwise the landholder's own labour was used entirely. Very little labour was required where there was no toilet block.

e) Establishment cost

The average establishment cost per caravan: £737

This contained on average: cost of caravan 72%
eequipping/furnishing 11%
site preparation (toilet block) 17%

Variation in establishment cost
Coefficient of variation: 32%

Range: £409 - 1333 (fairly even gradation within the range)

Explanation of variation

The lower establishment costs occurred where landholders had small caravans and/or ones purchased second hand, with chemical toilets or just a wooden shed for a toilet block.
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High costs occurred where caravans were large and purchased new. The overall variation in establishment cost was not especially great because high quality caravans did not necessarily go with expensive toilet blocks. The two landholders with the highest establishment cost per caravan had just one caravan each. They had been extravagant with the caravans and their equipment but naturally had not built toilet blocks: one caravan had a good chemical toilet and the other, the most expensive, had a w.c. plumbed in.

f) Financing the investment

None of the landholders visited had obtained grants or loans from statutory or voluntary bodies. Two had used bank loans.

g) Planning permission

Landholders required planning permission for caravans under the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1947 (and later 1972).* Also they required a site licence under the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960.+ There is an exemption relevant to all landholders which could apply to static caravans — namely if the holding is of 5 or more acres and the site has not more than three caravans on it at any one time and is not used for more than 28 days in the year. Twenty eight days is extremely short for the use of static caravans. However the exemption has been extended by an order made by the Secretary of State for Scotland relating only to the seven crofting counties: it reduces the minimum holding size to 2 acres and the length of use is increased to 6 months (April to September).

Only three landholders reported problems with obtaining planning permission. These all related to the need to screen the vans from view. Two overcame this by agreeing to place the caravans behind farm buildings. The third landholder agreed to put in a high hedge but, in the end, did not do so because it would have completely blocked the view from the caravans.

h) Landowner's permission

All but two of the landholders were tenants, most of them being crofters. Only one had had objections from the landowner, on amenity grounds, but this was quickly sorted out and the estate's factor then helped with obtaining planning permission. Four of the landowners were very positively encouraging.

* HMSO (1947)b and (1972).
+ HMSO (1960)
2. OPERATION

a) Labour

Time spent on:

Regular work -

Cleaning. (includes share of time in cleaning the communal facilities, e.g. cleaning of toilets, clearing up the site, emptying bins)

Average time per van per change of tenant: 50 mins

Variation depends on cleanliness of tenants.

The estimated average number of smd's per year per caravan:

Taking bookings.

average time spent per van per week in spring: 1 hour

There is a large variation, depending on popularity of the site, location, and amount of advertising. Less time was spent per van on large sites.

With average booking season of Jan., Feb., March, average smd's per van per year is estimated at:

Estimated total average smd/year for regular work:

Irregular work -

Maintenance. The static caravans themselves required little maintenance. Toilet blocks sometimes required attention. A reasonable allowance per caravan per year might be:

Estimated total smd per year per caravan (all work):

Personnel involved:

Only family labour was used on holdings visited. Usually the wife did the cleaning and the booking was shared between her and the farmer or crofter.

b) Advertising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advertising Method</th>
<th>% of Landholders Visited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STB or HIDB booklets</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Tourist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Centre</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Holiday Guide</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own leaflet</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign board</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caravan Clubs, etc.</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Newspapers were very frequently used and considered successful. Scottish papers (e.g. Record, Courier) were more often used than the UK national press. Signs were not common: one landholder said his sign served to direct visitors who had already booked and not to attract custom off the road.

c) Running costs

i) Basic items

Average costs per caravan per year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rates</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs and replacements</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas (calor cylinders)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning and other materials</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£46</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variation in running costs
Coefficient of variation: 31%
Range: £23 - 65 (fairly even gradation within the range)

Explanation of variation and notes on items of cost

Rates. These varied considerably between holdings. Some landholders with just one or two caravans said they had not been approached by the local authority for assessment and paid no rates.

Insurance. Little variation. Almost all landholders insured their caravans and the premiums were fairly uniform.

Advertising. Little variation. Most landholders used the local tourist information centre and newspapers for short spells. No landholders spent a large amount, e.g. no glossy brochures.

Repairs and replacements. Considerable variation. Little maintenance work was done on the caravans themselves but replacements caused variation - replacements occurred more frequently with older vans where equipment was wearing out. Higher maintenance costs occurred where enterprises had external toilet blocks; also fencing and other site work was important on larger establishments.
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Fuel. Gas cylinders for cooking and lighting in vans. Variation in cost depends on the length of the season. Two holdings had vans connected to electric power cables and here there was no gas cost: guests paid for electricity by a coin meter. Toilet blocks had cold water, except for two with hot showers but these were paid for by a coin meter.

ii) Additional items

Hardly any static caravan enterprises incurred costs not common to the majority. Where there were chemical toilets, fluid cost about £4 per caravan per year.

d) Price

The average tariff per van varied between months as follows:

May £14.2, June £15.9, July £18.9, August £18.9, September £14.3

The variation between holdings in the peak tariff per van (July and August) was:

Coefficient of variation: 30%

Range: £11 to 30

Explanation of variation

Size and quality. These two factors tend to go together. More modern caravans were larger and better equipped and commanded higher tariffs. The most expensive static van was connected to electricity, mains water and drainage.

Location. Tariffs were high in popular tourist areas such as the west Highlands. In the Western Isles, Orkney and Shetland, tariffs were low.

e) Occupancy

Taking the average over all static caravans visited, the percentage of weeks let each month was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>27%</th>
<th>64%</th>
<th>87%</th>
<th>91%</th>
<th>42%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average number of weeks occupied per caravan per year: 12.7 weeks

Variation in weeks occupied per year

Coefficient of variation: 31%

No static caravan on the holdings visited was let out for non-holiday use in the winter months.
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Explanation of variation

Most landholders expected and received many more requests for their caravans in July and August than they could satisfy. The length of the letting season varied with location — the Western Isles, Orkney and Shetland fared badly, the western Highlands did well — and this factor seemed more important than the extent of advertising. Two landholders whose caravans had low occupancy rates said this was because the enterprise was new and without an established clientele. High occupancy rates tended to be associated with high rather than low tariffs:

Correlation between occupancy and price \( R^2 = 49\% \)
(significant at 99\% confidence)

3. FINANCIAL RESULTS

a) Revenue

Average revenue per caravan: £236

Coefficient of variation: 45\%

Range: £60 - 420

Revenue depended both on price and occupancy:

Correlation between revenue and occupancy \( R^2 = 84\% \)
price \( R^2 = 66\% \)

b) Net income

Average net income per caravan: £192

Coefficient of variation: 52\%

Range: £29 - 361

Holdings' relative net income per static caravan depended almost entirely on revenue:

Correlation between net income and revenue \( R^2 = 98\% \)

Running cost was nowhere great enough to cause any holding's net income to be depressed below what one would expect from the occupancy achieved and price charged.

c) Management and investment income

After charging for family labour at £0.70/hour for cleaning and booking and £0.55/hour for maintenance (c.f. holiday cottages) the average management and investment income per caravan: £173
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Coefficient of variation: 56%
Range: £12 - 325

All landholders used exclusively family labour and the management and investment income reflected the net income.

d) Profit

Allowing for the opportunity cost of capital improvements (establishment cost at 1973 prices), using a 10.85% interest rate, the average profit per caravan: £93

Coefficient of variation: 91%
Range: £-62 - £259

Two holdings showed negative profit.

Once again revenue dominated the scene - the highly profitable holdings were those with high price and occupancy and holdings with low profits did not necessarily have high establishment costs.

e) Yield

Average yield on establishment cost was 23.5%

Coefficient of variation: 53%
Range: 1.7% - 53.1%

The establishment cost did not vary much between holdings and so no very extreme yields were found. In fact yields tended to be dictated rather more by variation in management and investment income. The holding with the highest yield per caravan had achieved a very high revenue (but not the highest) through being in an extremely popular tourist area, while the establishment cost was about average.
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This Facts Sheet covers caravan sites which contain pitches for towing caravans or camping. Along with these pitches, sites may well contain static caravans for letting or stances let to clients for their own static caravans. These different types of accommodation unit can be added together to give a total number of units per site. The financial data given in this Facts Sheet are presented on a per unit basis. Combinations of units are referred to generally as pitches.

23 holdings with caravan sites were visited.

The figures given in the list below are numbers of touring caravan or tent pitches specified in the site licence (as distinct from the maximum number of vans or tents ever found on the site) and the actual number of static caravans or static caravan stances. These figures have been used in the calculations in the Facts Sheet to give results per unit (pitch).

