Chapter **9**
Visitor management

Learning objectives

At the end of this chapter, you should be able to:

- **demonstrate a general understanding of what constitutes visitor management;**
- **demonstrate an understanding of various attempts at visitor management and the advantages and disadvantages of these processes;**
- **indicate the problems of the lack of adequate data in relation to visitor management;**
- **define in your own words the term interpretation in relation to visitor management;**
- **define in your own words the term education in relation to visitor management;**
- **define in your own words the term regulation in relation to visitor management.**

Introduction

Managing visitors is one of the important ways of managing the impacts of tourism, particularly impacts on the environment, but in addition managing sociocultural and economic impacts. Visitor management has been viewed in the past 25 years or so as a significant way to attempt to reduce the negative impacts of tourism. Often, this has been through attempts to divert tourists from areas with large volumes of tourists, the so-called 'honey pots'. Another approach has been to minimize the negative impacts at popular site by 'hardening' (e.g. resurfacing paths and footpaths), or by schemes such as 'park and ride' which keep cars out of the immediate environment of a popular attraction. However, there is a danger that by attempting to improve the site, this only encourages more visitors who in turn cause more damage (Swarbrooke, 1999; Mason, 2005).

This introductory statement indicates that the visitor management can be viewed as a way to regulate visitors. Hence, regulation may relate to such factors as preventing (or indeed allowing access) to particular areas or sites. Regulation is also likely to involve the provision of information and instructions on what can and cannot be done. In most cases, regulations relating to tourism are likely to be voluntary, of a self-regulatory nature, and unlikely to be backed up with laws. There are, however, legal regulations of relevance to tourism relating to transport, health and safety, and hygiene.

As well as regulation, managing visitors can also involve education. Education frequently involves the process of interpretation. This educational process may not only involve the dissemination of information about a particular site, but is also likely to involve more general education about social and environmental factors. In certain situations, a combination of education and regulation is used in an attempt to manage visitors. Education and regulation in relation to visitors are discussed in greater detail in Part Three of this book. This chapter considers the overall framework in which visitor management takes place and presents a number of management issues via an investigation of selected examples.

Key perspectives

Visitor management has been used by a number of different agencies and organizations, at different scales and in a variety of locations. In some countries, it

has become a major tool in an attempting to control visitor flows. In the United Kingdom, for example, a government task force produced a tourism report that had visitor management as a key strategy. This report, *Maintaining the Balance*, from the UK Ministry of Environment/Department of Employment and published in 1991, focused on the relationship between the environment and the visitor and suggested that there are three main ways of managing visitors. These are as follows:

- controlling the number of visitors – either by limiting numbers to match capacity, or spreading the number throughout the year, rather than having them concentrated in time in a focused 'tourist season';
- modifying visitor behaviour;
- adapting the resource in ways to enable it to cope with the volume of visitors, and hence become less damaged.

In relation to the first of these three methods, that of controlling the numbers of visitors, the report suggested that the initial task is to determine the carrying capacity. The report then cites the following threshold levels at which the ambience and character of the place is damaged and the quality of the experience is threatened. These are as follows:

- a level above which physical damage occurs;
- a level above which irreversible damage occurs;
- a level above which the local community suffers unacceptable side effects.

In addition to this approach to controlling the number of visitors, the report also discussed the ways of managing traffic. It argued for positive routing of vehicles, clear parking strategy, park and ride schemes, the use of public transport, road closures, traffic calming and traffic control systems.

The report also made a number of suggestions on modifying visitor behaviour. These are as follows:

- marketing and general information provision;
- promotion to bring visitors out of season, to help spread the load;
- promotion of alternative destinations;
- niche marketing, to attract particular types of visitors;
- providing visitors with specific information;

- the use of signs, Travel Information Centres and information points/boards;
- the use of codes of conduct to enable a combination of education and regulation in the interpretation process.

In addition, the report made suggestions on modifying/adapting the resource as a part of the process of visitor management. It indicated that this approach acknowledges there will be some wear and tear of the tourism resource. Minimizing damage through an adaptation of the resource in an attempt to promote protection is the key aim of this approach. The report suggested the following approaches:

- the use of wardens, guides and even guards to watch over and/or supervise. This is to prevent unruly behaviour, theft or deliberate damage;
- restrict the use of the site (e.g. cordoning off areas, to prevent access, allow re-growth);
- protective measures (e.g. coverings over valuable carpets, stones, reinforcement of footpaths, the wearing of slippers/shoe covers to protect floors);
- the building of replicas (e.g. there has been a suggestion to create a 'Foam Henge' to prevent damage to Stonehenge, a prehistoric monument in the south of England. This is discussed in more detail in a case study in this chapter.

