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Executive Summary

- Between the 3rd and 30th November 2014, the fourth University of Bath Travel Survey, surveying students and staff currently based at the University of Bath, was run with 2,932 responses logged – 2,316 of which provided usable travel information.

- The most popular mode of travel for students (N = 1169) was the bus (62.7%) followed by walking (13.3%), bicycling (9.4%) and private (8.4%) or shared (4.2%) vehicle use.

- For staff (N = 1147), the most frequently reported mode was driving alone (48.0%) followed by car-sharing (i.e. as or with passengers; 16.0%), public transport (bus) use (12.6%), then walking or bicycling (10.7% and 9.0%, respectively) and train users (4.1%).

- Comparison with the 2014 Traffic Count data showed the survey to under-represent bus users (-15.7%), while over-representing cyclists (+6.4%).

- For return journeys, about 24% of respondents varied their return mode at least occasionally, largely comprised of bus users walking; walkers using the bus; or bus users and walkers taking lifts from friends or colleagues.

- On average, people spend between 23 to 80 minutes travelling to campus, and 83% of all respondents lived within 15 kilometres of the University.

- 72% of staff report travelling to campus 5 times a week, while 54.8% of students travel 5 times a week (with 26.3% travelling 6 or 7 times a week).

- Reasons for car use focus on non-competitive speed and inadequacy of bus services. Bus users report no car access, steepness of hill and distance as motivators. Bicyclists and Walkers cite the exercise, enjoyment and cost-effectiveness as their primary motives.

- General satisfaction with services and facilities for travel has remained stable, with 51% rating the facilities as either “Good” or “Very good” (36% “Average”).

- Only 40% of staff (12% of students) were aware of car-share parking permits, and merely 25% (12%) were aware of electric vehicle permits.

- 12.5% of respondents were unaware of the University car-share scheme but interested, with a further 15.3% unaware but unsure if suitable for them.

- For CO₂ reduction targets, staff and students rated improvements to bus services as most important, followed by improving car-sharing schemes and improving cycling facilities. In addition, there was a clear desire to enable more working from home where possible.
Introduction

The University of Bath carries out a bi-annual survey of all staff and students currently based on campus to investigate and measure travel behaviour and travel-related attitudes. This report summarises the method and findings of the 2014/15 University Travel Survey (UTS) which was held in November 2014.

The travel surveys are carried out to obtain an accurate assessment of actual travel patterns to the University and to reflect current needs and interests of staff and students at the University. In the current survey report, particular attention was also paid to the latter by providing a summary of frequent staff and student comments.

The results of the travel surveys are also used for monitoring attitudes and actions to assist with the 43% Carbon Reduction target set by the HEFCE, assisting CO₂ calculations and identifying areas for improvement. The survey acts in partnership with the annual Traffic Count undertaken by IMA Consultants for a more complete picture of commuting to the University of Bath. Moreover, survey results are used in consultation with local bus service providers, and provide a source of information to the Student’s Union and other representatives to identify issues with travel to campus.

Like the 2012/13 Travel Survey, the 2014/15 UTS was designed and run in-house as part of a PhD project in co-ordination between the Department of Estates and the Department of Psychology. The survey was partly informed by and conducted in agreement with the following stakeholders and interested parties: the Department of Estates; the Student’s Union; Corporate Communications; Equality and Diversity; UCU and UNITE unions; Learning & Teaching Development Officer; and the Vice-Chancellor’s Group.

A final outline of the survey was presented to the Vice-Chancellor’s Group in October 2014 and approved without further edits.

First, this report will give a brief background of the methodology of the survey, before discussing the response rate, highlighting travel behaviour to and from the University campus, and presenting current attitudes and awareness of travel-related topics as well as staff and student comments.

As with previous surveys, it should be noted that the range of data collected from the 2014/15 UTS is incredibly detailed, with opportunity to segment and display data in a myriad of different ways. All data and graphics presented in the survey report are designed for a broad perspective, and largely differentiate between staff and student responses, and responses for each travel mode or the four main travel modes (car, bus, walking and bicycle). Further detail of results can be found in the tables in the Appendix of this report.
Methodology

The 2014/15 Travel Survey used the design of the 2012/13 Survey as the primary inspiration for the structure of the survey. A primary benefit of using the 2012/13 Survey would allow a more direct comparison with previous results to measure trends and changes in behaviour and attitudes. Additionally, using feedback from the previous survey led to a number of changes and amendments to the current survey to improve data collection and results. A major amendment included the incorporation of a separate section directed at students living on campus whose travel behaviour was entirely neglected in the past Travel survey.