List of sites visited by size:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Touring sites</th>
<th>Mixed sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Touring caravans or tents only</td>
<td>With static caravans accounting for under 35% of all pitches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>TV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 F</td>
<td>15 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 C</td>
<td>15 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 F</td>
<td>26 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 E</td>
<td>30 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 E</td>
<td>255 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 F</td>
<td>TV = Touring van/tent pitches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 C</td>
<td>SV = Static caravans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 F</td>
<td>SVS = Static caravan stances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380 E</td>
<td>F,C,E = Farm, Croft, Estate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. ESTABLISHMENT

a) Description of Establishment

All the sites had toilet blocks: some of the larger sites had more than one. Quality varied considerably; many toilet blocks had hot showers while a few were just small prefabricated huts. One quarter of the sites had shops.
Facilities such as launderettes, play areas and TV or games rooms were found on some of the larger sites. Not many landholders had needed to spend much money preparing the land itself; a few provided tarmac roads, the rest used gravel or considered the grass to be adequately firm for cars and caravans.

b) Duration

Touring sites: Over half the landholders visited had completed their sites in just one period. The rest had started with just a few pitches and with simple facilities (e.g. huts as chemical toilets, use of a bathroom in the farm house) and then some years later had undertaken major expansion and investment (i.e. more pitches, new toilet block, etc.). The expansion tended to occur in one burst rather than being staggered.

Mixed sites: On half of the mixed sites visited, one or two static caravans were provided first; touring pitches, together with a toilet block catering for both types of caravan forming one major investment later. Frequently the number and quality of static caravans changed over a period of years. On two of the mixed sites a rough field for tents and touring caravans preceded a formal site with toilet blocks and static caravans.

Most sites required a few months or even as much as a year for construction. Large sites, e.g. with a shop, launderette, etc., naturally took a long time.

c) Available resources

Only three of the landholders visited had used existing buildings. Of these, two had used barns and out-houses as site offices, play room, etc., while the third had converted parts of an old castle into toilets, a reception area and a shop. On all other holdings, land was the only resource already available. The average amount of land used per pitch was 0.10 acres (range 0.04 to 0.4). Mostly the land had been in-bye grazings and was still used as such during the winter months. Five landholders had used land which was previously disused and three had set up caravan sites in the policies of castles.

The majority of sites were near to crofts or farm steadings – hence benefiting from easy access, nearby water supply and some screening from view. Ease of access was especially important in choosing a site as was, naturally, the flatness of the land. These features were deemed essential and so
tended to override landscape considerations. Some landholders were able to find suitable land which was also screened by existing topographical features or trees but many had to plant trees (also see planning permission below). A few considered an open landscape one of the existing assets - it provided potential visitors with a good view.

d) Labour

Just over half the landholders visited had used some outside contractors, mainly to assist with plumbing in the toilet block, etc. Only four landholders employed contractors to be responsible for the whole site. Crofters and most farmers relied mainly on their own labour while estate proprietors detailed maintenance staff and agricultural labourers to work on the site, mostly during the winter months.

e) Establishment cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Touring sites</th>
<th>Mixed sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;35% stat.</td>
<td>£107</td>
<td>£276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;35% stat.</td>
<td>£610</td>
<td>£175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stat. stance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average establishment cost per pitch:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range:</td>
<td>£11 - 291</td>
<td>£76 - 516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£273 - 980</td>
<td>£39 - 246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient of variation:</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average establishment cost per enterprise:</td>
<td>£9905</td>
<td>£9181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£17,361</td>
<td>£29,072</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation of variation

Touring sites: The cost of communal facilities, especially the toilet block was all important. The two sites with highest cost per pitch were small sites with very expensive toilet blocks - one also had a shop and launderette. Other high cost sites tended to have good facilities but also to be large so that the cost per pitch was not extreme. The lowest cost was found on one site where the small wooden toilet block seemed inadequate for the size of the site.

Mixed - with static caravans: Naturally, the higher the proportion of static caravans to touring pitches the greater the cost per total pitch. However, the factors of site size and facility quality described above were important on mixed sites as well.

Mixed - with stances for statics: One site was small and provided just an average toilet block. The other three were large and more costly per pitch owing to shops, launderette and, on one site, a tennis court and a swimming pool being provided. The landholders with these three sites thought such facilities were necessary as clients with their own vans could be living on the site for long periods each year.
f) Financing the investment

Nature of financial resources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Financial Resources</th>
<th>Percentage of Holdings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsupported</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemented by grant</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemented by loan</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

52% of holdings. These were HIDB grants or STB grants. Also one crofter received a grant from the Countryside Commission for Scotland, and one farmer received a local authority grant for tree planting.

35% of holdings. These were HIDB grants or STB grants. Also one crofter received a grant from the Countryside Commission for Scotland, and one farmer received a local authority grant for tree planting.

30% of holdings. 22% of holdings received bank loans. Two crofters received Highland Fund loans at 4% interest.

(17% of landholders received both a grant and a loan)

The average establishment cost per pitch per enterprise where the landholder used his own financial resources alone or with a bank loan was £284. Where any other loan or a grant was involved, the cost was £221 but the effect of the financial support reduced the landholder's share to £159.

g) Planning permission

Landholders required planning permission and a licence for sites as described in Facts Sheet No. 4 under static caravans. One exemption was mentioned there. However, further exemptions are relevant for touring caravans — namely no licence is needed if the site is occupied and supervised by an exempted organisation (e.g. the Caravan Club), if the site is approved and certified by an exempted organisation and is used for not more than five caravans at any one time, or if one caravan only at any time stops for not more than three consecutive nights on the site and the site is so used for not more than 28 days in the year. None of the sites visited was so exempted.

Forty percent of the landholders had difficulty obtaining planning permission. In all cases this involved amenity considerations — landholders were either told to plant trees for screening or to resite their development behind existing woodland. Sometimes landholders considered these tree planting requests ridiculous (one landholder was told to have at least three trees between each van) and either had them overruled after providing further evidence (e.g. that trees would not grow on an exposed site in Sutherland).
or simply ignored them. Landholders considered it important not to block the caravanners' view from the sites nor to expose campers to the insects found in woodland.

A few landholders had arguments with the planning authority over what constituted adequate access to and from the site. One landholder was forced to reduce his plans from 30 to 10 pitches and had to fight to prevent crippling requirements for lighting, an expensive water supply and paved roads. Three landholders were most concerned because they were not given permission to erect notices beside the public road before the site entrance.

h) Landowner's permission

One quarter of the landholders were tenants, all but one of these being crofters. Problems with the landowner occurred on only one holding, where the landholder was very against development because of the effect on the landscape. After much discussion with the local authority and the Countryside Commission for Scotland the matter was resolved.

2. OPERATION

a) Labour

Time spent on:

Regular work -

Cleaning, checking in, maintenance, etc. It was not possible to obtain information on the time spent on separate aspects of running caravan sites. On some sites a site warden or manager would work a full day as a regular employee, fitting in different tasks at intervals with no particular time-table. All sites required cleaning of toilet blocks, meeting new arrivals and collecting dues and some maintenance work. On most sites grass had to be cut, though occasionally it was grazed. Where there were static caravans on sites these had to be cleaned.

The average standard man days per year per pitch for these tasks worked out as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Touring sites</th>
<th>&lt;35% stat.</th>
<th>&gt;35% stat.</th>
<th>stat. stances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5 smd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range:</td>
<td>1.1 - 3.8</td>
<td>1.4 - 3.1</td>
<td>2.5 - 7.0</td>
<td>0.7 - 2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Static caravans require individual cleaning and in this respect take up more time per pitch than do touring caravans. However, new people can arrive at a touring site every day and so the site requires daily attention while static caravans can be left alone during the week: also toilet blocks should be cleaned at least once a day.

There was considerable variation between enterprises. Landholders varied in their attitudes to the benefit of having someone on the site all the time. On three quite small sites the landholder was always around, doing odd jobs and chatting to people. Here and on larger sites with full-time wardens it was felt that personal contact paid off by encouraging people to return. On the other hand, some landholders just carried out the strictly necessary tasks and so the standard man days per pitch figure was low. The proximity to the farm house was important - if the wife could just look out of the window and see if she was wanted, she could be occupied with other jobs rather than having someone on the site all the time.

**Taking bookings**. The average standard man days per pitch for taking bookings worked out as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Touring sites</th>
<th>Mixed sites&lt;br&gt;35% stat.</th>
<th>Mixed sites&lt;br&gt;35% stat.</th>
<th>stat. stances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3 smd</td>
<td>0.8 smd</td>
<td>1.3 smd</td>
<td>0.2 smd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only a few touring sites did not accept advanced bookings. However usually under half the visitors actually booked in advance, so the time spent on taking bookings was less than for static caravans.