New Zealand provides a good example of possible conflict in relation to visitor management. The potential for real conflict is linked closely to traditional New Zealand attitudes to use of the environment (these were discussed briefly in Chapter 6). The New Zealand Government Ministry, the Department of Conservation (DOC), produced a report in 1994 and according to DOC there are potential points of conflict. These are as follows:

- The majority of New Zealanders view the environment as one to which they have free access and this is particularly so with the backcountry (remote mountain areas), even though they may visit such areas only infrequently. New Zealanders are therefore generally opposed to attempts to limit access.
- The New Zealand tradition of self-reliance means opposition to improving existing accommodation and increasing the number of huts and other facilities in the backcountry.

- International visitors generally demand easy access to facilities, and these need to be of a relatively high standard, particularly toilets and washing facilities. International visitors also demand good signage, clear notice boards, good maps and sufficiently well-serviced campsites. International visitor numbers are likely to increase significantly in the next 10–15 years, while domestic visitors will remain almost constant. Hence the pressure will be to improve and increase facilities for the international visitor, but this is likely to be opposed by domestic visitors.
- There will come a point when the visitor experience/satisfaction declines. This will occur when numbers reach a certain (as yet unknown) level. At this point there may well be conflict between, for example, international hikers and domestic mountain bikers.
- There is pressure for visitors to make a greater contribution and to pay more to help maintain the environment they are visiting.
- There is an increased desire by local communities and Maori communities to have a greater say in environment/conservation decision-making.

A major problem in relation to all types of visitor management is the lack of data about the impacts of tourism at particular sites that attract visitors (Shackley, 1998). In certain locations, site records relating to details of visitors may not be kept at all, or records from one site may be combined with others. Some sites attracting visitors are not neatly contained within a limited geographical area. Given the problems of measuring visitor numbers, site managers may resort to guesswork (Shackley, 1998). However, as Shackley asserts, it is clear that visitors to many visitor attractions are increasing. Nevertheless, visitor numbers are not spread evenly throughout the year in many destinations, but there are usually seasonal peaks and troughs. At the microscale, even during the peak period of visits, there is a variation in visitor numbers at a given site. Often, the weekly (and even daily peaks and troughs) are linked to the schedule of tour operators and carriers. Those organizing such visits seldom take into account issues of crowding, visitor preferences or visitor satisfaction levels (Shackley, 1998; Mason and Kuo, 2007).

An extreme case of this 'periodicity' of visits is that of a cruise ship. Visits by cruise ships to relatively remote attractions, for example, to Antarctica or the Arctic region may take place infrequently. Several weeks may elapse between visits and when a ship arrives, the visit may have a duration of less than 1 hour

Photo 4   Road rage at The Eden Project, Cornwall. Police carrying out an arrest for dangerous driving at the Eden Project at Easter 2001

(Mason *et al.*, 2000). During this time, up to 10 per cent of annual arrivals may occur, creating enormous pressure on all shore-based facilities.

At particularly popular 'honey pots', crowding may not only contribute to low satisfaction levels, adversely affect the natural and/or built environment, but also may create safety problems. Photo 4 shows the aftermath of the problems caused by queuing to enter the Eden Project in Cornwall, England. The Project, involving the creation of biomes (plant worlds) in large domed glasshouses in a disused quarry, was first opened in March 2001.

Photo 5 was taken a month later at Easter 2001. The attraction was planned to take a maximum of 5,000 visitors per day. On the day the photograph was taken, over 13,000 visitors came to the site. Queuing time for the car park at the attraction averaged one and a half hours and the pedestrian queue added another 1 hour on average to a proposed visit. On this particular day, as is shown in Photo 5, police arrested a driver for alleged dangerous driving. The car was seen to overtake a line of queuing cars and drive in a hazardous manner narrowly avoiding a car park steward and running over traffic cones. This form of tourism-related 'road rage' is clearly an undesirable consequence of overcrowding at an attraction.

