Market Research You Can Action

PETER GLEN RESEARCH

Telephone (04) 564-4525
Fax (04) 564-4528
Mobile (0274) 914-330
P O Box 31-397
Lower Hutt
e-mail:
peter.glen@xtra.co.nz

# MARKET RESEARCH REPORT:

# REGIONAL LAND TRANSPORT STRATEGY REVIEW

## - DETAILED TABLES -

*Report prepared for*

*the Greater Wellington Regional Council*

*March 2007*

**TABLE OF CONTENTS.**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS.**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS** (continued)

# SECTION 1. STATISTICAL NOTE.

## 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).

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.

| SAMPLE SIZE (n)/ CONFIDENCE LEVELS | PERCENTAGE OBSERVATION: 50% | 70% or 30% | 90% or 10% |
|---|---|---|---|
| 90% CONFIDENCE | | | |
| n=1200 | ±2.4% | ± 2.2% | ± 1.4% |
| n=1000 | ±2.6% | ±2.4% | ±1.6% |
| n=800 | ±2.9% | ±2.7% | ±1.7% |
| n=600 | ±3.3% | ±3.1% | ±2.0% |
| n=400 | ±4.1% | ±3.7% | ±2.5% |
| n=200 | ±5.7% | ±5.3% | ±3.5% |
| n=100 | ±8.2% | ±7.5% | ±4.9% |
| 95% CONFIDENCE | | | |
| n=1200 | ±2.8% | ±2.6% | ±1.7% |
| n=1000 | ±3.1% | ±2.8% | ±1.9% |
| n=800 | ±3.5% | ±3.2% | ±2.1% |
| n=600 | ±4.0% | ±3.7% | ±2.4% |
| n=400 | ±4.9% | ±4.5% | ±2.9% |
| n=200 | ±6.9% | ±6.3% | ±4.1% |
| n=100 | ±9.8% | ±9.0% | ±5.9% |

By way of example, if the survey of 800 randomly selected residents of the greater Wellington region shows that 50% hold a particular attitude, we can be 90% certain that the true percentage who hold that view would be 50% ±2.9%. Thus, the actual percentage would lie somewhere between 47.1% and 52.9%.

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

Where appropriate, the results of this survey have been analysed by the Territorial Authority areas specified in 3.1.2 above. This has established meaningful sub-group bases of at least 70 respondents, which provides indicative results (± 10% at 90% confidence) of any differences that exist between areas. The three Wairarapa districts have been combined for analysis purposes, to provide the effective base size.

# SECTION 2. THE TABULATED DATA.

TABLE 1: MODE OF TRAVEL MAINLY USED BY PEOPLE IN THE RESPONDENT BUSINESSES FOR SPECIFIC PURPOSES

Base: Total respondents who participated in the business survey

| MODE OF TRAVEL | | TRANSPORTING GOODS OR EQUIPMENT | TRAVELLING TO BUSINESS MEETINGS | COMMUTING |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bases: | | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | | % | % | % |
| Motor vehicle | - car | 17 | 68 | 70 |
| | - van | 18 | 19 | 17 |
| | - truck | 45 | - | - |
| | - motorcycle | - | - | - |
| Taxi | | - | 3 | - |
| Bus | | - | - | 3 |
| Train | | - | - | 3 |
| Walking | | - | 4 | 6 |
| Cycle | | - | 2 | 1 |
| Courier | | 14 | - | - |
| Don't Know/Can't Say | | 6 | 4 | - |
| TOTAL BUSINESS RESPONDENTS | | 100% | 100% | 100% |

TABLE 2: HOW THE PUBLIC RATE TRAVEL IN THE GREATER WELLINGTON REGION, BY DIFFERENT MODES OF TRANSPORT, IN TERMS OF EASE, RELIABILITY AND SAFETY

Base: Total respondents in each group

| | RESIDENTIAL | | | BUSINESS | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (a) PRIVATE MOTOR VEHICLE | EASE OF TRAVEL | RELIABILITY | SAFETY | EASE OF TRAVEL | RELIABILITY | SAFETY |
| Bases: | 800 | 800 | 800 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| Ratings: 10 (Very Positive) | 13 | 28 | 16 | 21 | 15 | 15 |
| 9 | 11 | 14 | 19 | 6 | 24 | 21 |
| 8 | 21 | 21 | 23 | 34 | 25 | 28 |
| 7 | 13 | 12 | 16 | 9 | 18 | 12 |
| 6 | 12 | 8 | 10 | 6 | 2 | 9 |
| 5 | 12 | 8 | 7 | 15 | 14 | 15 |
| 4 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | - |
| 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | - |
| 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | - | - | - |
| 1 (Not at all positive) | 4 | 2 | 1 | 3 | - | - |
| TOTAL RESPONDENTS | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Average (mean) rating | 6.7 | 7.7 | 7.5 | 7.3 | 7.8 | 7.8 |

TABLE 2: HOW THE PUBLIC RATE TRAVEL IN THE GREATER WELLINGTON REGION, BY DIFFERENT MODES OF TRANSPORT, IN TERMS OF EASE, RELIABILITY AND SAFETY

Base: Total respondents in each group

| (b) TRAIN | RESIDENTIAL | | | BUSINESS | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | EASE OF TRAVEL | RELIABILITY | SAFETY | EASE OF TRAVEL | RELIABILITY | SAFETY |
| Bases: | 800 | 800 | 800 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| Ratings: 10 (Very Positive) | 9 | 4 | 16 | 12 | 6 | 29 |
| 9 | 11 | 13 | 23 | 18 | 15 | 34 |
| 8 | 20 | 21 | 26 | 13 | 19 | 15 |
| 7 | 16 | 19 | 13 | 9 | 12 | 3 |
| 6 | 17 | 11 | 7 | 3 | 15 | 6 |
| 5 | 15 | 14 | 9 | 12 | 12 | 6 |
| 4 | 4 | 7 | 2 | 6 | 4 | - |
| 3 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 18 | 4 | - |
| 2 | 2 | 5 | - | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| 1 (Not at all positive) | 4 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 10 | 6 |
| TOTAL RESPONDENTS | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Average (mean) rating | 6.7 | 6.5 | 7.8 | 6.1 | 6.3 | 8.1 |

