

**PETER GLEN
RESEARCH**

Market Research You Can Action



Ph. (04) 564 4525
Fax. (04) 564 4528
Mobile. (0274) 914 330
peter.glen@xtra.co.nz
www.peterglenresearch.co.nz
P.O. Box 31-397
Lower Hutt

**SHORT TRIP ACTIVE MODE RESEARCH
2009 UPDATE SURVEY**

*Report prepared for the
Greater Wellington Regional Council*

Patrick Farrell

June 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page No.</u>
1. Introduction	3
2. Research Objectives	4
3. Method	5
4. Statistical Note	8
5. Timing	8
6. The Research Results:	9
6.1. Cycle ownership	10
6.2. The percentage of the population making short trips	10
6.3. Total trips	11
6.4. Time of day short trips are made	12
6.5. Mode of travel	12
6.6. Purpose of the short trip	13
6.7. Reasons for not walking/cycling short trips	14
6.8. What would encourage people to walk/cycle short trips	15
6.9. Factors that may make it easier for people to walk/cycle short distances	16
6.10. Trips of more than two kilometres walked/cycled	18
6.11. The Petone to Wellington Pathway	19
6.12. Conclusion	21
7. Detailed Tables	22
Section A: The Short Trip data	23
Section B: The Petone to Wellington Pathway data	46
8. Questionnaire	62

1. INTRODUCTION.

As part of its Regional Land Transport Strategy (RLTS) and Long Term Community Council Plan (LTCCP), Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) encourages people to use the active modes of walking, running, or cycling for trips of less than two kilometres. The LTCCP target is that by 2016: *'at least 80% of all trips up to one kilometre and 60% of all trips between one and two kilometres will be walked or cycled'*.

The Regional Walking Plan (adopted in October 2008) and the Regional Cycling Plan (adopted in December 2008) include the following aspiration for walking and cycling (as set out in the RLTS vision): *'People will generally walk or cycle for short and medium length trips. Pedestrian and cycling networks will be convenient, safe and pleasant to use'*.

The relevant RLTS outcomes for walking and cycling are:

- Increased mode share for pedestrians and cyclists
- Improved level of service for pedestrians and cyclists
- Increased safety for pedestrians and cyclists.

The relevant RLTS 2016 targets for walking and cycling are:

- Active modes account for at least 15% of region wide journey to work trips
- Nearly all urban road frontages are served by a footpath
- All of the strategic cycle network provides an acceptable level of service
- Fewer than 100 pedestrians injured in the region per annum
- Fewer than 75 cyclists injured in the region per annum.

In accordance with the signals in the Government Policy Statement and New Zealand Transport Strategy 2008, the Walking Plan and Cycling Plan also seek to achieve increases in total walking trip/cycling trip numbers in the region across all trip purposes.

In order to track progress towards the long-term targets, the GWRC has a need to conduct regular surveys of travel behaviour. A major benchmark study into regional land transport was conducted in 2001, that indicated that 44% of people made trips of less than one kilometre by way of walking or cycling and 33% made trips of between one and two kilometres by the same modes.

Peter Glen Research subsequently conducted the first two surveys in a series of planned update studies in 2004 and 2006, which specifically focused on active mode travel. This research revealed the following:

- (a) In both surveys, just under 40% of greater Wellington residents 16+ years of age made a short trip up to one kilometre in an “*average 24-hour day*” during the survey period. 74% of the trips made by these residents were by active mode (i.e. walking or cycling), with this result being identical in 2004 and 2006.
- (b) In 2006, 71% of residents made a short trip between one and two kilometres in an “*average day*” during the same period. 27% of the trips made by these respondents were by active mode, up from 19% in 2004.
- (c) In the 2006 survey, the “*net*” result converted to 89% of residents who made any short trip up to two kilometres in an “*average day.*” 42% of the total short trips made were by active mode.

The GWRC has, in 2009, commissioned Peter Glen Research to conduct an update survey, to measure the changes that have occurred in short trip behaviour. This report presents the results of the 2009 update survey.

2. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES.

