

**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

**RESEARCH TO ASSIST THE STRATEGIC REVIEW
OF REGIONAL PARKS & FORESTS IN THE
GREATER WELLINGTON REGION**

- STAGE TWO QUANTITATIVE SURVEY -

*Research report prepared for
the Greater Wellington Regional Council*

*Murray Waititi
Amanda Cox*

July 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page No.</u>
1. Introduction	3
2. Objectives	3
3. Target group for the research	4
4. Method	4
5. The Quantitative Survey	4
6. Statistical Note	6
7. Timing	7
8. Summary of Findings:	8
8.1. Awareness of regional parks	9
8.2. Usage of regional parks	9
8.3. Reasons for use/non-use	11
8.4. Profile of park usage segments	12
8.5. The importance of decisions relating to the regional parks	12
8.6. The relative importance of the benefits of the regional parks	13
8.7. The outcomes of the parks of the future	15
8.7.1. The parks role in keeping people healthy	15
8.7.2. The conservation role	16
8.7.3. The role of parks in bringing people together	17
8.7.4. The educational role	17
8.7.5. The economic role	18
8.8. The size and number of regional parks preferred for the future	19
8.9. Development parameters	20
8.10. Acceptability of possible park features	21
8.11. Conclusion	22
9. Detailed tables	24 - 58
10. Questionnaire	59 - 74

1. INTRODUCTION

The Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) is in the process of preparing a long-term plan for the management and development of the major regional parks and forests, which include:

- Battle Hill Farm Forest Park
- Belmont Regional Park
- East Harbour Regional Park
- The Hutt River Trail
- Akatarawa Forest
- Kaitoke Regional Park
- Queen Elizabeth Park
- Pakuratahi Forest

To assist with the preparation of the plan, it is important that the GWRC obtains input from members of the public, who are users and potential users of the parks, to determine their needs and wishes for the future.

Peter Glen Research has, accordingly, been commissioned to conduct a research project that will specifically address the information needs of the GWRC. This document presents the results of the stage two quantitative survey.

2. OBJECTIVES

The overall purpose of the research is to determine what residents of the greater Wellington region want from the major regional parks and forests over the next twenty years.

Specific objectives are to determine:

- (a) What experience residents want from the parks now and in the future
- (b) What residents perceive to be the current strengths/weaknesses of the major regional parks
- (c) Their suggestions for improving the parks and reactions to potential changes
- (d) The broad parameters for park enhancement and development (e.g. what would be acceptable/not acceptable? To what extent can the parks include any degree of commercialisation?)

3. TARGET GROUP FOR THE RESEARCH

The research was undertaken amongst a broad cross-section of users, potential users and non-users of the major regional parks and forests in the Greater Wellington Region.

Previous research has revealed that users comprise two important groups: frequent users, who visit one or more parks at least monthly; and occasional users, who visit the parks less frequently.

The prime potential users of the major regional parks and forests are current non-users, but are physically active and visit other parks and green areas at least once every three or four weeks.

Other non-users form the remainder of the greater Wellington population. They have also been included in the quantitative survey, to check their attitudes and opinions with regard to the parks of the future.

4. METHOD

In order to gain a thorough insight to the needs and attitudes of park users and non-users, it was recommended that a two-stage research programme be used:

- Stage 1: An in-depth qualitative review, to explore and understand the public's attitudes, identify issues and gain direction for the full-scale survey.
- Stage 2: A full-scale quantitative survey, to measure the extent to which attitudes are held by a broader cross-section of the target population and further assess issues and opportunities that may be relevant to future planning.

It is recommended that both reports be read by interested parties, as they provide different, but complementary, perspectives on the future of the regional parks in the greater Wellington area.

5. THE QUANTITATIVE SURVEY

5.1. OVERALL APPROACH

Following the Stage One Qualitative Research, a structured questionnaire was developed for the Stage Two Quantitative Survey. It was based around the findings of the qualitative work, coupled with considerable input from the GWRC to determine possible outcomes that may apply to the parks of the future.

The survey covered a representative cross-section of residents 16+ years of age in the greater Wellington region. It included both users and non-users of the regional parks and the information gathered has enabled us to further segment the population for analysis and subsequent targeting purposes.

A large sample of 1,000 interviews was recommended, to cover a broad cross-section of the greater Wellington population, with access to the eight major regional parks and forests.

The quantitative research will be conducted as a telephone survey, using random sampling of residents from the local directories.

5.2. SAMPLE SIZE AND STRUCTURE

The research was undertaken among a randomly selected sample of 1,000 residents 16+ years of age who live in the greater Wellington region.

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	%	Sample n=1,000
Kapiti Coast District Council	42,477	10.0	100
Porirua City Council	47,370	11.2	112
Wellington City Council	163,824	38.7	387
Lower Hutt City Council	95,478	22.5	225
Upper Hutt City Council	36,372	8.6	86
South Wairarapa District Council	8,742	2.1	21
Carterton District Council	6,849	1.6	16
Masterton District Council	22,617	5.3	53
TOTAL	423,729	100.0%	1,000

} 90

5.3. 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.

5.4. FIELDWORK EXECUTION

An experienced team of interviewers, employed by Peter Glen Research, conducted the fieldwork. Questioning was administered by way of a structured questionnaire, which was developed in consultation with client on completion of the Stage One Qualitative Research.

5.5. INFORMATION OBTAINED

A copy of the questionnaire is attached to this report in Section 10.

6. 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.

SAMPLE SIZE (n)/ CONFIDENCE LEVELS	PERCENTAGE OBSERVATION:		
	50%	70% or 30%	90% or 10%
<u>90% CONFIDENCE</u>			
n=1000	±2.6%	±2.4%	±1.6%
n=800	±2.9%	±2.7%	±1.7%
n=500	±3.7%	±3.4%	±2.2%
n=400	±4.1%	±3.7%	±2.5%
n=200	±5.7%	±5.3%	±3.5%
n=100	±8.2%	±7.5%	±4.9%
<u>95% CONFIDENCE</u>			
n=1000	±3.1%	±2.8%	±1.9%
n=800	±3.5%	±3.2%	±2.1%
n=500	±4.4%	±4.0%	±2.6%
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 a survey of 1,000 randomly selected adults in the Wellington Region shows that 50% hold a particular attitude, we could be 95% certain that the true percentage who held that view would be 50% ±3.1%. Thus, the actual percentage would lie somewhere between 46.9% and 53.1%.

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

7. TIMING.

Interviewing for the Stage Two Quantitative Survey was conducted in April/May 2009.

8. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

8.1. AWARENESS OF REGIONAL PARKS

Respondents were asked whether they had heard of each of the major regional parks and forests in the greater Wellington area. The research participants indicated that they had heard of 5.9 parks on average.