**Extra activities** -

One quarter of the sites visited had shops for the campers and caravanners. Most of these were open for a number of hours in the morning and the evening. The average time spent keeping the shop worked out per pitch as 0.83 standard man days per year.

This varied between 0.22 and 2.2 smd's per year depending mainly on the size of the site. One site with a shop was quite small - only 32 pitches - and so the time per pitch was very high.
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Personnel involved:

Regular work -

Family labour only - 44% of holdings visited (wife does cleaning, landholder checks people in and does maintenance or similar arrangement)

Mixed, family and paid labour - 26% of holdings (either paid full-time warden with landholder overseeing operations and doing some maintenance, or landholder running site with some part-time help with cleaning)

Paid labour only - 30% of holdings (on half of these, wives of agricultural workers cleaned and collected dues, on the rest full-time wardens plus other part-time employees ran the site)

Extra activities -

All but one of the shops were run by the warden's wife, sometimes with help from local school girls.

One shop was run by the landholder's daughter.

b) Advertising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advertising outlet</th>
<th>% of holdings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sign boards</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Tourist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Centre</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STB or HDB booklets</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caravan/Camping magazines</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA Guide</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own leaflet</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Holiday Guide</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only one of the landholders who had sites exclusively for touring caravans or tents advertised in newspapers. The newspapers used for static caravans tended to be local Scottish papers rather than UK ones. Magazines and guides provided specially for caravanners - such as the Caravan Club guide - proved very successful: some landholders advertised in specialist guides published in other European countries. The Farm Holiday Guide was not used by owners of exclusively touring sites.
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c) Running costs
i) Basic items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Touring sites</th>
<th>Mixed sites</th>
<th>Mixed sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;35% stat.</td>
<td>&gt;35% stat.</td>
<td>stat. stances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning and</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacements and</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£11.3</td>
<td>£16.5</td>
<td>£36.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Coefficient of variation: 36%

Average cost per site: £771 £1141 £726 £2948

Explanation of variation and notes on items of cost

Rates. The variation in rates per pitch was not very great but was, perhaps, higher than one might expect. Local authorities seemed not to be very consistent in their rates assessment. Some landholders had fought to have a rate applied to the site as a whole rather than per individual pitch: others did not bother about this. Sites with many buildings (e.g. office, shop, etc.) naturally incurred higher rates.

Insurance. This was more varied between exclusively touring sites than between sites with static vans. On touring sites insurance was for public liability and for communal facilities. On larger sites the latter served more pitches and so insurance per pitch was lower. On the other hand the value of facilities on the larger sites tended to be higher.

Advertising. There was some variation here, depending on use of newspapers and printed material. Larger sites tended to advertise more extensively and so their advertising cost per pitch was not necessarily below average. There was considerably less cost and variation on sites exclusively for touring caravans/tents.
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Cleaning and other materials. The presence of static caravans increased the cost. With touring sites, larger sites incurred less cleaning costs per pitch.

Replacements and repairs. These costs were higher where there were static caravans, mainly due to replacement of equipment in vans. Site maintenance costs were more variable on larger sites where there tended to be more scope for one-off large scale repairs, such as re-tarmacing the roads.

Fuel. Variation depended partly on the length of the season. There was considerable variation on exclusively touring sites. One landholder had an unlit toilet block with cold water and so incurred no fuel costs. At the other extreme, the ablution blocks on one site provided hot water throughout the day. Static caravans had a stabilising effect on fuel costs – use of gas in static caravans often contributed a high proportion of the cost and yet varied little per van between sites. On the four sites where the landholder provided the stance but not the static caravan, gas was paid for by the clients.

ii) Additional items

Labour. One half of the sites visited had paid labour. The average labour cost per pitch per enterprise with paid labour was £10.2 (the average cost per enterprise figure was £1484). There was considerable variation in the wages paid to wardens (from £10 to £30 per week). Many wardens were retired people who were glad to live in a house or caravan in a rural setting and did not seek a high wage. They were given free accommodation and often other perks: it was difficult to place a value on these and this has not been done. Most wardens were caravan enthusiasts.

Shop trading stock. Shop overheads have been included in the above. Trading accounts in shops are discussed under net income below.

d) Price

Taking all the sites visited (mixed as well as exclusively touring) the average price charged per night per touring caravan was £0.60 and per tent £0.55.

Most landholders did not discriminate between touring caravans and tents in pricing. Some landholders charged an extra 5 or 10p. per person over the basic 'two people plus car and van or tent'.

The average price charged for static caravans per week in the peak season (July and August): £20.3

The yearly rental of stances for static caravans on the four sites providing them was respectively £35, £40, £82 and £1000; Average: £58.3

Variation in touring caravan charges
Coefficient of variation: 26%
Range: £0.40 - £1

Variation in static caravan charges per week in the peak season
Coefficient of variation: 24%
Range: £14 - 28

Explanation of variation

Static caravans and stances: Static caravans on caravan sites, like those provided separately, varied in price according to location and the size and quality of the caravan. However the latter factor appeared more important than location and indeed the quality of the site as a whole appeared to affect the price. The variation in annual rent charged for a static caravan stance reflected the relative qualities of the sites.

Touring caravans/tents: The price charged appeared to depend hardly at all on the site's location with respect to popular tourist areas. Once again the relative quality of the site seemed important, i.e. presence of shops, well equipped ablution blocks, etc.

e) Occupancy

The occupancy of touring caravan/tent pitches each month is expressed below by taking caravan/tent numbers as a percentage of site capacity as indicated by the licence.

Percentage occupancy of touring pitches per enterprise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>107%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taking the total number of touring van/tent nights available each year as site capacity x 365, the average occupancy rate per site per year was 22.4%

Coefficient of variation: 45%
Range: 7.5% - 49.9%
The average number of weeks occupied per static caravan per year was 12.1
Coefficient of variation: 28%
Range: 8% - 19%

Explanation of variation

Static caravans: The factors affecting the variation in occupancy of static caravans on caravan sites appear to be similar to those affecting occupancy of static caravans located separately, i.e. location seems more important than the extent of advertising.

Touring caravans/tents: The occupancy of touring caravan sites varies very greatly.

Over use: Forty percent of landholders said that the total of touring caravans and tents in the peak months exceeded the total allowed by the licence. Other landholders would not permit this to happen. Consequently the landholder's attitude partly explains the variation in occupancy.

Location: Location was important. Once again the Highland Region, especially the west coast mainland, did well and the islands badly. However Tayside and also Dumfries and Galloway were successful regions.

Advertising: Advertising seemed to have little effect on the occupancy rate but there was little variation in the advertising efforts of touring site operators.

The occupancy of touring caravan/tent pitches was totally unrelated to the price charged:
Correlation coefficient: .002 i.e. $R^2 = 0.00\%$

3. FINANCIAL RESULTS

a) Revenue

The revenue received by landholders consisted of income from caravan/tent pitches plus static caravans and also the trading profit on the shops where they existed.

On average the shops achieved a trading profit of 23% of turnover and this represented 22% of the total site revenue (range 16% to 32%).
Average revenue per pitch:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Touring sites</th>
<th>Mixed sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;35% stat.</td>
<td>&gt;35% stat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£71</td>
<td>£58</td>
<td>£127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range:</td>
<td>£29 - 167</td>
<td>£30 - 83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Naturally, high revenues are partly explained by the presence of shops. However, shops tended to occur on sites which would exhibit a high revenue per pitch anyway.

Shops occurred on holdings which charged relatively high prices for touring pitches as well as static caravans but did not necessarily achieve above average occupancy rates. Thus revenue tended to be rather more strongly correlated with price than with occupancy. Touring sites only, revenue correlated with price: \( R^2 = 81\% \); with occupancy \( R^2 = 16\% \).

This effect makes it difficult to distinguish which of price or occupancy in their own right most influences revenue. The variation in occupancy between holdings was greater than the variation in price so this may be the more important characteristic (e.g. extent of over use of touring sites in the summer).

Taking all sites with touring pitches and also static caravans, the revenue per pitch increased as the proportion of static to touring caravans increased:

Correlation of revenue with % of static vans: \( R^2 = 59\% \) (significant at 95% confidence level)

Taking all caravan sites visited, the average revenue from touring pitches amounted to only £47 per touring pitch while from static caravans it amounted to £219 per van. On all mixed sites with more than 15% caravans static, the static caravans were contributing more to total revenue than were the touring caravans.

