

# **Appendix D: Community Car Sharing Survey Analysis**

**Appendix D1: Residents' Survey** 

**Appendix D2: Visitors' Survey** 

## **Appendix D1: Residents' Survey**

A total of 206 people in total took part in the online resident's survey.

#### Location of respondents

Respondents gave their postcode (first four digits) to identify where they live. 94 people were from Cockermouth, 68 from Keswick, 13 from Workington, 11 from Carlisle, eight from Penrith, 10 from the wider Cumbria area and two were from Lancashire. The majority of respondents (162) reside in the target area of Keswick and Cockermouth.



## Transportation and usage

Participants were asked about the type of transport they currently use and the frequency of usage. Walking was marginally higher than the use of a car or van with 112 and 110 responses, respectively. Use of a car or van two to three times per week was the third highest response.

Frequent use of public transport was low, with only 33 responses collectively on a daily, weekly, or bi-weekly basis. The most frequent use of public transport is monthly. Informal lift sharing with friends and family was relatively well represented with 56 people sharing a lift on a fortnightly or weekly basis, with a further 31 receiving a lift on a monthly basis. This shows a potential relation to car sharing and a more formalised scheme within the community.



Cycling is also regularly used in the area, whereas motorbike usage is very low.

#### Ability to drive and access to vehicles

Question three asked 'how many people hold a current driving licence within your household'. All participants chose to answer this question. 65% had two licences, 21% had only one licence, and 7% had three licences within their household. 5% had four or more licences, with the remaining 2% had no licences within their household.



Respondents were asked how many vehicles they had access to within their household. 205 people answered this question. Half of respondents have access to two vehicles within their household. 36% have access to only one vehicle, 11% have access to three or more vehicles in their household with the remaining 3% having no vehicle access.



To understand the correlation between the number of licences per household and access to vehicles, the data was cross tabulated. The data highlighted that 52 households have less vehicles available to them than the number of licences in their household, approximately 25%.

This does not give a definitive guide to car sharing potential as there are households who will reduce the number of vehicles within their household, if a car club or car sharing was available.

69 people who have the same or more vehicles per household to licence ratio said they may use a car club if created and a further 53 said they would, which shows a high potential for removing additional vehicles from the road.

#### Vehicles ownership types

Respondents were asked to highlight the type of vehicle ownership within their household. 205 people answered this question. It was possible to give more than one response to this question which meant that a total of 265 responses were received.

The majority (181) owned their vehicle(s) outright, 63 hold lease or personal contract agreements. 13 have company vehicles, one has a mobility scheme vehicle, and one uses a car share vehicle. Five stated that it was not applicable to them.



#### Car clubs and car sharing

Participants were asked whether they had used a car club before. All participants answered this question. 90% (185) had not used a car club before, 14 stated that they had used a car club or car share scheme previously. Three people had shared their cars through a car share scheme, one used a car-pool at work and another car shared to work previously. One highlighted the car sharing scheme at Sellafield and buses provided to access the site. The table below highlights this data.



The survey highlighted the types of vehicles that could be available through a car club or car share scheme and asked participants which of those services they may wish to use and how often.

The highest of all responses was for an electric car. 51 people said they would use an EV two-three times per week, with 43 stating daily usage. 30 people would use an EV weekly, four fortnightly and 12 monthly.

32 people then requested a non-EV car daily and 25 would use it two-three times a week and a further 11 said that they would use it on a weekly basis.

Nine people would like to use an electric van daily, with a further 18 suggesting they would use an e-van during the month.

Electric bikes received lots of votes with a total of 48 people highlighting a need between once a month to daily usage.

Pedal cycles were requested by a total of 24 people with usage ranging from once a month to daily.

E-cargo bikes were selected by 18 people for monthly to daily usage. Finally non-evans were selected by 14 people with various usage across the month.

The responses are all contained in the table below.



In summary the data shows a particularly high need for EVs on a daily, weekly bimonthly and monthly basis. With a total of 124 requesting usage on at least a weekly basis.

There is a potential need for non-EVs although it is not clear as to why this is the case. It could be for longer journeys, or linked to concerns around range anxiety, the ability to charge or the unfamiliar technology.

With the usage demand highlighted above this could indicate a need for around 10-15 electric shared vehicles in the area depending on the hire period required, with non-EVs or hybrids in addition.

#### Benefits of car sharing and car clubs

Respondents were then asked to consider the benefits a car club or car sharing could bring to their community. 203 people gave a total of 1087 responses.

'Reduce carbon emissions' received the highest of all responses with 165 selecting this option. This was closely followed by 'reducing the cost of using a car' with 155 and 'reducing the number of cars in the community' with 149 responses.

112 said it would 'encourage people to take up electric vehicles'. 90 people felt it would 'reduce transport poverty.'