The prompted awareness levels for each of the parks were as follows:

	<u>% Aware</u>
Queen Elizabeth Park	96
Belmont Regional Park	88
Kaitoke Regional Park	87
Hutt River Trail	80
Akatarawa Forest	77
Battle Hill Farm Forest Park	68
Pakuratahi Forest	53
East Harbour Regional Park	41

These prompted awareness levels are similar to those registered in the 2008 study. However, it is interesting to note that in the 2009 survey, 41% of respondents indicated that they had heard of East Harbour Regional Park, an increase from 34% last year.

8.2. USAGE OF REGIONAL PARKS

Tables 2 to 7(a) of the Detailed Tables provide information on the research participants visits to parks in the greater Wellington region in the past twelve months. To summarise:

- 52% of respondents had visited at least one of the regional parks in the past 12 months. On average, they had visited 2.0 regional parks.
- 84% of respondents had visited other parks in the greater Wellington area, including reserves, sports grounds and other green spaces.

The park usage information has enabled us to segment the population into four key groups, as follows:

<u>SEGMENTS</u>	<u>%</u>
Frequent users of regional parks <i>(use them at least monthly)</i>	23
Occasional users of regional parks <i>(use less often)</i>	29
Users of other parks only <i>(at least monthly)</i>	32
Non/infrequent users of parks	16

In comparison to research undertaken in previous years, the size of the '*frequent user group*' is growing significantly, indicating that regional park users are visiting the parks more frequently.

Potential for increasing park usage in future, primarily lies with the '*occasional users*' of the regional parks, who can be influenced to visit more regularly. Users of '*other parks only*' also represent potential, as they currently use green spaces, but have not yet had the regional park experience.

Respondents had undertaken a wide variety of activities in the parks in the past twelve months. It is interesting to compare the activities undertaken in the regional parks, with those undertaken in other green spaces around the greater Wellington area. That is:

Activities	Regional Parks	Other Parks
	%	%
Walking/bush walking	54	46
Picnics/barbeques	28	28
Mountain biking/cycling	24	18
Running/jogging	11	23
Walking/running with dog	9	19
Swimming	11	8
Camping	10	-
Tramping	7	2
Family outings/recreation	6	38
Outings with organised groups	5	12
Participated in organised sports event	-	33
Watched organised sport	-	14
Other activities	18	35
Average no. of activities	1.8	2.8

The activities on which the regional parks score a little higher are '*walking/bush walking*', '*mountain biking/cycling*', '*camping*' and '*tramping*'. However, other parks and green areas score more predominantly in the areas of '*family outings*', '*sports events*', '*running/jogging*' and '*walking/running with dog*'.

It might be possible for the regional parks to attract a greater proportion of the '*family outings*' and '*outings with other organised groups*', in particular, as a way of gaining trial and increased use in future. Similarly, it might be possible to promote the regional parks as a good place for '*running/jogging*'.

8.3. REASONS FOR USE/NON-USE

Respondents were asked to outline their reasons for selecting the specific regional park that they last visited. The results for the individual parks are shown in Table 7(b) of the Detailed Tables. However, to summarise, the main factors on which people select a park are as follows:

Main reasons for choosing a regional park	%
Proximity; time and convenience	36
Good tracks for walking/cycling/ horse riding	28
A relaxing/peaceful/quiet environment	26
The scenery/natural beauty of the park	24
Tracks are well maintained	20
The terrain (challenging/variety/a good workout)	20
It provides a sense of adventure/ places to explore	18
The openness/open space	16
The terrain (flat/good easy walks)	12
Good picnic areas	12
The water/river/seashore/beach	10

Residents who visit other parks and green areas only, were asked for their reasons why they do not visit the regional parks. A variety of reasons emerged, the main ones being as follows:

Main reasons for using local green areas rather than the regional parks	%
Timing issues (too far to travel)	25
Activity is sports/sports field based	24
Prefer to go to the gym; not an outdoors person	16
Lack awareness/knowledge of the regional parks (e.g. don't know what they have to offer)	14
Prefer short walks (e.g. Regional Parks are for longer walks/serious trampers)	13
Cost issues (too expensive to get there/petrol costs)	11
Uncertain about the degree of difficulty the parks present	9

The respondents who do not visit any parks gave a variety of reasons for not doing so. *'Lack of time', 'a preference for indoor activity', 'weather', 'health, mobility and age factors'* and *'a dislike of exercise'* were cited as the major barriers to park use.

8.4. PROFILE OF PARK USAGE SEGMENTS

The profile of the four user segments that were identified in Section 8.2 indicates that they each span a broad cross-section of the public by gender, age and household income level (see Table 10b of the Detailed Tables).

However, the '*frequent users of regional parks*' segment has a weighting toward people in the 30 to 59 year age bracket, especially those from higher income households (over \$70k per annum).

'*Occasional users of the regional parks*' have an above average representation in both the 16 to 29 year age group and the 60+ group. They tend to be more strongly represented in the middle and lower household income categories.

'*Users of other parks only*' span a representative cross-section of the greater Wellington population base.

The '*non and infrequent users*' segment peaks in both the 16 to 29 year age group and among people 50 – 59 years of age. It also has an above average incidence of people in the low household income bracket (i.e. up to \$30k per annum).

8.5. THE IMPORTANCE OF DECISIONS RELATING TO THE REGIONAL PARKS

The majority (61%) of the greater Wellington population consider the decisions relating to the future use of the regional parks to be important. Indeed, 39% consider these decisions '*very important*' and a further 22% regard them as '*quite important*'.

Current users of the regional parks and, to a lesser extent, users of other parks regard the decisions as more important than the non/infrequent users. Nevertheless, approximately one-third of non/infrequent users of parks still consider the decisions important.

DEGREE OF IMPORTANCE	Frequent Users	Occasional Users	Other Park Users	Non/Infreq. Users
	%	%	%	%
Very important	68	50	26	6
Quite important	23	25	16	25
Neutral	5	22	32	19
Not very important	4	-	23	13
Not at all important	-	3	3	37
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%

8.6. THE RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF THE BENEFITS OF THE REGIONAL PARKS

Respondents were asked to rate each of the six core benefits of the regional parks in terms of importance:

- (a) to them *personally*; and
- (b) to the *community as a whole*.

All six core benefits were considered important, with approximately 50% or more respondents rating them '7' or higher on the 10-point rating scale. The average (mean) scores were generally greater for the 'community' rating than the 'personal' rating, indicating that many residents consider the value of the parks to extend beyond their own personal need.