The primary aim of the research was to gain an updated reading of active mode travel in the greater Wellington region, specifically:

- (a) To determine the percentage of the adult population (16+ years), who undertake short trips of under two kilometres (measured on an “*average day*” basis).
- (b) To ascertain the percentage of short trips, of less than one and two kilometres, which are made using the active modes of walking, running and cycling.
- (c) To identify the barriers that the public perceive to walking and cycling short trips of less than one and two kilometres.
- (d) To obtain an updated base of information that will assist the GWRC to assess the potential and set strategies for promoting active modes of travel in future.
- (e) To track trends over time (two to three-yearly) in the use of, and attitudes toward, active mode travel for short trips in the greater Wellington region.

A further objective of the 2009 survey was:

- (f) To measure the public’s interest in using a wide and safe, shared pathway (for walking, running and cycling) between Petone and Wellington. Two possible options are to be explored: the first involves developing the pathway alongside SH2; the second involves a new pathway on the seaward side of the railway, protecting users from the effects of motorised traffic and rail traffic.

3. METHOD.

3.1. OVERALL APPROACH

The basic methodology remained consistent with that used in the 2004 and 2006 surveys, so that a direct comparison of results could be made where appropriate. The research was therefore undertaken by way of a telephone survey, among a randomly selected sample of 800 residents 16+ years of age who live in the greater Wellington region. Questioning focused on their short trip travel behaviour in the previous 24 hours.

3.2. SAMPLE STRUCTURE

Interviews were spread throughout the greater Wellington region in accordance with population distribution, in order to recruit a representative cross-section of the public. That is:

AREAS COVERED BY:	Total population 2006 Census	%	Sample n=800
Kapiti Coast District Council	46,197	10.3	82
Porirua City Council	48,546	10.8	86
Wellington City Council	179,466	40.0	320
Lower Hutt City Council	97,701	21.8	175
Upper Hutt City Council	38,415	8.5	68
South Wairarapa District Council	8,889	2.0	16
Carterton District Council	7,101	1.6	13
Masterton District Council	22,623	5.0	40
TOTAL	448,938	100.0%	800

3.3. SAMPLE SELECTION

Respondents were recruited for the research by way of random telephone enrolment, using the local telephone directories as the sampling frame. Up to three calls were made to establish contact with each randomly selected respondent, thus preserving, as far as practicable, the random integrity of the survey. Where more than one person qualified per household, the interview was undertaken with the person whose birthday fell next.

3.4. THE NEED FOR A “BOOSTER SAMPLE”

In order to fulfil objective 2(f), regarding the public’s interest in using a wide and safe, shared pathway between Petone and Wellington, it was necessary to confine this section of the questionnaire to people who realistically met the ‘*target group*’ criteria for potential use. This was defined as follows:

- (a) People who had walked, run, or cycled more than two kilometres in the seven days prior to interview; and were
- (b) Residents of Wellington and Hutt City in areas where, realistically, they are likely to be potential candidates for using the proposed pathway. That is, they reside in areas where the journey to/from the proposed pathway is easily achieved by way of cycling, walking, running, or a car ride from which they would “*park and cycle*” or “*park and walk*.”

Based on the sample size for the above sub-region and the incidence of walking and cycling more than two kilometres recorded in the 2006 survey, it was estimated that the random sample would reach over 100 potential walkers, but possibly less than 50 potential cyclists. It was, therefore, recommended that a “*booster sample*” was used in order to double the sample of 2 kilometres+ cyclists from whom we could seek opinions regarding the proposed pathway. The targeted sample of 100 cyclists would provide a sampling accuracy of $\pm 8.2\%$ at the 90% confidence level, with regard to their opinions.

The 2009 random survey produced a sub-sample of 58 respondents that had cycled 2 kilometres+ in the previous 7 days. A further 42 cyclists (who had cycled 2 kilometres+) were recruited by way of the “*booster sample*”.

With reference to the area specified in (b) above, we note that in discussion with client there were two lines of thought as to how the potential catchment should be defined. One idea was to define the catchment as:

- (a) Residents of Wellington and Hutt City (excluding Wainuiomata, Eastbourne, Stokes Valley and any area north of Hutt Hospital – as, according to client, some journey to work analysis had suggested that the distance required to cycle between these locations and Wellington City was too great to warrant inclusion).