There was a clear link to social impacts including the potential to 'provide a transport service for elderly and disabled people', 'preventing isolation and loneliness', 'improving social engagement', and 'creating new friendships'.

51 people felt it could 'alleviate poverty', whereas eight people felt car sharing would not bring any community benefit. Four people highlighted the link to reducing parking issues within the area and one felt that the benefits would depend on the cost of the scheme. The table shows this information below.



## Types of car sharing and car clubs

Participants were shown a diagram highlighting the different models of car ownership and sharing. They were asked 'if a car club or sharing scheme was created, do you have a preference to the type of scheme'?



201 participants chose to respond to this question. They could select more than one preference which meant that a total of 521 responses were received.

A preference for a community car club scheme was highlighted with 112 responses, followed by car sharing with 83.

Informal lift sharing was the third highest category with 78 responses which correlates with the current transport choices used in the area.

Peer-to-peer and work colleague sharing both received 54 responses. Only 41 responders selected a commercial car club, almost a third less than a community car club. 27 selected rent-a-car or to be added to a friend or family's policy.

The extensive response shows that residents are open to sharing vehicles through potentially a number of options, formalised and informal.



To verify the potential for car sharing, the survey then asked participants 'if a car club or car sharing scheme was developed in your community would you be interested in using it?'

A total of 205 responses were received. 35% said yes (71 people), 49% (101 people) said they may use such a scheme. 12% (25 people) said no. There were a handful of other comments, highlighting the accessibility of vehicles, cost, range, and the desire to share a vehicle but not hire a vehicle.



To understand the interest in the two localities of Keswick and Cockermouth the data was then segmented per area as highlighted below:



The graph shows a higher level of interest within Cockermouth than Keswick but this is reflected in the number of responses from those respective areas. To understand the potential types of scheme required in each area the data was split by area, by 'yes', and 'maybe'.



In Keswick there is a preference for a community car club followed by car sharing. Then informal sharing between friends and family or lift sharing with work colleagues. Commercial car club was again the lowest ranking of the formalised schemes.



In Cockermouth, as in Keswick there is a preference for a community car club followed by car sharing. Then informal sharing between friends and family or lift sharing with work colleagues. Commercial car club was again the lowest ranking of the formalised schemes, yet there is clearly more interest in a commercial car club in Cockermouth than in Keswick. This could be linked to the fact that operators such as Enterprise have been expanding into communities surrounding Cockermouth.

## **Reduction of vehicles**

The survey then asked `if a car club or sharing scheme was developed locally would you consider reducing car ownership in your household?'

73 people said maybe, 49 people answered yes, and 63 answered no. 13 did not know. Four said it was not applicable as they do not own a vehicle and one said it would depend on the cost of the car sharing option.

This means that there is the possibility of removing between 49 and 136 cars from the roads based on this survey of 206 people.



Participants were asked whether they would be prepared to share their vehicle if a car share scheme was developed. 40 people said yes, 91 said maybe and 73 said no. One person said it was not applicable.



To understand if there are differences in area the data was split by location (Keswick and Cockermouth). In line with other survey responses there is more interest in Cockermouth than Keswick but again this links to the higher response rate from that area. There is potential in both areas for car sharing with residents interested in putting their vehicles into a scheme.



Respondents were asked if they would be interested in finding out more about car clubs and car sharing. 80 people said 'yes' with a further 71 saying 'maybe'. 46 said no.



#### Electric Vehicles (EVs) and EV charging

Respondents were asked about their plans to purchase or lease an EV in the future. There were 198 responses to this question.

The highest number of responses (64) stated that they do not plan to buy or lease an EV. 55 people plan to buy or lease an EV within the next three-five years, 31 plan to buy/lease in the next one-three years and 13 plan to buy or lease within the next 12 months. 16 people already own an EV. Nine people said they could not afford to buy an EV. Seven are unsure or may buy one in the future. Two do not drive so it was not applicable.



People were then asked what concerns, if any, they have about owning or using an EV? 203 people chose to respond to this question. As it was a multiple choice question a total of 484 answers were recorded.

The highest response (116) highlighted concerns around the high purchase/ lease costs, followed by the limited range of EVs. 107 said limited charging locally was a concern and 55 said they were concerned they would have nowhere to charge. 44 stated the cost of charging and 18 were concerned about the unfamiliar technology. There were a handful of additional comments linked to battery concerns and the carbon



footprint of EVs, reliability and the inability to tow. 21 people had no concerns related to owning or leasing an EV.

They were then asked, 'If you own an EV or plan to buy/ lease one in the future, where do you plan to charge your vehicle'? Of the 191 people who answered this question, 78 said they would use an at home charger and public charger where necessary. 19 people have a charger at home, and 14 would use public chargers. 23 said they did not know and 57 felt the question was not applicable.