PARK BENEFITS	Average (mean) Rating	
	Personal Rating	Community Rating
Parks protect and conserve our natural environment	7.6	8.5
Parks help people keep healthy, by providing a place of recreation and exercise, away from the pressures of urban living	7.3	8.1
Parks bring people together, as family groups and with community activities	7.1	7.4
Parks help build an informed and educated community, which is in touch with nature and our local history	6.3	6.6
Parks contribute to our economy, through employment of people, support of our recreational industry and through tourism	6.3	7.1
Parks conserve and protect the cultural heritage of early Maori and European settlement sites	6.2	7.4

The research participants were then asked to identify what they considered to be the three most important benefits of the regional parks and to identify the benefit they regarded as the single most important. Results were as follows:

PARK BENEFITS	% Ranking No. 1	% Ranking in Top 3
1. Parks protect/conserv e our natural environment	37	78
2. Parks bring people together as family/community	17	63
3. Parks help people keep healthy	21	57
4. Parks contribute to our economy	12	33
5. Parks help inform and educate the community	8	33
6. Parks conserve and protect cultural heritage	5	36
TOTAL	100%	300%

Tables 12(d) and (e) of the Detailed Tables analyse these results further by park segment and demographic profiling. Overall, the results were fairly consistent across the various demographic sub-groups. Some notable differences that did emerge, however, are:

- Residents who identified themselves as *‘Maori’* tended to rate the *‘conservation and protection of cultural heritage’* as more important than did the general population. They also rated *‘protection and conservation of the natural environment’* most highly.
- Men rated the *‘parks contribution to our economy’* more highly than did women. The reverse was true for the benefits relating to *‘education’* and *‘conservation of cultural heritage’*.
- Frequent and occasional users of the regional parks, and users of parks generally, rated the *‘protection and conservation of the natural environment’* and the *‘healthy community’* benefits more highly than the non-users.
- The non-and infrequent user segment was inclined to rank the *‘economic’* benefit more highly.

8.7. THE OUTCOMES OF THE PARKS OF THE FUTURE

Respondents were next asked to indicate what they would expect from the regional parks of the future, by rating various possible outcomes of the parks under the main themes presented in the previous section. The overall importance rankings are summarised below.

8.7.1. THE PARKS ROLE IN KEEPING PEOPLE HEALTHY

All of the ‘*healthy community*’ outcomes, which are based around providing a place of recreation and exercise, were considered important. They were each rated ‘7’ or higher on the 10-point scale by well over half the residents interviewed.

The overall importance ranking that emerged for these outcomes was as follows:

HEALTHY COMMUNITY OUTCOMES	Importance Ranking	
	No. 1	In Top 3
	%	%
The parks cater for the needs of different ages and abilities	23	47
The parks are a place where people can feel safe	20	41
The parks are a place where people can go to enhance their physical health and fitness	16	33
The parks provide a wide range of activities that people can enjoy	13	36
The parks offer new tracks, features and natural attractions for people to explore	9	32
The parks offer people the chance to feel relaxed and refreshed	5	34
The parks offer people the chance to escape the city and be alone	6	29
The parks are a place people can visit with little preparation	4	27
The parks are a place where people can challenge themselves physically	4	21

8.7.2. THE CONSERVATION ROLE

The ‘*conservation*’ outcomes are clearly considered very important by residents of the greater Wellington region. Seven out of the eight outcomes listed were rated ‘7’ or higher on the 10-point scale by 70% or more respondents.

The overall importance ranking of the conservation outcomes was:

CONSERVATION OUTCOMES	Importance Ranking	
	No. 1	In Top 3
Protect and encourage bird and animal life	18	62
Protect water quality	16	54
Protect land from subdivision and development	12	45
Help make the region better able to adapt to climate change	14	28
Preserve the landscape	11	30
Increase the variety and quality of native vegetation	8	37
Protect modified rural environments, such as farms	12	21
Protect historic or cultural features	9	23

8.7.3. THE ROLE OF PARKS IN BRINGING PEOPLE TOGETHER

This role was also seen as important for the parks of the future. Over 60% of respondents rated each of the four outcomes '7' or higher on the 10-point scale.

The overall importance ranking of the people and community outcomes was:

PEOPLE AND COMMUNITY OUTCOMES	Importance Ranking	
	No. 1	In Top 3
The parks provide a place for family activities and children's play	36	82
The parks are a place for organised community events and activities	28	90
The parks bring people together to participate in the conservation of our natural environment (e.g. through volunteer days)	29	63
The parks are a place where people feel encouraged to interact with others	7	65

8.7.4. THE EDUCATIONAL ROLE

The 'educational' contribution of parks was also rated as important by over 60% of respondents.

The overall importance ranking of the individual outcomes was:

EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES	Importance Ranking	
	No. 1	In Top 3
The parks help children learn as part of school environmental programmes	28	73
The parks help people learn to have fun and be safe outdoors	28	56
The parks help people learn about caring for our natural environment	19	53
The parks help people learn about the history or culture of our region	12	60
The parks help people learn about plant life, bird life and animal life	13	58

8.7.5. THE ECONOMIC ROLE

Three of the five ‘*economic*’ outcomes were rated ‘7’ or more on the importance scale, by two-thirds or more of the research participants.

The overall importance ranking of the economic outcomes can be shown as follows:

ECONOMIC OUTCOMES	Importance Ranking	
	No. 1	In Top 3
The parks offer space for local communities to hold organised events	29	69
The parks help the economy, by employing people and supporting workers involved in the recreational industry	25	72
The parks help attract visitors to the Wellington region to support our economy	24	73
The parks help provide their own funding for the provision of recreational areas and the protection of the natural environment, with less burden on the ratepayers	10	48
The parks add value to residential properties, by helping to make them more sought after (e.g. through easy access to green areas, pleasant views, etc)	12	38

8.8. THE SIZE AND NUMBER OF REGIONAL PARKS PREFERRED FOR THE FUTURE

The following result clearly shows that the majority of residents in the greater Wellington region would like to see the regional parks of the future at least stay the same in size and number. But many would like the regional parks of the future to expand, thus including more parks and/or land.

REGIONAL PARKS SHOULD:	TOTAL	Frequent Users	Occasional Users	Other Park Users	Non/Infreq. Users
	%	%	%	%	%
Stay the same in size and number	53	32	57	65	50
Expand to include more parks and/or land	41	68	43	29	24
Be smaller and/or fewer in number	4	-	-	3	19
Unsure	2	-	-	3	7
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

A relatively small percentage of the population in the greater Wellington region would favour smaller or fewer parks. These residents are mainly non-users.

8.9. DEVELOPMENT PARAMETERS

In order to test the parameters of what constitutes acceptable development for the parks of the future, the research participants were presented with five development options. They were then asked to rate each option according to its acceptability for the regional parks of the future (say, in 20 years time). The results were as follows:

	<u>% Rating Acceptable</u>
<p><u>Option 1:</u> That the regional parks are maintained for preservation, access and use, in their present form</p>	85
<p><u>Option 2:</u> That the regional parks are developed, with even more emphasis given to their conservation, environmental improvement, education and community interest roles</p>	91
<p><u>Option 3:</u> That the regional parks are developed as per Option 2, plus they include a limited amount of commercial activity that can enhance the recreational park experience, e.g. refreshment facilities, hirers of outdoor equipment such as bikes, tents, or clothing.</p>	61
<p><u>Option 4:</u> That the regional parks are developed, with some of the land use going to other operations (e.g. built accommodation, wind farms), with some change to the current park experience</p>	48
<p><u>Option 5:</u> That the regional parks assign some of their land resource for other operations (as per Option 4), but at the same time place more emphasis on the conservation, education and community interest roles (as per Option 2)</p>	68

These results suggest that Options 1 and 2 are the most acceptable, which is consistent with the findings of the Stage One Qualitative Research. However, Options 3 and 5 would still be acceptable to a majority of the research participants.