Photo 5 The Eden Project in Cornwall. The attraction opened in early 2001. During the Easter week of 2001, visitor numbers exceeded the planned maximum day targets by more than double. This caused huge traffic jams and contributed to the incident shown in the accompanying photograph

Even relatively remote 'wilderness areas' including several in Australia are not without their visitor management problems. Issues relating to growing numbers of visitors and related visitor management strategies are discussed in the following case study that focuses on the World Heritage Site (WHS) of Kakadu National Park in Australia.

Case Study: Visitor management in Kakadu Park

Kakadu Park is a WHS in the Northern Territory of Australia. It was established as a National Park in the late 1980s. The establishment of the Park was an attempt to reconcile the interests of conservation, mining, Aboriginal land rights and tourism. Kakadu achieved World Heritage status in 1992.

Kakadu has a tropical climate, with high temperatures all year round (with a mean between 30 and 37°C). It has two seasons; a wet season from October to March and dry season from April to September. Heavy rain falls, particularly in January and February, and this causes widespread flooding in the riverine flood plains. The area has several large rivers and streams.

The climate supports a complex tropical ecosystem and the only recent arrival of Europeans and European-descended settlers, means Kakadu is a major habitat for a large range of wildlife. Over one-third of Australia's bird life is found here, over 120 reptiles and amphibians, 50 different fish species, 55 types of mammal, 1,500 types of butterfly and moth and over 1,600 botanical species. In addition to the bird life, for many visitors the key attraction is the saltwater crocodile.

Aboriginal settlements in Kakadu date back at least 50,000 years. One of the major cultural components of the park is the large number of Aboriginal rock paintings. There are least 5,000 known sites of rock paintings and, probably, another 5,000 yet to be itemized. These are important living parts of Aboriginal culture, they are a repository of local knowledge, a source of teaching, manifestations of the spiritual made physical and a link between Aboriginal Dreamtime and the present. A number of these rock paintings are tourist attractions.

The discovery of gold in the nineteenth century and uranium in the 1950s led to the creation of a frame-work in which the interests of Aborigines, conservation and mining could be encompassed. The result was that title was invested in Aboriginal peoples under the 1976 Aboriginal Land Rights Acts. Jabiru town was established at this time as a mining centre.

Visitor management issues

Initially, tourism development was denied in some areas including Jabiru. By the late 1970s, with the establishment of the area as a National Park, tourism infrastructure was allowed. Visitor numbers increased rapidly in the period from the early 1980s to the mid-1990s (46,000 in 1982 and 220,000 in 1994). Visitors tend to be well educated, better paid than the average Australian. The average length of stay was 3–4 days in the mid-1990s. One of the major destinations is Yellow Rivers with over 75 per cent of tourists visiting. Here, the main tourist product is a wildlife experience, the opportunity to go bird watching and a scenic boat ride. Aboriginal involvement in tourism is significant, although not always direct. The most famous hotel in the area, the Gagudju Crocodile Hotel, is Aboriginal owned. The hotel owners also own Yellow Rivers Boat tours, motels and camping grounds. In addition to the group that owns the Gagudju Crocodile Hotel, there are two other Aboriginal associations actively involved in tourism. Aboriginal groups obtain significant economic benefits from tourism. Considerable amounts of this benefit are ploughed back into sustaining the Park and maintaining the traditional lifestyle.

The original intention when creating the Park was to prevent tourism development in the town of Jabiru. However, Jabiru grew as shops, services and a town infrastructure

developed and as a result it was decided to concentrate tourism here. Nevertheless, the town is zoned, with some areas focusing on tourism and in other areas tourism is excluded.

On the rivers in the park, there is recommendation that boats should not travel faster than 10 kilometres per hour. This restricts bank erosion to only a minor scale. While the larger tour boat run by the Yellow River operation tend to comply with the recommendation, smaller craft have been reported as travelling faster.

Evidence was emerging in the late 1990s that tourism is affecting wildlife in the park. A number of bird species including the red-winged parrots, sulphur-crested cockatoos and shining flycatchers were recorded as being 'highly disturbed' when tourist boats passed them. This means they flew away but it was not known whether they regrouped after the departure of the tourists.