The other line of thinking was to define the catchment more broadly as:

- (b) Residents of Wellington and Hutt City in its entirety, as there is potential for the public to not just walk and cycle to the proposed pathway, but to drive to an access point and then “*park and cycle*” or “*park and walk*.”

Peter Glen Research requested that client make a decision as to which catchment definition would apply, prior to commencement of the study. It was decided that the sample (a) catchment definition would apply.

3.5. TIMING ISSUES/VALIDATION

The survey was conducted throughout weekday evenings and weekends, in order to reach a representative cross-section of the population.

The interviews were spread evenly over a similar 8-week timing period as the 2006 survey (i.e. 9 February – 5 April 2009), to enable “*average day*” information to be gathered over time. This would help minimise any distortion that could arise in travel patterns, as a result of factors such as weather, holiday periods and other travel variables. The dates for this year’s survey were also chosen to avoid Easter and ANZAC Day (10 – 25 April), which could distort the public’s “*average week*” travel behaviour.

The effective execution of this research depended, of course, on the respondents’ ability to recall their short trip travel activity in the previous 24 hours. At the start of the 2004 study, a preliminary pilot study was undertaken to test the validity of this approach, using the questionnaire that had been developed. In one of the regional cells (i.e. Lower Hutt), two demographically matched sub-samples were recruited. One sub-sample was incentivised to complete a 24-hour travel diary and the other was subjected to the 24-hour telephone interviewing procedure.

The results of the testing indicated there were no significant differences in reported behaviour between the methods. On this basis, the full-scale telephone survey was then completed.

Telephone interviewing was used because it offered significant cost and timing benefits over diary placement. It was decided that it would not be necessary to re-validate the research method in the 2009 survey, as the core questionnaire had already been tested.

3.6. THE INTERVIEWS

Interviews were administered by way of a structured questionnaire, which was developed in consultation with client. A copy of the questionnaire is attached to the back of this report.

The interviewing was conducted by a team of experienced interviewers employed by Peter Glen Research, who were each fully briefed on the specific requirements of the project.

4. STATISTICAL NOTE.

Sample surveys provide estimates of the actual percentages that would be obtained if the total target population were interviewed (i.e. a census). In this case, the target population is the total number of residents 16+ years of age in the Greater Wellington Region.

Sampling theory, based on the Standard Normal Distribution, can be used to measure the estimated '*margin of error*' that will apply to the sample, providing the respondents have been selected using random sampling procedures.

It should be noted that the '*margin of error*' varies, according to:

- the observed percentage in the survey;
 - the sample base on which the percentage is being calculated;
- and
- the degree of confidence that is required for the study.

To illustrate this point, we have provided below the '*margin of error*' that would apply at different percentage levels, on alternative base sizes and at two different confidence levels – 90% and 95% confidence.

PERCENTAGE OBSERVATION:	90% CONFIDENCE				95% CONFIDENCE			
	n=800	n=400	n=200	n=100	n=800	n=400	n=200	n=100
50%	±2.9%	±4.1%	±5.8%	±8.2%	±3.5%	±4.9%	±6.9%	±9.8%
60% OR 40%	±2.8%	±4.0%	±5.7%	±8.0%	±3.4%	±4.8%	±6.8%	±9.6%
70% OR 30%	±2.7%	±3.7%	±5.3%	±7.5%	±3.2%	±4.5%	±6.3%	±9.0%
90% OR 10%	±1.7%	±2.5%	±3.5%	±4.9%	±2.1%	±2.9%	±4.1%	±5.9%

By way of example, if a survey of 800 randomly selected adults in the Wellington Region shows that 60% make short trips between one and two kilometres in an "*average day*", we could be 90% certain that the true percentage who held that view would be 60% ±2.8%. Thus, the actual percentage would lie somewhere between 57.2% and 62.8%.

It should be noted that it requires four times the sample size to halve the '*margin of error*'.