The change in result between Options 4 and 5 reveals that if there are major changes to the park experience, it would be important to “*give something back*” by placing greater emphasis on the conservation, education and community interest roles of the remaining park area.

8.10. ACCEPTABILITY OF POSSIBLE PARK FEATURES

To test the parameters of acceptable park development further, respondents were asked to consider a list of developments and activities, some of which are already available in some regional parks. They evaluated each development or activity according to how it could potentially fit in with the character, heritage and roles of the parks.

Questioning then checked whether respondents '*wanted*' that particular feature. The results are shown below, from highest to lowest level of acceptance. They may be interpreted as the percentage of respondents who would find each feature '*acceptable*' if it were introduced to the parks of the future and fitted with the character, heritage and roles of the parks as presented in the interview.

POSSIBLE PARK FEATURES	TOTAL
	%
1. Information centres	72
2. Working farms and forests	66
3. Education facilities, e.g. classrooms	65
4. Museums	59
5. Wind farms	56
6. Small commercial operations, e.g. refreshments, equipment	52
7. Facilities for organised sport	38
8. Facilities for leisure activities, e.g. playgrounds	29
9. Motorised recreation	25

To clarify, for example, the table above does *not* state that 25% of the population want '*motorised recreation*'. However, in the qualitative research there was an '*acceptance*' among some park users that there is a need for an area for this type of recreation. They therefore rationalised that it would be better to create an area for it in a controlled environment, as long as it did not interfere with the use and enjoyment of the park by other park users.

8.11. CONCLUSION

The research has confirmed that the regional parks are playing an increasingly important role in peoples' lives. This is evidenced by the fact that:

- Over half the adult population in the greater Wellington region have visited at least one regional park in the past twelve months.
- The '*frequent user*' segment is growing, to the point where 23% of the total population in the greater Wellington area now visit a regional park at least monthly. This equates to 44% of the total park users.

There remains, however, an opportunity to further increase usage of the regional parks. One-third of the residents currently visit only '*other parks and green areas*' in the region and have not yet had the regional park experience.

61% of total residents consider decisions relating to the future use of the regional parks important. These decisions are considered even more important by 82% of the current users of these facilities. However, 42% of the '*other park*' users and 31% of the '*non-park*' users also regard the decisions relating to the future use of the regional parks as important.

The quantitative survey has confirmed that the great majority of residents either want the regional parks to stay the same in size and number, or to expand to include more parks and/or land where possible. This was also a key finding of the Stage One Qualitative Research, in which residents strongly expressed the view that they want to preserve what the parks have for their on-going use and future generations.

The survey has confirmed that there are six key benefits of the regional parks that are all important to residents. These have been defined as:

- Parks protect/conserves our natural environment
- Parks bring people together as family/community
- Parks help people keep healthy
- Parks contribute to our economy
- Parks help inform and educate the community
- Parks conserve and protect cultural heritage

Section 8.7 of the report has identified the relative importance of specific outcomes for the parks, relating to each of the key benefits. This, coupled with the section on parameters for development, should provide considerable insight to the ‘*shape*’ of the regional parks that are desired in the future.

Readers are encouraged to peruse both the qualitative and quantitative reports, as they provide different but complementary insights to peoples’ attitudes. The qualitative research provides insight to what the public ‘*freely*’ think about parks, whereas the quantitative survey has enabled the resulting concepts/park outcomes to be ranked and tested among a broader cross-section of the population.

It is noted, for example, that in the qualitative research the ‘*economic*’ benefit of the regional parks was hardly mentioned. However, when this benefit was presented to respondents in the Stage Two survey, it emerged as the fourth most important overall. This points to the need for clear communication to the public if this (and other key outcomes) were to be advanced in future.

9. DETAILED TABLES

TABLE 1: EXTENT TO WHICH RESPONDENTS HAD HEARD OF THE MAJOR REGIONAL PARKS AND FORESTS IN THE GREATER WELLINGTON REGION

Base: Total respondents in the survey

MAJOR REGIONAL PARKS/FORESTS	TOTAL 1,000
	%
Battle Hill Farm Forest Park	68
Belmont Regional Park	88
East Harbour Regional Park	41
Hutt River Trail (from Hikoikoi Reserve on the Petone Foreshore, to Birchville north of Upper Hutt)	80
Kaitoke Regional Park	87
Queen Elizabeth Park	96
Akatarawa Forest	77
Pakuratahi Forest (including Tunnel Gully recreational area and Rimutaka Rail Trail)	53
RESPONDENTS WHO RECALLED A PARK	100%
Average number of parks recalled	5.9

TABLE 2: MAJOR REGIONAL PARKS VISITED IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS

Base: Total respondents in each group

MAJOR REGIONAL PARKS/FORESTS Bases:	TOTAL 1,000	AREA					
		Kapiti 100	Porirua 112	Wellington 387	Lower Hutt 225	Upper Hutt 86	Wairarapa 90
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Battle Hill Farm Forest Park	9	7	21	9	5	9	1
Belmont Regional Park	16	4	15	18	24	9	4
East Harbour Regional Park	9	2	4	14	9	3	3
Hutt River Trail	22	4	5	24	35	31	9
Kaitoke Regional Park	16	6	13	13	20	28	21
Queen Elizabeth Park	18	51	27	15	13	15	2
Akatarawa Forest	7	3	6	7	4	22	7
Pakuratahi Forest	10	2	-	14	9	20	7
RESPONDENTS WHO HAD VISITED A PARK	52%	56%	54%	53%	52%	59%	39%
Average number of major parks visited	2.0	1.4	1.7	2.2	2.3	2.3	1.4

TABLE 3: FREQUENCY OF VISITING EACH PARK IN THE PAST TWELVE MONTHS

Base: Total respondents who had visited each park in the past 12 months

FREQUENCY Bases:	TOTAL PARKS 1,061	PARK							
		Battle Hill 85	Belmont 157	East Harbour 86	Hutt River Trail 217	Kaitoke 158	Queen Elizabeth 184	Akatarawa 73	Pakuratahi 101
Once	35	55	27	56	21	34	36	36	50
2 – 4 times	38	44	35	26	34	52	36	41	38
Monthly	15	1	23	12	21	12	15	14	7
Fortnightly	6	-	6	3	11	1	6	5	5
Weekly	4	-	5	3	6	1	6	4	-
Daily	2	-	4	-	7	-	1	-	-
TOTAL VISITORS	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 4: ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN IN EACH PARK IN THE PAST TWELVE MONTHS

