The Royal Parks In-Park Research Report 2009 – All Parks Combined

Prepared for: Jason Dudley-Mallick
Prepared by: Melania Gabrieli / Rachel Wilson
Date: 15th February 2010

The concepts and ideas submitted to you herein are the intellectual property of Synovate Ltd. They are strictly of confidential nature and are submitted to you under the understanding that they are to be considered by you in the strictest confidence and that no use shall be made of the said concepts and ideas, including communication to any third party without Synovate Ltd's express prior consent.
Contents

1. Introduction .................................................................................................................. 3
    1.1 Research objectives ................................................................................................. 4
    1.2 Research methodology ............................................................................................ 5
    1.3 Notes on data analysis and comparisons .................................................................. 7

2. Executive Summary ..................................................................................................... 9
    2.1 Overall Satisfaction and Key Action Areas ............................................................... 9
    Overall quality 9
    2.2 Awareness of The Royal Parks ................................................................................ 10
    2.3 Recycling facilities .................................................................................................. 10
    2.4 Royal Park Website .................................................................................................. 11
    2.5 Royal Park Trees ..................................................................................................... 11
    2.6 Cycling in Regent’s Park ......................................................................................... 11
    2.6 Kensington Gardens Attractions ............................................................................. 11
    2.5 Visitor Profile .......................................................................................................... 12

3. Main findings .............................................................................................................. 14
    3.1 Overall quality of the Parks ..................................................................................... 14
        3.1.1 Overall quality of the Parks – All Parks Combined ...................................... 14
        3.1.2 Overall Quality of the Royal Parks – By Central Parks ................................. 15
        3.1.3 Overall Quality of the Royal Parks – By Provincial Parks ......................... 16
        3.1.4 KPI Performance Ratings – All Parks Combined ...................................... 18
        3.1.7 KPI Performance Ratings – By Individual Park ......................................... 24
    3.2 Activities requested in the parks ............................................................................... 29
    3.3 Feeling of Safety in Parks ......................................................................................... 32

3.4 Awareness of The Royal Parks ................................................................................. 33
    3.4.1 Spontaneous awareness of The Royal Parks ..................................................... 33
    3.4.2 Prompted awareness of The Royal Parks ........................................................... 35
    3.4.3 Awareness Park is a Number of Parks Managed by Central Organisation ...... 36
    3.4.4 Sources of information ....................................................................................... 37
3.5 Recycling facilities ........................................................................................................... 38
3.5.1 Current Usage of Recycling Facilities ........................................................................ 38
3.5.2 Evaluation of Current Recycling Facilities – Conveniently located ....................... 39
3.6 Royal Parks Website ....................................................................................................... 43
3.7 Park Trees ....................................................................................................................... 50
3.8 Cycling in Regent’s Park ................................................................................................. 52
   3.9 Kensington Gardens Attractions ............................................................................... 53
   3.9 Intentions of visiting Kensington Gardens Attractions ........................................... 54
4 Visitor profile .................................................................................................................... 55
   4.2 Gender Profile ............................................................................................................ 56
   4.3 Socio-economic grade ............................................................................................... 57
   4.4 Ethnicity Profile ........................................................................................................ 58
   4.5 Visitor Residence ....................................................................................................... 59
   4.6 Country of Origin ....................................................................................................... 60
   4.7 Frequency of Visiting the Parks ................................................................................. 61
   4.8 Season visited ........................................................................................................... 62
   4.10 Main Method of Transport to Park ......................................................................... 64
   4.12 Main purpose for visiting Parks .............................................................................. 66
1. Introduction

As part of the visitor survey programme that Synovate has conducted on behalf of The Royal Parks Agency since 2004, two waves (one in summer and one in winter) of the survey were conducted in 2009 in the nine Royal Parks.

The main aim of the research programme is to contribute towards achieving The Royal Parks’ business objectives, as well as guiding future strategies and Park programmes.

The business objectives can be summarised as follows:

- To improve the quality and range of visitor services;
- To protect, conserve and enhance the environment of the Parks;
- To develop policies and initiatives to encourage wider use of the Parks;
- To raise the profile, understanding and value of the Parks;
- To manage the Parks efficiently and effectively.
1.1 Research objectives

The main objectives of the research are to:

- Identify the profile of visitors of the Royal Parks in terms of:
  - Demographic characteristics
  - Visit frequency and length
  - Reasons for visiting the parks
- Measure overall satisfaction with the Royal Parks and specific attributes, services and facilities.
- Investigate specific areas of interest in order to guide future developments

In 2009 the specific areas of interest were to understand:

- Awareness of the Royal Parks brand
- Usage and interest in recycling facilities in the parks
- Royal Parks website usage
- Opinions on Park trees
- Opinions of cycling in Regent’s Park
- Intentions of visiting any of the Kensington Garden Attractions

This report details Synovate’s findings and recommendations from the 2009 in-park visitor surveys, with comparison to the results from the 2006 (Provincial Parks only) and 2008 (Central Parks only) surveys where relevant.
1.2 Research methodology

The method can be described as follows:

- Visitors were interviewed as they left the parks.
- Two waves of the survey were carried out in 2009:
  - One in summer (fieldwork was conducted between the 31st July and 24th August between 9.30am and 3.30pm)
  - One in winter (fieldwork was conducted between the 24th November and the 5th December (30th November – 5th December for Bushy) between 8.00am and 3.00pm).
- Interviews were conducted in the five central parks, and in Provincial parks, namely:
  - Regent’s Park (and Primrose Hill within it)
  - St. James’s Park
  - Green Park
  - Hyde Park
  - Kensington Park
  - Richmond Park
  - Bushy Park
  - Greenwich Park
- ‘Next available respondent’ recruitment technique used i.e. the next person walking past the interviewer was approached for interview.
• The survey was paper-based, with the interviewer reading out the questions to the respondent.

• The interview lasted about 10 minutes.

• Interviews took place at various times on weekdays, and weekends.

• Interviewers rotated around different park exits.
In total 2528 interviews were conducted. At the analysis stage the data was weighted, so that each park has the same value in their influence on the overall findings.