TABLE 2: HOW THE PUBLIC RATE TRAVEL IN THE GREATER WELLINGTON REGION, BY DIFFERENT MODES OF TRANSPORT, IN TERMS OF EASE, RELIABILITY AND SAFETY

Base: Total respondents in each group

| | | | Residential | | | Business | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (c) Bus | | | Ease of Travel | Reliability | Safety | Ease of Travel | Reliability | Safety |
| | | Bases: | 800 | 800 | 800 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | | | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| Ratings: | 10 | (Very Positive) | 10 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 16 |
| | 9 | | 9 | 10 | 26 | 15 | 13 | 22 |
| | 8 | | 16 | 22 | 24 | 9 | 13 | 25 |
| | 7 | | 21 | 19 | 17 | 19 | 24 | 15 |
| | 6 | | 15 | 15 | 9 | 18 | 7 | 10 |
| | 5 | | 13 | 16 | 8 | 13 | 23 | 3 |
| | 4 | | 5 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3 | - |
| | 3 | | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 | - | - |
| | 2 | | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | - |
| | 1 | (Not at all positive) | 4 | 4 | 3 | 12 | 10 | 9 |
| Total respondents | | | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Average (mean) rating | | | 6.5 | 6.4 | 7.4 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 7.5 |

TABLE 2: HOW THE PUBLIC RATE TRAVEL IN THE GREATER WELLINGTON REGION, BY DIFFERENT MODES OF TRANSPORT, IN TERMS OF EASE, RELIABILITY AND SAFETY

Base: Total respondents in each group

| | RESIDENTIAL | | | BUSINESS | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (d) CYCLE | EASE OF TRAVEL | RELIABILITY | SAFETY | EASE OF TRAVEL | RELIABILITY | SAFETY |
| Bases: | 800 | 800 | 800 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| Ratings: 10 (Very Positive) | 8 | 11 | 1 | 12 | 6 | 2 |
| 9 | 7 | 11 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 1 |
| 8 | 16 | 20 | 8 | 9 | 19 | 3 |
| 7 | 5 | 10 | 8 | 9 | 20 | 6 |
| 6 | 9 | 10 | 12 | 25 | 19 | 3 |
| 5 | 15 | 15 | 18 | 13 | 3 | 28 |
| 4 | 10 | 4 | 15 | 3 | - | 12 |
| 3 | 5 | 2 | 11 | 8 | 10 | 27 |
| 2 | 10 | 6 | 11 | - | 3 | 9 |
| 1 (Not at all positive) | 15 | 11 | 15 | 15 | 13 | 9 |
| TOTAL RESPONDENTS | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Average (mean) rating | 5.3 | 6.2 | 4.3 | 5.8 | 5.9 | 4.1 |

TABLE 2: HOW THE PUBLIC RATE TRAVEL IN THE GREATER WELLINGTON REGION, BY DIFFERENT MODES OF TRANSPORT, IN TERMS OF EASE, RELIABILITY AND SAFETY

Base: Total respondents in each group

| (e) WALKING | RESIDENTIAL | | | BUSINESS | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | EASE OF TRAVEL | RELIABILITY | SAFETY | EASE OF TRAVEL | RELIABILITY | SAFETY |
| Bases: | 800 | 800 | 800 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| Ratings: 10 (Very Positive) | 21 | 27 | 8 | 6 | 13 | 3 |
| 9 | 13 | 15 | 15 | 22 | 16 | 18 |
| 8 | 22 | 24 | 23 | 9 | 23 | 9 |
| 7 | 15 | 12 | 14 | 21 | 19 | 15 |
| 6 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 15 | 7 | 9 |
| 5 | 8 | 7 | 15 | 6 | 10 | 25 |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 5 | - | - | 6 |
| 3 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | - | 3 |
| 1 (Not at all positive) | 4 | 2 | 3 | 17 | 10 | 9 |
| TOTAL RESPONDENTS | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Average (mean) rating | 7.2 | 7.8 | 6.6 | 6.3 | 7.0 | 6.0 |

TABLE 3: AMOUNT OF IMPACT THAT THE REGION'S TRANSPORT SYSTEM IS CONSIDERED TO HAVE ON THE ENVIRONMENT

Base: Total respondents in each group

| IMPACT ON THE ENVIRONMENT | TOTAL | | RESIDENTIAL BREAKDOWNS | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | SEX | | AGE (YEARS) | | | | |
| | RESIDENTIAL | BUSINESS | MALE | FEMALE | 14-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60+ |
| Bases: | 800 | 100 | 375 | 425 | 169 | 111 | 136 | 128 | 256 |
| | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| Ratings 10 (High level of impact) | 5 | 10 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 3 |
| 9 | 9 | 13 | 12 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 13 | 13 |
| 8 | 20 | 16 | 16 | 24 | 24 | 26 | 21 | 29 | 10 |
| 7 | 15 | 29 | 13 | 17 | 20 | 23 | 21 | 14 | 7 |
| 6 | 16 | 3 | 15 | 16 | 13 | 11 | 13 | 10 | 26 |
| 5 | 18 | 16 | 15 | 20 | 17 | 19 | 15 | 13 | 21 |
| 4 | 7 | 3 | 8 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 10 |
| 3 | 6 | 7 | 9 | 4 | 15 | - | 6 | 6 | 3 |
| 2 | 3 | - | 6 | 2 | - | 3 | 3 | 3 | 7 |
| 1 (Low level of impact) | 1 | 3 | 2 | - | - | 3 | 3 | - | - |
| TOTAL RESPONDENTS | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Average (mean) rating | 6.3 | 6.8 | 6.1 | 6.5 | 6.1 | 6.6 | 6.5 | 6.8 | 6.0 |