Distribution and advertising of the survey was designed in partnership with Corporate Communications, with a Communication Strategy developed that included a visual branding design which was publicised across campus using hard-copy posters and digital advertisements on TV screens across campus (mainly faculty departments and Sports Training Village). For the first time, visual displays advertising the survey also included QR codes in addition to the survey link, enabling instant access to the survey. Further advertisements included using the University of Bath (@UniofBath) and University of Bath Staff (@UniofBathStaff) twitter feeds, as well as University of Bath staff and student homepages. As incentive to take part, an optional prize draw for one of three £50 online shopping vouchers was open to those who completed the survey. One prize draw each was held for staff and students with the third winner being selected from among all the survey respondents.

The Travel survey was run online using SurveyMonkey, with a single link to the survey using the University shortened URL service (go.bath.ac.uk/travel-survey) used in all advertisements. The Survey was launched 4th November via an email addressed to all staff and students based on campus from the office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, inviting recipients to take part and including a link to the survey. For a limited time, a link to the survey was kept on the student homepage, and regular reminders were posted on the Internal Homepage newsfeed.

Due to environmental considerations and widespread social media use, no hardcopies of the survey were offered to staff without computer access.

On the day after the close of the Survey at 10am on the 1st of December, the prize draw was held and winners were notified of the result.
Response Rate & Demographics

Response Rates

A total of 2,932 responses were logged on the survey during November 2014. Of these, 616 respondents did not answer the mandatory question describing their main travel mode (350 respondents reported living on campus and 266 omitted the question), and were removed. This left 2,316 responses giving basic details.

With figures provided by the University, the total number of staff based on campus is 2,628 (approx. 6.4% more than in 2012/13: 2,470), and figures for total students currently studying at the University campus (i.e. not on placement year or studying elsewhere) is 13,837 (no significant change in student numbers compared to 2012/13: 13,851). Using these figures, the response rate for the 2014/15 Travel Survey, with historical comparisons of previous surveys, is highlighted in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Staff (%)</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Student (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1244</td>
<td>47.12</td>
<td>2045</td>
<td>18.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>1125</td>
<td>44.54</td>
<td>1491</td>
<td>10.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>1755</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>1258</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>1674</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Historical trend of response rates to Travel Survey

The 2014/15 survey saw an increase in the proportion of staff responses (~7.5%), reversing the decreasing trend from the previous surveys. However, in the light of unchanged student numbers at the University of Bath, the proportion of student responses decreased slightly (~1.4%) compared to 2012/13.

Demographics

A breakdown of gender for staff and students completing the survey (N = 2,932) is shown in Table 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1328</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1458</td>
<td>49.73</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2932</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1258</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1674</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Gender split of student, staff, and total responses to Survey

A comparison of gender proportions for staff members was available from the Annual Equality & Diversity Performance Indicators for the 2012/13 academic year, indicating a 48% female proportion of staff. Similarly, the proportion of student gender indicated a 46% female students split (Bath Students’ Union Media Pack 2013/14). Comparison with institutional reports indicates the survey sample has a significantly higher proportion of female respondents than the institutional average for staff, but only slightly higher for students.

The mean age for staff (N = 1137) was 42.08 years (SD = 11.09) with 121 respondents not disclosing their age. For students (N = 1586), the mean age was 21.77 years (SD = 5.14) with 88 respondents not disclosing their age. Figure 1 and 2 indicate the number and proportion of staff by main area of research/employment (N = 1197) and the general level of study by students (N = 1603), respectively.
Physical Disability & Mobility Access

Figures for those reporting a physical disability affecting their mobility are shown in Table 3, with percentages reflecting the total response rate and proportion of student/staff response rate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (N = 2560)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff (N = 1115)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student (N = 1445)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Number and proportion of respondents reporting a physical disability affecting their mobility

For comparison with Annual Equality & Diversity Performance Indicators Report for 2012/13, the report indicates 70 staff members reported a disability, with the current Survey reflecting responses from 31 staff, or around 44% of staff with disabilities. Unfortunately, no statistics on student disability rates could be obtained.
General comments regarding inclusivity and access for staff members and students affected by a physical disability mainly focused on navigating through campus rather than on travel to campus. Frequently mentioned comments included:

- Difficulties with the opening of heavy doors (e.g. in 3W & 4W)
- False labelling of automatic doors – for instance, a door that is labelled automatic, yet requires a button push to open
- Accessing the Parade from the southern side of campus (particularly with the lifts adjacent to Wessex House being disabled)
- Few ramps or lifts (especially from the bus area), which also impede access for parents with small children (e.g. having to carry the buggy up the stairs)
- Availability of proximate parking
- Patchy links between parking and lifts
- Broken lifts

Among those with a disability, the key issues regarding public transport usage mentioned by respondents are highlighted in Table 4 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue with bus use</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other difficulty with buses</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers do not consider disabled needs</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty getting on/off buses</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No ‘grabbing rail’ on the bus</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty using wheelchairs on buses</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No wheelchair space on bus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Areas of difficulty with using buses for those with physical disability affecting mobility

The category of ‘Other disability difficulties with buses’ asked for additional details, with responses focusing on:

- Difficulty walking to bus stops
- Difficulty standing for prolonged periods of time when either waiting for a bus at the bus stop or being on the bus – also, lack of seating arrangements at the First bus stop on campus
- Not enough space on some buses
- Dangerous driving/speeding by bus drivers
- People not giving up their seats until explicitly asked to do so
- Movement of the bus (e.g. not being given the chance to sit down before the bus moves on)
Travel Behaviour
Main Modes of Travel

For the key question within the survey, respondents were asked to try and describe their main mode of travel to the University using a single method. Results are shown in Table 5 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel mode</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>62.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car alone</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car with passengers</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car as passenger</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle/Scooter</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (all modes)</td>
<td>2316</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1169</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus (students)</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (whole sample)</td>
<td>2932</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1258</td>
<td>1674</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Reported main mode of travel for respondents with total and staff/student proportions; *Other mode including running, electric bicycle or alternating use of modes

A presentation of the proportions of main modes used, with student/staff proportions of each mode, are highlighted in Figure 3. Please note that the proportions of travel mode users do not include those living on campus.

Figure 3. General proportions of the main modes used to travel to campus, with each mode marked by a different colour. The student/staff splits of respondents using the same mode are indicated by colour tone. For example, the proportion of respondents using the bus (38% in total) is 83.4% comprised of students (blue) with a far lower proportion of staff (16.6%) using the bus (light blue)
A comparison of mode share percentages between the 2014/15 UTS and previous surveys is shown in Table 6 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car alone</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car as or with</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passenger(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle/Scooter</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Historical trends of reported main travel mode choice for staff and students with differences between 2012/13 and 2014/15 highlighted

Whereas there was only little change in the share of travel modes used by staff members, some differences occurred in the reported main modes by students. Notably, there was a 2.2% decrease for student bus users, accompanied by a 2.7 increase in single occupancy car use. However, there was also a 2% increase of students walking to and/or from campus.

An additional comparison for the validity of the survey results can be made with a comparison of Traffic Count data collected by IMA Consulting, that took place in November 2014 whilst the survey was active. As the Traffic Count took place on campus and identified end-of-journey modes, an adjustment to the survey figures was needed to correct for the number of respondents who indicated they travel by train (as they use another mode to directly reach campus). Using the 8-stage journey diaries recorded in the survey, we can observe what the final mode chosen by train users was; 72.2% took the bus to campus and 13% walked, with 14.8% either using or not indicating another mode. The train user data has then been synthesised into the traffic count data for a more accurate comparison, with results shown in Table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Traffic count</th>
<th>Travel survey</th>
<th>+/-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>10,330</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car alone</td>
<td>4,676</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>1,391</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car with passengers</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car as passenger</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle/Scooter</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (all modes)</td>
<td>18,695</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Comparison of Traffic Count and Travel Survey Modal Split with train-user adjustment
The results shown in Table 7 indicate that the data from the survey deviate strongly from the recorded traffic count data in the case of bus users (55.3% versus 39.6%). Consequently, other mode users are over-represented in the Survey, especially cyclists with an increased representation of 6.4%, which should be considered when interpreting results from all respondents.

As an additional factor included in the survey, bicycle users, walkers and those using an unclassified mode were asked to describe their most common access point to arrive on campus using the map shown in Figure 4.

![Campus Map](https://example.com/campus_map.png)

**Figure 4. Campus map depicting possible access routes to the campus environment**

Table 8 shows the most frequented access points by these modes. Clearly, for both walkers and cyclists the most common access route to campus was at the south side of campus, near the junction of North Road and Bathwick Hill (Circle 5). For cyclists, other common access routes included Norwood Avenue (Circle 3; main access for private and public motorized transport) and Quarry Road (Circle 6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access point</th>
<th>Walking</th>
<th>Cycling</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>247</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>208</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 8. Most frequented access point by walkers, cyclists and other mode users*
Return Journey

The survey included space for respondents to indicate how often they used a different travel mode to return from work, and space to clarify how they made the return journey. General indication of the proportion of respondents travelling home by a different mode is shown in Figure 5.

![Figure 5. Proportion of travel mode groups and total respondents indicating an infrequent or regular mode change when returning home](image)

In general, 23.98% of all respondents reported at least the occasional change in how they travelled home. This was largely due to a high proportion of train users reporting variation in their return mode (43.4%), as well as high proportions of carpoolers/passengers (40.3%), bus users (36.5%) and walkers (32.5%) changing their return mode, who between them accounted for 83% of those changing their modes.

We asked people to say what different modes they used (if they did change their mode) to return home. For the two modes that represented the largest absolute amount of people changing their return trips (i.e. bus users and walkers with N = 319 and N = 80 using a different return mode, respectively), bus users mostly walked home (65%) or had a lift in a car with a friend/colleague (15%), whereas Walkers often switched to the bus (55%) or also had a lift with friends/colleagues (19%).
Travel Indicators

Travel Time

In describing their typical journey to campus, respondents were asked to indicate the average amount of time at each step of their journey – from using their mode, travelling between modes (e.g. walking to bus stop) or waiting for their main mode (e.g. waiting for carpool lift). Details of average time estimates (in minutes) by travel mode are shown in Table 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>+/-</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>2014/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car alone</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as passenger</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with passengers</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle/Scooter</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. Mean, minimum and maximum time spent travelling to campus in minutes

In total, the average time taken to travel to campus between all travel mode users has increased from 33.4 minutes (UTS 2012/13) to 40.25 minutes according to the current survey. This difference arose in the light of reported increases in travel time for all modes, except for train users for whom travel time slightly decreased.

As in the previous survey, motorcyclists report the shortest commute time (26.5 minutes), and train users report the longest (77.1 minutes) presumably due to longer distances travelled. Of interest, the average reported waiting time for bus users on their general commute was 11.74 minutes (SD = 7.83) for travel to campus and 12.38 minutes (SD = 7.57) for travel from campus.

Travel Distance

Respondents were asked to provide the first half of their postcode (e.g. BA2) to map the locations that staff members and students tend to travel from. In total, 2316 valid responses were received and the most prevalent postcode areas (i.e. with at least 10 people travelling from that area; N = 2295) have been mapped, as can be seen in Figure 6. In addition, postcodes were grouped into categories of distance, with proportional results for students and staff shown in Table 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>km to campus</th>
<th>0 to 15</th>
<th>15 to 30</th>
<th>30 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Distance from home to University of Bath grouped into segments
An overwhelming majority of students regularly travelling to campus live within 15 kilometres of the University (95.0%) with only very small proportions as distance increases. University Staff show a wider spread, although still about two third of the current sample (68.2%) live within 15 kilometres of campus.

As can be seen in Figure 6, the large majority of survey respondents live either in Bath or in close proximity to Bath (thick red line). A smaller proportion of respondents travel from neighbouring areas of Bath such as Chippenham, Corsham or Melksham, or the wider Bristol area. Only few staff members and hardly any students travel from areas located more than 30 kilometres away from the University campus, such as the Gloucester area.

Figure 6. Mapped postcodes of respondents reflecting general areas and number of respondents
Travel Frequency

Respondents indicated, on average, how many days a week they typically travel to campus for work or study. Below, results are summarised for students and staff (see Figure 7) who indicated the number of days \( (N = 1138 \text{ for staff and } N = 1178 \text{ for students}) \) in proportions. Note that the graph excludes respondents who do not regularly travel to campus, such as students living on campus.

![Graph showing average frequency of trips to campus for staff and students.]

The vast majority of staff \((72.0\%)\) reported travelling 5 times a week with \(18.1\%\) reporting either 3 or 4 days a week on campus. Students showed a somewhat smaller spike of travelling 5 days a week \((54.8\%)\), though were more likely to travel 6 or 7 days a week, with \(26.3\%\) reporting such frequency.

Views on Travel Mode, Facilities and Policies

Reasons for Travel Mode use

Respondents were asked to select from a predetermined list their top reasons for using their travel mode. The frequency with which each reason was cited is shown in Figure 7 for the top four modes (Car \(N = 649\), Bus \(N = 878\), Walking \(N = 247\) and Cycling \(N = 208\)). As shown in Figure 8, car users predominantly cite insufficient bus speed and services, too long walking or cycling distance, cost of PT and being in control of their journey as their key reasons for car use. Bus users cite a lack of car access as their top reason, with the steepness of the hill towards University an important consideration, followed by too long walking or cycling distance. Bicyclists and Walkers have similar motivations with exercise and enjoyment among their most important motivations. For Walkers though, the most frequently cited reason was the cost of alternatives such as the bus or car.
Figure 8. Frequency of reasons cited for bus/car use and walking/cycling
Car travel

A comparison of motivations for using travel modes can be drawn for car users from the 2008, 2010/11 and 2012/13 Travel Surveys as shown in Table 11 below (red columns), with the most popular reasons bolded. Note, however, that respondents in the current survey were instructed to select as many reasons as apply to them instead of ranking them, which allowed them to make their choices more freely. Consequently, percentages of the 2014/15 UTS reflect the frequency with which each reason was selected by car users (blue column) rather than the frequency with which each reason was rated as the top reason.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faster than bus</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate bus</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheaper than bus</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other commitments</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irregular hours</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenient parking</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need car for work</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry heavy load</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical condition</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11. Historical trends of top reasons for car use

With no answer options for ‘Independence’ (“I like to be in control of my journey”) and “Because of a medical condition” in previous Travel surveys, these options were made available for the current survey. Despite the different response format, the most popular cited reason for car use is maintained, with 74.1% of drivers preferring the car due to it being faster than using public transport (bus). Similarly, inadequate bus services and travel distance to campus (“Too far to walk or cycle”) remain the second and third most popular reasons for car use (53.6% and 51.8%, respectively). For almost half of respondents the car also compares favourably to the bus in terms of cost (47.8%) and offers more control over their journey (39%).

Bus travel

Bus users were asked to state their satisfaction with various aspects of the local bus services. Figure 9 shows the proportions of (dis-)satisfied bus users for each aspect (based on N = 852). Further bus usage details are shown in Figure 10.

Overall, 69% of bus users reported owning a bus pass, with the remaining 31% preferring the purchase of single/return or multiple-journey tickets. The First company somewhat outnumbered Wessex/Uni-Connect in terms of preferred bus service provider (51% vs 40%), with only 9% of bus users having no preference or using other services. Finally, there was a huge desire for bus passes/tickets that enable the use of both providers, with 90% of respondents endorsing this.
Figure 9. Satisfaction with bus service aspects

Figure 10. Bus usage details
Satisfaction with University Facilities

Respondents were asked to indicate their general level of satisfaction with the facilities provided for their main travel mode within the University on a 1 to 5 scale, with 1 being “Very satisfied” and 5 being “Very dissatisfied” with a neutral option (“Average”) for 3. Results for each travel mode (total N = 2228) and general attitudes are presented in Figure 11.

For all travel modes except “Other mode” (e.g. running, electric bicycle), more than 80% of respondents rated the facilities provided for their travel to be at least average. The most satisfied was the small group of motorcyclists (68% “Very good” or “Good”), followed by cyclists (59%) and car users (alone or car-pool; 58% and 56.7%, respectively). Regarding bus users and walkers, 45% (48%) found the facilities to be “Good” or “Very good”. Notably, staff and students travelling by train were the most likely to rate the facilities provided as average (54%).

Overall, less than 13% of respondents rated the facilities provided as “Poor” or “Very poor”, mainly affected by the large proportion (31.8%) of the otherwise small group of “Other mode” users (N = 22).

Respondents were asked to specify if there were certain areas or facilities they wished to see an improvement in, with a choice of several areas presented and the option to specify their own. For clarity, results for the four main travel modes are presented in Figure 12. For bicyclists, 65.4% indicated that they wished for more (or improvements to) showers and lockers on campus. This was also a concern among frequent walkers (35.2%). Other popular requests were for improvements to cost for bus users (34.1% of bus users), improvements regarding security for cyclists (25.5%) and improvements in lighting for both car users (30%) and walkers (26.3%).
Parking Permit Awareness

The survey included a question that asked respondents to state which parking permits they were currently aware of. The findings duplicate the results of the previous 2012/2013 University Travel Survey and are shown in Figure 13.

Figure 13 highlights a clear divide between staff and student awareness, though with more students being aware of the Undergraduate (exceptional circumstance) permit. This likely stems from the fact this is the only permit available to undergraduates. Also of note is the relatively low level of staff awareness (<50%) for permits other than the standard permit, such as the EV, Part-time, Occasional or Car-share permits.
Awareness & Interest in Car-sharing scheme use

As with the 2012/13 Travel Survey, the current survey attempted to measure interest and awareness of the University car-sharing scheme. Headline results for all respondents and those travelling by car (alone or with passengers) are shown in Figure 14 below.

For all respondents, 39.4% indicated some awareness of the University carshare scheme (compared to 31.2% in 2012/13), leaving 60.6% reporting no knowledge of the scheme. The two groups of car users reported higher awareness than other groups; that is, 74.3% of solo car drivers knew of the scheme, as did two third 66.7% of those already carsharing.

As shown in Figure 14, there is some interest in the scheme for those who were previously unaware (12.5% of all respondents) and a slightly higher proportion of respondents who are unsure whether the scheme is suited to them (15.3%). Solo car drivers report the lowest interest among travel mode groups (5.9%) compared to other groups such as students currently based on campus (23.1%) or bus users (19.4%). Somewhat higher proportions of car (8.2%) and bus users (23.5%) were not certain whether the scheme could be an option for them (29.7% for students based on campus), suggesting a lack of information.

Support for methods of reducing emissions

Because of the need to reduce the University’s CO₂ emissions, and also as a general guide as to which travel facilities/service the University should be focusing on, the survey asked respondents to indicate the most important areas to address, including the reduction of staff and student car use, improvements to bus and (motor-)cycle facilities, the support of walking and encouragement for staff and student car-sharing. The average values by mode and staff/student support, on a scale from (1 – Not important at all to 5 – Very important) are shown in Figure 15.
Figure 15. Rated importance (1 - Not important at all; 5 - Very important) of areas to reduce CO2 emissions displayed by main mode of travel and staff/student split
Overall, respondents regarded all areas with the potential for emission reductions as at least somewhat important (3 = midpoint of the scale). Results shown in Figure 15 mirror the results of the 2012/13 UTS and show a clear support for the University to focus on bus use, a popular choice among all travel mode users. In addition to improving bus services, staff car users showed a clear preference for reducing student car use. Generally, reducing car use, be it by students of by staff, was regarded as less important than other means of emission reductions, except for the improvement of motorcycle facilities for which only Motorcyclists themselves showed a clear preference. Supporting student/staff car-sharing was seen as equally important as the improvement of cycling facilities and encouraging people to walk.

**Working from home**

Despite being included in the 2012/13 Travel Survey, relatively little attention was paid to the potential of reducing travel to the University campus through increased working from home by both staff members and students. Thus, in the current survey, an effort was made to accurately represent staff and student opinions on the issue by reproducing some of the most common comments to the question “How many days a week do you typically work from home, and do not need to travel to the University?” In total, 495 comments were recorded which were grouped thematically and a selection of which is presented below.

**No permission**

A lack of permission to work from home was frequently cited as the major barrier to work from home more often.

- “Make working from home a choice of the employee”
- “If I was allowed to work from home, I would, but this isn't offered”
- “Permission! The policy on home working does not encourage more than 1 day at home.”
- “The University needs to agree its attitude/policy towards home working. According to HR's website, staff should work from home a max of .2 FTE per week. Clearly this is ridiculous.”
- “I am on a short term contract and so working from home was not given as an option despite the lack of desk space which means I have to 'hot desk'.”
- “Being given permission to work from home - I do computing work and could easily work from home on 2 or 3 days most weeks”
- “Yes, let the Faculty allow it! There are some members of the Faculty allowed to work from home, but not all staff are given this perk, which seems unfair. As I only work 3 hours on a Thursday, working from home on that day would be of benefit!”
- “There is the possibility of working from home, but my manager doesn't like us working from home”

**No information**

Apart from not being allowed to work from home in the first place, for some, uncertainty about the eligibility of working from home was seen as an issue.
• “More information about eligibility of working from home”
• “Have a clear policy that makes it permissible”
• “Knowing when one can or cannot work from home. No clear guidelines within the ASC.”
• “Make it easier to request time working from home / clearer about how to make such requests.”

Lack of supportive environment

A lack of support from management and a general culture within the University marked by a negative predisposition concerning working from home were seen to prevent corresponding wishes by employees.

• “More support from management to do this”
• “Everything is in place but cultural approval”
• “Increase acceptance of homeworking by managers”
• “University policy, social norms and expectations from senior staff”
• “I could work from home at least one day a week, but senior management do not seem keen on the idea, although my line manager is.”
• “Encouragement from line managers etc. I assumed working from home was exceptional rather than desirable.”
• “There would be many benefits but is not generally encouraged and is seen as a last resort.”
• “We are not always made to feel as though working at home is an option, when I feel it would be an exceptionally beneficial one to have the use of.”
• “The ‘culture’/policy is that one day a week is the maximum number of days you can work at home.”

Perception of working from home as equivalent to working in the office

• “Need to change attitudes, a lot of people/management think that working from home is a day off and is just an excuse”
• “Formal and clear recognition of equivalent status of working from home being considered equal to turning up in the office.”
• “I try to work from home one day per week as I get more done - but rarely manage it. Also, there is a mixed attitude to home working.”
• “On the odd occasion that I do work from home, I find that I am far more productive, as I do not have constant interruptions that I get while in the office”
• “Helping others in the office to understand that working from home doesn't mean you aren't working! And for those who are unable to work from home to be understanding and non-judgemental of those who can”

Timetabling

More effective timetabling was seen as an opportunity to reduce commuting days to the University.

• “Timetabling is the problem”
• “A better-organised teaching timetable”
• “Timetable lectures more sensibly - I have three days with just one lecture/seminar to attend”
• “Current lecture timetable could be condensed into 3-4 days from 5.”
• “Better timetabling. Instead of two 1-hour lectures over two days, have them on the same day”
“I work from home approximately 1 day per month. I would like to do it more. What would help is either a lower teaching load, or, more intelligently-designed timetables so that academics had 1 day per week with no teaching.”

**Better online/remote facilities**

Inadequate remote facilities were often seen as preventing more working from home.

- “Improvements to IT support especially better VPN connections to university software (i.e. SAMIS and Deski)”
- “Yes. VPN often breaks. Webmail is utterly shocking.”
- “More software available from remote desktop. Better visibility of remote desktop.”
- “Better (more hassle free) remote desktop access.”
- “All programs available on remote desktop (solidedge...)”
- “The remote desktop connection to UniDesk or to my work PC is so slow it is completely unfeasible to do any actual work without coming to campus.”

**More online/remotely accessible content**

- “More resources made available online e.g. textbooks, reference materials etc.”
- “Ensure that all lectures are recorded properly and uploaded on Moodle.”
- “Recording lectures and not being aggressive about people not coming on campus”
- “Provide more varied materials on Moodle and links to useful websites and e-learning materials”

**Off-campus University facilities**

According to some respondents, a further measure to reduce trips to campus could be achieved by having University facilities off-campus, notable a University library.

- “Library in town”
- “A student library in the city”
- “Group work/individual work with printers space downtown”
- “Space in town for example a library with desks, sockets and wifi”
- “Printing facilities. A University printer in a cafe on Moorland Road would be very helpful.”

**Video-conferencing**

For staff, in some cases, video-conferencing was seen as a viable alternative to face-to-face meetings, especially when attendance was not essential.

- “Enable good video conferencing”
- “Better supported video conferencing”
- “Mandated committee days. Committee free days”
- “Better broadband service. Fewer job responsibilities requiring presence on campus.”
- “Allowing staff to dial in to meetings, either just as voice, or preferably with video [...] Support could be given to purchase/updating of laptop computers for staff working from home, or funds towards the cost of my data connection [...] at the moment the presumption is that everyone has to be there in person, which is not necessarily the most efficient use of time.”
**Need for face-to-face contact/presence on campus**

Despite the potential benefits of working at home, some also mentioned the need for presence and interaction in an office environment on campus.

- “I don't like this question as it implies we should by default be encouraging more home working. In my area, we are keen to have a core number of days where faculty an IN work to generate collaboration and innovation”
- “If we were better resourced in terms of staffing I would feel it might be appropriate to ask to work at home for specific tasks on specific days. However, the full demands of my role and departmental service delivery make this impossible.”
- “Management buy-in. Working from home can impact on colleagues who have to cover phones, lack of availability for ad hoc discussions etc.”
- “I could spend more time working from home but I think it's important for me to be visible on campus.”

**Equipment to work from home provided by the University**

According to some respondents, working from home should be supported by the University through the provision of appropriate equipment, such as a laptop, or IT support.

- “Provision of laptop, IT Support, phone diversion”
- “I'd need a university supplied laptop and external monitor”
- “Make it possible to queue print jobs from home.”
- “Provide a laptop instead of a fix computer”

**Special cases**

Working from home appeared to be an issue in some departments in particular.

- “Regularly working from home has been actively discouraged in [department]”
- “Change of attitude towards homeworking... In [department] homeworking is not regarded as 'the norm' requiring justification and only agreeable for particular types of work; reports, project documentation etc. Normal day to day, business as usual work, although easily conducted remotely is unlikely to receive agreement for home working. There is also a concern about custom and practice; pattern based home working becoming contractual.”
- “Given the role many hold in [department], working from home could be more available. At the moment it's requested by exception. At previous organisations I've worked in all staff were allowed to work from home up to 2 days a week without authorization required and were trusted to make the right decision if it was wise to do so on any given day.”
General comments, thoughts and suggestions

The University Travel Survey is a unique opportunity for staff and students to share their travel experiences to and from campus. On the last page, respondents were given the opportunity to comment on the survey and share their thoughts and/or suggestions regarding travel-related issues. Some of these comments focused on particular travel modes, whereas others focused on wider aspects of travel. Below, a selection of anonymous comments is provided, complementing the data presented in the current report.

**Buses**

- “Cross-boarding on the buses would be good....”
- “Universal tickets for all bus operators would be great”
- “I understand that there will always be queues at peak times etc., but having a pass for both buses just mean that it would make life easier for everyone.”
- “Buses get so full on previous stops in the morning so a number drive past before we are picked up”
- “The public transport in Bath is very expensive and overcrowded which puts many people off travelling by bus.”
- “The only real problem with the Busses is how full they are for a 9:15 lecture on weekdays and in the evenings”
- “My main issue is with the reliability of the buses. There are simply too few buses for the number of people using them at peak times, meaning that at those times it is impossible to catch buses from the centre of town as they are all full and drive straight past.”
- “Make the X18 more frequent. The U18 often fills up, with students going to the University - not town, completely before leaving Oldfield Park. However, it must still go through town because it’s a U18. This is silly.”
- “Maybe the X18-U18 ratio could be increased at peak hours and the U18s only go to town and not Oldfield Park. This would in one swoop remove the annoyance of getting on an U18 in Oldfield Park and being overtaken by and empty X18 right behind and mean there's more space for the people in town as it's not full of people from Oldfield Park”
- “Short hop busses from the City Centre and back again at peak times”

**Cycling**

- “I would like to cycle to work, but I just don't think it is safe enough.”
- “Clear cycle lanes on common routes to Uni would encourage more cyclists and reduce accidents.”
- “Rainbow Woods cycle path - this needs to happen honestly, not the present situation where the council turns a blind eye to the extensive use of a footpath by cyclists.”
- “I would very much like to see secure bike storage at the bottom of the hill so I can lock my bike up there and walk up as the hill is too steep to bike up and down comfortably.”
- “Cycling should be broadcast more to students as I know several uni students that wish they'd brought their bike up or wish that they'd been told the best routes to cycle to uni so they'd know whether it was realistic or not to cycle.”
- “Something that would be very useful is for there to be a dropped curb at that entrance directly opposite Copseland, so cyclists at the junction of Copseland could pull out and cycle straight across, rather than having to stop in the road to lift their bikes over the curb. As there
is limited visibility from that junction anyway it would make it a lot safer if cyclists could quickly get off of the road."

**Walking**

- "You should support the benefits of walking up and down the hill. Good for the health, environment and not that hard after a bit of practice."
- "I would walk if the shower facilities were better (more private)"
- "The reason why I am not walking up the hill anymore, or at least not as frequently as before, is because I don't have a shower room close by anymore"
- "I don't want to walk on my own in the dark, even if Bath is seen as "safe"."

**Car-sharing**

- "I would like any action the Uni takes to increase car sharing to take account of the many people who, like me, share lifts to nearby workplaces as well as solely to this campus."
- "I car-share two days a week, if there were more incentive (i.e. halving car parking fees and allowing both drivers to have a parking permit) I would push to car share every day."

**Living outside of Bath / Park & Ride services**

- "The University does not help those who live out of town and have to come into work by car due to a lack of any reasonable alternative."
- "There is much more that can be done if there is a will to provide services to those living outside of Bath, there are no direct buses and you have to be a risk taker as well as being very fit to cycle - the average person has no choice but to drive."
- "Because I live in a small village with no public transport, there is no alternative than to drive."
- "University could run its own buses, pricing it cheaper than the cost of car parking. These services could run from places where many staff live such as Trowbridge, Bradford-on-avon and Bristol."
- "I think it would be good for the Uni to put on bus that goes from Warminster, Frome, Trowbridge, Bradford on Avon to the Uni as there are a lot of staff that live in these areas."
- "A shuttle bus from Odd Down Park and Ride to the University could reduce the need for parking spaces at the Uni."
- "I would be happy to park at Odd Down Park and Ride if there was a regular and cheap bus to Uni - the cost would need to be no more than car parking fees."
- "How about University bus running between Odd Down park and ride and the campus with a couple of pick up points in Combe Down. I would stop using the car if there was an option like this one."
- "The Sulis club should be used as a park and ride."
- "A shuttle bus from Combe Down park and ride would make my journey a lot easier"
- "I would like to be able to use the Wessex Water park and ride if it dropped off on campus as an alternative to driving along Claverton Down."
- "Could the University consider partnering with the existing Wessex Water park & Ride scheme. If this service could be extended to include Wessex Water and University staff, there may be mutual benefits."
Thinking about the future

- “The bus is problematic what about a cable car up the hill?”
- “Think of something outside the box, you can’t get any more frequent buses. Why not have some sort of lift that goes up Widcombe hill. The hill is the main reason why people don’t walk or cycle to campus.”
- “Buses from town still get to campus late and services up Widcombe hill are so sparse it makes them not time efficient and not worth doing. Would love a stairlift to uni. #dreambig”

Positive comments

- “Wessex actually have done a good job almost all semester as far as I am concerned. No complaints.”
- “To be fair with both bus companies that operate on campus, in recent days I have noticed some effort to improve the waiting time for passengers”
- “It’s good to see the University is trying to improve the quality of the buses! I appreciate First’s commitment to respecting their schedule online, great to avoid long waits in the cold especially returning to the city on Sundays.”
- “I do think that even though the car parking situation is currently far from ideal, especially in the West car park. I am still grateful that I have the luxury of being able to park where I work, a lot of places often don’t have any on site parking and I think some may take this for granted!! Thank you for all the hard work that goes into the parking situations and aims for improvements.”

Miscellaneous

- “If this survey results in a change in policy by the local council (that is where the problem lies after all) then I will eat my left shoe.”
- “I do not enjoy commuting journeys at all. I really only want to get to work as painlessly as possible, because it is only a means to the end-point ie. getting to work. I need to gain home at the end of the working day for the same reason. If I could transport myself like they do on Star Trek then that would suit me!”