In Kakadu, it is possible for tourists to see rock art *in situ*. Sites are managed through the use of mainly Aboriginal guides. Guided walks are a popular part of the tourist experience in the Park. Guides act as interpreters and also in an unofficial policing role, monitoring any unintentional damage or vandalism at sites. The Park authorities also have a record of the sacred sites in the Park, but these are not generally known to tourists or any other member of the public. The Park authorities also have the power to deny access to certain sites.

In conclusion, in Kakadu National Park there has been an attempt to allow local indigenous people to retain their traditional lifestyle, promote their culture in the way they see fit, obtain employment and to allow tourists to see wildlife in a natural setting within the context of Aboriginal culture.

Adapted from Ryan (1998).

The study of Kakadu National Park indicates a number of issues concerned with managing WHS where visitors go to a relatively remote area that contains important natural attractions. However, some WHSs are based on built attractions and the United Kingdom's attraction Stonehenge is such a site. It is the most visited prehistoric site in the United Kingdom and is one of the world's most important archaeological remains. The location of the site amongst other factors contributes to significant visitor management problems. These are presented in the following case study.

Case Study: Visitor management at Stonehenge

Stonehenge is a stone monument dating back at least 4,000 years and possibly as far back as 4000 BC (hence, it may be nearly 6,000 years old). What the monument was used for has caused much controversy over a period of several hundred years. This, in turn, has generated much literature, which has been a form of marketing to potential tourists. A number of theories exist:

- it is a prehistoric temple or religious site;
- it is a prehistoric calendar;
- it has astronomical significance helping to mark position of stars.

It seems likely that it was probably a combination of all the three listed above, with compelling evidence that it was a calendar. The stones at Stonehenge mark the position of the sun at different times of the year, with mid-summer's day (June 21) and mid-winter's day (December 21) given particular prominence in the stone circle.

Stonehenge is a WHS. It had approximately 900,000 paying visitors in 2006 (plus at least 200,000 who looked from the road but did not pay). It is the most visited pre-historic site in the United Kingdom and has been consistently in the top ten UK visitor attractions since 1990. In 2003, as high a proportion as 73 per cent of visitors were from overseas (41 per cent of visitors from the United States) and 98 per cent of visitors arrived by car/coach. Most visitors stay for only 20–30 minute and about half of these do not get beyond the visitor centre/or car park so they do not actually go to the stones. It has been estimated that up to 500 visitors per hour could be accommodated in the stone circle if access was allowed, but there are up to 2,000 visitors per hour in the peak summer season of July and August. The facilities include a Visitor Centre, a souvenir shop, a take away café/restaurant, toilets and a large car park.

Stonehenge is owned by English Heritage (EH), an independent body set up in 1984 by Parliament to protect England's archaeological and architectural heritage. It is marketed globally, but particularly in the United States, by EH and the British Tourist Authority. The interpretation of the Stonehenge is almost exclusively by hand-held mobile phone-sized electronic device, known as an audio wand. This operates in a number of languages and provides a basic interpretation of the site, but has the option of more details. There are numbered stopping off points with a linked commentary in English, six different European languages and also Japanese.

There are several key management issues, which are as follows:

- The sheer number of visitors (there is likely to be increase to in excess of 1 million paying visitors by 2009).

- There is the problem of possible damage to the monument. To prevent damage to the stones they are normally roped off. One of the reasons given is the potential damage caused by too many hands and feet. But another reason is that alternative groups in Britain, those who claim to be Celtic priests (Druids) and others, usually referred to as New Age travellers have tried to use Stonehenge for festivals and quasi-religious ceremonies. Recently, access has been granted for the use by 'Druids' on the summer solstice (21 June). But as most visitors cannot get this type of access they may feel cheated.

- Authenticity of the experience and related tourist satisfaction is a key factor.

- Entrance costs are relatively low at £5–60 for adults and £3.20 for children in 2006, and with other concessionary fares for groups and senior citizens and students may encourage large numbers of visitors.

- The site is between two relatively major roads linking London with Southwest England. The traffic noise, particularly in summer, is disruptive to the experience of the site. The busiest road is the A303 trunk road and over the past 20 years, there have been several plans to build a tunnel to house this road. As of late 2007, none of these had been accepted. The longer the tunnel is delayed the more it will cost to build.