TABLE 3: AMOUNT OF IMPACT THAT THE REGION'S TRANSPORT SYSTEM IS CONSIDERED TO HAVE ON THE ENVIRONMENT

Base: Total respondents in each group

| | RESIDENTIAL BREAKDOWNS | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | HOUSEHOLD INCOME (PRE-TAX) PER ANNUM | | | | | AREA | | | | | |
| IMPACT ON THE ENVIRONMENT | Up to $30k | Over $30-50k | Over $50-70k | Over $70K | DK/ Refused | KAPITI | PORIRUA | WGTN | LOWER HUTT | UPPER HUTT | W'RAPA |
| Bases: | 176 | 152 | 131 | 258 | 83 | 80 | 90 | 309 | 180 | 69 | 72 |
| | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| Ratings 10 (High level of impact) | 7 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 23 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | - |
| 9 | 11 | 11 | 9 | 6 | 6 | 10 | 6 | 4 | 9 | 15 | 25 |
| 8 | 12 | 14 | 34 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 6 | 23 | 20 | 32 | 31 |
| 7 | 12 | 10 | 19 | 23 | - | 14 | 22 | 15 | 13 | 10 | 19 |
| 6 | 19 | 22 | 7 | 15 | 18 | 10 | 18 | 18 | 13 | 26 | 10 |
| 5 | 23 | 19 | 10 | 18 | 17 | 24 | 25 | 18 | 18 | 9 | 10 |
| 4 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 2 | 16 | 9 | 10 | 9 | 5 | 2 | - |
| 3 | 2 | 10 | 6 | 3 | 15 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 9 | 4 | - |
| 2 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 10 | - | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| 1 (Low level of impact) | 2 | 2 | - | - | 1 | - | 3 | x | 2 | - | - |
| TOTAL RESPONDENTS | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Average (mean) rating | 6.2 | 6.0 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 5.2 | 6.9 | 5.7 | 6.0 | 6.3 | 6.9 | 7.3 |

TABLE 4: AMOUNT OF IMPACT THAT THE REGION'S TRANSPORT SYSTEM IS CONSIDERED TO HAVE ON THE AIR QUALITY

Base: Total respondents in each group

| | TOTAL | | RESIDENTIAL BREAKDOWNS | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | SEX | | AGE (YEARS) | | | | |
| IMPACT ON THE AIR QUALITY | RESIDENTIAL | BUSINESS | MALE | FEMALE | 14-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60+ |
| Bases: | 800 | 100 | 375 | 425 | 169 | 111 | 136 | 128 | 256 |
| | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| Ratings 10 (Very good air quality) | 9 | 12 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 8 | 6 | 9 | 14 |
| 9 | 24 | 27 | 28 | 20 | 17 | 15 | 18 | 35 | 29 |
| 8 | 25 | 28 | 28 | 22 | 32 | 27 | 33 | 13 | 21 |
| 7 | 20 | 15 | 18 | 22 | 24 | 31 | 18 | 17 | 16 |
| 6 | 9 | 3 | 8 | 10 | 7 | 12 | 9 | 10 | 8 |
| 5 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 12 | 5 | 3 | 12 | 9 | 8 |
| 4 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 10 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | x | - | - | - | 3 | x |
| 1 (Very poor air quality) | x | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| TOTAL RESPONDENTS | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Average (mean) rating | 7.6 | 7.6 | 7.8 | 7.4 | 7.3 | 7.5 | 7.4 | 7.5 | 7.8 |

TABLE 4: AMOUNT OF IMPACT THAT THE REGION'S TRANSPORT SYSTEM IS CONSIDERED TO HAVE ON THE AIR QUALITY

Base: Total respondents in each group

| | RESIDENTIAL BREAKDOWNS | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | HOUSEHOLD INCOME (PRE-TAX) PER ANNUM | | | | | AREA | | | | | |
| IMPACT ON THE AIR QUALITY | Up to $30k | Over $30-50k | Over $50-70k | Over $70K | DK/ Refused | KAPITI | PORIRUA | WGTN | LOWER HUTT | UPPER HUTT | W'RAPA |
| Bases: | 176 | 152 | 131 | 258 | 83 | 80 | 90 | 309 | 180 | 69 | 72 |
| | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| Ratings 10 (Very good air quality) | 12 | 11 | 6 | 7 | 14 | 10 | 11 | 8 | 4 | 6 | 25 |
| 9 | 21 | 32 | 32 | 19 | 14 | 29 | 20 | 17 | 34 | 16 | 35 |
| 8 | 21 | 24 | 22 | 29 | 25 | 33 | 17 | 31 | 20 | 28 | 10 |
| 7 | 13 | 16 | 19 | 32 | 7 | 5 | 12 | 25 | 19 | 33 | 15 |
| 6 | 12 | 6 | 6 | 11 | 3 | 10 | 13 | 10 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| 5 | 12 | 8 | 9 | 2 | 15 | 9 | 20 | 6 | 8 | 6 | - |
| 4 | 5 | 3 | 3 | - | 16 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 5 | - |
| 3 | 2 | - | 3 | - | - | - | 1 | - | 4 | - | - |
| 2 | - | - | - | - | 6 | - | - | - | 1 | - | 5 |
| 1 (Very poor air quality) | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4 |
| TOTAL RESPONDENTS | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Average (mean) rating | 7.3 | 7.9 | 7.6 | 7.7 | 6.8 | 7.6 | 7.2 | 7.6 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 8.0 |

TABLE 5: AMOUNT OF IMPACT THAT THE REGION'S TRANSPORT SYSTEM IS CONSIDERED TO HAVE ON CLIMATE CHANGE, GREENHOUSE GASES & CARBON DIOXIDE LEVELS

Base: Total respondents in each group

| IMPACT ON CLIMATE CHANGE, GREENHOUSE GASES, $CO^2$ | TOTAL | | RESIDENTIAL BREAKDOWNS | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | SEX | | AGE (YEARS) | | | | |
| | RESIDENTIAL | BUSINESS | MALE | FEMALE | 14-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60+ |
| Bases: | 800 | 100 | 375 | 425 | 169 | 111 | 136 | 128 | 256 |
| | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| Ratings 10 (High level of impact) | 4 | 11 | 2 | 5 | - | - | 6 | 9 | 4 |
| 9 | 7 | 28 | 5 | 9 | 8 | 15 | 3 | 3 | 7 |
| 8 | 18 | 28 | 22 | 15 | 18 | 11 | 15 | 39 | 14 |
| 7 | 22 | 15 | 25 | 20 | 18 | 33 | 35 | 17 | 17 |
| 6 | 15 | 4 | 16 | 14 | 17 | 23 | 15 | 10 | 12 |
| 5 | 13 | 3 | 10 | 16 | 15 | 11 | 7 | 6 | 20 |
| 4 | 10 | 5 | 9 | 11 | 15 | 7 | 7 | 10 | 10 |
| 3 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 5 | - | 9 | 3 | 6 |
| 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | - | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 1 (Low level of impact) | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | - | - | - | - | 8 |
| TOTAL RESPONDENTS | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Average (mean) rating | 6.2 | 7.6 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 6.0 | 6.7 | 6.4 | 6.9 | 5.8 |