On sites with stances for clients' own static caravans, the variation in revenue was dictated by the rent charged for the stances. The average rent was only £66 but again the stances brought in more revenue per unit than did the touring caravans/tents, so revenue tended to be greater where the proportion of touring pitches was low.

b) Net income

Average net income per pitch:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Touring sites</th>
<th>Mixed sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;35% stat.</td>
<td>&gt;35% stat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£56</td>
<td>£38</td>
<td>£83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range:</td>
<td>£7 - 151</td>
<td>£21 - 53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Revenue dominated net income:

Correlation between revenue and net income for:
- touring sites \( R^2 = 97\% \)
- mixed sites with static caravans \( R^2 = 88\% \)

Running cost only accounted for holdings doing relatively badly where they employed costly labour.

Taking mixed sites with static caravans, net income also was higher the greater the proportion of static to touring vans:

Correlation of net income with \% of static caravans: \( R^2 = 34\% \) (significant at 90\% confidence)

\[ \text{c) Management and investment income} \]

After charging for family labour at 60p. per hour, average management and investment income per pitch was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Touring sites</th>
<th>Mixed sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;35% stat.</td>
<td>&gt;35% stat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£47</td>
<td>£32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£57</td>
<td>£23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range: £7 - 121, £13 - 53, £10 - 120, £7 - 42

On mixed sites the proportion of static caravans to touring pitches was no longer important. Management and investment income was not related to this. This is because some of the sites with many static caravans were especially expensive in terms of family labour input.

\[ \text{d) Profit} \]

Taking the opportunity cost of capital improvements using a 10.85\% interest rate, average profit per pitch was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Touring sites</th>
<th>Mixed sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;35% stat.</td>
<td>&gt;35% stat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£35</td>
<td>£2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£1</td>
<td>£4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


With exclusively touring sites, establishment cost per pitch was not high enough with respect to management and investment income to affect greatly the relative profits of enterprises.

Touring sites: correlation between profit and management and investment income: \( R^2 = 93\% \)

The profits from mixed sites were low. Static caravans were very much more costly to establish than touring pitches. Low profits were still slightly more likely to be due to low revenue but the relative establishment cost was important as well.
### Yield

Average yield on establishment cost per pitch was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Touring sites</th>
<th>Mixed sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;35% stat.</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;35% stat.</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range: 14% - 44% 5% - 20% 4% - 24% 3% - 61%

Some touring caravans cost very little to establish (e.g. just a small wooden toilet block) and so showed extremely high yields. Yields from sites with static caravans were less variable.
10 holdings were visited with pony-trekking.

The sizes of the pony-trekking enterprises visited were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of ponies</th>
<th>Number of holdings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average number of ponies per enterprise: 9.6

Two holdings were estates, seven were farms and one was a croft. All offered pony-trekking but one of the estates was very active in giving riding lessons - it called itself a riding establishment rather than a pony-trekking enterprise.

1. ESTABLISHMENT

a) Description of establishment

Two landholders did not use any buildings for their ponies at all. The rest kept the ponies outside generally but still used stables from time to time. One landholder had built a few basic wooden stalls. The rest used old buildings (see below) either slightly modified or kept as they were with a few repairs. The two estates had constructed arenas - one a new outside manege, the another an enormous barn simply converted.

Ponies were either bought in, bred, or were already on the holding - as described below.

b) Duration

Only two of the landholders visited had bought all of the ponies they were using at one purchase. The rest had either bought a few ponies at a time, starting the trekking enterprise on a small scale and building it up, or had bought a few mares from which they had bred foals to add
eventually to the trekking stock. A few of the enterprises were continually buying and selling ponies. The size of a pony-trekking enterprise can be quite flexible.

Initial building work took a few months on the two holdings with arenas. On other holdings, conversion and small construction work took hardly any time.

c) Available resources

Buildings — All but three of the landholders used existing buildings. Five had old stables (on the two estates these were the stables for the mansion house), while two used cattle byres with a small amount of modification.

Stock — On most holdings the landholder or his family owned horses already, which were used for accompanying treks. Three of the enterprises had existing ponies which were turned to use as trekking ponies. One landholder was a pony breeder and went in for trekking as a way of exercising the stock.

Land — All landholders used their own land for grazing. The amount of pasture used for grazing ponies averaged 1.8 acres per beast. Sometimes ponies were grazed on the hill — in one case the crofters' common grazing — and often in fields with cattle and sheep, in this way making less impact on the agricultural use of the land.

All the landholders used their own land for trekking (although in the case of the crofter this was the common grazing): mostly this provided some variety — i.e. hill and low ground, woodland and sea views. However, over half the landholders made arrangements to use neighbouring land as well. Twice this meant a landowner approaching his tenants and once the reverse. Only two landholders felt that relationships had been strained by the pony-trekking.

Feed — Hay for feeding was obtained from the agricultural enterprise on all but two holdings. Half the holdings obtained all their hay in this way.

d) Labour

One holding (an estate) used local contractors for buildings. Otherwise employees or the landholder himself did any work required.
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e) Establishment cost

The average establishment cost per pony: £342

(average per enterprise cost: £3531)

Variation in cost per pony
Coefficient of variation: 82%

Range: £50 - 1050

Explanation of variation

There were two enterprises with very extreme costs* - one of £1050 per pony where there was the new outdoor arena and new access roads and the use of expensive tack; the other of £50 per pony where the landholder had all the ponies already, for breeding and sale. With the exception of the latter enterprise, the extent of building costs was the major factor causing variation in establishment cost. Generally building costs were small but, as explained above, some enterprises spent no money on buildings.

The cost of ponies averaged £200, ranging from £129 to £250. This figure is based on the purchase price of adult ponies and the costs met by landholders who reared their own ponies to working age. The latter worked out cheaper but not greatly so. The cost of tack per pony averaged £66, ranging from £43 to £93.

f) Financing the investment

Only one landholder used outside finance to set up the pony-trekking. This was a crofter who received a grant from the HLB amounting to about 40% of the cost.

g) Planning Permission

The landholders visited considered that they did not require planning permission as the pony-trekking was merely an extension of existing types of activity on the land - there was no effective change of use. None of the landholders had been approached by the local authority.

On the other hand, landholders were required to obtain a licence under the Riding Establishments Acts 1964 and 1970.** One landholder had gone ahead with his enterprise unlicensed. The rest had had no trouble in obtaining licences - all the instructresses were experienced and some had certificates from the British Horse Society. Many landholders knew the local vet very well, because of their farming enterprises, and he happily recommended their establishments for approval.

* If these two are excluded, the range is only £171 to £571.
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b) Landowner's permission 

Four of the landholders were tenants. Only one had experienced problems with the landowner's attitude to pony-trekking. This was due to considerable existing problems on the estate from de facto riding. Eventually agreed routes were worked out with the landowner. The one croft visited with pony-trekking had received a letter from the landowner (DAFS) confirming the use of the common grazing for ponies.

2. OPERATION

a) Labour 

Time spent:

Time has to be spent actually leading the treks, cleaning tack, grooming the ponies and feeding them in the winter. Those landholders with the largest enterprises said that their daughter or the instructress worked full-time, without distinguishing between tasks. However, with the smaller enterprises the average times are roughly as follows:

Trekking (summer): 4 hours/day. Treks lasted usually 1 or 2 hours (one of the larger enterprises did whole day treks).

Grooming ponies and cleaning tack (summer): $2\frac{1}{2}$ hours/day

Feeding (winter): $\frac{1}{2}$ hour/day. Feeding usually took place between November and April and barely overlapped with the trekking.

Taking bookings for treks usually involved a quick telephone call and took up little time.

Maintenance; Few landholders mentioned this. There was really no maintenance work where enterprises had little in the way of buildings. The two enterprises with arenas were estates where any work was carried out along with other general maintenance of estate buildings.

Taking all tasks on all enterprises visited -

Average smd's per pony: 16.5 smd
Average smd's per enterprise: 164.0 smd
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Standard man days per pony varied between 6.5 and 44. The variation was due quite considerably to the length of season of operation of the enterprises. The enterprise with 44 smd's per pony was the 'riding establishment'; well patronised throughout the year. The enterprise with the second largest value recorded used only 21 smd's per pony; and if the former enterprise is excluded, the average smd's per pony per enterprise is reduced to 13.5.

Generally, smaller enterprises required more smd's per pony since fewer ponies could be taken out on a trek, although this did not apply to grooming time.

Personnel -

Family labour only: 6 holdings. On 4 of them the landholder's daughter was exclusively responsible for pony-trekking; on the other two it was the landholder (evenings) and his son, and the landholder's wife, respectively.