- The Visitor Centre is currently underground and there is an under-road bypass to get to the site. This is for safety reasons as there were road accidents in the past. The Visitor Centre was called 'a national disgrace' by the House of Commons Select Committee on Heritage in 1994. A new visitor centre is planned for a location approximately 3 km away, just to the north of Amesbury, the nearest town. This centre will provide an interpretation of the site of Stonehenge over a 10,000-year period. Visitors who wish to will then be able to walk to the actual site of the stones from this visitor centre. However, siting a visitor centre away from Stonehenge has raised authenticity issues.

- Who actually owns the site and for what purposes it should be used, is a major area of controversy. In the past 25 years or so, various groups have claimed that they should have access to the site, including New Age travellers for festivals and 'Druids' for religious purposes. As these groups have been viewed until very recently as outside the main stream of society, it has been relatively easy for the police and authorities to get the support of locals to restrict access. However, in the mid-1980s, a number of clashes between police and New Age travellers led to serious injury to persons and property. Eventually, the police had to pay compensation and access to the site has been on the agenda ever since.

In the early part of the twenty-first century, Stonehenge is roped off most of the time, although there have been occasions, such as mid-summer's day, when access

has been allowed. Increasingly, private access is being allowed outside normal opening hours, particularly for educational purposes. An important issue for future management relates to who is allowed regular access. Is it fair, for example, that scientists/archaeologists can gain easy access, but not those who claim they want to use the site for religious purposes?

In an attempt to find answers to some of the questions concerned with the visitor experience and management issues, a questionnaire survey of visitors to Stonehenge was conducted in 2004 (see Mason and Kuo, 2007). The survey, involving questions relating to demographic factors and a number of statements involving Likert response scales, was conducted for 2 days towards the end of the main summer season. Visitors were questioned at a point just outside the main turnstile entrance to Stonehenge. The main results are presented below.

Approximately 40 per cent of visitors were British, whilst almost 60 per cent were from overseas with the single biggest group (29 per cent) from the United States. There were also a large number of visitors from continental Europe. Approximately three-quarters were first time visitors and the remaining respondents who had visited more then once were nearly all British. In terms of motivational factors for visiting, the uniqueness of Stonehenge, its status as a WHS and its role in helping visitors' understanding of archaeology and prehistory were the most significant. In relation to the visitor experience, generally favourable responses were revealed, with interpretation at Stonehenge being viewed as largely satisfactory, and visitors were particularly pleased with the audio wands. However, the various facilities, and amenities at the monument, such as the toilets and food kiosk, achieved mixed results. The survey suggested a desire by visitors to regulate visitation so that Stonehenge can be conserved, to ensure future generations continue to enjoy the monument. But visitors also wanted Stonehenge to be available for all types of visitor and not just specialist groups.

Although there was generally little difference between male and female visitors' responses, female visitors felt more strongly about the uniqueness of the site and also felt more strongly than the males that not allowing visitors to touch the stones is necessary to conserve Stonehenge. There were differences between British and overseas visitors in relation to views on entrance charges. Overseas visitors supported more strongly than British visitors the entrance charge for adults. Overseas visitors also showed a higher acceptance of increasing entrance charges and using the extra income for resource protection. There were also some differences between first time and repeat visitors' views on entrance charges, who should be allowed access and whether visitors should be encouraged to go to the new visitor centre, which would be build away

from Stonehenge, rather than Stonehenge itself. With reference to the statements concerned with these three issues, repeat visitors' Likert scale mean scores were lower than those for first-time visitors.

Although this survey was only a snapshot of views at a particular moment in time, the responses of the visitors reveal a variety of views, and a rather more complex picture than much of the rhetoric concerning Stonehenge. In summary, and largely contradicting the UK Government Report suggesting that Stonehenge is a 'national disgrace', the majority of visitors indicated that Stonehenge is a unique site, with good interpretation, a fair entrance charge, generally good value for money and, overall, an enjoyable experience.

Stonehenge is located in the county of Wiltshire in the United Kingdom. This county has more prehistoric sites than any other in the United Kingdom. Only 30 km away from Stonehenge, at Avebury, is another stone circle, albeit with a much larger diameter than that at Stonehenge. Another difference in appearance between Stonehenge and Avebury is that the site of Avebury includes a village located within the stone circle. The site has been used for continuous habitation for probably 5,000 years. This means there are somewhat different visitor management issues.