TABLE 5: AMOUNT OF IMPACT THAT THE REGION'S TRANSPORT SYSTEM IS CONSIDERED TO HAVE ON CLIMATE CHANGE, GREENHOUSE GASES & CARBON DIOXIDE LEVELS

Base: Total respondents in each group

| | RESIDENTIAL BREAKDOWNS | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | HOUSEHOLD INCOME (PRE-TAX) PER ANNUM | | | | | AREA | | | | | |
| IMPACT ON CLIMATE CHANGE, GREENHOUSE GASES, $CO^2$ | Up to $30k | Over $30-50k | Over $50-70k | Over $70K | DK/ Refused | KAPITI | PORIRUA | WGTN | LOWER HUTT | UPPER HUTT | W'RAPA |
| Bases: | 176 | 152 | 131 | 258 | 83 | 80 | 90 | 309 | 180 | 69 | 72 |
| | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| Ratings 10 (High level of impact) | 5 | 5 | 3 | 4 | - | 5 | - | 3 | 6 | 11 | - |
| 9 | 3 | 5 | 10 | 11 | - | 9 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 12 | 10 |
| 8 | 20 | 18 | 20 | 16 | 20 | 11 | 7 | 24 | 19 | 12 | 25 |
| 7 | 18 | 21 | 19 | 26 | 25 | 5 | 52 | 15 | 28 | 23 | 21 |
| 6 | 17 | 13 | 17 | 13 | 16 | 20 | 5 | 22 | 8 | 13 | 10 |
| 5 | 15 | 24 | 8 | 12 | 4 | 21 | 18 | 7 | 21 | 12 | 6 |
| 4 | 12 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 24 | 19 | 4 | 14 | 5 | 6 | 10 |
| 3 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 10 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 11 | 5 |
| 2 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 2 | - | 4 | 1 | 3 | 2 | - | 4 |
| 1 (Low level of impact) | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 1 | - | 8 | 1 | 2 | - | 9 |
| TOTAL RESPONDENTS | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Average (mean) rating | 6.1 | 6.2 | 6.1 | 6.4 | 5.8 | 5.8 | 5.9 | 6.3 | 6.6 | 6.7 | 6.0 |

TABLE 6: THE "*THREE CHANGES RELATING TO THE REGION'S TRANSPORT NETWORK*" THAT RESPONDENTS WOULD LIKE TO SEE

Base: Total respondents in each group

| SUGGESTED CHANGES | RESIDENTIAL 800 | BUSINESS 100 |
|---|---|---|
| | % | % |
| (a) PUBLIC TRANSPORT IN GENERAL | | |
| Encourage the use of public transport | 27 | 21 |
| Introduce "*combined travel*" cards | 7 | 4 |
| (b) BUSES | | |
| Introduce additional/extended bus routes | 8 | 8 |
| Increase the frequency of bus services | 6 | 7 |
| More buses that circulate the city | 3 | 7 |
| Have seatbelts on buses | 4 | 4 |
| Access for disabled/elderly people on buses | 4 | - |
| Ensure that buses run to time | 2 | 7 |
| Have bus priority/more bus-only lanes | 1 | 3 |
| Buses should have cycle storage/capacity | 3 | 1 |
| Miscellaneous | 5 | 4 |

TABLE 6: THE "*THREE CHANGES RELATING TO THE REGION'S TRANSPORT NETWORK*" THAT RESPONDENTS WOULD LIKE TO SEE (continued)

Base: Total respondents in each group

| SUGGESTED CHANGES | RESIDENTIAL 800 | BUSINESS 100 |
|---|---|---|
| | % | % |
| (c) TRAINS | | |
| Modernise/upgrade the trains/rail system | 20 | 11 |
| Increase the frequency of train services | 13 | 9 |
| Introduce 'light rail' or 'monorail' to Wellington/the CBD | 10 | 3 |
| Improve/extend rail links | 10 | 8 |
| More carriages/capacity on trains | 3 | 4 |
| Improve the reliability of the train service | 4 | 1 |
| Address safety on trains | 3 | - |
| Miscellaneous | 4 | 1 |
| (d) CYCLING RELATED SUGGESTIONS | | |
| Make roads more cyclist friendly/safe (with more cycle lanes) | 17 | 18 |
| Upgrade the Hutt to Wellington cycleway | 3 | 1 |
| Promote cycling in general | 2 | 1 |
| Introduce secure cycle parks | 2 | 1 |
| Miscellaneous | 1 | 1 |

TABLE 6: THE "*THREE CHANGES RELATING TO THE REGION'S TRANSPORT NETWORK*" THAT RESPONDENTS WOULD LIKE TO SEE (continued)

Base: Total respondents in each group

| SUGGESTED CHANGES | RESIDENTIAL<br>800 | BUSINESS<br>100 |
|---|---|---|
| | % | % |
| (e) ROADING | | |
| Upgrade/improve roads | 19 | 24 |
| Prioritise Transmission Gully/A second access route | 14 | 23 |
| Improve the safety of roads/road safety | 9 | 2 |
| Improve/install roundabouts at intersections | 4 | 4 |
| Don't take so long on road works | 3 | 4 |
| Miscellaneous | 6 | 2 |
| (f) REDUCE VEHICLE USE | | |
| Encourage car-pooling/ride-sharing | 5 | 5 |
| Discourage high car usage, especially in the CBD | 8 | 8 |
| Discourage the use of large vehicles/heavy traffic | 3 | 3 |