Base: Total respondents who had visited each park in the past 12 months

ACTIVITY	TOTAL PARKS 1,061	Battle Hill 85	Belmont 157	East Harbour 86	Hutt River Trail 217	Kaitoke 158	Queen Elizabeth 184	Akatarawa 73	Pakuratahi 101
Bases:	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Walking/bush walking	54	47	54	55	63	44	62	40	51
Running/jogging	11	13	14	15	14	9	7	7	10
Walking/running with dog	9	-	11	10	17	8	5	10	4
Mountain biking/cycling	24	19	29	28	25	18	22	26	21
Swimming	11	-	4	12	12	18	17	7	10
Fishing	1	-	-	2	1	1	1	-	-
Hunting	x	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-
Tramping	7	12	15	6	-	11	-	4	15
Camping	10	13	17	-	-	30	-	10	14
Horse riding	4	9	8	-	3	-	4	5	2
Picnics/barbeques	28	29	32	36	24	26	36	18	22
Driving for pleasure (e.g. 4WD, Trail biking)	2	-	-	-	-	3	3	11	2
Participated in organised sports event	2	4	1	-	2	1	2	-	2
Canoeing/kayaking/rafting	1	-	-	-	5	1	-	1	-
Photography	2	1	-	1	3	4	1	-	-
Painting/artwork	1	-	-	2	3	1	1	4	-
Researching/nature study	1	2	1	-	-	3	-	3	1
Family outings/recreation	6	5	5	5	7	4	7	4	6
Outings with organised groups	5	-	1	6	5	9	3	7	11
Farm parks/petting zoo	x	4	-	-	-	-	-	3	-
Volunteer activities e.g. planting trees	1	4	4	-	x	1	-	1	1
Other	2	3	2	1	3	1	1	3	2
TOTAL VISITORS	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Average no. of activities	1.8	1.7	2.0	1.8	1.9	1.9	1.7	1.7	1.7

TABLE 5 (a): EXTENT TO WHICH RESPONDENTS HAD VISITED ANY **OTHER** PARKS, SPORTS GROUNDS, OR GREEN AREAS IN THE GREATER WELLINGTON REGION, IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS

Base: Total respondents in each group

VISITATION OF PARKS OTHER THAN THE REGIONAL PARKS Bases:	TOTAL 1,000 %	AREA					
		Kapiti 100 %	Porirua 112 %	Wellington 387 %	Lower Hutt 225 %	Upper Hutt 86 %	Wairarapa 90 %
Had visited in past 12 months	84	88	82	85	82	80	87
Had <i>not</i> visited	16	12	18	15	18	20	13
TOTAL RESPONDENTS	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 5 (b): ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN IN 'OTHER PARKS' IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS

Base: Total respondents who had visited a park

ACTIVITY	Base:	TOTAL PARKS
		840
		%
Walking/bush walking		46
Running/jogging		23
Walking/running with dog		19
Mountain biking/cycling		18
Swimming		8
Fishing		3
Hunting		1
Tramping		2
Camping		-
Horse riding		5
Picnics/barbeques		28
Driving for pleasure (e.g. 4WD, Trail biking)		3
Participated in organised sports event		33
Canoeing/kayaking/rafting		9
Photography		3
Painting/artwork		5
Researching/nature study		2
Family outings/recreation		38
Outings with organised groups		12
Farm parks/petting zoo		3
Volunteer activities e.g. planting trees		1
Other (mainly watching sport)		16
TOTAL VISITORS		100%
Average number of activities		2.8

TABLE 6: FREQUENCY OF VISITING ANY PARKS IN THE GREATER WELLINGTON REGION

Base: Total respondents in the survey

FREQUENCY	TOTAL RESPONDENTS
	1,000
	%
Every day	8
Most days	13
At least once a week	30
Once a fortnight	12
Once every 3 or 4 weeks	11
2 – 6 times per year	10
Once a year	x
Less often	-
TOTAL RESPONDENTS WHO VISIT PARKS	84%

TABLE 7 (a): REGIONAL PARK LAST VISITED

Base: Total respondents in the survey

REGIONAL PARKS	TOTAL RESPONDENTS
Base:	1,000
	%
Battle Hill Farm Forest Park	4
Belmont Regional Park	6
East Harbour Regional Park	5
Hutt River Trail	11
Kaitoke Regional Park	7
Queen Elizabeth Park	11
Akatarawa Forest	4
Pakuratahi Forest	4
RESPONDENTS WHO HAD VISITED A PARK	52%

TABLE 7 (b): REASONS FOR CHOOSING A PARTICULAR PARK FOR THE LAST VISIT

Base: Total respondents who last visited each park

REASONS	TOTAL PARKS 524	Battle Hill 42	Belmont 61	East Harbour 46	Hutt River Trail 111	Kaitoke 69	Queen Elizabeth 112	Akatarawa 41	Pakuratahi 42
Bases:	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Proximity; time and convenience	36	17	46	17	43	29	54	27	17
A relaxing/peaceful/quiet environment	26	21	15	20	32	28	28	34	24
The scenery/natural beauty of the park	24	24	31	20	28	17	20	27	29
The openness/open space	16	12	13	24	20	14	14	17	12
The terrain (flat/good easy walks)	12	-	11	-	37	-	10	10	-
The terrain (challenging/variety/a good workout)	20	24	18	39	-	19	-	59	69
The water/river/seashore/beach	10	-	-	4	16	13	21	-	-
Good tracks for walking/cycling/ horse riding	28	26	15	20	50	14	15	56	29
Tracks are well maintained	20	17	16	28	14	25	24	24	17
It provides a sense of adventure/ places to explore	18	24	20	17	-	28	-	41	67
Has good/safe areas for children/family	6	7	-	-	10	3	13	10	-
Good picnic areas	12	12	-	26	16	25	6	10	-
To study/watch the natural environment (plants, bird life)	6	10	10	9	1	10	1	10	12
To study/observe the local history in the park	2	7	7	-	-	-	1	-	7
To get inspiration for painting/artwork, etc	6	2	2	4	10	13	2	10	2
A good area to walk the dog	6	-	-	20	19	-	-	-	-
To attend an event or volunteer activity	4	12	-	-	7	1	5	-	2
Other reasons	3	5	2	2	2	4	3	2	5
RESPONDENTS WHO VISITED EACH PARK	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Average no. of reasons given	2.6	2.2	2.1	2.5	3.1	2.4	2.2	3.4	2.9

TABLE 8: REASONS FOR USING LOCAL GREEN AREAS RATHER THAN REGIONAL PARKS

Base: Total respondents who used 'other parks' only

REASONS	TOTAL RESPONDENTS
	316
	%
Timing issues (too far to travel)	25
Activity is sports/sports field based	24
Prefer to go to the gym; not an outdoors person	16
Lack awareness/knowledge of the regional parks (e.g. don't know what they have to offer)	14
Prefer short walks (e.g. Regional Parks are for longer walks/ serious trampers)	13
Cost issues (too expensive to get there/petrol costs)	11
Uncertain about the degree of difficulty the parks present	9
Transport issues (no car, no public transport)	8
Support my children at sport; based around children's activities	8
Safety is an issue	7
The parks I use are close to where I live	6
I have health/mobility problems	3
Other	5
TOTAL RESPONDENTS WHO USE 'OTHER PARKS' ONLY	100%
Average number of reasons given	1.5