The table below shows the number of interviews achieved and the weighting values:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Number of interviews</th>
<th>Weighted numbers of interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regent's Park</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primrose Hill</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. James's Park</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Park</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde Park</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington Gardens</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushy Park</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwich Park</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Park</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2528</strong></td>
<td><strong>2400</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3 Notes on data analysis and comparisons

In 2008, the survey was only conducted in the following Central Parks:

- Regent’s Park
- Primrose Hill
- St James’s
- Green Park
- Hyde Park
- Kensington Park
Therefore, for Central Parks, comparisons will be made with the findings for 2008 while for Provincial Parks comparisons will be made with the findings for 2006.

In 2006, the survey was only conducted in the following Provincial Parks

- Bushy
- Richmond
- Greenwich

Furthermore, in 2006, the second wave was conducted in autumn, whilst in 2009 it was conducted in winter. Therefore, when looking at differences between 2009 and 2006 we advise viewing the statistical differences identified with a certain level of caution.

Statistically significant differences between either 2006 or 2008 and 2009 data are shown as follows: a green ring around a number signifies that the number in question is significantly higher at the 95% confidence level than the equivalent number for the other year being compared to. Given the large sample sizes, in many cases, only a small difference is needed (typically 3-4%) for it to be statistically significant.
2. Executive Summary

2.1 Overall Satisfaction and Key Action Areas

Overall quality

- Ratings of the overall quality of the park visited are extremely high, with all visitors saying their visit was at least satisfactory. Sixty per cent rate their visit as excellent and a further 37% rate it as good. The high ratings are consistent across all parks.

- Compared to 2008, there has been a significant increase in the proportion of visitors giving a rating of ‘excellent’ for the Central Parks (from 47% to 57% in 2009).

- Ratings for the Provincial Parks are consistent with 2006, with levels of satisfaction remaining very high.

- The main strengths of the Royal Parks continue to be:
  - Ease of access by chosen method of transport
  - Ease of getting around the park
  - Quality of the natural environment
  - Upkeep of the park
  - Tidiness and cleanliness
  - Peace and quite

The worst rated aspects are:

- The number of toilets
- Visibility and friendliness of park staff
• Quality and number of sports facilities.

Car parking facilities are identified as a key action area.

• Compared to 2008, there has been an increase in the performance of all areas, except car parking facilities for the Central Parks.

• While for Provincial Parks performance has remained on par with 2006, except for sport facilities (number and quality of) which have seen an increase in 2009.

2.2 Awareness of The Royal Parks

• Overall awareness of The Royal Parks as the organisation responsible for managing the park visited is fairly low:

  • Unprompted awareness of The Royal Parks responsibility for the management of the park visited stands at just over a third of visitors.

  • When prompted with a list of organisations, under half name it.

2.3 Recycling facilities

• Recycling facilities in the parks are currently used by a small minority of visitors (11%).

• Those who use the recycling facilities rate them highly. Around three fifths give positive ratings both for being conveniently located and easy to use.

• Visitors are positive about the idea of adding recycling facilities to the park with two thirds indicating this. Nearly five in ten say they would use recycling facilities more if additional recycling points were provided.
2.4 Royal Park Website

- The Royal Park website is currently used by a small minority of visitors 16%.
- Of those who use it, over half rate it highly.

2.5 Royal Park Trees

- Ninety-five percent of visitors are happy to have dead wood standing in the parks.
- Two fifths of visitors feel that the importance of wildlife should be the first consideration by Park Management when planting trees in the park.

2.6 Cycling in Regent’s Park

- Over half of all visitors in Regent’s Park feel that cyclist should only ride in dedicated cycle lanes. Only 1% think they should be allowed to ride anywhere within the park
- A third of visitors to Regent’s Park say they ride a bicycle regularly or occasionally.

2.6 Kensington Gardens Attractions

- Over half of visitors have no intention of visiting any of the Kensington Garden Attractions. For those intending to, Kensington Palace is the most popular attraction (with a fifth intending to visit).
### 2.5 Visitor Profile

The table below summarises the main differences in the visitor profile for each of the 9 Royal Parks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total sample</th>
<th>Regent’s Base</th>
<th>Primrose</th>
<th>St. James’ Green</th>
<th>Hyde</th>
<th>Kensington</th>
<th>Bushy</th>
<th>Greenwich</th>
<th>Richmond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Age (in years)</strong></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% AB</strong></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% from London</strong></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% from outside the UK</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% visit once a week or more</strong></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% first visit</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average journey length (in min.)</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average length of park visits</strong></td>
<td>1hr 12</td>
<td>1hr</td>
<td>45min</td>
<td>1hr</td>
<td>48min</td>
<td>1hr 18</td>
<td>1hr18</td>
<td>1hr24</td>
<td>1hr30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% who use car to get to the parks</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% who walk to the parks</strong></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: A number with a green ring around it indicates that the findings from the specific park is significantly higher than a park with a number with a red ring around it (for the same data point) at the 95% confidence level.
As shown in the table above:

- Primrose Hill Park in particular has the highest proportion of local and frequent visitors, whilst Green Park and Hyde Park are characterised by:
  - a higher proportion of non UK visitors and therefore of first time visitors
  - a higher proportion that use public transport to reach the park

- Primrose Hill Park along with Regent’s Park have the highest proportion of visitors who walk to the park, whilst Bushy Park and Richmond Park have the highest proportion of visitors who travel by car.

- Richmond Park and Bushy Park have by far the highest proportion of older and AB socio-economic grade visitors

- Visitors stay for the longest amount of time in Greenwich Park and Richmond Park, whilst the shortest amount of time is spent in Primrose Hill and Green Parks.

.
3. Main findings

3.1 Overall quality of the Parks

3.1.1 Overall quality of the Parks – All Parks Combined

Visitors were asked to rate the overall quality of the park using a scale of ‘excellent’, ‘good’, ‘satisfactory’, ‘poor’ and ‘very poor’.

Overall, quality of all parks in 2009 is extremely high, with less than 1% of visitors giving a rating of ‘poor’ or ‘very poor’. Six in ten (60%) visitors rate the overall quality as ‘excellent’, while over a third (37%) rate it as ‘good’ and 3% as satisfactory. ‘Excellent’ ratings increase with frequency of visits (those who come more often) and
with length of stay (those who visit for longer). ‘Excellent’ ratings are also higher amongst Provincial Parks than Central Parks.

### 3.1.2 Overall Quality of the Royal Parks – By Central Parks

For the Central Parks, there has been a significant increase from 2008 in the proportion of visitors giving a rating of ‘excellent’ (47% in 2008 to 54% in 2009).

The chart below shows the overall quality ratings for each of the six Central Parks and a combined rating for all the Central Parks for both 2008 and 2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>2008 %</th>
<th>2009 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of the Central Parks – By Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Central Parks 2008</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Central Parks 2009</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regent’s Park 2008</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regent’s Park 2009</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primrose Hill 2008</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primrose Hill 2009</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St James’ Park 2008</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St James’ Park 2009</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Park 2008</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Park 2009</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde Park 2008</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde Park 2009</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington Park 2008</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington Park 2009</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base excluding no opinion: All Royal Central Parks 2009 n = 1633; Regent’s Park 2009 n = 222; Primrose Hill 2009 n = 138; St James’ Park 2009 n = 319; Green Park 2009 n = 324; Hyde Park 2009 n = 329; Kensington Park 2009 n = 301; All Royal Central Parks 2008 n = 1708; Regent’s Park 2008 n = 250; Primrose Hill 2008 n = 160; St James’ Park 2008 n = 314; Green Park 2008 n = 315; Hyde Park 2008 n = 345; Kensington Park 2008 n = 324

Q9. Overall quality of the park by parks – Central
Overall, all Central Parks receive very high ratings. As shown in the chart on the previous page, Kensington Park and Hyde Park are rated significantly higher than in 2008 (excellent ratings), while Regent’s, Primrose Hill and St James’s Parks remain unchanged from 2008. Although Green Park (39%) gets the lowest proportion of visitors rating it as ‘excellent’, it sees a significant increase from 2008 (31%).

3.1.3 Overall Quality of the Royal Parks – By Provincial Parks

The chart below shows the overall quality rating for each of the three Provincial Parks and a combined rating of all the Provincial Parks for both 2006 and 2009.

Greenwich Park (75%) and to a lesser extent Richmond Park (70%) receive the highest ‘excellent’ scores compared to all other parks. Compared to 2006, Greenwich
Park sees a significant increase in visitors giving it a score of excellent (75% in 2009 from 66% in 2006). Although Richmond Park is rated very highly, compared to 2006, significantly fewer people rate it as excellent (77% in 2006 compared to 69% in 2009). Of all Royal Parks, Richmond Park is the only one to see a significant decrease in the portion of visitors giving an ‘excellent’ rating.

Bushy Park sees no change from 2006, with two thirds of visitors (64%) giving it a rating of excellent.
3.1.4 KPI Performance Ratings – All Parks Combined

After rating the overall quality of the park they visited, visitors were asked how satisfied they were with the individual aspects of the parks (the Key performance Indicators - KPI's).

The chart below (1 of 2) shows the ‘excellent’ satisfaction ratings across all Parks in 2009 in respect of aspects relating to Park Environment, Information and staff and catering.

The chart overleaf (2 of 2) shows the ‘excellent’ score satisfaction ratings in respect of aspects relating to Toilets, Other Facilities and Ease of Getting Around.

KPI Performance Ratings All Parks 2009 (1 of 2)
In 2009 the highest ratings were given to:

- Ease of access by chosen method of transport
- Ease of getting around the park
- Quality of the natural environment
- Upkeep of the park
- Tidiness and cleanliness
- Peace and quite

The worst rated aspects are the number of toilets, visibility and friendliness of park staff, quality and number of sports facilities.
3.1.5 KPI Performance Ratings – All Central Parks Combined

The chart below (1 of 2) shows the ‘excellent’ satisfaction ratings across all Central Parks in 2009 and 2008 in respect of aspects relating to Park Environment, Information and staff and catering.

KPI Performance Ratings Central Parks (1 of 2)
The chart overleaf (2 of 2) shows the ‘excellent’ score satisfaction ratings in respect of aspects relating to *Toilets*, *Other Facilities* and *Ease of Getting Around*.

### KPI Performance Ratings Central Parks (2 of 2)

Compared to 2008, for the Central Parks there has been an increase in the performance of all areas, except car parking facilities. Aspects which have seen the biggest improvement since 2008 are:

- Facilities for children
- Number of sports facilities
- Quality of sports facilities
3.1.6 KPI Performance Ratings – All Provincial Parks Combined

The chart below (1 of 2) shows the ‘excellent’ satisfaction ratings across all Provincial Parks in 2009 and 2006 in respect of aspects relating to Park Environment, Information and staff and catering.

KPI Performance Ratings Provincial Parks (1 of 2)

The chart below (2 of 2) shows the ‘excellent’ score satisfaction ratings in respect of aspects relating to Toilets, Other Facilities and Ease of Getting Around.
KPI Performance Ratings Provincial Parks (2 of 2)

For the Provincial Parks performance has remained on par with 2006, except for sport facilities (number of and quality) which in 2009 have seen an increase.
3.1.7 KPI Performance Ratings – By Individual Park

As shown in the table below, best and worst performing aspects tend to be similar across all parks. The best performing aspects are access and park environment, whilst the worst aspects tend to be toilets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parks</th>
<th>Best performing aspects based on mean score</th>
<th>Worst performing aspects based on mean score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regent’s Park</td>
<td>• General tidiness and cleanliness&lt;br&gt;• Quality of the natural environment&lt;br&gt;• Upkeep of the park&lt;br&gt;• Ease of access&lt;br&gt;• Ease of getting around&lt;br&gt;• Peace and quiet</td>
<td>• Number of toilets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primrose Hill</td>
<td>• Upkeep of the park&lt;br&gt;• Ease of getting around&lt;br&gt;• Ease of access&lt;br&gt;• Quality of the natural environment&lt;br&gt;• Peace and quiet</td>
<td>• Park staff&lt;br&gt;• Number of catering facilities&lt;br&gt;• Car parking facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St James’s Park</td>
<td>• Ease of getting around&lt;br&gt;• Ease of access&lt;br&gt;• Upkeep of the park&lt;br&gt;• Quality of the natural environment&lt;br&gt;• General tidiness and cleanliness</td>
<td>• Overall quality of toilets&lt;br&gt;• Cleanliness of toilets&lt;br&gt;• Number of toilets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Park</td>
<td>• Ease of access&lt;br&gt;• Ease of getting around&lt;br&gt;• Upkeep of the park&lt;br&gt;• Quality of the natural environment&lt;br&gt;• General tidiness and cleanliness</td>
<td>• Number of toilets&lt;br&gt;• Overall quality of toilets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Factors</td>
<td>Additional Features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde Park</td>
<td>- Quality of the natural environment&lt;br&gt;- General tidiness and cleanliness&lt;br&gt;- Ease of access&lt;br&gt;- Ease of getting around&lt;br&gt;- Upkeep of the park</td>
<td>Number of toilets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington Park</td>
<td>- Quality of the natural environment&lt;br&gt;- Ease of access&lt;br&gt;- Ease of getting around&lt;br&gt;- General tidiness and cleanliness&lt;br&gt;- Upkeep of the park</td>
<td>Number of toilets&lt;br&gt;Overall quality of toilets&lt;br&gt;Cleanliness of toilets&lt;br&gt;Car parking facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwich Park</td>
<td>- General tidiness and cleanliness&lt;br&gt;- Upkeep of the park&lt;br&gt;- Quality of the natural environment&lt;br&gt;- Ease of access&lt;br&gt;- Ease of getting around</td>
<td>Number of toilets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Park</td>
<td>- Quality of the natural environment&lt;br&gt;- Upkeep of the park&lt;br&gt;- General tidiness and cleanliness&lt;br&gt;- Ease of access</td>
<td>Seating&lt;br&gt;Number of sporting facilities&lt;br&gt;Number of toilets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushy Park</td>
<td>- Quality of the natural environment&lt;br&gt;- General tidiness and cleanliness&lt;br&gt;- Upkeep of the park&lt;br&gt;- Ease of access&lt;br&gt;- Ease of getting around&lt;br&gt;- Peace and quiet</td>
<td>Number of toilets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1.8 Key action areas

Strategy matrices are an effective way of identifying how KPI areas may be addressed, given both their importance and performance. The matrices plot importance (derived by conducting Key Driver Analysis\(^1\)) versus performance (satisfaction rated by respondents).

The four quadrants of the matrix (shown overleaf) identifies which aspects of the Parks offerings could potentially:

- be *improved* (Key Action Areas - top left)
- be *maintained and communicated* (Communicate and Maintain Performance - top right)
- be considered *lower priorities* (Lower Priorities - bottom left)
- be considered for *communicate performance* (Communicate Performance - bottom right)

The Strategy Matrix for all of the Parks combined, based on the 2009 visitor data, is shown overleaf.

---

\(^1\) The relative importance of each of the different aspects are calculated using correlation analysis.
Firstly, the matrix confirms that the main strengths of the Royal Parks are aspects related to the park environment, followed by accessibility of the parks. Not only are these aspects rated more highly than all others, they are also the aspects that have the most impact on satisfaction.

There is no particular priority area that the Royal Parks need to action. This said car parking facilities have the highest impact (slightly above average) than all other aspects rated less positively.

In general all facilities are rated below average and could therefore benefit from improvement, although their impact on overall satisfaction is low.
The table below shows the Key Action Areas for each of the Parks and the average across all nine Parks².

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall across all Parks</th>
<th>Regent's Park</th>
<th>Primrose Hill Park</th>
<th>Kensington Park</th>
<th>St. James’s Park</th>
<th>Green Park</th>
<th>Hyde Park</th>
<th>Bushy Park</th>
<th>Greenwich Park</th>
<th>Richmond Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car parking facilities</td>
<td>Quality of sporting facilities</td>
<td>Car parking facilities</td>
<td>Quality of catering facilities</td>
<td>Facilities for children</td>
<td>Car parking facilities</td>
<td>Cleanliness of toilets</td>
<td>Visibility and friendliness of Park staff</td>
<td>Quality of catering facilities</td>
<td>Car parking facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seating</td>
<td>Cleanliness of toilets</td>
<td>Number of catering facilities</td>
<td>Activities for adults</td>
<td>Overall quality of toilets</td>
<td>Quality of catering facilities</td>
<td>Activities for adults</td>
<td></td>
<td>Visibility and friendliness of Park staff</td>
<td>Number of sporting facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities for adults</td>
<td>Visibility and friendliness of Park staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of sporting facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Car parking facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown above, there is no one key action area that is common across all parks and there is also a high variation in the number of action areas identified per park. Consistent with the overall picture, the lower ratings are given to aspects regarding park facilities.

As shown in the overall picture, car parking facilities are considered a key area of improvement in Primrose Hill, Green, Hyde and Richmond Parks.

² Key action areas are identified as aspects that have higher derived importance and lower performance than the overall (including all parks) averages for these measures.
3.2 Activities requested in the parks

Following the evaluation of the different aspects and park facilities, visitors were shown a list of types of information, educational or cultural activities and asked which, if any, they would like to see in the park they visited.

As shown in the chart below, music events and concerts are the main activities requested by visitors (30%). However, compared to previous years, the proportion doing so is significantly lower for Provincial Parks. ‘Theatre/open air theatre’ and ‘nature events’ are the second most mentioned events, with each requested by nearly a quarter of visitors (23%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information, education or cultural activities or park facilities requested in the park</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Music Events &amp; Concerts</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre/open air theatre</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature events</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical events</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guided walks and talks</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle hire</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childrens events or entertainment</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open air film screenings</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers market</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant information</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational activities</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardening/horticultural events</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All Parks 2009 n = 2528; All Central Parks 2009 n = 1666; All Provincial Parks 2009 n = 862; All Central Parks 2008 n = 1716; All Provincial Parks 2006 n = 1339

Q13. What types of information, education or cultural activities or park facilities, if any would you like this park to offer?
In 2009, the overall proportion of all Royal Parks visitors saying they do not want any events in the park is 10% while 11% have no opinion. For Central Parks, the proportion saying they do not want to see anything is significantly higher than in 2008 (8% in 2009 and 5% in 2008) whilst for the Provincial Parks the number who do not want to see any events has significantly declined from 21% in 2006 to 13% in 2009.

Looking at requests by park, the following activities and events are named by a considerable proportion (20% or more) of visitors:

**Music events & concerts:** This aspect is identified by a significant proportion of visitors as a possible activity that would enhance their enjoyment of:
- All Parks except Primrose Hill Park and Richmond Park. Visitors to Hyde Park and St James’s Park are the most likely to request such activities.

**Theatre/open-air theatre:** This aspect is identified by a significant proportion of visitors interviewed as a possible activity that would enhance their enjoyment of:

- St James’s Park, Kensington Park, Bushy Park and Greenwich Park.

**Nature events:** This aspect is identified by a significant proportion of visitors interviewed as a possible activity that would enhance their enjoyment of:

- All Parks except Primrose Hill Park and Green Park, with the highest proportion of requests from Regent’s Park visitors.
3.3 Feeling of Safety in Parks

Feelings of safety in park

Safety does not appear to be a problem in the parks, with almost all visitors (99%) indicating to some extent that they feel safe (either ‘very safe’ or ‘quite safe’). Both Central and Provincial Parks have seen significant increases in the proportion of visitors feeling ‘very safe’. This is a result of a shift in the proportion of visitors feeling ‘quite safe’ (to now feeling ‘very safe’).
3.4 Awareness of The Royal Parks

There is a gap in awareness of Royal Parks management of the parks. When visitors are spontaneously asked if they know who is responsible for managing the park they visited just over a third (36%) name The Royal Parks. Around one in five wrongly named another body as being responsible for the management of the park. As shown in the chart below, the bodies named include the Local Authority (8%), City of London (6%) and the Corporation of London (1%).

3.4.1 Spontaneous awareness of The Royal Parks

Responsibility of managing visited park? %

Two fifths (44%) didn’t have an opinion about who was responsible for managing the park. For the Central Parks, the proportion of visitors aware that the Royal Parks
Agency is responsible for the management of the park they visited is significantly higher than in 2008 (25% in 2009 compared to 22% in 2008).

Not surprisingly, knowledge of who manages the parks increases with frequency with which people visit, specifically, those who visit five times a week (55%) compared to those who visited once a year (12%) or less (16%). First time visitors have the lowest awareness of the park’s management (9%).

Visitors from London (48%) are more likely to know that the parks are managed by the Royal Parks Agency than both those from elsewhere in the UK (40%) and fewer still, from outside the UK (8%).

Looking at the findings for the parks individually, visitors to Provincial Parks (52% for Greenwich and Richmond – 62% for Bushy) are more likely to know that the parks are managed by the Royal Parks Agency, than those visiting Central Parks (17% for Hyde Park- 45% for Primrose Hill Park). The difference between Provincial and Central Parks is likely to be because Provincial Parks are more local to visitors. This would also explain why a high proportion of visitors to Primrose Hill Park (which is used by a high proportion of locals) know that the park is managed by The Royal Parks Agency.
3.4.2 Prompted awareness of The Royal Parks

Proportion knowing specific park is a Royal Park  %

Visitors were then asked if they were aware that The Royal Parks Agency is responsible for managing the park they visited. Nearly half (48%) know or sort of know that the park they visited is a Royal Park. Three quarters (73%) of those who visit five times a week or more know the park is a Royal Park, compared to only 22% of those who visit the park less than once a year. Again, those from London (64%) are more likely to know that the park they visited is a Royal Park compared to those from the UK but not London (51%) and outside of the UK (13%).

Again visitors to Provincial Parks are more likely to report awareness of the Royal Parks Agency than those to the Central Parks.
Visitors were then asked if they knew that the park they were visiting was one of a number of parks managed by a central organisation. As shown in the chart below, overall, four in ten visitors either knew this before the survey (35%) or sort of knew (8%).

3.4.3 Awareness Park is a Number of Parks Managed by Central Organisation

Proportion knowing specific park is one of a number of parks managed by a central organisation %

As shown in the chart above, awareness that the park visited is one of a number of parks managed by a central organisation is particularly high in Provincial Parks (66% compared to 22% in Central Parks). However, awareness in Central Parks is higher than in 2008.
3.4.4 Sources of information

Sources of information  %

Visitors were then asked to cite the sources of information from which, if any, they had heard anything about the park they were visiting. Six in ten of all visitors (59%) did not know of any information sources or did not have an opinion. The most mentioned source of information is word of mouth, mentioned by around one in seven (15%) visitors.

Looking at the individual parks, those visiting Green Park (74%), Kensington Park (70%) and St James’s Park (67%) are more likely than those visiting Hyde Park and Bushy Park (46% for both) to be unaware of sources of information or have no opinion. Visitors to Bushy Park are more likely (28%) than those from Greenwich Park (7%) and...
Kensington Park (6%) to cite ‘word of mouth’ as the information source on the park they were visiting.

3.5 Recycling facilities

Recycling facilities are currently used by few park visitors. Only one in ten (11%) use recycling facilities in the Park they visited. This said there has been a significant increase in Central Parks visitors using recycling facilities since 2008 (from 7% to 12% in 2009).

3.5.1 Current Usage of Recycling Facilities

Current usage of recycling facilities %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Parks 2009</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Provincial Parks 2009</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Central Parks 2009</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Central Parks 2008</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All Parks 2009 n = 2528; All Provincial Parks 2009 n = 862; All Central Parks n = 1666; All Central Parks 2008 n = 1716. Note this question was not asked in the 2006 surveys Q14a. Can you tell me if you have used the recycling facilities in this park?

Older visitors, especially those aged 40 - 49 years old are more likely to use recycling facilities (24%) than those aged 17-19 (5%). Recycling is more prevalent among Londoners (57%) than those from outside London but within the UK (17%).
Visitors to Kensington Park appear to be using recycling facilities more often, with 16% saying they have done so. The use of recycling facilities is lowest among visitors to Bushy Park (4%).

Across all Parks, visitors using recycling facilities give them a rating of ‘excellent’ or ‘very good’ for being conveniently located (60%) and for being easy to use (61%) and a further quarter (25%) rate each of these two aspects as ‘satisfactory’. As shown in the chart below and overleaf, since 2008, there has been a significant increase in the proportion of Central Parks visitors rating the recycling facilities as ‘excellent’ or ‘very good’ for being conveniently located and being very good for their ease to use.

### 3.5.2 Evaluation of Current Recycling Facilities – Conveniently located

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation of current recycling facilities - conveniently located %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Parks 2009</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Provincial Parks 2009</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Central Parks 2008</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Base: All who have used recycling facilities - All Parks 2009 n = 292; All Provincial Parks 2009 n = 87; All Central Parks 2009 n = 205; All Central Parks 2008 n = 122*

*Q14b. How would you rate them on being conveniently located?*
Across all parks, very few visitors rate the park they visited as ‘very poor’ for the recycling facilities location and for ease of use.

Although current use of recycling facilities in parks is relatively low, around two thirds (63%) of visitors think that having more recycling facility points would be a positive addition to the park. A half (52%) go on to say if more facilities are provided, they will use them (much more and a little more). The proportion of visitors to Central Parks who think that more recycling points would be a positive addition has significantly increased since 2008 (from 66% to 74% in 2009).
3.5.4 Interest in Additional Recycling Points

Visitors to Kensington Park (87%) stand out as being the most likely to think that additional recycling points would make a positive addition to the park. While visitors at Bushy Park (46%) and to a lesser extent Richmond Park (36%) are the most likely to believe that more recycling points would be a negative addition. Age is also a differentiator, with visitors aged under 40 (56%) more likely to think recycling points would make a positive addition to the park than visitors aged over 40 (43%).

Base: All Parks 2009 n = 2528; All Provincial Parks 2009 n = 862; All Central Parks 2009 n = 1666; All Central Parks 2008 n = 1716
Q14d. Do you think that more recycling points would be a positive addition to the park?
### 3.5.5 Intended Usage of Additional Recycling Points

Over half of all park visitors (52%) would use recycling points if more are provided. It is worth noting that although more people say they would use the recycling points if they are available, current usage of the facilities is very low (10%). It is therefore important to view these findings with a degree of caution.
In 2009, two new sections were added to the questionnaire, one on the Royal Parks Website and the other on park trees.

### 3.6 Royal Parks Website

Overall, one in six visitors have visited the Royal Parks website. As shown in the chart overleaf, 9% visited the site in the last month while 7% had visited more than three months ago. More than any other parks, Bushy (32%) and Richmond (29%) Parks stand out as having significantly more visitors who have visited the Royal Parks website. While St James’s (7%), Green Park (6%) and Hyde Park (6%) have the lowest proportion of people saying they have ever visited the Royal Parks website.

Overall, over eight in ten people have not visited the website (69%) or did not know whether they had (15%).
3.6.1 Usage and Rating of Royal Parks Website

There is a correlation between the frequency with which people have visited Royal Parks and access to the website. More than any other group, weekly visitors (27%) are more likely to have visited the Royal Parks website in the last 3 months. Likelihood to visit the website decreases among less frequent visitors and those visiting for the first time.

Of the 16% of visitors who have used the website, over half rate it as excellent (8%) or good (45%). Just 3% of visitors rate the website as either poor or very poor.
When asked what, if anything on the website they find useful, visitors cite a variety of features. The three most mentioned features are the ability to look at events (14%), the opening/closing times (11%), and the car parking charges (10%). Other features visitors say they find useful include:

- General information (9%)
- General information about the park (7%)
- Looking at maps (7%)
- Good and clear information (4%)
- Facilities at the park (4%)
- The park history (4%).
Around two thirds (63%) of visitors find all aspects of the website useful. Features that are not found useful are limited information of things like gardening, events, animals, tennis courts etc (6%), difficult to access (1%) and directions (1%).

What did you not find useful on the website  

| Not enough information about: gardening, events, animals, fountain, tennis courts… | 6 |
| Difficult / complicated to access | 1 |
| About parking: facilities, charges | 1 |
| Detailed directions | 1 |
| Nothing | 63 |
| Don’t know | 25 |

Base: All who have been on the Royal Parks website n = 392  Mentions above 1%  
Q17c. What, if anything on the website did you not find useful?

Overall, six in ten visitors to the Royal Parks have looked at information displayed in the park they visited. As shown in the chart overleaf, four in ten (41%) have looked at the notice boards, a third (33%) have looked at maps and 9% at leaflets. A further third (37%) of visitors have not looked at any notice boards park leaflets or maps within the parks.

Visitors to Richmond Park and to a lesser extent Regent’s Park, Kensington Park and Bushy Park are more likely than those in other parks to say they have looked at park notice boards, leaflets or maps.
3.6.2 Usage of Royal Parks Notice Boards, Leaflets or Maps

Use of notice boards, park leaflets or maps within the park?

When asked what they had used the maps to locate, no one use is mentioned by more than 10% of visitors. The most mentioned use is to locate position (10%). The second most mentioned uses are way or route finding, way or route finding within the park and to identify locations or places to go (each mentioned by 6%). All other map uses mentioned by 3% or more visitors are shown in the chart overleaf. It is worth noting that more than a quarter of visitors could not say what, if anything they had used the map for.
One in eight (12%) visitors who have looked at the maps feel that the maps in the Royal Parks could be improved. This said, there is no improvement that was mentioned by more than 2% of visitors. Some of the improvements mentioned include:

- More details (2%)
- More maps within the parks (2%)
- Should be cleaner (1%)
- More visibility using colour (1%)
- Larger maps (1%).
How could the maps be improved %

- It was okay / fine / good / no improvement: 38
- More details / information: 2
- More maps within the park: 2
- Larger maps: 1
- More visibility using colour: 1
- Putting mileage / distances on: 1
- Difference languages: 1
- Don't know: 49

Base: All who have been on the Royal Parks website n = 826  Mentions above 1%
Q18c. How, if at all, do you think the maps could be improved?
3.7 Park Trees

Visitors were asked how they felt about Park Management leaving standing dead wood that isn’t a safety hazard in the park to provide a good place for wildlife. As shown in the chart below, almost all of visitors (95%) say they would be happy to have standing dead wood in the parks.

3.7.1 Opinion on Usage of Dead Trees or Wood within The Royal Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinions on dead wood</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am happy to have standing dead wood in parks</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not happy to have standing dead wood in parks</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/no opinion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All Parks 2009 n = 2528
Q13a. Dead trees or wood provide a good place for wildlife such as bats, insects and woodpeckers. For this reason, the Park Management would like to leave standing dead wood that isn’t a safety hazard. Which of the following statements best applies to you…?

Visitors were then asked which aspects the Park Management should consider first when deciding which trees to plant. Two fifth (43%) of visitors feel that the importance for wildlife should be the first consideration by Park Management, followed by a third (31%) who say it should be the trees contribution to the London environment generally.
Visitors to Richmond Park (64%) are more likely to state the importance for wildlife than those who visited Hyde Park (28%), are those from London (58%) compared to those from outside the UK (19%).

3.7.2 Considerations for Planting Trees within The Royal Parks

Aspects Park Management should consider first when planting tree %

- Their importance for wildlife: 43%
- Their contributions to the London environment generally: 31%
- Their contribution to the park landscape: 24%
- Their ability to provide shade and shelter: 2%

*Base: All Parks 2009 n = 2528
Q13b. Which of the following aspects, should the Park Management consider first when deciding which trees to plant*
3.8 Cycling in Regent’s Park

Two new questions on cycling were added to the Regent’s Park questionnaire in 2009.