TABLE 6: THE "*THREE CHANGES RELATING TO THE REGION'S TRANSPORT NETWORK*" THAT RESPONDENTS WOULD LIKE TO SEE (continued)

Base: Total respondents in each group

| SUGGESTED CHANGES | RESIDENTIAL 800 | BUSINESS 100 |
|---|---|---|
| | % | % |
| (g) ENVIRONMENTAL | | |
| Replace petrol with electricity (and other more environmentally friendly fuels) | 11 | 5 |
| Have cleaner fuel/air (reduce vehicle emissions) | 2 | 3 |
| (h) WALKING RELATED SUGGESTIONS | | |
| Better/more walking tracks and pathways are required | 5 | - |
| (i) ALL OTHER SUGGESTIONS | 7 | 15 |
| RESPONDENTS WHO GAVE A SUGGESTION | 99% | 98% |
| Average number of suggestions given | 2.6 | 2.3 |

TABLE 7(a): EXTENT TO WHICH RESIDENTIAL RESPONDENTS WOULD BE PREPARED TO PAY FOR '*THE THREE CHANGES*' THEY IDENTIFIED IN TABLE 6

Base: Total residential respondents (800)

| COST OF CHANGES TO AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD SPEND (PER WEEK) | PREPARED TO PAY? Definitely | Probably | Probably Not | Definitely Not | Unsure | TOTAL RESIDENTIAL RESPONDENTS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| $100 | 5 | 14 | 17 | 62 | 2 | 100 |
| $50 | 15 | 19 | 13 | 51 | 2 | 100 |
| $25 | 32 | 20 | 7 | 39 | 2 | 100 |
| $12 | 49 | 19 | 6 | 25 | 1 | 100 |
| $6 | 62 | 15 | 3 | 19 | 1 | 100 |

TABLE 7(b): AMOUNT PER WEEK THAT RESPONDENT BUSINESSES ESTIMATE THEY SPEND ON TRAVEL & TRANSPORT RELATED COSTS IN THE GREATER WELLINGTON AREA

Base: Total business respondents (100)

| AMOUNT PER WEEK | TOTAL BUSINESS RESPONDENTS |
|---|---|
| | % |
| Up to $1,000 | 73 |
| Over $1,000 to $2,000 | 9 |
| Over $2,000 to $5,000 | 4 |
| Over $5,000 to $10,000 | 5 |
| Over $10,000 | 9 |
| TOTAL | 100% |

TABLE 7(c): PERCEIVED VALUE THAT BUSINESS RESPONDENTS ESTIMATE '*THE THREE CHANGES*' IDENTIFIED IN TABLE 6 WOULD BE LIKELY TO CONTRIBUTE TO THEIR BUSINESS OPERATIONS

Base: Total business respondents (100)

| PERCENTAGE MORE PER WEEK (IN RELATION TO CURRENT TRAVEL & TRANSPORT COSTS) | WOULD CONTRIBUTE THE PERCENTAGE STATED? | | | | | TOTAL BUSINESS RESPONDENTS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Definitely | Probably | Probably Not | Definitely Not | Unsure | |
| | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| 100% | 2 | 4 | 3 | 82 | 9 | 100 |
| 50% | 5 | 7 | 14 | 65 | 9 | 100 |
| 25% | 11 | 16 | 23 | 41 | 9 | 100 |
| 12% | 31 | 29 | 21 | 12 | 7 | 100 |
| 6% | 56 | 31 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 100 |

TABLE 8(a): WHAT IS MORE IMPORTANT – INVESTING IN ROADS, OR INVESTING IN PUBLIC TRANSPORT?

Base: Total respondents in each group

| | TOTAL | | RESIDENTIAL BREAKDOWNS | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | SEX | | AGE (YEARS) | | | | |
| WHAT IS MORE IMPORTANT? Bases: | RESIDENTIAL 800 | BUSINESS 100 | MALE 375 | FEMALE 425 | 14-29 169 | 30-39 111 | 40-49 136 | 50-59 128 | 60+ 256 |
| | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| Investing in roads, to improve capacity, safety and reliability | 23 | 33 | 23 | 23 | 22 | 30 | 15 | 16 | 29 |
| Investing in public transport, to improve capacity, quality, reliability and provide alternatives to car travel | 61 | 58 | 63 | 59 | 68 | 58 | 65 | 65 | 52 |
| Both | 16 | 9 | 14 | 18 | 10 | 12 | 20 | 19 | 19 |
| TOTAL RESPONDENTS | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

TABLE 8(a): WHAT IS MORE IMPORTANT – INVESTING IN ROADS, OR INVESTING IN PUBLIC TRANSPORT?

Base: Total respondents in each group

| | RESIDENTIAL BREAKDOWNS | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | HOUSEHOLD INCOME (PRE-TAX) PER ANNUM | | | | | AREA | | | | | |
| WHAT IS MORE IMPORTANT? Bases: | Up to $30k 176 | Over $30-50k 152 | Over $50-70k 131 | Over $70K 258 | DK/ Refused 83 | KAPITI 80 | PORIRUA 90 | WGTN 309 | LOWER HUTT 180 | UPPER HUTT 69 | W'RAPA 72 |
| | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| Investing in roads, to improve capacity, safety and reliability | 19 | 13 | 26 | 23 | 48 | 19 | 40 | 20 | 17 | 20 | 40 |
| Investing in public transport, to improve capacity, quality, reliability and provide alternatives to car travel | 60 | 61 | 55 | 69 | 42 | 52 | 50 | 66 | 61 | 65 | 50 |
| Both | 21 | 26 | 19 | 8 | 10 | 29 | 10 | 14 | 22 | 15 | 10 |
| TOTAL RESPONDENTS | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

TABLE 8(b): THE PROPORTION OF FUNDING THAT RESPONDENTS WOULD ALLOCATE TO EACH OPTION (ROADS v's PUBLIC TRANSPORT)