TABLE 9: REASONS FOR NOT VISITING ANY PARKS IN THE PAST TWELVE MONTHS

Base: Total respondents who had not visited any parks in the past 12 months

REASONS	TOTAL RESPONDENTS
	160
	%
Too busy/don't have time	46
I'm not an outdoors person (prefer the gym/to exercise indoors/to do indoor activities)	44
Have other interests (which fulfil me/fill my time)	36
Health/mobility issues	27
The weather deters me	26
Don't choose/like to exercise	18
Age/too old	9
Have very young children/a baby	8
Transport issues (can't get to the parks)	3
Cost issues (too expensive to get there/petrol costs)	3
Other reasons	4
TOTAL RESPONDENTS WHO HAD NOT VISITED ANY PARKS	100%
Average number of reasons given	2.2

TABLE 10 (a): PARK USER SEGMENTS

Base: Total respondents in the survey

SEGMENTS	TOTAL (n=1,000)
	%
Frequent users of regional parks <i>(use them at least monthly)</i>	23
Occasional users of regional parks <i>(use less often)</i>	29
Users of other parks only <i>(at least monthly)</i>	32
Non/infrequent users of parks	16
TOTAL	100%

TABLE 10 (b): PROFILE OF USER SEGMENTS – BY GENDER AND AGE

Base: Total respondents in each group

PROFILE		TOTAL	FREQUENT	OCCASIONAL	OTHER PARK	NON/INFREQUENT
Bases:		1,000	USERS	USERS	USERS	USERS
		%	231	293	316	160
		%	%	%	%	%
<u>GENDER:</u>						
	Male	51	50	50	52	50
	Female	49	50	50	48	50
	TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<u>AGE (YEARS):</u>						
	16 – 29	20	5	28	19	24
	30 – 39	14	18	14	13	6
	40 – 49	22	32	18	23	19
	50 – 59	16	27	8	13	25
	60 – 69	15	12	18	16	11
	70+	13	6	14	16	15
	TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 10 (c): PROFILE OF USER SEGMENTS – HOUSEHOLD INCOME

Base: Total respondents in each group

PROFILE		TOTAL 1,000	FREQUENT USERS 231	OCCASIONAL USERS 293	OTHER PARK USERS 316	NON/INFREQUENT USERS 160
Bases:		%	%	%	%	%
<u>INCOME:</u>						
	Up to \$30k per annum	16	9	21	13	25
	Over \$30 – 50k	24	18	25	26	25
	Over \$50 – 70k	21	14	29	19	20
	Over \$70k	28	45	21	26	18
	Don't know/refused	11	14	4	16	12
	TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 11: HOW IMPORTANT ARE DECISIONS REGARDING THE FUTURE USE OF THE REGIONAL PARKS?

Base: Total respondents in each group

DEGREE OF IMPORTANCE	TOTAL 1,000	FREQUENT USERS 231	OCCASIONAL USERS 293	OTHER PARK USERS 316	NON/INFREQUENT USERS 160
Bases:	%	%	%	%	%
Very important	39	68	50	26	6
Quite important	22	23	25	16	25
Neutral	21	5	22	32	19
Not very important	10	4	-	23	13
Not at all important	8	-	3	3	37
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 12 (a): IMPORTANCE RATING OF REGIONAL PARK BENEFITS TO '*YOU PERSONALLY*'

Base: Total respondents in the survey (1,000)

PARK BENEFITS	IMPORTANCE RATING (1 TO 10 scale)										TOTAL	Av. (mean) rating
	Not important									Very Important		
Bases:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	%	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Parks protect and conserve our natural environment	5	5	1	1	8	2	19	15	10	34	100	7.6
Parks help people keep healthy, by providing a place of recreation and exercise, away from the pressures of urban living	-	6	1	7	16	7	7	19	8	29	100	7.3
Parks bring people together, as family groups and with community activities	3	4	2	5	10	9	15	21	12	19	100	7.1
Parks help build an informed and educated community, which is in touch with nature and our local history	7	8	6	6	13	11	9	14	6	20	100	6.3
Parks contribute to our economy, through employment of people, support of our recreational industry and through tourism	4	8	9	6	12	6	17	13	10	15	100	6.3
Parks conserve and protect the cultural heritage of early Maori and European settlement sites	8	7	5	3	15	9	12	20	8	13	100	6.2

TABLE 12 (b): IMPORTANCE RATING OF REGIONAL PARK BENEFITS TO THE '*COMMUNITY AS A WHOLE*'

Base: Total respondents in the survey (1,000)

PARK BENEFITS	IMPORTANCE RATING (1 TO 10 scale)										TOTAL	Av. (mean) rating
	Not important									Very Important		
Bases:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	%	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Parks protect and conserve our natural environment	-	-	-	1	4	3	23	19	6	44	100	8.5
Parks help people keep healthy, by providing a place of recreation and exercise, away from the pressures of urban living	-	-	-	2	8	6	14	30	14	26	100	8.1
Parks bring people together, as family groups and with community activities	-	-	1	2	19	10	21	17	8	22	100	7.4
Parks help build an informed and educated community, which is in touch with nature and our local history	2	4	3	5	22	13	18	10	6	17	100	6.6
Parks contribute to our economy, through employment of people, support of our recreational industry and through tourism	1	1	3	7	18	11	11	19	7	22	100	7.1
Parks conserve and protect the cultural heritage of early Maori and European settlement sites	1	1	2	4	12	6	22	23	11	18	100	7.4

TABLE 12 (c): OVERALL RANKING OF THE IMPORTANCE OF REGIONAL PARK BENEFITS

Base: Total respondents in the survey

BENEFITS	% RANKING No. 1 (n=1,000)	% RANKING IN TOP 3 (n=1,000)
	%	%
1. Parks protect/conserv e our natural environment	37	78
2. Parks bring people together as family/community	17	63
3. Parks help people keep healthy	21	57
4. Parks contribute to our economy	12	33
5. Parks help inform and educate the community	8	33
6. Parks conserve and protect cultural heritage	5	36
TOTAL	100%	300%

TABLE 12 (d): THE No. 1 MOST IMPORTANT BENEFIT OF THE PARKS, CROSS-ANALYSED BY SEX, AGE & COMBINED HOUSEHOLD INCOME

Base: Total respondents in each group

BENEFIT RANKED MOST IMPORTANT Bases:	TOTAL 1,000	SEX		AGE (YEARS)					HOUSEHOLD INCOME (PER ANNUM)				
		Male 509	Female 491	16-29 198	30-39 144	40-49 218	50-59 160	60+ 280	Up to 30k 159	Over \$30-50k 242	Over \$50-70k 212	Over \$70k 278	DK/ Refused 109
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Parks protect and conserve our natural environment	37	37	37	38	47	38	34	32	37	33	32	46	33
Parks bring people together, as family groups and with community activities	17	16	18	16	12	18	15	20	15	14	23	16	18
Parks help people keep healthy, by providing a place of recreation and exercise, away from the pressures of urban living	21	21	21	26	19	17	26	19	23	24	19	21	15
Parks contribute to our economy, through employment of people, support of our recreational industry and through tourism	12	17	7	11	10	13	16	11	16	12	8	9	20
Parks help build an informed and educated community, which is in touch with nature and our local history	8	6	10	4	10	10	4	11	3	8	13	6	10
Parks conserve and protect the cultural heritage of early Maori and European settlement sites	5	3	7	5	2	4	5	7	6	9	5	2	4
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 12 (e): THE No. 1 MOST IMPORTANT BENEFIT OF THE PARKS, CROSS-ANALYSED BY PARK SEGMENT AND ETHNICITY