5. TIMING

Fieldwork for the 2009 update survey was conducted from 9 February to 5 April 2009.

6. THE RESEARCH RESULTS.

6.1. CYCLE OWNERSHIP.

31% of respondents stated that they currently own a bicycle and a further 6% indicated that they have access to one.

Bicycle ownership and access appears to be reasonably consistent across the various sub-regions, i.e.:

<u>% Ownership & Access</u>	
Lower Hutt	43
Porirua	38
Upper Hutt	36
Wellington	35
Kapiti	32
Wairarapa	32

6.2. THE PERCENTAGE OF THE POPULATION MAKING SHORT TRIPS.

To summarise:

RESPONDENTS MAKING SHORT TRIPS	Any short trips up to 2 kms			Trips up to 1 km			Trips between 1 & 2 kms		
	2004	2006	2009	2004	2006	2009	2004	2006	2009
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Respondents who made a short trip (by any mode of travel)	81	89	79	39	36	37	60	71	69
Respondents who travelled by active mode (net):	37	45	49	26	25	31	13	26	37
- walking	36	44	48	25	24	30	12	25	36
- cycling	2	3	4	1	1	1	2	3	3

- 79% of respondents in the greater Wellington region had made a short trip up to two kilometres in the 24 hours prior to interview, which is a decrease on the 89% recorded in the 2006 survey. These respondents had made an average of 3.4 such trips during this time period.
- A net 49% of respondents had made a short trip up to two kilometres by active mode in an “average” 24-hour period. This is a notable increase on the 45% who had done so in the 2006 survey and indicates a continuing trend toward short distance active mode travel.
- The greatest gain with active mode travel has again been made with trips between one and two kilometres. In the latest survey, 37% of respondents had made such a trip, compared to 26% in 2006 and 13% in 2004.

6.3. TOTAL TRIPS.

A summary of the total number of short trips made by respondents during the survey period can be made as follows:

NUMBER OF TRIPS	Total short trips			Trips up to 1 km			Trips between 1 & 2 kms		
	2004	2006	2009	2004	2006	2009	2004	2006	2009
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.
Total short trips made by the 800 respondents (by any mode of travel)	2154	2178	2135	778	703	705	1376	1475	1430
% change		+1.1%	(2.0%)		(9.6%)	+0.3%		+7.2%	(3.1%)
Total active trips made:	837	917	1220	576	522	548	261	395	672
% change		+9.6%	+33.0%		(9.4%)	+5.0%		+51.3%	+70.1%
- By walking	788	855	1145	568	505	528	220	350	617
% change		+8.5%	+33.9%		(11.1%)	+4.6%		+59.1%	+76.3%
- By cycling	49	62	75	8	17	20	41	45	55
% change		+26.5%	+21.0%		+112.5%	+17.6%		+9.8%	+22.2%
Total active mode trips as a percentage of total short trips	39%	42%	57%	74%	74%	78%	19%	27%	47%

- The latest results show an overall decrease of 2% in the total number of short trips made by the survey participants. The reason for this change is not clear, but it might possibly relate to factors such as a less mobile population during the economic recession, weather, or other factors.
- However, what is interesting to note, is that active mode travel has continued to increase, especially for trips between one and two kilometres. Active mode travel now accounts for 78% of all trips up to one kilometre and 47% of trips between one and two kilometres.

6.4. TIME OF DAY SHORT TRIPS ARE MADE.

The overall results again reveal that short trips are made throughout the day, but less so in the evening. However, in the latest survey, the number of short trips undertaken in the evening has doubled, suggesting a major shift in travel patterns.

When trips are made	Total Short Trips up to 2 km		
	2004	2006	2009
	%	%	%
Morning	45	44	36
Afternoon	41	42	35
Evening	14	14	29
TOTAL TRIPS	100%	100%	100%

6.5. MODE OF TRAVEL.

The mode of travel for trips up to one kilometre appears to have moved even more strongly toward active mode travel between survey periods. However, as was noted in Sections 6.2 and 6.3, active mode travel has registered a very significant increase for trips between one and two kilometres.