Base: Total respondents in each group

| PROPORTION OF FUNDING | | RESIDENTIAL 800 | BUSINESS 100 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Roads : | Public Transport | % | % |
| 100 | 0 | 3 | 8 |
| 95 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| 90 | 10 | 1 | 1 |
| 85 | 15 | x | 1 |
| 80 | 20 | 5 | 1 |
| 75 | 25 | 4 | 6 |
| 70 | 30 | 3 | 5 |
| 65 | 35 | 1 | 1 |
| 60 | 40 | 4 | 6 |
| 55 | 45 | x | 1 |
| 50 | 50 | 26 | 16 |
| 45 | 55 | 1 | 1 |
| 40 | 60 | 17 | 2 |
| 35 | 65 | 1 | 1 |
| 30 | 70 | 9 | 19 |
| 25 | 75 | 5 | 15 |
| 20 | 80 | 8 | 6 |
| 15 | 85 | 2 | 1 |
| 10 | 90 | 3 | 2 |
| 5 | 95 | 2 | 1 |
| 0 | 100 | 3 | 3 |
| TOTAL RESPONDENTS | | 100% | 100% |

TABLE 9(a): THE MAIN PURPOSES FOR WHICH RESIDENTS TRAVEL

Base: Total respondents in the residential sample

| MAIN PURPOSES OF TRAVEL Base | TOTAL RESIDENTIAL 800 |
|---|---|
| | % |
| To travel to/from work | 63 |
| To visit the shops | 41 |
| To visit friends/relatives | 37 |
| To attend sports or recreation | 15 |
| To travel to/from a place of education, e.g. school, university | 12 |
| To take children to/from school, pre-school, or day-care | 7 |
| To attend business meetings/appointments | 5 |
| To attend private meetings/appointments | 3 |
| To attend church/a place of worship | 2 |
| Other | 15 |
| | |
| TOTAL RESIDENTIAL RESPONDENTS | 100% |
| Average number of '*main purposes*' nominated (out of 2 requested) | 2.0 |

TABLE 9(b): MODE OF TRANSPORT MAINLY USED BY RESIDENTS FOR THEIR '*MAIN PURPOSE TRIPS'*

Base: Total respondents who nominated each '*main purpose trip'*

| MAIN PURPOSE TRIPS | Bases | MAIN MODE OF TRAVEL | | | | | | | | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | PRIVATE MOTOR VEHICLE | TAXI | BUS | TRAIN | WALKING | CYCLE | CAR SHARE | OTHER | |
| | | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| Travel to/from work | 503 | 53 | 1 | 13 | 17 | 10 | 5 | x | 1 | 100 |
| To visit the shops | 331 | 72 | 1 | 9 | 1 | 10 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 100 |
| To visit friends/relatives | 299 | 67 | - | 12 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 100 |
| To attend sports or recreation | 120 | 69 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 10 | 7 | 3 | - | 100 |
| To travel to/from a place of education, e.g. school, university | 96 | 46 | - | 21 | 8 | 19 | 5 | 1 | - | 100 |
| To take children to/from school, pre-school, etc | 52 | 73 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 15 | 4 | - | - | 100 |
| To attend business or private meetings/appointments | 60 | 60 | - | 13 | 7 | 20 | - | - | - | 100 |
| To attend church/a place of worship | 16 | 75 | - | - | - | 25 | - | - | - | 100 |
| Other purposes | 123 | 76 | 2 | 9 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 100 |

TABLE 9(c): EXTENT TO WHICH THE COST OF THE TRIP IS A MAJOR, MODERATE, OR MINOR CONSIDERATION

Base: Total respondents who nominated each '*main purpose trip*'

| MAIN PURPOSE OF TRIP | Bases | THE COST OF THE TRIP IS: A major consideration | A moderate consideration | A minor consideration | Not a consideration | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | % | % | % | % | % |
| RESIDENTIAL | | | | | | |
| - Travel to/from work | 503 | 13 | 21 | 16 | 44 | 100 |
| - To visit the shops | 331 | 10 | 14 | 18 | 58 | 100 |
| - To visit friends/relatives | 299 | 21 | 17 | 26 | 36 | 100 |
| - To attend sports or recreation | 120 | 7 | 17 | 17 | 59 | 100 |
| - To travel to/from a place of education | 96 | 52 | 19 | 5 | 24 | 100 |
| - To take children to/from school, pre-school, etc | 52 | 15 | 17 | 26 | 42 | 100 |
| - To attend business or private meetings/appointments | 60 | 25 | 6 | 12 | 57 | 100 |
| - To attend church/a place of worship | 16 | - | 25 | - | 75 | 100 |
| - Other purposes | 123 | 13 | 7 | 10 | 70 | 100 |
| BUSINESS | | | | | | |
| - Transporting goods and equipment | 94 | 15 | 21 | 15 | 49 | 100 |
| - Travelling to business meetings | 96 | 3 | 16 | 19 | 62 | 100 |

TABLE 9(d): EXTENT TO WHICH THE COST OF THE TRIP INFLUENCES HOW OFTEN RESPONDENTS MAKE IT

Base: Total respondents who nominated each '*main purpose trip*'

| MAIN PURPOSE OF TRIP | Bases | THE COST INFLUENCES THE FREQUENCY OF THE TRIP: On all occasions | Quite often | Sometimes | Hardly ever | Never | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| RESIDENTIAL | | | | | | | |
| - Travel to/from work | 503 | 13 | 5 | 6 | 10 | 66 | 100 |
| - To visit the shops | 331 | 4 | 14 | 18 | 17 | 47 | 100 |
| - To visit friends/relatives | 299 | 10 | 22 | 12 | 13 | 43 | 100 |
| - To attend sports or recreation | 120 | 10 | 3 | 7 | 31 | 49 | 100 |
| - To travel to/from a place of education | 96 | 24 | 14 | 9 | 14 | 39 | 100 |
| - To take children to/from school, pre-school, etc | 52 | 8 | 8 | 13 | 8 | 63 | 100 |
| - To attend business or private meetings/appointments | 60 | - | 12 | 21 | 10 | 57 | 100 |
| - To attend church/a place of worship | 16 | - | - | 19 | 6 | 75 | 100 |
| - Other purposes | 123 | 6 | 4 | 7 | 10 | 73 | 100 |
| BUSINESS | | | | | | | |
| - Transporting goods and equipment | 94 | 6 | 6 | 16 | 3 | 69 | 100 |
| - Travelling to business meetings | 96 | 6 | 6 | 15 | 3 | 70 | 100 |