Family and paid labour: 4 holdings. All had qualified instructresses helped by the landholder, his wife or his daughter. One enterprise had seasonal part-time help as well.

b) Advertising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of holdings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STB leaflet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own leaflet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Tourist Information Centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enterprises with posters displayed in local hotels and elsewhere in the vicinity found this the best way of attracting custom. Newspapers where used tended to be local and sometimes were quite successful at bringing in local residents and day-trippers.

b) Running costs

i) Basic items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average cost per pony per year:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vet &amp; Farrier</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licence</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£543</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average cost per enterprise:
Variation in cost per pony
Coefficient of variation: 35%
Range: £25 - 94

Explanation of variation and notes on items of cost

Insurance. This covered insuring the ponies and also public liability insurance, the latter being very costly. The variation is not very great except for the fact that one landholder (with no licence) had no insurance cover. Two landholders paid considerably reduced public liability insurance premiums as this was contained in the membership fee for the British Horse Society which had certified their enterprises. However, these two, unlike other landholders, happened to pay an insurance premium on buildings used for pony-trekking in addition to the general insurance of the holding.

Advertising. Advertising costs were generally quite high because of the use of leaflets and posters. However, one landholder spent nothing on advertising while the four using newspapers incurred heavy costs. One would expect the cost per pony to be greater on smaller enterprises but this was counterbalanced by larger establishments doing considerably more advertising.

Vet and farrier. Most of the cost here was in the shoeing of the ponies. There was considerable variation between enterprises according to frequency and quality and special arrangements with the blacksmith.

Feed. This was by far the most important item of running cost. The large variation between enterprises was due to:

1) the quality of the grazing available and hence the amount of feed and length of feeding season required;
2) the availability of feed from the holding itself in the form of forage crops (i.e. hay) grown on the farm;
3) the amount of concentrates with which the landholder thought it necessary to supplement the ponies' diet. Some used none, others brought in nuts or oats and fed them to the ponies during periods when they were especially active.

Most of the landholders using home grown feed had not costed it. However production costs can be estimated based on the amount of hay grown for the ponies or the number of bales fed to them. Feed costs based on the cost of producing hay on the holding were considerably lower than on holdings where all or most of the feed was bought in.

* This was done using information from the North of Scotland College of Agriculture on variable costs per acre or ton of hay for 1970/71 (North of Scotland College of Agriculture, 1971) inflated to 1973/4 prices using an agricultural prices index (Central Statistical Office, 1974). Labour costs, tractor running costs and machinery depreciation were estimated using certain standards (e.g. 15nd per acre). The final cost taken was £16.5 per ton.
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ii) Additional items

Maintenance. Four of the landholders mentioned expenditure on the maintenance of buildings. This varied from £100 (outside arena) to £25 (a small stable).

Labour. Four enterprises used paid labour. The average cost was £1094 per enterprise, varying from £700 for two instructresses for the summer only to £1500 for a full-time instructress. The instructress' wage was about £30/week or £20/week with a house.*

d) Price

The average price for pony-trekking per hour was £0.80

Range: £0.50 - £1

It was difficult to explain the variation in price, except enterprises very recently set up were charging less in order to attract a clientele. The two estates charged more than the rest. They had arenas but these were really used for lessons only which cost more anyway. Lessons cost between £1.50 and £2 per hour but only appreciably added to the revenue on one holding.

e) Occupancy

Landholders described the nature of the demand for pony-trekking and how its extent varied through the year but did not provide adequate figures to enable one to quantify occupancy (number of riders) as a % of capacity (number of ponies available for trekking**). However, from what the landholders said it appears that:

i) With seven enterprises July and August were by far the busiest months, with only slight demand outwith this period, although only two landholders said they really could not accommodate any more people then. These enterprises rely mainly on holidaymakers wishing to ride, although some attracted a few local people.

ii) The remaining three landholders found that a combination of some holidaymakers and a considerable number of local people produced reasonable occupancy in April, May, June, September and October. Local interest enabled a fair amount of riding to be maintained through the winter.

Therefore, generally the variation in occupancy between holdings was high.

* The wage equivalent of this has not been included.

** At any one time this was usually a little less than the total number of ponies in the enterprise.
Explanation of variation

The ability to attract local riders out of the holiday season explains a lot of the variation. This depends on: the type of riding offered (e.g. hacking as well as trekking, lessons); the location with respect to urban population (two farmers said that the local demand was poor as so many country people had their own horses or ponies); and advertising (one landholder with a large local clientele advertised every week in three local papers).

Taking only those enterprises relying on tourists' custom, the variation in occupancy was less and advertising effort was fairly uniform. Location in popular tourist areas was quite important, i.e. two enterprises in Aberdeenshire fared relatively poorly.

There was little relationship between price and occupancy.

3. FINANCIAL RESULTS

a) Revenue

Average revenue per pony: £175
Coefficient of variation: 52%
Range: £50 - 295

Revenue appeared more closely related to variation in occupancy than to variation in price. The three enterprises with the highest revenue had succeeded in attracting considerable local custom in July and August. The figures include income from lessons. The one estate which was very active in giving lessons achieved an especially high revenue.

b) Net income

Average net income per pony: £84
Coefficient of variation: 81%
Range: £-31.9 - £209
(one enterprise had negative income)

Net income is quite strongly related to revenue -
Correlation between net income and revenue: $R^2 = 64\%$
(significant at 99% confidence)

Running costs did not affect the relative net incomes of enterprises very much, apart from on two holdings where paid labour costs were high.
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c) **Management and investment income**

After charging for family labour at £0.70 per hour (roughly the hourly wage of instructresses), **average management and investment income per pony was £23.**

Range: £-57 - £134 (negative for half the enterprises)

Management and investment income was considerably lower than net income owing to the great deal of family labour used in pony-trekking enterprises. Even so, revenue was still more important than cost in determining which holdings fared well.

**Correlation between management and investment income and revenue:** $R^2 = 48\%$  
(significant at 95\% confidence)

d) **Profit**

The **average profit per pony per enterprise** (after charging for the opportunity cost of capital improvements at 10.85\% interest): £-14

Range: £-135 - £115 (over half the enterprises failed to show a positive profit)

Profit was mainly related to management and investment income —

**Correlation between profit and management and investment income:** $R^2 = 87\%$  
(significant at 99\% confidence)

However, establishment cost was important —

**Correlation between profit and establishment cost:** $R^2 = 26\%$  
(significant at 90\% confidence)

The two enterprises with extremely high or low establishment costs, described in 1(e), achieved respectively much lower or higher profits than their management and investment income would suggest.

e) **Yield**

Half the enterprises had negative management and investment income and consequently zero yield. Taking **holdings with positive income**, yield averaged **35\%** (Range 3\% to 78\%)

With these holdings, establishment cost and management and investment income appeared to be equally important in determining yield.
FACTS SHEET NO. 7

PERMIT FISHING

14 enterprises with permit fishing were visited:

- 4 lochs - managed
- 2 lochs - unmanaged
- 8 rivers

Loch fishing

This was provided by six landholders visited. Four managed the fishing in the sense of an initial stocking of rainbow trout (followed by regular restocking) and sometimes feeding. Of these four, two had created artificial lochs through earth excavation, one had excavated a breeding and rearing pond but the fishing loch was natural, and one used a small natural loch requiring no preparation. Two of the managed fishing lochs took only two rods, the third five and the fourth twenty. All these holdings were farms. The unmanaged lochs catered for 2 and 6 rods each. One was on an estate, the other on a farm.

River fishing

This was provided on eight holdings visited: seven estates and one farm. No initial preparation, stocking or feeding was carried out. The number of rods provided on each river was 1, 2, 3, 6, 6, 6, 10 and 27, averaging 7.6 per river.

1. ESTABLISHMENT
   a) Description of establishment
      See above.
   b) Duration
      Lochs - managed fisheries:
      The time required to bring the fishing to a suitable standard depended on the size of fish used for stocking, the quality of natural food in the loch and the existence of any fish already there at the outset. Generally it took about one to one and a half years before the new fisheries were available to the angler. However all the landholders visited had set up their fisheries over two and a half years previously but were still adjusting stocking rates, etc. and did not consider the enterprises to be fully established.
      Excavation of the artificial lochs was time consuming.
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Rivers and unmanaged lochs:
Here the fishing was traditional. No time had been spent establishing the enterprises. Often the size of enterprise had declined, rather than being built up, as the quality of fishing had deteriorated.

c) Available resources

Land and water

Lochs - managed: The landholders who had excavated lochs used pieces of very boggy and unproductive land, 3 and 1\frac{1}{2} acres respectively, located by springs which provided the water. The two natural lochs were 21 acres and 2 acres. The nature and situation of the natural lochs and of the land used for artificial lochs was such that all the lochs could be reasonably rich in natural foods. The average number of acres per rod was 0.8.

Lochs - unmanaged: One holding had fishing rights on a 180 acre loch, and the other on 25 acres.

Rivers: The average length of river used for permit fishing was 2.5 miles. However, all but one landholder had rights on both banks and so the average length of bank available was 4.75 miles. The average number of miles of bank per rod was 0.92 miles (range 0.5 to 3.0).

Access

The managed lochs were all quite close to the farm buildings and parking was available there. On one of the holdings with unmanaged lochs the water was remote and required quite a long walk. All the rivers had roads or high quality tracks providing good access at various points along their length, and pull-off places which required no construction.

Buildings/equipment

Three of the landholders with lochs provided boats. One had a boat already. Two of them used boathouses; both being existing buildings requiring no initial capital expenditure.

Quality of fishing

Lochs - managed: Existing fish population in only one loch. This had some very large brown trout providing excellent sport.
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Lochs - unmanaged: One loch had reasonable salmon and brown trout, the other had only brown trout and these were of a fairly low standard.

Rivers: All but one provided salmon as well as brown trout. However, only three landholders reckoned that the quality of salmon fishing was average or above. Both trout and salmon fishing was considered to be poor on three of the rivers.

d) Labour

Where lochs required excavation, local contractors were used. The landholder did the initial stocking of lochs himself. Otherwise there was barely any labour involved in establishing the fisheries.

e) Establishment cost

Lochs - managed:

Average establishment cost per rod per enterprise: £340
Average establishment cost per enterprise: £1773

Variation in establishment cost per rod

Range: £204 - 573

Explanation of variation

The two landholders who had created artificial lochs spent about £900 each in excavation and preparation, even though one loch was 3 acres (5 rods) and the other 1.5 acres (2 rods). The presence of, and discrepancy in, this excavation cost was one of the main causes of variation in establishment cost between the four holdings. One of the two landholders with natural lochs had to buy boats, but he bought inexpensive ones and this cost did not match the excavation costs per rod elsewhere.

The other main cause of variation was cost of initial stocking. Three landholders spent between £60 and £130 per rod on initial stocking, depending partly on the size of fish used. One landholder who wanted to develop his fishing fast spent £350 per rod on quite large fish plus an extensive feeding programme. This landholder incurred no excavation costs but this expensive stocking brought his total establishment cost per rod into line with the others.
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Lochs - unmanaged: One of the landholders had provided three boats at just over £100 (1973 prices) each. Otherwise there was no establishment cost.

Rivers: There was really no establishment cost.

f) Financing the investment

None of the landholders visited used external sources of finance.

g) Planning permission

None of the landholders sought planning permission and none had been troubled so far.

h) Landowner's permission

All the landholders were owners bar one. He was a tenant farmer who had created an artificial loch. The landowner was very pleased to hear of this good use of an unproductive piece of land.

2. OPERATION

a) Labour

Time spent:

Regular activities -

Feeding and stocking (managed lochs only). Feeding took only two to three hours a week. Restocking was done in bursts, e.g. 2 hours one day per month or a whole day once a year.

Estimated £md per year per enterprise: 13 £md

Selling permits (all fishery types). This was usually just a matter of someone on the holding stopping work for five or ten minutes when approached. However, one estate employed a water bailiff who had to be at a certain place for 2 hours per day selling permits.

Estimated £md per year per enterprise: 3 £md

Taking bookings. Sometimes, especially with the small loch fisheries offering only a few rods, clients telephoned to reserve permits, taking up a few odd minutes per day.
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Irregular activities -

Control. On some holdings the landholder or his employee would occasionally make spot checks to see that nobody was fishing without a permit. One landholder employed a private water bailiff who spent about two hours per day policing a 7½ mile stretch of river.

Maintenance. The three loch fisheries with boats required time to be spent on boat maintenance.

Personnel involved -

Lochs - managed. All the work was done by the landholder or his family. Usually the landholder was responsible for stocking and feeding and any maintenance and his wife was responsible for selling permits.

Rivers and lochs - unmanaged. One holding was a farm. Here the landholder or his wife sold permits, etc. The rest of the holdings were estates: here permits were sold either by a game-keeper, by the estate office, through an arrangement with a local fishing shop or by an employee's wife. As mentioned above, one estate employed a water bailiff full time to oversee the permit and private fishing. Any maintenance was done by estate maintenance staff.

b) Advertising

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Loch (managed)} & \text{Loch (unmanaged)} & \text{River} \\
\text{Poster} & 4 & 4 \\
\text{Local fishing shop} & 2 & 4 \\
\text{STB booklet} & 1 & 1 \\
\text{Local Tourist Information Centre} & 1 & 2 \\
\text{Newspapers (local)} & 2 & 2 \\
\text{Own leaflet} & 2 & \\
\text{Sign board} & 1 & \\
\end{array}
\]

c) Running costs

Lochs - managed fisheries

i) Basic items
Permit fishing

Average running costs per rod:
- Rates: £3
- Advertising: £3
- Stocking: £27
- Feeding: £6

Average running cost per enterprise: £191

Variation in running cost per rod
Range: £21 - £63

Explanation of variation and notes on items of cost

All items varied considerably between enterprises but stocking costs varied the most followed by feeding costs.

Rates. All lochs were rated bar one.

Stocking. All landholders restocked with rainbow trout. Normally 8-inch trout at about £30 per 100 were used. The cheapest stocking per rod was carried out by a landholder who spent a lot on feeding the fish even though the loch contained much natural food, consequently he was able to use very small and cheap fish for stocking (i.e. about £40 per 1000). Another landholder also spent little on stocking, simply because he kept the number of fish available per rod at a low level.

Feeding. The amount of feeding depended on the size of fish used in stocking (as above) and the quality of the natural food in the loch. One loch was eutrophic (over abundant in nutrients) and no artificial feeding was carried out at all.

ii) Additional items

The largest enterprise, with 20 rods, incurred the following additional expenses (total, not per rod):

- Insurance: Public liability and insurance on 9 boats. The premium was about £75.
- Repairs and maintenance: About £100 per year on boat repairs.
- Permits: (the only landholder to actually issue duplicated permits) about £3.

Lochs - unmanaged

The two unmanaged fisheries incurred no stocking or feeding costs. Rates were none and £26 (£4.3/rod). Only one advertised (at £5 (£0.8/rod)). Both issued permits costing about £1 to produce (a negligible amount per rod). Both incurred boat repair costs at £40 (£6.6/rod) and £36 (£18/rod) respectively.
Permit fishing: .......

Rivers

i) Basic items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average running costs per rod:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rates and levy*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit production</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average running cost per enterprise: £75

Variation in running cost per rod
Coefficient of variation: 73%
Range: £1 - 36

Explanation of variation and notes on items of cost

Rates. One landholder said that his trout fishing was not rated at all - his only outgoings were advertising and permits. Rates did tend to reflect quality of fishing. The rates per rod figure naturally depended on the number of rods the landholder was prepared to allow per length of beat.

Advertising. Only three landholders advertised, and cheaply at that.

Permit production. This occurred with all enterprises but was only a very small item and varied little. No permits were specially smart but most laid out certain rules, e.g. the use of fly only.

ii) Additional items

Labour. All but one of the holdings were estates and used non-family labour. However, three said that keepers or the factor sold permits but that no extra consideration was made to them for this and the landholder could not possibly estimate what share of their wages might be apportioned to cover this task. On two estates permits were sold by the wife of an estate worker - on both she was paid £40 (average £6/rod). One landholder paid £1 per year (£0.2) to a tackle shop for the sale of tickets.

On the one estate with a special water bailiff, his wage was about £1250 and half this could be attributed to overseeing the permit fishing, i.e. selling permits, directing the fishermen and watching the river. This worked out at about £23 per rod. On some other holdings the landholders said that the keepers did watch the river but that they could not possibly apportion a share of wages to this task.

* Fishery Board Assessment.
Permit fishing

\[\text{d) Price}\]

**Average tariff per rod per day:**

- **Lochs - managed:** £2.9; range £2 to £4
- **Lochs - unmanaged:** £0.75; £0.50 and £1
- **Rivers:** £1.75; range £0.25 to £6

Most permits were for one day. A few landholders sold permits by the half day. Two half day permits tended to cost a little more than the average day permit figure.

Managed lochs: It was uncertain why the price varied as it did, certainly it did not reflect the quality of the fishing.

