EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Nelson City Council (Council) commissioned Versus Research to conduct its Resident Satisfaction Survey. This survey identifies the perceptions residents of Nelson (residents) have on a wide range of measures, including services and facilities provided by Council.

The Resident Satisfaction Survey asked residents about their:
- Satisfaction with Council services and facilities
- Satisfaction and usage of transport network
- Perceptions on environmental issues facing the region
- Usage and satisfaction of arts and cultural facilities and Council events

TRANSPORT

In 2017, 48% of residents are satisfied (34%) or very satisfied (14%) with transport activities including roads, cycleways, footpaths and public transport. Of note, is a decrease in neutral ratings (25% cf. 2016, 41%) and an increase in dissatisfied (20% cf. 2016, 10%) and very dissatisfied (7% cf. 2016, 3%) compared to 2016 results. Reasons for dissatisfaction with transport activities include public transport being limited (51%), the roads being poor and need improving (35%) and the cycleways need improving (21%).

Forty-five per cent of residents work fulltime, while 23% are employed part-time. This year there are significantly fewer residents (31%) not in the workforce when compared with previous years.

Of those residents who are in the workforce, more than half 58% travel to work in a private vehicle. At a lower level, residents travel to work by bicycle (10%) and walk or run to work (9%).

Fifty-two per cent of residents are satisfied (42%) or very satisfied (10%) with roads and streets in the area. There are significantly fewer very satisfied ratings when compared with results from three years ago (10% cf. 2014, 14%). Reasons for dissatisfaction with roads and streets include the general condition of the roads (57%), roads which aren’t repaired properly (37%) and the length of time taken for repairs (16%).

Sixty-three per cent of residents are satisfied (50%) or very satisfied (13%) with footpaths and walkways. There are significantly fewer very satisfied ratings when compared with results from three years ago (13% cf. 2014, 17%). Reasons for dissatisfaction with footpaths and walkways is the feeling there is not enough of them (51% mentions), the area should not have shared pathways or cycleways (37% mentions), the area needs more buses (79%), it’s too expensive or needs an alternative fare system (13%) and it is under utilised or needs incentives to use public transport (8%).

About a third of residents (36%) are satisfied (27%) or very satisfied (9%) with the area’s street lighting. There are significantly fewer very satisfied ratings (9% cf. 2014, 14%). