

Public transport as catalyst for social interactions: how it works in low-density environment?

Hitomi Nakanishi Cameron Gordon Richard Nash University of Canberra, Australia

CRICOS #00212K



Background – low mobility and social disadvantage

- 'while it is clear that there have been substantial increases in personal mobility since the 1950s, it is also clear that these increases have not been equally spread around society' Tight et al. (1999)
- Social disadvantage can affect mobility, which in turn can adversely affect one's ability to access social networks (Currie & Stanley, 2008; Currie & Delbosc, 2010; and Dodson et. al, 2007).



Background – barriers to mobility

- Barriers in our physical environment such as; long commute distances and/or times, poor walkability in suburbs (Tranter & Whitelegg, 1994; Speck, 2012), poor public transport.
- Access to services and employment in car dominated cities requires the purchase of an expensive 'membership' (in the form of a car, a licence, and fuel) to enjoy the advantages of mobility (Nash, 2013).

Many challenges in low-density environment



Research question

- How does public transport could help social interactions in low-density environment?
- How transit induced social interactions contribute to building of social capital?
- What is the role of public transport in the context of building social interaction and how do these factors affect quality of life?



Method

- Barriers examined by
- Satisfaction with the public transport services
- Distance to work
- Public transport commute times
- Neighbourhood walkability
- Combined barriers to mobility (service frequency, commute distance and walkability)
- Social disadvantage

Data

- ACTION Bus passenger travel data (Myway card), Census 2011 (j-t-w),(no travel diary data, no national transport survey)
- Quality of life in your city questionnaire survey



MyWay card data

Passenger travel in June 2012, all rountes

- Origin date time
- Origin bus stop
- Passenger type (Senior, Adult, Student, Concession, Pensioner, over 75)
- Destination date, time
- Destination stop



Quality of life in your city and living environment questionnaire survey

2012 May – Aug

Online questionnaire + mail(sent to appro 3,000 households) 648 responses collected (on-line: 278; mail: 370)

Male 230: 37.4%; Female 385: 62.6%

- Satisfaction with access to closest bus stop
- Satisfaction with the quality of public transport
- Daily travel behaviour
- Willingness to change travel behaviour





Canberra



Population 365,621 (Census 2011) Urban population density 452.2 persons/km² Canberra

t00212K



Canberra in Australian context

City	Persons/ km ²	Area (km ²)
Canberra (0.37 mil.)	454.8	807.6
Sydney (4.5 mil.)	379.6	12133.7
Melbourne (4.2 mil.)	533.7	7697.4
Brisbane (0.95 mil.)	349.8	5954.2
Adelaide (1.2 mil)	659.7	1826.6
Perth (1.9 mil)	324.1	5382.4

Canberra – a planned city





Canberra (Bush capital) - Garden City principle



"Canberra, Federal Capital of Australia, Preliminary Plan" - "Walter Burley Griffin's Plan of Canberra as Finally Revised and Accepted" Source Reproduction of plan from Supplement to "Building and Real Estate Magazine" first published 12 December 1913



Griffin's Amended Plan 1918



Source: Collection: National Capital Authority Library & Information Services





CANBERRA OUTLINE PLAN TO 250,000 POPULATION

Canberra Outline Plan 1965

Population 10,000 (1939) 50,000 (1960)

Source: Collection: National Capital Authority Library & Information Services



Y Plan 1970

Population 200,000 (1976) 270,000 (1988)



Source: Collection: National Capital Authority Library & Information Services





Transport for Canberra 2012 00212K





Density by neighbourhood type

	Garden City	Y Plan	New
	(North	(Belconne	Urbanism
	Canberra,	n, Weston	(Gungahlin)
	South	Creek,	
	Canberra)	Tuggernon	
		g, Woden)	
Gross population density	7.85	13.54	15.61
(person/ha)			
Net residential density	30.18	46.93	47.31
(person/ha residential land)			
Open space density	156.92	170.12	173.46
(person/ha open space)			

Canberra – high car dependent transportation



Modal share in J-T-W 2006





J-T-W Compared to Other Capital Cities



Source: ACT Government Integrated Transport Framework, 2008

00212K



Mode of transport and travel time (from questionnaire survey)

	Car	Bus	Cycle	Walk	Motorbike	0-10 min.	11-30 min.	31-60min.	over 60 min.
Work	76%	7%	10%	7%	0%	17%	63%	20%	0%
Shopping	87%	3%	0%	11%	0%	60%	37%	0%	2%
Leisure	66%	3%	10%	20%	1%	17%	52%	22%	10%
Other journey	74%	5%	7%	14%	0%	13%	42%	21%	24%



Willingness to reduce one car journey per week





Public Transport in Canberra

- ACTION Bus (ACT Internal Omnibus Network)
 Two rapid routes (every 5-15 min.) and 73 routes (weekdays)
- One rapid route (every 15 min.) and 42 routes (weekend)

Transport for Canberra, 2012



Transport Disadvantage in Canberra

Transport disadvantage = shades of green





UNIVERSITY OF CANBERRA

Satisfaction with public transport and PT use







Distance to work

AVGDIST = \sum (% working at employment centre x distance to employment centre)



Public transport commute times



AVGDIST = \sum (% working at employment centre x distance to employment centre)





Neighbourhood walkability

based on the proximity of services, facilities and open space to an area with 100 being the highest possible score



Combined barriers to mobility (service frequency, commute distance and walkability)





\$00212K

Social Disadvantage spatial distribution of individuals over 60 and those requiring assistance with core activities





12k



Ongoing work

- Myway data analysis understand how the public transport is used
- Why not choose public transport?
 What is the factors that affect mode choice individual circumstances?
 qualitative analysis
- Explore how public transport increases social interaction (currently car is the main contributor) and how it relates to quality of life





Thank you!

hitomi.nakanishi@canberra.edu.au