Rivers: Here the quality of the fishing was important, e.g., the £6 permit was on a river with excellent salmon and sea trout and the £0.25 was only for brown trout and few at that. However, one landholder charged just £1 for good fishing and another £1.50 even though he said that there was small hope of a catch. The location of the holding did not seem to affect the price charged.

\[\text{e) Occupancy}\]

No figures could be obtained on the monthly variation in the use of the fisheries. However this was discussed with the landholders. A figure for the total number of permits issued was obtained.

**Lochs - managed.** Three of the enterprises relied mainly on custom from holiday-makers, i.e., the peak months were July and August. The fourth attracted nearly all its visitors on day trips from the nearest large cities, Newcastle and Edinburgh, and the peak months were May, September and October. All the enterprises could take more custom, even in the peak periods.

**The average number of permits sold per rod was 46.**

Range 22 to 84. The variation reflected the quality of the fishing and the extent of advertising.

**Lochs - unmanaged.** The number of permits sold per rod were 67 and 90 on the two lochs. The latter was nearer to urban population.

**Rivers.** Half the enterprises attracted custom mainly from locals and other day-trippers, two relied mainly on holiday-makers and two were mixed. Naturally where holiday-makers were important there was a peak in July and August. However locals often preferred other months when the rivers were not so low: also they could pick and choose their days, e.g., after a spate.
Permit fishing

The average number of permits sold per rod was 29. Range 6 to 67. The variation reflected the quality of the fish to some extent but also there was a tendency for the permits/rod figure to be low if there was an above average number of rods allowed per length of beat. There was little advertising and neither this nor the location of the rivers with respect to popular holiday areas seemed to have any very marked influence on use.

Price and occupancy were not related on lochs or rivers.

3. FINANCIAL RESULTS

Lochs — managed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>£128</td>
<td>£44 - 210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net income</td>
<td>£86</td>
<td>£19 - 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and investment income (family labour @ 60p/hour)</td>
<td>£62</td>
<td>£13 - 170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit (establishment cost @ 10.85% interest)</td>
<td>£25</td>
<td>£-12 - 148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3 of the 4 enterprises showed negative profit)

Yield

26% 4% - 84%

The variation in occupancy between holdings was greater than the variation in price. On the four holdings visited, occupancy more readily explained the variation in revenue. One enterprise achieved a considerably greater revenue than the others (£210 c.f. £150 for the next highest) but had the second lowest tariff. This was the enterprise which best succeeded in attracting local custom. The smallest revenue occurred on the holding which had the lowest tariff but also the lowest number of permits sold per rod.

The enterprise with the highest revenue also had, per rod, the second lowest running cost and was the cheapest to establish. Family labour input per rod was low. Consequently this enterprise showed a far higher net income, management and investment income, profit and yield than the others. It was considerably larger than the other enterprises (20 rods) and this partly explains the low cost per rod.

The other three enterprises all showed negative profits and very low yields (between 4% and 8%). One received a management and investment income of £49 which was higher than for the other two simply because of a greater revenue: however, the establishment cost was very high and so yield and profit were low.
Permit fishing .......

Lochs - unmanaged.

Revenue: £33 and £90; Net income: £21 and £67; Management and investment income: £11 and £64; Profit: £-1 and £64; Yield: 10% and infinity.

The enterprise which cost nothing to establish, i.e. 'infinity' yield, also had the higher price, occupancy and, consequently, revenue, although it incurred higher running costs per rod due to boat maintenance.

Rivers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>£5 - 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net income</td>
<td>£33</td>
<td>£-6 - 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and investment income</td>
<td>£32</td>
<td>£-7 - 112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The enterprise with the highest revenue charged a much higher price (£6 per rod per day) than any of the others (next highest £2). Apart from this case, generally the occupancy (number of permits sold per rod) was more variable and had a greater influence than price.

The variation in running cost per rod was not great, while the variation in revenue was high. The variation in net income was entirely dictated by revenue. Labour input was small and consequently management and investment income was almost identical to net income.

No landholder incurred a cost in establishing the fishing enterprises. Profit equalled management and investment income and yield was naturally 'infinity' on this basis.
APPENDIX TWO

THE RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF RECREATION AND TOURISM IN THE ECONOMIES OF 12 ESTATES VISITED DURING THE INTERVIEW SURVEY

Twelve estates visited were able to supply summary financial results of their traditional enterprises as well as their recreation and tourism facilities sufficient for a reasonable estimate to be made of the total net income. The situation on these 12 estates is described below. They are grouped according to the relative importance of recreation and tourism, and the reasons for this importance, or lack of it, are discussed.

Two of the estates relied totally on tourism and recreation for their income. Neither had any agriculture in-hand. Both had amenity woodland giving no commercial return and very poor quality shooting let out at a very low rent. One estate had numerous crofting tenants paying nominal rents, the other had a few farming tenants paying low fixed rents. On neither estate did rental income match the overall maintenance costs. The two landholders had turned to recreation and tourism developments as the only way of providing a positive income. The net income from these facilities was £4,500 on one estate and considerably in excess of £8,500 on the other.* Naturally the recreation and tourism facilities provided the main source of employment on these estates - viz. on one 5 permanent and 14 seasonal staff as against 6 estate maintenance staff, and on the other 2 permanent and 10 seasonal part-time staff as against one maintenance man.

* This estate, in addition, received a considerable income from visitors to the castle but the landowner was not prepared to disclose how much.
Another two estates received about half of their net income in 1973/4 from the provision of recreation and tourism facilities - in both instances high quality caravan sites plus other smaller developments. The first of these estates had a large forestry enterprise including a saw mill. Owing to the nature of the felling programme, the estate earned a high positive net income in 1973/4. The large in-hand dairy farm provided a reasonable income but was not very successful in that year. Rental income about broke even with maintenance costs but sport (mainly for the private use of the proprietor) was run at a loss. The overall net income from these traditional enterprises was about £5,000 which was matched by the net income from recreation and tourism provision. However, the latter activity accounted for the employment of only 6 permanent and 2 seasonal full-time staff (plus one other seasonal but part-time only) compared with 42 permanent and 12 seasonal employees in traditional enterprises. The second estate received net income from traditional enterprises of about £7,500, arising mainly from cattle stock rearing and arable farm-in-hand (a small forestry enterprise showed a loss in 1973/4 contracted by a profit from some low ground shooting). An equivalent income was earned from recreation and tourism but again the latter activity employed less people - 3 permanent and 4 seasonal compared with 14 permanent staff in traditional enterprises.

Three estates received about one quarter of their total net income from recreation and tourism. One of these had a popular castle open to the public, plus holiday cottages, generating a net income of about £7,000 - at least as high as the income obtained from facilities on the estates described above where tourism and
recreation were relatively more important. However, this was a very large estate and the net income from traditional enterprises was very high — mainly earned as rents and game sales from excellent grouse moors and deer forests. Recreation and tourism required only two permanent and five seasonal staff while about 40 permanent and 20 seasonal staff were employed in traditional enterprises. The other two estates received only about £2,000 as net income from recreation and tourism. The had ten holiday cottages, for which four seasonal staff were employed for a few hours per week, and the other had four holiday cottages and permit fishing with little labour required. However, the net income from traditional enterprises was not great. The first estate had 23 permanent and 3 seasonal employees; there was a large farm-in-hand but forestry and the management of tenanted property showed a net loss in 1973/4. The second estate had five permanent employees with just a medium sized farm, fishing and pheasant shooting.

Finally, on five estates the contribution of recreation and tourism to net income was under ten percent. The situation on one of these estates was very different from the others. Here there was a large touring caravan site, holiday cottages, a castle open to the public, a shop, gardens and a museum — involving 9 permanent staff and 7 seasonal. However, the net income from recreation and tourism was not very high, only about £53,000. The caravan site and cottages were satisfactory but the complex of inactive recreation facilities was showing an overall loss — one should bear in mind that it was set up partly for political reasons, to use and maintain previously disused resources and to indulge a special interest
of the proprietor. On the other hand, traditional enterprises, employing 175 permanent staff, produced an impressive net income — about £73,000 — arising from a massive in-hand farm, forestry showing a high positive net income for the year and the letting of valuable grouse moors.

On the four other estates, the proportion of net income from recreation and tourism was low because little was done in this field. The estates were not especially large — earning between £4,000 and £10,000 net income from traditional enterprises and employing between 4 and 21 permanent staff. Recreation and tourism provision amounted to just one or two holiday cottages plus (on two estates) river fishing by permit. Wives of estate workers were employed part-time in the season as cleaners. Net income from the facilities was under £750 (under £300 on two of the estates).
APPENDIX THREE

THE POSTAL SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Covering letter  457
Main questionnaire  458
Additional questions included in the S.L.F./S.W.O.A. survey  461
Dear Sir,

The University of Edinburgh is engaged in a study of recreation and tourism on farms and estates in Scotland.

We feel that it is essential to understand the attitudes of farmers and landowners concerning the use of their property in this way since they are in a position to decide how the land is best used. Some landholders say that recreation and tourism is beneficial in that it can provide extra income or some other advantage, while others have reasons to decide against the provision of recreational facilities. Public access may have caused harm in some cases. Information is required to guide various public bodies in their policy making.

This is the first nationwide study of this subject to be made in Scotland and the University is being assisted and supported by the organisations listed below. We require a good response if we are to present the true picture and so we would be very grateful if you will complete the attached questionnaire and return it to us promptly in the stamped envelope provided.

This questionnaire is being sent to a sample of landholders, chosen to give us a representative cross-section of holdings throughout Scotland, providing all the questionnaires are returned. Therefore it will be most helpful if everybody answers the questions on the white sheet, however little this subject may affect them. If you are providing facilities for recreation and tourism or are thinking of doing so, please answer the blue form as well.

The questions refer to the occupier of the land (or partner of a company), be he owner or tenant. Estate owners or their managers are asked to answer as occupiers and not on behalf of their tenants. The questionnaire is anonymous but if you would like a summary of the findings of this survey and of the financial results of recreational provision, please write your name and address at the top.

Any information given to us will be treated in the STRICTEST CONFIDENCE. I do hope you will be able to help.

Yours faithfully,

W.E.S. MUTCH.

The Study is being assisted by:
The National Farmers' Union of Scotland.
The Scottish Landowners' Federation, and The Scottish Recreational Land Association.

The Study is sponsored by:
The Scottish Tourist Board, and The Highlands and Islands Development Board.
They will be guided by our report in the formulation of policy.
RECREATION AND TOURISM ON PRIVATE LAND

1. Size of the farm or estate (including areas you let out) ........................................... Acres
   (Area let by you to farming tenants ........................................... Acres)

2. Is your land (or most of it): 1 Owned by you, your family or your company
   (RING the appropriate number) 2 Rented by you

3. Which are the two most important types of agricultural enterprise you operate? Please write in the box 1 for
   the most important and 2 for the second most important. If you have no agriculture, just tick the final box.
   1 Dairying 5 Mixed Cropping
   2 Beef production 6 Pigs and/or Poultry
   3 Sheep production 7 Horticulture
   4 Crop production (mainly cereals) 8 No Agriculture

4. Acreage of commercial forestry, if any: ............................................. Acres

5. Is there any sporting which you lease out or retain for your own use?
   (Please TICK the appropriate boxes)
   1 Heavy 2 Moderate 3 Slight 4 None
   Fishing Use Shooting Use Stalking

6. You may find tourists and others using your land for recreation without being invited. Please indicate the
   extent to which the following occur, in high summer, on your land (apart from any facilities you have
   provided). (TICK the appropriate boxes)
   1 Heavy (almost every day) 2 Moderate (about once a week) 3 Slight (occasionally) 4 None
   Car-parking/Picnicking
   Rough Camping
   Caravanning
   Walking/Climbing

7. What is your attitude to these activities (Please TICK the appropriate boxes)
   1 Object to it 2 Indifferent to it 3 Welcome it in moderation
   Car-parking/Picnicking
   Rough Camping
   Caravanning
   Walking/Climbing

8. Have these activities caused any nuisance or damage on your land?
   (Please TICK the appropriate boxes)
   1 Both nuisance and damage 2 Damage 3 Nuisance 4 Neither
   Car-parking/Picnicking
   Rough Camping
   Caravanning
   Walking/Climbing

9. Please NUMBER in order of importance the four most serious problems arising from public access on your
   land.
   1 Litter 6 Disturbance of sporting
   2 Gates left open 7 Disturbance of farming livestock
   3 Parking in gateways by dogs
   4 Vandalism
   5 Damage to crops by people
   6 Other problems (specify below)

Other problems

For Office Use

11 - 16
17 - 22
Turn over
10. You may be providing facilities for public recreation and tourism, or thinking of doing so.  
Please TICK in column ONE those facilities which you NOW provide.  
Please TICK in column TWO those facilities which you are THINKING of providing in the FUTURE.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Now</th>
<th>2 Future</th>
<th>1 Now</th>
<th>2 Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bed and breakfast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bed, breakfast, evening meal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Catering (e.g. cafe, teas)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Guest House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Site for Touring Caravans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Camping Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Static Caravans for letting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Chalets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Holiday Cottages for letting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fishing by permit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Shooting by permit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Others provided: ....................................................................................................................................

Others in prospect: ........................................................................................................................................

If you have ticked any of the above facilities please also fill in the blue sheet after you have completed this page.

11. What is your main reason for having NO facilities (or having NO MCT E)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Very important</th>
<th>2 Quite important</th>
<th>3 Of little importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Considered not profitable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lack of time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lack of capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lack of suitable land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Too little demand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Value your privacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Obtaining planning permission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Obtaining landlord's permission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Damage caused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Conflicts with traditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Today's economic situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Simply not interested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other reasons, comments on specific facilities (e.g. caravans, chalets, bed and breakfast), or previous experience of providing facilities:—

12. Please indicate your age  
(RING the appropriate number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Under 40</th>
<th>2 40–55</th>
<th>3 Over 55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13. Are you personally engaged in farming?  
(RING the appropriate number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Full-time</th>
<th>2 Part-time, over 2/3 of your time</th>
<th>3 Part-time, between 1/3 and 2/3</th>
<th>4 Part-time, under 1/3 of your time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If you are regularly employed outside farming, is this:—  
(RING the appropriate number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 on this land</th>
<th>2 elsewhere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14. Apart from yourself, how many people do you employ full-time on your holding in your farming enterprise?  
........................................................................................................................................ (include family labour)

And in other enterprises?

........................................................................................................................................ 60, 61

........................................................................................................................................ 62, 63
a. **Reasons for providing facilities or thinking of doing so**

Please answer the following questions for each facility you ticked in question 10 (i.e. existing facilities and future ideas). Write the type of facility at the top of the column and then tick the relevant boxes below it. When you have completed the first column, do the same for the next facility in the second column and so on.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Facility</th>
<th>2nd Facility</th>
<th>3rd Facility</th>
<th>4th Facility</th>
<th>5th Facility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

i. Please **tick** those reasons for having or thinking about the facility:

1. To increase annual income
2. Because of falling income from farming
3. For capital investment
4. To use disused resources
5. To attract people to other facilities you provide
6. To control damage caused by visitors
7. Because of personal interest in the facility
8. Because you enjoy the company
9. As a gesture to those seeking recreation in the countryside
10. Other Reasons, specify here & below and tick as appropriate

ii. Please **tick** if the idea of having the facility was prompted by:

1. Other people doing the same
2. The possibility of obtaining financial support from statutory bodies
3. The Local Tourist Organisation
4. Visitors asking for it
5. None of the above

b. **For those facilities that you are already providing:**

Please write the facility type at the top of the column and the year of setting it up immediately below. Then indicate whether the results have been greater or less than you expected when you set up the facility, by writing in the box 'Greater' if greater than expected, 'Same' if the same as expected and 'Lower' if lower than expected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Date set up</th>
<th>Greater</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>Lower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Were the following greater, the same or less than expected?

1. Demand for the facility
2. Cost of setting it up
3. Annual running cost
4. Damage caused by visitors

Any further comments, or information on other facilities — please use the back of this form
15. How frequently do people ask permission to have access to your land? 
(Please describe below, or write 'None')

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Car-parking</th>
<th>Picnicking</th>
<th>Rough Camping</th>
<th>Caravanning</th>
<th>Walking/Climbing</th>
<th>Trout Fishing</th>
<th>Pony Trekking/Peding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do those who ask permission cause less nuisance and damage? 

16. Are there any particular areas on your estate or farm which are managed or kept as areas for public access (apart from specific facilities mentioned in question 10)?

Yes / No

If YES, is this — (Please tick)

- Amenity Woodland
- Commercial Woodland
- Open Hill
- Rough Lowland
- Arable or in-bye
- Sea or Loch Side
- Or other types

17. What measures, if any, have you taken to control access (e.g. notices, fencing, wardening), and what is the result? 

18. Do you have any comments on the activities of the following, concerning assistance with the provision of facilities on private land and problems with public access? (Your identity is confidential)

- The Countryside Commission for Scotland
- The Scottish Tourist Board
- The Highlands and Islands Development Board
- The Local Planning Authority
- Other bodies you may care to mention

(Please write below and on the next page):
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