TABLE 10(a): IMPORTANCE OF SPECIFIC CONSIDERATIONS IN INFLUENCING HOW THE **RESIDENTIAL** RESPONDENTS TRAVEL

Base: Total residential respondents in the survey (800)

| CONSIDERATIONS | Very Important | Quite Important | Neither Important nor Unimportant | Not Very Important | Not At All Important | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| Total journey time | 36 | 37 | 13 | 7 | 7 | 100 |
| Cost of the trip | 17 | 32 | 17 | 20 | 14 | 100 |
| Convenience | 53 | 33 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 100 |
| Reliability of journey time | 56 | 34 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 100 |
| Safety | 56 | 27 | 10 | 3 | 4 | 100 |
| Environmental impacts | 17 | 38 | 23 | 12 | 10 | 100 |
| Health benefits from physical activity | 43 | 24 | 14 | 11 | 8 | 100 |
| Air quality | 33 | 25 | 22 | 12 | 8 | 100 |

TABLE 10(b): IMPORTANCE OF SPECIFIC CONSIDERATIONS IN INFLUENCING HOW THE **BUSINESS** RESPONDENTS TRAVEL

Base: Total business respondents in the survey (100)

| CONSIDERATIONS | Very Important | Quite Important | Neither Important nor Unimportant | Not Very Important | Not At All Important | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| Total journey time | 40 | 27 | 12 | 9 | 12 | 100 |
| Cost of the trip | 24 | 25 | 12 | 13 | 26 | 100 |
| Convenience | 57 | 28 | 12 | 3 | - | 100 |
| Reliability of journey time | 64 | 27 | 6 | 3 | - | 100 |
| Safety | 61 | 33 | 1 | 5 | - | 100 |
| Environmental impacts | 21 | 15 | 34 | 3 | 27 | 100 |
| Health benefits from physical activity | 23 | 14 | 13 | 11 | 39 | 100 |
| Air quality | 18 | 18 | 22 | 6 | 36 | 100 |

TABLE 11(a): AWARENESS OF THE REGIONAL LAND TRANSPORT STRATEGY (RLTS)

Base: Total respondents in each group

| HAVE YOU SEEN OR HEARD OF THE RLTS? | RESIDENTIAL 800 | BUSINESS 100 |
|---|---|---|
| | % | % |
| Yes | 44 | 47 |
| No | 53 | 45 |
| Unsure | 3 | 8 |
| TOTAL RESPONDENTS | 100% | 100% |

TABLE 11(b): AWARENESS OF THE REGIONAL LAND TRANSPORT STRATEGY (RLTS) – BY RESIDENTIAL DEMOGRAPHICS

Base: Total respondents in each group

| HAVE YOU SEEN OR HEARD OF THE RLTS? | TOTAL RESIDENTIAL | SEX | | AGE (YEARS) | | | AREA | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | MALE | FEMALE | 14-29 | 30-49 | 50+ | KAPITI | PORIRUA | WGTN | LOWER HUTT | UPPER HUTT | W'RAPA |
| Bases: | 800 | 375 | 425 | 169 | 247 | 384 | 80 | 90 | 309 | 180 | 69 | 72 |
| | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| Yes | 44 | 50 | 39 | 22 | 38 | 57 | 61 | 47 | 37 | 43 | 48 | 49 |
| No | 53 | 48 | 57 | 68 | 61 | 41 | 39 | 53 | 56 | 55 | 52 | 51 |
| Unsure | 3 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 1 | 2 | - | - | 7 | 2 | - | - |
| TOTAL | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

TABLE 11(c): SOURCE OF AWARENESS OF THE REGIONAL LAND TRANSPORT STRATEGY (RLTS)

Base: Respondents in each group who had heard of the RLTS

| SOURCE OF AWARENESS OF THE RLTS<br>Bases: | RESIDENTIAL<br>351 | BUSINESS<br>47 |
|---|---|---|
| | % | % |
| Have obtained a copy of the document | 9 | 13 |
| In the DominionPost | 23 | 9 |
| In a local Community Newspaper | 22 | 15 |
| Received a summary document in the letterbox | 38 | 15 |
| On the radio | 8 | - |
| On television | 9 | 11 |
| On a website | 2 | 6 |
| At work | 2 | 17 |
| Other (e.g. meeting, seminar, university, with rates bill, Fair Go, word-of-mouth) | 7 | 17 |
| RESPONDENTS NAMING A SOURCE | 99% | 100% |
| Average number of sources named | 1.20 | 1.03 |

TABLE 11(d): WAY IN WHICH THE RLTS WAS RAISED ON THE RADIO

Base: Respondents who named the radio as a source of awareness of the RLTS

| IT WAS RAISED<br>Base: | TOTAL<br>29 |
|---|---|
| | % |
| On the news segment | 52 |
| As a topic of talkback discussion | 38 |
| In an interview with a transport representative | 10 |
| TOTAL | 100% |

TABLE 12: DETAILS OF **RESIDENTIAL** RESPONDENTS TRAVEL IN THE FOLLOWING TIME PERIODS

Base: Total residential respondents (800)

| DETAILS | | PEAK TIME (Weekdays 7 to 9am and 4 to 6pm) | OFF-PEAK WEEKDAYS | WEEKENDS |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | % | % | % |
| (a) FREQUENCY OF TRAVEL | | | | |
| - | Always | 36 | 18 | 16 |
| - | Often | 13 | 34 | 40 |
| - | Occasionally | 31 | 42 | 37 |
| - | Never | 20 | 6 | 7 |
| | TOTAL | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| (b) MAIN MODE OF TRAVEL | | | | |
| - | Private motor vehicle | 47 | 59 | 66 |
| - | Taxi | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| - | Bus | 13 | 11 | 8 |
| - | Train | 11 | 6 | 6 |
| - | Ferry | x | - | - |
| - | Walking | 5 | 14 | 9 |
| - | Cycle | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| - | Other | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | TOTAL WHO TRAVEL | 80% | 94% | 93% |