The site is owned by the National Trust (NT). This is a body set up about 100 years ago (1895) as a charitable organization to preserve both natural and built heritage. It owns areas of land and many old country houses. Rather confusingly, the site is in the guardianship of EH and is managed by the NT. Avebury, like Stonehenge, is a WHS (Photo 6).

Because of the nature of the site, with a living community inside the stone circle, there are different management issues. These are as follows:

- There is no entrance charge, because a road cuts through the site and hence it would very difficult to have one.
- There is a car park (Photo 7) at some distance from the site, so visitors have to walk to the site itself, but there is only a relatively low charge here during the main season and not in winter at all.
- There is a museum that is also a visitor centre. There is no charge to NT members here, but there are many NT and EH publications, plus souvenirs

Photo 6   Prehistoric Avebury is a WHS in the care of the NT

Photo 7   Parking at Stonehenge (and nearby Avebury) is a major visitor management issue

are on sale here. There is a small café. There is a public house and cafes in the village, mainly catering for tourists.

- The stone circle is easily accessible and the stones can be touched. However, the land is also used for sheep grazing, dog walking and the circle is cut in two by a busy, relatively dangerous road. The road passing through raises questions of authenticity/satisfaction of tourists.
- It is a living community, so there is potential conflict, in particular the feelings of locals in relation to the satisfaction of visitors.

- Periodically in the last 25 years, a number of stones have been defaced by graffiti. This has led to arguments over whether there should be continued free access, or if the area should be roped-off, as at Stonehenge.
- Unlike Stonehenge, there is no security team. This is viewed as not desirable as the site is part of a living community.

The site at Avebury, unlike that at Stonehenge, is not marketed directly either to domestic or overseas visitors. It is largely by word of mouth and a small range of publications, that it is known. This is part of a deliberate visitor management strategy, which has been used in the past in an attempt to limit the number of visitors (R. Henderson, personal communication, 8 January 2003). The strategy to date appears to have been successful, as Avebury received only 54,000 visitors in 2000. However, these were visitors recorded in the Avebury museum and it is likely the number of visitors to the stone circle will have been at least three or four times this figure (R. Henderson, personal communication, 8 January 2003). This means that probably 200,000 to 250,000 visitors come annually to Avebury. Nevertheless, Avebury has not had the visitor management problems of Stonehenge and the different approach here suggests that such problems are unlikely to occur in the near future. Despite the low visitor numbers and scale of activities at Avebury, there is a cost to maintaining the site. Hence, a key question for the future remains: 'What economic contribution does the site make to its own upkeep?'

Summary

Visitor management involves regulating and often educating visitors. Controlling visitor numbers and/or modifying their behaviour are important approaches. Adapting the resources used by tourists is another approach in visitor management. Various techniques, including interpretation and the use of codes of conduct can be used in relation to these visitor management approaches.

In some locations, New Zealand is one such example, managing visitors is not straightforward. This relates to the attitudes to the use of the environment amongst domestic visitors – they expect to have free unhindered access to virtually all areas. Increasing numbers of international visitors will place greater strains on even the remote wilderness areas. At currently heavily visited attractions such as Stonehenge, in the United Kingdom, there are serious concerns about visitor satisfaction, although the results of the visitor survey suggest that these concerns may be exaggerated. Nevertheless, radical solutions, including

preventing site access, the creation of replicas and the building of a visitor centre at a distance from the attraction are being seriously considered. However, as the example of Avebury in the United Kingdom suggests, a deliberate policy of not marketing a site can assist in the process of visitor management.

Student activities

(1) What are the three main methods of controlling visitors suggested in the 1991 ETB report *Maintaining the Balance*? Consider each of these methods in turn and discuss how effective they would be in the longer term.

(2) Why are there particular problems in relation to visitor management in New Zealand?

(3) With reference to the case study of Kakadu National Park, produce a table with three columns headed as shown below and then complete the table:

Visitor management issue	Possible solution	Likelihood of success of solution
(a)		
(b)		
(c)		
(etc.)		

(4) What are the main differences in terms of management issues between Stonehenge and Avebury?

(5) What plans are there to improve the visitor experience at Stonehenge? What factors may affect the success of these plans?

(6) The results of the questionnaire survey conducted at Stonehenge in 2004 suggest a more complex picture than many of the conventionally held views on visitor management issues there. How would you explain the results of the survey?

(7) What are the possible long-term problems/issues with the visitor management approach adopted at Avebury?