Participants were asked if they have EV charge points within a 5 minute walk of your home, are they being installed or would you like them in the future? 200 responses were received to this question. 33 said they would like an EV charge point in the future, and four said they were in the process of getting on in their community. 91 were not aware of plans to install EV charge points in their community and 33 do not know.

18 said they have an EV charge point already and 11 said they have multiple charge points in their community. Two said that more charge points were needed as opposed to six who felt they were not needed.



Participants were then asked about the speed of chargers that they would require for public charging within their community. 194 people chose to answer this question.

84 require rapid charging, 32 asked for fast and 11 said slow chargers. 77 people did not know. This data was then correlated against the data set related to current and future ownership of EVs.

The 16 who currently own their own EV, eight require rapid charging in the community alongside their home charger. Three said they did not know, and four required fast charging.



Respondents were asked if they had any specific locations that you would like a charge point to be located in. The table below highlights the responses.



71 people would like to be contacted, and 38 may like to be contacted in the future regarding local low carbon transport. 91 said they did not wish to be contacted with regards to low carbon transport.

103 people left follow up contact details.

## **Demography of respondents**

153 respondents were female and 54 were male, equating to 207 people which suggests that one response was on behalf of two people. The highest category for responses was 40-59 with 112 responses, followed by 57 in the 60+ category and 38 in the 39 and under age group. No participants recognised themselves as non-binary. The chart below highlights the age of respondents and their gender.



## **Other Comments**

Comments included:

- Car sharing is not for me but a good idea for the community.
- I own a car which is not used often, could be great for a car share.
- Currently car share with a friend but would be interested in a scheme.
- Locating car sharing bays centrally may be an issue.
- We live in a remote village which has no services or shops, so car use is essential.
- The issue is a lack of good public transport. This needs to be improved as well to reduce carbon emissions.
- Better public transport links would encourage tourists to leave their cars at the rental property, thereby reducing congestion and emissions.
- Having better bike lanes and links would make me more likely to use my bike if it was safer and I could cycle with my children.
- Have you considered opening up the disused railway lines like they have in the Peak District i.e. Tissington trail, Monsal Dale etc. this could link so many towns!!
- Would support a community car sharing scheme but would need reliable availability of vehicles.

- As a tourist destination, a large number of public chargers are required. Need financial incentives to install charges in houses which do NOT have an EV to future proof.
- *Reduced cost is the main driver for me.*

## Prize draw

119 people left contact details to be entered into the prize draw for cinema tickets.

## **Appendix D1: Visitors' Survey**

Car clubs, car sharing and car hire visitor survey responses

93 responses were received to the visitor survey.

Participants were asked where they had travelled from. 76 travelled from the UK, including 24 from the local region of the Northwest, 18 from the North East and nine from Yorkshire. Three had travelled from various locations in Europe with a further three having travelled from the United States of America. Ten did not give their location.



Respondents were asked how they had travelled to the area. The vast majority (85%, 77 people) had travelled by car. A total of 11 people had travelled by public transport, train, bus or ferry.



For those who had travelled to the area by car they were asked whether or not their car was an EV. 90% (72 people) said that their car was not an EV. 3% (two people) had driven to the area in an EV. 6% (five) people said their vehicle was a hybrid, and one said that the question was not applicable.



Respondents were asked how they would prefer to charge an EV whilst on holiday. 27 people responded to this question which was multiple choice, therefore 44 answers were given. The highest response was overnight at their hotel or accommodation with 20 responses. 10 of those also requested rapid charging. Two simply asked for rapid charging and four said they would require slow charging overnight at their hotel or accommodation. Seven did not know.



The participants were then asked if they were to travel here again, would they be prepared to travel by public transport if a car club or car share option was available to them. The majority, 67% (57 people), said no they would not. 18% (15 people) said they would, six people said maybe and seven were unsure. Although these are not huge numbers if a scheme was in place it would be utilised by some visitors to the area.



Respondents were then asked what type of scheme they would prefer to use if such a scheme was available in the area. Hiring from a community organisation was the highest with 22 responses. Eight people said they would use whichever scheme was most cost effective. Two would like to car share by borrowing a resident's vehicle, two said 'other' and one said none.



To understand why people would not utilise a car club or car share scheme we asked if there was any reason why they would not use such a scheme when visiting the area? The main reason was that it was too complicated and impractical this links with the responses around travelling with equipment and or family. 11 stated that driving is easier which also confers this data. Four highlighted cost as an area of concern.

However, 12 said there was no reason why they would not use such a scheme, with one stating that they want to support the local community.



Finally visitors were given the chance to submit any additional comments which are highlighted in the graph below. The main comment given was linked to not liking public transport or limited public transport.