TABLE 13: TIME PERIODS IN WHICH **BUSINESS** TRAVEL (EXCLUDING STAFF JOURNEYS TO/FROM WORK) IS MAINLY UNDERTAKEN

Base: Total business respondents (100)

| BUSINESS TRAVEL IS MAINLY IN: | TOTAL |
|---|---|
| | % |
| The peak time (weekdays 7 to 9 am and 4 to 6pm) | 24 |
| Off-peak weekdays | 24 |
| Both of the above (peak time and off-peak weekdays) | 28 |
| Weekends | 2 |
| All three time periods (peak time, off-peak weekdays, and weekends) | 22 |
| TOTAL | 100% |

TABLE 14: EXTENT TO WHICH ACCESS OR AVAILABILITY OF GOOD PUBLIC TRANSPORT SERVICES AFFECTS STAFF RECRUITMENT IN RESPONDENTS' BUSINESSES

Base: Total business respondents (100)

| IT AFFECTS STAFF RECRUITMENT | TOTAL |
|---|---|
| | % |
| A lot | 6 |
| A little | 26 |
| Not at all | 68 |
| TOTAL | 100% |

TABLE 15: EXTENT TO WHICH TRANSPORT CONSIDERATIONS HAVE INFLUENCED THE LOCATION OF RESPONDENTS' BUSINESSES

Base: Total business respondents (100)

| TRANSPORT CONSIDERATIONS HAVE INFLUENCED BUSINESS LOCATION: | TOTAL |
|---|---|
| | % |
| A lot | 21 |
| A little | 33 |
| Not at all | 46 |
| TOTAL | 100% |

TABLE 16: SAMPLE PROFILE – RESIDENTIAL RESPONDENTS

Base: Total residential respondents in the survey

| PROFILE | | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|
| | Base: | 800 |
| | | % |
| (a) GENDER: | | |
| | Male | 47 |
| | Female | 53 |
| | TOTAL | 100% |
| (b) AGE: | | |
| | 14 – 29 years | 21 |
| | 30 – 39 | 14 |
| | 40 – 49 | 17 |
| | 50 – 59 | 16 |
| | 60+ | 32 |
| | TOTAL | 100% |

TABLE 16: SAMPLE PROFILE – RESIDENTIAL RESPONDENTS (continued)

Base: Total residential respondents in the survey

| PROFILE | Base: | TOTAL 800 |
|---|---|---|
| | | % |
| (c) ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME (PRE-TAX): | | |
| | Up to $30k | 22 |
| | Over $30 – 50k | 19 |
| | Over $50 – 70k | 16 |
| | Over $70k | 32 |
| | Don't know/refused | 11 |
| | TOTAL | 100% |

TABLE 16: SAMPLE PROFILE – RESIDENTIAL RESPONDENTS (continued)

Base: Total residential respondents in the survey

| PROFILE | | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|
| | Base: | 800 |
| | | % |
| (d) AREA: | | |
| | Kapiti Coast | 10 |
| | Porirua City | 11 |
| | Wellington City | 39 |
| | Lower Hutt City | 22 |
| | Upper Hutt City | 9 |
| | Wairarapa District | 9 |
| | TOTAL | 100% |
| (e) NUMBER OF PEOPLE 15+ YEARS OF AGE IN THE HOUSEHOLD: | | |
| | One | 15 |
| | Two | 51 |
| | Three | 19 |
| | Four | 8 |
| | Five or more | 4 |
| | Would not say | 3 |
| | TOTAL | 100% |

TABLE 16: SAMPLE PROFILE – RESIDENTIAL RESPONDENTS (continued)

Base: Total residential respondents in the survey

| PROFILE | | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|
| | Base: | 800 |
| | | % |
| (f) NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS WITH DRIVERS LICENCES: | | |
| | One | 24 |
| | Two | 53 |
| | Three | 15 |
| | Four | 3 |
| | Five or more | 1 |
| | Would not say | 4 |
| | TOTAL | 100% |
| | | |
| (g) NUMBER OF REGISTERED VEHICLES IN THE HOUSEHOLD: | | |
| | One | 41 |
| | Two | 36 |
| | Three | 10 |
| | Four | 2 |
| | Five or more | 2 |
| | Would not say | 9 |
| | TOTAL | 100% |

TABLE 17: SAMPLE PROFILE – BUSINESS RESPONDENTS

Base: Total business respondents in the survey

| PROFILE | | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|
| | Base: | 100 |
| | | % |
| (a) GENDER: | | |
| | Male | 49 |
| | Female | 51 |
| | TOTAL | 100% |
| (b) INDUSTRY SECTOR: | | |
| | Retail/wholesale | 14 |
| | Manufacturing | 11 |
| | Engineering | 9 |
| | Automotive | 9 |
| | Building/construction | 10 |
| | Hospitality/tourism | 10 |
| | Recreation | 3 |
| | Transport | 8 |
| | I.T./Communications | 6 |
| | Financial | 5 |
| | Professional services | 6 |
| | Public sector | 6 |
| | Other | 3 |
| | TOTAL | 100% |

TABLE 17: SAMPLE PROFILE – BUSINESS RESPONDENTS (continued)

Base: Total business respondents in the survey

| PROFILE Base: | TOTAL 100 |
|---|---|
| | % |
| (c) NUMBER OF FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES IN THE WELLINGTON REGION | |
| 0 – 5 | 33 |
| 6 – 10 | 15 |
| 10 – 15 | 16 |
| 16 – 20 | 9 |
| 21 – 30 | 3 |
| 31 – 50 | 6 |
| 51 – 100 | 12 |
| More than 100 | 6 |
| TOTAL | 100% |

TABLE 17: SAMPLE PROFILE – BUSINESS RESPONDENTS (continued)

Base: Total business respondents in the survey

| PROFILE Base: | TOTAL 100 |
|---|---|
| | % |
| (d) ANNUAL BUSINESS TURNOVER | |
| Up to $100,000 | 9 |
| Over $100 - $250,000 | 12 |
| Over $250 - $500,000 | 7 |
| Over $500,000 - $1 million | 17 |
| Over $1 million - $2 million | 12 |
| Over $2 million - $5 million | 6 |
| Over $5 million - $10 million | 11 |
| Over $10 million | 13 |
| Undisclosed | 13 |
| TOTAL | 100% |