MODE OF TRAVEL	Total short trips			Trips up to 1 km			Trips between 1 & 2 kms		
	2004	2006	2009	2004	2006	2009	2004	2006	2009
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Walk	37	39	54	73	72	75	16	24	43
Cycle	2	3	4	1	2	3	3	3	4
Car or private vehicle	59	55	33	25	24	20	78	69	40
Bus or train	2	3	7	1	1	1	3	4	9
Other	x	x	2	-	1	1	x	x	4
TOTAL TRIPS	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

The increase in active mode travel appears to have primarily replaced trips by private motor vehicle, rather than public transport. Indeed, public transport has also increased in use for trips between one and two kilometres. Table 4 of the Detailed Tables suggests that this has occurred most predominantly in Wellington City, moreso than in the outlying suburbs.

6.6. PURPOSE OF THE SHORT TRIP.

The results of the 2009 survey again show that the public make short trips for a variety of reasons.

PURPOSE OF SHORT TRIP	TOTAL SHORT TRIPS	Trips up to 1 km	Trips between 1 & 2 kms
	%	%	%
To visit a friend or relative	6	7	6
To visit the shops	16	15	16
To catch public transport	9	12	7
To go to a place of work or study	11	8	13
To take children to/from school	6	7	6
To attend a business meeting or appointment	2	1	2
To attend a private meeting or appointment	3	5	2
To attend a sporting event or other recreation	5	6	4
To attend church/a place of worship	1	1	1
To return home (from work or study)	6	2	8
To return home (from elsewhere)	23	23	23
To return to a place or work or study	6	5	6
A short walk/walk for fitness	2	2	2
To walk the dogs	1	-	2
Other purposes	3	6	2
TOTAL SHORT TRIPS	100%	100%	100%

Table 5 of the Detailed Tables reveals that active mode trips are also made for a variety of reasons, similar in fact to the profile shown for the total short trips above.

6.7. REASONS FOR NOT WALKING/CYCLING SHORT TRIPS.

Respondents expressed a variety of reasons as to why they did not travel by active mode for their short trips. A similar “*resistance profile*” emerged to both walking and cycling short distances.

BARRIERS TO ACTIVE MODE TRAVEL	Reasons why the public do not walk	Reasons why cycle owners do not cycle
	%	%
Weather	18	12
Lack of time	17	13
Too much to carry	10	12
Habit	9	9
Have young/sick children	6	9
Road safety concerns	5	10
Travelling further afield	7	7
Health/fitness concerns; pregnancy	8	4
Personal safety concerns	5	4
Travelling with another person	5	4
Steep terrain (hills/steps)	4	2
Doesn't suit corporate dress/religious or cultural dress	2	2
No secure storage for cycle	-	3
Nowhere to shower/change	-	1
Other reasons	4	8
TOTAL NON-ACTIVE TRIPS	100%	100%

Cycling does, however, attract its own set of difficulties, relating to corporate or cultural dress and the lack of secure storage facilities.

In this year's survey, additional questions were used in an attempt to clarify what is meant by the third highest resistance factor, '*too much to carry*'. Respondents revealed that a range of items make up this category, including:

- School bags, backpacks, etc (for children)
- Recycling material/rubbish
- Groceries, (heavy items such as a week's grocery order, milk, potatoes, dog biscuits, cat litter, etc)
- Sports equipment
- Items for a presentation to clients/a group
- Office supplies; art projects/equipment
- Books/library books
- A wide range of other material and equipment.

The items were generally described as '*too bulky*' and/or '*too heavy*' to carry when walking or cycling.

6.8. WHAT WOULD ENCOURAGE PEOPLE TO WALK/CYCLE SHORT DISTANCES?

In just over half the cases where active modes were *not* used for short trips, respondents indicated that nothing could be done to encourage them to walk or cycle for those particular types of trips. A variety of barriers were identified and these can be examined in Table 6 (d) of the Detailed Tables.

However, in over 40% of cases, respondents could identify factors that would have made their short trip travel more conducive to active mode. With the exception of '*weather*' and, possibly, '*more time/timing issues*', it would seem that many of the barriers could be addressed over time.