Base: Total respondents in each group

BENEFIT RANKED MOST IMPORTANT Bases:	TOTAL 1,000	PARK SEGMENT				ETHNICITY					
		Frequent Users 231	Occasional Users 293	Other Park Users 316	Non/ Infrequent Users 160	NZ Maori 109	NZ European 701	British & Other European 52	Pacific Island 57	Asian 76	Other 5
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Parks protect and conserve our natural environment	37	55	43	28	18	41	36	37	40	37	40
Parks bring people together, as family groups and with community activities	17	9	11	22	29	7	17	21	24	20	20
Parks help people keep healthy, by providing a place of recreation and exercise, away from the pressures of urban living	21	23	24	24	6	23	21	15	18	22	20
Parks contribute to our economy, through employment of people, support of our recreational industry and through tourism	12	4	3	16	32	11	13	13	4	10	20
Parks help build an informed and educated community, which is in touch with nature and our local history	8	8	7	6	13	5	9	6	7	8	-
Parks conserve and protect the cultural heritage of early Maori and European settlement sites	5	1	12	4	2	13	4	8	7	3	-
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 13 (a): IMPORTANCE RATING OF OUTCOMES RELATING TO **KEEPING PEOPLE HEALTHY**

Base: Total respondents in the survey (1,000)

HEALTHY COMMUNITY OUTCOMES Bases:	IMPORTANCE RATING (1 TO 10 scale)										TOTAL	Av. (mean) rating
	Not important 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Very Important 10		
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
The parks cater for the needs of different ages and abilities	1	6	-	3	7	8	20	15	11	28	100	7.5
The parks are a place where people can go to enhance their physical health and fitness	1	6	3	3	11	6	17	11	16	26	100	7.4
The parks are a place where people can challenge themselves physically	3	8	4	3	16	8	17	10	9	22	100	6.7
The parks offer people the chance to escape the city and be alone	1	2	3	9	9	9	19	19	9	20	100	7.2
The parks offer people the chance to feel relaxed and refreshed	1	3	-	2	19	9	16	17	8	25	100	7.3
The parks are a place people can visit with little preparation	7	5	2	9	16	5	16	17	11	12	100	6.4
The parks provide a wide range of activities that people can enjoy	2	2	1	5	9	8	18	27	16	12	100	7.3
The parks are a place where people can feel safe	3	1	1	1	5	9	16	23	18	23	100	7.8
The parks offer new tracks, features and natural attractions for people to explore	-	2	3	-	8	6	26	19	13	23	100	7.7

TABLE 13 (b): OVERALL RANKING OF THE IMPORTANCE OF OUTCOMES RELATING TO **KEEPING PEOPLE HEALTHY**

Base: Total respondents in the survey (1,000)

HEALTHY COMMUNITY OUTCOMES	% RANKING No. 1	% RANKING IN TOP 3
The parks cater for the needs of different ages and abilities	23	47
The parks are a place where people can go to enhance their physical health and fitness	16	33
The parks are a place where people can challenge themselves physically	4	21
The parks offer people the chance to escape the city and be alone	6	29
The parks offer people the chance to feel relaxed and refreshed	5	34
The parks are a place people can visit with little preparation	4	27
The parks provide a wide range of activities that people can enjoy	13	36
The parks are a place where people can feel safe	20	41
The parks offer new tracks, features and natural attractions for people to explore	9	32
TOTAL	100%	300%

TABLE 14 (a): IMPORTANCE RATING OF OUTCOMES RELATING TO THE **CONSERVATION** ROLE OF PARKS

Base: Total respondents in the survey (1,000)

CONSERVATION OUTCOMES	IMPORTANCE RATING (1 TO 10 scale)										TOTAL	Av. (mean) rating
	Not important									Very Important		
Bases:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	%	
Preserve the landscape	2	7	2	1	5	8	17	13	7	38	100	7.7
Protect water quality	1	-	1	5	6	6	9	12	16	44	100	8.3
Protect and encourage bird and animal life	2	1	2	1	6	2	12	15	18	41	100	8.3
Help make the region better able to adapt to climate change	3	7	2	4	8	6	12	16	17	25	100	7.3
Protect land from subdivision and development	5	3	-	3	5	3	16	13	11	41	100	7.9
Protect modified rural environments, such as farms	6	7	3	3	7	21	14	15	8	16	100	6.5
Protect historic or cultural features	4	2	3	1	12	8	8	21	18	23	100	7.5
Increase the variety and quality of native vegetation	1	4	3	4	3	10	11	20	16	28	100	7.7

TABLE 14 (b): OVERALL RANKING OF THE IMPORTANCE OF OUTCOMES RELATING TO THE **CONSERVATION**
ROLE OF PARKS

Base: Total respondents in the survey (1,000)

CONSERVATION OUTCOMES	% RANKING No. 1	% RANKING IN TOP 3
Preserve the landscape	11	30
Protect water quality	16	54
Protect and encourage bird and animal life	18	62
Help make the region better able to adapt to climate change	14	28
Protect land from subdivision and development	12	45
Protect modified rural environments, such as farms	12	21
Protect historic or cultural features	9	23
Increase the variety and quality of native vegetation	8	37
TOTAL	100%	300%

TABLE 15 (a): IMPORTANCE RATING OF OUTCOMES RELATING TO THE ROLE OF PARKS IN **BRINGING PEOPLE TOGETHER**

Base: Total respondents in the survey (1,000)

PEOPLE & COMMUNITY OUTCOMES Bases:	IMPORTANCE RATING (1 TO 10 scale)										TOTAL	Av. (mean) rating
	Not important 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Very Important 10		
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
The parks provide a place for family activities and children's play	2	7	-	8	2	5	21	12	14	29	100	7.5
The parks are a place where people feel encouraged to interact with others	2	4	5	9	12	5	13	20	9	21	100	6.9
The parks are a place for organised community events and activities	1	2	3	-	10	11	18	20	10	25	100	7.6
The parks bring people together to participate in the conservation of our natural environment (e.g. through volunteer days)	4	5	1	2	11	14	12	21	11	19	100	7.1

TABLE 15 (b): OVERALL RANKING OF THE IMPORTANCE OF OUTCOMES RELATING TO THE ROLE OF PARKS IN
BRINGING PEOPLE TOGETHER

Base: Total respondents in the survey (1,000)