3.8.1 Opinions on Cycling within Regent’s Park

Opinions of cycling in Regent’s Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cyclists should only ride on dedicated cycle lanes</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclists should not be allowed at all to ride inside the Park</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclists should be allowed to ride on the wide paths in the Park alongside pedestrians</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclists should be allowed to ride on any path</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t mind</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclists should be allowed to ride anywhere within the Park including on the grass</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/no opinion</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All visiting Regent’s Park n = 223
Q18d. At the moment cyclists have limited access to Regent’s Park. Which of the following statements best describes your opinion on cycling in the Park?

Over half (55%) of all visitors questioned in Regent’s Park feel that cyclists should only ride on dedicated cycle lanes, one in ten (9%) think that cyclists should be allowed to ride on the wide paths in the park alongside pedestrians. 3% think cyclists should be allowed to ride on any path while 1% think they would be allowed to ride anywhere within the park including on the grass.

One in five visitors (21%) do not think cyclists should be allowed to cycle at all inside the park.
3.8.2 Cycling

Cycle usage of visitors to Regent’s Park  %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>57</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, regularly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, occasionally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All visiting Regent’s Park n = 223
Q18e. How often, if ever, do you ride a bicycle?

A third of visitors to Regent’s Park say they regularly (10%) or occasionally (23%) ride a bicycle.

3.9 Kensington Gardens Attractions

In 2009, a new question was asked of Kensington Park visitors around the Garden Attractions. Visitors were asked if they had come to the park with the intention of visiting any of the Gardens Attractions.
3.9 Intentions of visiting Kensington Gardens Attractions

Intention of visiting any of Kensington Gardens attractions

- Kensington Palace: 22%
- The Diana Playground: 11%
- The Diana Memorial Fountain: 8%
- The Diana Walk: 5%
- None of the above: 55%
- No answer/Not stated: 16%

*Base: All visiting Kensington Gardens n = 309
Q12a. Today, did you come to Kensington Gardens with the intention of visiting any of the following attractions?

Kensington Palace was the most popular with a fifth (22%) of visitors intending to visit the attraction. One in ten (11%) came with the intention to visit the Diana Playground, 8% the Diana Memorial fountain and 5% the Diana Walk. Over half (55%) of visitors had no intention of visiting any of the garden attractions and one in six did not declare their intentions.
4 Visitor profile

This section of the report details the visitor profile for all Parks in 2009 (summer and winter combined); it also draws comparisons with Central Parks 2008 and Provincial Parks 2006 where relevant.

As stated in section 1.3—the 2009 and 2006 statistical differences identified for the Provincial Parks have to be viewed with a degree of caution due to the differences in the time of year the surveys were conducted. In 2006, the second wave was conducted in autumn, whilst in 2009 it was conducted in winter. This difference impacts on the comparability of the data.

4.1 Age Profile

Of all the visitors to the Parks interviewed in 2009, over two fifths (44%) were aged between 30 and 49 and just under a third were aged over 50.
The average age of visitors interviewed in 2009 is 43 years. For the Central Parks there has not been much change since 2008 in ages of visitors with the majority still ranging between 20 – 39 years old.

The majority of visitors to the Provincial Parks are aged between 30 – 49 year olds. The Provincial Parks have seen a significant decrease in visitors aged 30 – 39 (25% in 2006 to 21% in 2009) but seen a significant increase in those aged 60+.

Visitors to the Provincial Parks are on average 10 years older than visitors to the Central Parks.

4.2 Gender Profile

Base: All Parks 2009 n = 2528; All Central Parks 2009 n = 1666; All Provincial Parks 2009 n = 862; All Central Parks 2008 n = 1716; All Provincial Parks 2006 n = 1339

Q23. Gender
The gender profile of visitors across all parks in 2009 is fairly evenly split but with slightly more females. There have been no changes in the gender profile between the years for either the Central or Provincial Parks.

4.3 Socio-economic grade

Compared to the population as a whole, in 2009, visitors across all parks are more likely to be in the AB or C1 socio-economic grades. Over four in ten are from the AB (45%) group. It is worth noting that for the overall UK population the AB socio group accounts for just 26% of the population.

Significantly more visitors from AB groups were interviewed in 2009 than in 2008 for the Central Parks and than in 2006 for the Provincial Parks, while significantly less from C1 socio-economic grade were interviewed.

Social group  %

[Table and graph showing the distribution of socio-economic groups across different years and regions]
4.4 Ethnicity Profile

In 2009, the vast majority (87%) of visitors to the Royal Parks are white, either ‘white British’, ‘white other’ or ‘white Irish’. This figure rises to 95% for the Provincial Parks. The Central Parks saw a significant increase in the number of ‘white British’ visitors in 2009, from 33% in 2008 to 40% in 2009, making it even with the number of ‘white other’ visitors.
4.5 Visitor Residence

As in previous years, visitors of the Royal Parks are mainly London residents or overseas tourists. Specifically in 2009, over half (52%) of visitors reside in London, while a quarter (24%) come from outside the UK. The number of visitors from London remains consistent for both Central and Provincial Parks when compared to previous years. Compared to 2008, the Central Parks have seen a significant decline in the number of overseas tourists from 45% to 37%. This decrease could be linked to the general decline in tourists to the UK as a whole during 2009 as a result of the recession. The Central Parks saw the only significant increase across all parks and regions, with the number of Southeast visitors rising from 6% in 2008 to 8% in 2009.

Those who did not come from the UK were then asked which region they came from.
As shown in the chart overleaf, a third (32%) of overseas visitors come from Western Europe and overall around half (55%) come from Europe generally. Other significant proportions of visitors come from North America and Australia or New Zealand.

### 4.6 Country of Origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western European</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North American</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian &amp; New Zealand</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Europe</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Europe</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Asia</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Eastern Asia</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Asia</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Asia</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared to previous years the country of origin profile is similar for Central Parks, although Provincial Parks have seen a significant increase in visitors from Western Europe and North America (from 1% in 2006 to 13% in 2009 for both), Australia and New Zealand which has grown by 23%, and South Eastern Asia by 13%.
4.7 Frequency of Visiting the Parks

In 2009, just over two fifths (42%) of visitors surveyed visited the parks at least once a week or more, with a further tenth (10%) visiting 1-3 times a month.