The main barriers to *walking* short trips, that could potentially be overcome, were as follows. They are listed in order of frequency of mention.

- (1) Better weather
- (2) More time
- (3) Personal motivation/help to change habits
- (4) We need safer streets at night
- (5) We need more/better street lighting
- (6) We need better footpaths and pedestrian crossings
- (7) We need better health/fitness
- (8) Encourage people to walk together.

The main barriers to **cycling** short trips, identified by respondents with a cycle, included the need for:

- (1) Safer bike user lanes
- (2) Safer streets at night
- (3) Wider (safer) roads for cycling
- (4) Better security for parked bikes
- (5) Cycle training (for confidence on the road)
- (6) Better weather
- (7) Personal motivation/help to change habits.

6.9. FACTORS THAT MAY MAKE IT EASIER FOR PEOPLE TO WALK/ CYCLE SHORT DISTANCES

Following on from the previous section, respondents were asked to rate various factors according to their degree of importance, in terms of making it easier for people to walk or cycle short distances.

The overall rank order of importance of the factors that may assist short distance **walking** was as follows:

RANK ORDER OF WALKING FACTORS	<u>Percentage rating each factor of:</u>		
	Major Importance	Minor Importance	No Importance
	%	%	%
1. Better footpaths and walking routes	41	33	26
2. Better driver awareness of pedestrians	32	42	26
3. Improved pedestrian flow	36	30	34
4. Having other people to walk or run with	31	25	44
5. Information or help planning a suitable route	20	17	63
6. Lower speed limits	17	18	65
7. Less traffic	12	23	65
8. Showers, changing rooms and lockers at destination	14	14	72

Based on the percentage of respondents with a cycle, who rated each factor important, the overall rank order of factors that may assist short distance *cycling* was:

RANK ORDER OF CYCLING FACTORS	Percentage rating each factor of:		
	Major Importance	Minor Importance	No Importance
	%	%	%
1. Better driver awareness of cyclists	46	37	17
2. More on-road cycle lanes	52	29	19
3. More off-road cycle paths	64	15	21
4. More road space for cyclists	56	21	23
5. Secure cycle storage at my destination	44	27	29
6. Having other people to cycle with	17	33	50
7. Less traffic	21	21	58
8. Showers, changing rooms and lockers available at destination	13	29	58
9. Cycle training to improve confidence and skills	25	15	60
10. Lower speed limits	19	18	63
11. Information or help planning a suitable route	19	14	67
12. Repairs to my cycle	14	11	75

6.10. TRIPS OF MORE THAN TWO KILOMETRES

Questions were also included to quantify the incidence of trips taken by active mode in the past seven days that involved travel of *more* than two kilometres.

The results revealed that:

- 58% of residents in the greater Wellington region had *walked* more than two kilometres in the seven days prior to interview. This is up significantly on the 47% who had done so in the 2006 survey.
- On average, they had walked 3.7 trips in the seven-day period.
- 31% of residents who owned, or had access to a cycle, had *cycled* more than two kilometres in the previous seven days, up marginally on the 27% who had done so in the 2006 survey.
- On average, they had cycled 3.8 trips, which is also up on the 2.5 trips registered in 2006.
- 23% of residents with a cycle had ridden more than two kilometres in the past five working days and 29% had done so in the previous weekend.
- 30% of the cyclists who had made trips during the weekdays were commuters. The majority of the remainder were on-road recreational cyclists (63%) compared to off-road/mountain bikers (7%).
- However, the commuters had made an average 4.7 trips, compared to the recreational cyclists' average 2.2 trips. This means that the commuters accounted for approximately half (48%) of the two kilometre+ trips made during the weekday period.
- 98% of the weekend cyclists were mainly recreational cyclists, with equal numbers describing themselves as '*on-road recreational cyclists*' versus '*off-road/mountain bikers*'.

6.11. THE PETONE TO WELLINGTON PATHWAY

6.11.1 USAGE OF THE EXISTING PATHWAY

35% of the respondents in the “*target area*”, who had walked or cycled more than two kilometres in the seven days prior to interview, stated that they had ‘*ever used*’ the existing pathway between Petone and Wellington.