PEOPLE AND COMMUNITY OUTCOMES	% RANKING No. 1	% RANKING IN TOP 3
The parks provide a place for family activities and children's play	36	82
The parks are a place where people feel encouraged to interact with others	7	65
The parks are a place for organised community events and activities	28	90
The parks bring people together to participate in the conservation of our natural environment (e.g. through volunteer days)	29	63
TOTAL	100%	300%

TABLE 16 (a): IMPORTANCE RATING OF OUTCOMES RELATING TO THE **EDUCATIONAL** ROLE OF PARKS

Base: Total respondents in the survey (1,000)

EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES Bases:	IMPORTANCE RATING (1 TO 10 scale)										TOTAL	Av. (mean) rating
	Not important 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Very Important 10		
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
The parks help people learn about caring for our natural environment	6	15	1	4	5	4	13	9	16	27	100	6.8
The parks help people learn about plant life, bird life and animal life	8	4	7	5	6	7	6	17	14	26	100	6.9
The parks help people learn about the history or culture of our region	10	1	2	8	10	6	17	22	5	19	100	6.7
The parks help people learn to have fun and be safe outdoors	2	-	3	4	11	9	18	23	8	22	100	7.4
The parks help children learn as part of school environmental programmes	-	5	3	3	4	9	15	25	10	26	100	7.6

TABLE 16 (b): OVERALL RANKING OF THE IMPORTANCE OF OUTCOMES RELATING TO THE **EDUCATIONAL**
ROLE OF PARKS

Base: Total respondents in the survey (1,000)

EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES	% RANKING No. 1	% RANKING IN TOP 3
The parks help people learn about caring for our natural environment	19	53
The parks help people learn about plant life, bird life and animal life	13	58
The parks help people learn about the history or culture of our region	12	60
The parks help people learn to have fun and be safe outdoors	28	56
The parks help children learn as part of school environmental programmes	28	73
TOTAL	100%	300%

TABLE 17 (a): IMPORTANCE RATING OF OUTCOMES RELATING TO THE **ECONOMIC** ROLE OF PARKS

Base: Total respondents in the survey (1,000)

ECONOMIC OUTCOMES Bases:	IMPORTANCE RATING (1 TO 10 scale)										TOTAL	Av. (mean) rating
	Not important 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Very Important 10		
The parks help attract visitors to the Wellington region to support our economy	% 3	% 5	% 1	% 7	% 9	% 3	% 14	% 17	% 15	% 26	% 100	7.4
The parks add value to residential properties, by helping to make them more sought after (e.g. through easy access to green areas, pleasant views, etc)	19	9	2	7	4	7	13	11	8	20	100	5.8
The parks help the economy, by employing people and supporting workers involved in the recreational industry	2	2	1	4	9	15	11	20	12	24	100	7.4
The parks offer space for local communities to hold organised events	1	2	2	2	7	9	27	20	13	17	100	7.4
The parks help provide their own funding for the provision of recreational areas and the protection of the natural environment, with less burden on the ratepayers	2	5	4	8	16	15	11	20	11	8	100	6.4

TABLE 17 (b): OVERALL RANKING OF THE IMPORTANCE OF OUTCOMES RELATING TO THE **ECONOMIC** ROLE OF PARKS

Base: Total respondents in the survey (1,000)

ECONOMIC OUTCOMES	% RANKING No. 1	% RANKING IN TOP 3
The parks help attract visitors to the Wellington region to support our economy	24	73
The parks add value to residential properties, by helping to make them more sought after (e.g. through easy access to green areas, pleasant views, etc)	12	38
The parks help the economy, by employing people and supporting workers involved in the recreational industry	25	72
The parks offer space for local communities to hold organised events	29	69
The parks help provide their own funding for the provision of recreational areas and the protection of the natural environment, with less burden on the ratepayers	10	48
TOTAL	100%	300%

TABLE 18: OPTION PREFERRED FOR REGIONAL PARKS OF THE FUTURE

Base: Total respondents in each group

REGIONAL PARKS SHOULD:	TOTAL 1,000	FREQUENT USERS 231	OCCASIONAL USERS 293	OTHER PARK USERS 316	NON/INFREQUENT USERS 160
Bases:	%	%	%	%	%
Stay the same in size and number	53	32	57	65	50
Expand to include more parks and/or land	41	68	43	29	24
Be smaller and/or fewer in number	4	-	-	3	19
Unsure	2	-	-	3	7
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 19 (a): EXTENT TO WHICH RESPONDENTS RATED EACH DEVELOPMENT OPTION AS 'ACCEPTABLE' OR 'UNACCEPTABLE' FOR THE REGIONAL PARKS

Base: Total respondents in the survey (1,000)

PARKS OF THE FUTURE ARE:	RATED THE OPTION				TOTAL
	Very Acceptable	Quite Acceptable	Not Very Acceptable	Not At All Acceptable	
	%	%	%	%	%
1. Maintained in present form	34	51	12	3	100
2. Developed, with more emphasis on conservation, environmental improvement, education and community interest roles	51	40	5	4	100
3. As per 2, plus limited commercial activity	27	34	19	20	100
4. Developed, with some land going to other operations (e.g. wind farms, built accommodation)	13	35	29	23	100
5. Developed, as per 4, but also with more emphasis on option 2 roles	32	36	24	8	100

TABLE 19 (b): PERCENTAGE RATING DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS 'ACCEPTABLE' FOR THE REGIONAL PARKS
– ANALYSED BY PARK USERSHIP SEGMENTS

Base: Total respondents in each group

PARKS OF THE FUTURE ARE: Bases:	TOTAL 1,000	FREQUENT USERS 231	OCCASIONAL USERS 293	OTHER PARK USERS 316	NON/INFREQUENT USERS 160
	%	%	%	%	%
1. Maintained in present form	85	86	82	87	81
2. Developed, with more emphasis on conservation, environmental improvement, education and community interest roles	91	95	96	87	81
3. As per 2, plus limited commercial activity	61	55	61	68	56
4. Developed, with some land going to other operations (e.g. wind farms, built accommodation)	48	27	54	48	69
5. Developed, as per 4, but also with more emphasis on option 2 roles	68	50	79	65	80
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 20: ACCEPTABILITY OF POSSIBLE PARK FEATURES

Base: Total respondents in each group

POSSIBLE PARK FEATURES Bases:	TOTAL	FREQUENT	OCCASIONAL	OTHER PARK	NON/INFREQUENT
	1,000	USERS 231	USERS 293	USERS 316	USERS 160
	%	%	%	%	%
1. Information centres	72	86	86	54	62
2. Working farms and forests	66	45	63	68	96
3. Education facilities, e.g. classrooms	65	92	67	42	68
4. Museums	59	77	69	49	33
5. Wind farms	56	67	48	60	47
6. Small commercial operations, e.g. refreshments, equipment	52	40	66	40	68
7. Facilities for organised sport	38	27	45	42	32
8. Facilities for leisure activities, e.g. playgrounds	29	37	37	11	37
9. Motorised recreation	25	28	22	24	27