Frequently of visiting parks %

Both the Central Parks and Provincial Parks have seen significant increases in the number of visitors visiting once a week or more, particularly those who visit 5 times or more – from 9% in 2008 to 16% in 2009 in the Central Parks and 18% in 2006 to 27% in 2009 in the Provincial Parks. There has also been a significant decrease in the proportion visiting the Central Parks for the first time (39% in 2008 to 30% in 2009), this is probably a reflection of the lower proportion of overseas visitors registered in 2009.
4.8 Season visited

The Royal Parks are a popular tourist attraction all year round, with over three quarters (77%) of visitors surveyed stating that they visit all year round. The number of all year round visitors to the Central Parks has seen a significant increase from 57% in 2008 to 66% in 2009, whilst the Provincial Parks have seen a significant increase from 83% in 2006 to 92% in 2009. These differences could be attributed to the change in visitor profiles to both the Central and Provincial Parks, with the Central Parks seeing a decline in the number of overseas visitors, whilst the Provincial Parks have seen an increase in more regular visitors.

As one would expect the summer months are the most popular time of year to visit any of the parks.
4.9 Journey length

Respondents were asked how long their journey to the park took; the average time taken to reach all parks in 2009 is 17 minutes. Half (51%) of visitors took less than 15 minutes, while a fifth (18%) took more than 30 minutes. Those with a journey time of less than 15 minutes were most likely to be Londoners (57%).

Length of journey to park  %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 minutes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 10 minutes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 15 minutes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 20 minutes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 30 minutes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 30 minutes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All Parks 2009 n = 2528; All Central Parks 2009 n = 1666; All Provincial Parks 2009 n = 862; All Central Parks 2008 n = 1716; All Provincial Parks 2006 n = 1339
Q7. How long did your journey to this park take today?

Only the Central Parks saw a significant increase in the proportion of visitors who have a journey time to the park less than 5 minutes, rising from 7% in 2008 to 9% 2009.
4.10 Main Method of Transport to Park

In 2009, the two main modes of transport used to reach the parks are ‘Walking’ (37%) and ‘Car’ (27%), whilst a fifth travel by underground (19%). Both Central and Provincial Parks have seen the proportion of visitors who walk to the parks significantly increase, from 39% in 2008 to 47% in 2009 from Central Parks and 15% in 2006 to 21% in 2009 for the Provincial Parks. Visitors to Provincial Parks are more likely to have driven whilst visitors to Central Parks are more likely to have walked. These figures reflect the locations and accessibility of the Central and Provincial Parks.

Main transport to the park  %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tube/underground</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local bus</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All Parks 2009 n = 2528; All Central Parks 2009 n = 1666; All Provincial Parks 2009 n = 862; All Central Parks 2008 n = 1716; All Provincial Parks 2006 n = 1339  Mentions above 2%

Q6. What was your main means of transport to the park today?
4.11 Length of Visit

In 2009 the average length of visit across all the Parks is one hour and 12 minutes. The most common length of stay is 1 to 2 hours (31%), followed by 30 minutes or less (29%). The proportion of visitors staying for 30 minutes or less has significantly increased for both Central and Provincial Parks. Please note that the second wave of fieldwork (2009) for Provincial Parks was conducted in winter instead of autumn (2006) so the lower average time spent in the park could be a reflection of the timings of the research.

Length of Park visit %

- **30 minutes or less**
  - All Parks 2009: 38%
  - Central Parks 2009: 29%
  - Provincial Parks 2009: 33%
  - Central Parks 2008: 26%
  - Provincial Parks 2006: 29%

- **31-60 minutes**
  - All Parks 2009: 26%
  - Central Parks 2009: 28%
  - Provincial Parks 2009: 28%
  - Central Parks 2008: 28%
  - Provincial Parks 2006: 27%

- **1 to 2 hours**
  - All Parks 2009: 41%
  - Central Parks 2009: 31%
  - Provincial Parks 2009: 42%
  - Central Parks 2008: 31%
  - Provincial Parks 2006: 29%

- **2 to 3 hours**
  - All Parks 2009: 6%
  - Central Parks 2009: 10%
  - Provincial Parks 2009: 8%
  - Central Parks 2008: 9%
  - Provincial Parks 2006: 15%

- **3 to 4 hours**
  - All Parks 2009: 5%
  - Central Parks 2009: 5%
  - Provincial Parks 2009: 4%
  - Central Parks 2008: 2%
  - Provincial Parks 2006: 4%

- **4 to 5 hours**
  - All Parks 2009: 1%
  - Central Parks 2009: 1%
  - Provincial Parks 2009: 1%
  - Central Parks 2008: 1%
  - Provincial Parks 2006: 2%

- **More than 5 hours**
  - All Parks 2009: 1%
  - Central Parks 2009: 1%
  - Provincial Parks 2009: 1%
  - Central Parks 2008: 1%
  - Provincial Parks 2006: 1%

Base: All Parks 2009 n = 2528; All Central Parks 2009 n = 1666; All Provincial Parks 2009 n = 862; All Central Parks 2008 n = 1716; All Provincial Parks 2006 n = 1339

Q8. How long did you stay in this park on this visit?
4.12 Main purpose for visiting Parks

Main purpose of visiting the park  %

As the chart above highlights there are a wide variety of reasons given for having visited all Parks on the day of the interview. In 2009, the main reasons for visiting are for a ‘walk or stroll’ (54%), ‘for fresh air’ (33%) and ‘peace and quiet’ (25%). The three main reasons remain the same for the Central Parks both in 2009 and 2008, whilst the third most popular reason for the Provincial Parks after ‘walk/stroll’ and ‘fresh air’ was to ‘walk the dog’, which has seen a significant increase from 25% in 2006 to 33% in 2009.
Main purpose of visiting the park cont. %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>All Parks 2009</th>
<th>Central Parks 2009</th>
<th>Provincial Parks 2009</th>
<th>Central Parks 2008</th>
<th>Provincial Parks 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Picnic/lunch/refreshments</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See the animals (e.g. birds, butterflies etc.)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise (not sports)/ informal games</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sightseeing in the park specifically</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the way to a visitor attraction</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed the animals</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just spent the day in the park</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All Parks 2009 n = 2528; All Central Parks 2009 n = 1666; All Provincial Parks 2009 n = 862; All Central Parks 2008 n = 1716; All Provincial Parks 2006 n = 1339. Mentions above 2%

Q12. What did you do when you visited this park today?