Usage was much higher (59%) among Lower Hutt residents than it was among Wellingtonians (28%). This may, to some extent, be reflective of the fact that *all* of Wellington and its suburbs was sampled, whereas interviewing was restricted to the “*more accessible*” suburbs in Lower Hutt.

Recent use of the pathway was a lot lower. A total of 14% of the “*target group*” had used it in the previous four weeks and 27% had done so in the previous twelve months.

6.11.2 WHAT DISCOURAGES PEOPLE FROM USING THE EXISTING PATHWAY?

The major deterrents are listed below in order of frequency of mention:

RATINGS	A Major Concern	A Minor Concern	Not a Concern
	%	%	%
1. It is currently unsafe or dangerous	67	12	21
2. Heavy or too much traffic	42	19	39
3. Existing pathway is too narrow	37	22	41
4. The distance is too far	28	30	42
5. The pathway surface is too uneven	24	34	42
6. Pollution (exhaust fumes)	19	26	55
7. The risk of a flat tyre (if cycling)	15	11	74
8. Traffic noise	6	15	79

It is interesting to note that the four greatest concerns of *recent* users of the route are:

1. The pathway surface is uneven (72% consider it a concern)
2. The risk of a flat tyre when cycling (69%)
3. The existing pathway is too narrow (52%)
4. It is currently unsafe or dangerous (22%)

6.11.3 LIKELIHOOD OF USING THE POTENTIAL NEW PATHWAYS

44% of the “*target group*” indicated that they would be likely to use ‘*a wide and safe, shared pathway (mainly alongside State Highway 2) that could be used by both cyclists and pedestrians*’. 32% claimed they would use it at least once a month and 6% stated they would do so at least once a week.

A significantly higher percentage of the “*target group*” expressed interest in the alternative pathway, which was described as ‘*a wide and safe, shared pathway developed as a new pathway on the seaward side of the railway line, protected from the effects of motorised traffic on State Highway 2 and rail traffic*’. 65% indicated they would be likely to use this pathway, 43% at least once a month and 13% at least once a week.

The results indicate that residents would use the newly developed pathway for both cycling and walking/running. However, a greater proportion of the more frequent users would use the pathway for commuting and, therefore, would travel more predominantly by cycle.

6.11.4 USE OF THE SHOULDER OF STATE HIGHWAY 2

19% of the “*target group*” stated that they currently cycle on the shoulder of State Highway 2.

80% of these cyclists indicated that they would use one of the proposed dual-use pathways. Their preference was strongly in favour of the pathway on the seaward side of the railway line, with 92% selecting this option.

The 20% of cyclists who would not use dual-use pathways, revealed that they ‘*prefer the freedom of cycling on the open road*’ and ‘*don’t wish to share the pathway with other users*’.

6.12. CONCLUSION

The key findings of the 2009 Short Trip research project are as follows:

- (a) 37% of respondents made a short trip up to one kilometre in an “*average 24-hour day*” during the survey period. 74% of the trips made by these respondents were by active mode (i.e. walking/cycling).

(The comparative figures in the 2006 survey were 36% and 74% respectively).

- (b) 69% of respondents made a short trip between one and two kilometres in an “*average day*” during the same time period. 47% of the trips made by these respondents were by active mode.

(The comparative figures in the 2006 survey were 71% and 27% respectively).

- (c) The “*net*” result converts to 79% of respondents made any short trip up to two kilometres in an “*average day*.” 58% of the total short trips made were by active mode.

(The comparative figures in the 2006 survey were 89% and 42% respectively).

These results suggest that whilst short distance travel has declined slightly in comparison to the 2006 survey (2% fewer trips overall), active mode travel has continued to increase, most significantly in the ‘*one to two kilometre*’ category.

The latest survey points to various factors that would help enhance residents’ propensity to walk and cycle short distances. These are summarised in Sections 6.8 and 6.9.

There is considerable interest in the possible new pathway suggested between Petone and Wellington. The report provides a base of information on which this proposal can be further assessed.

7. DETAILED TABLES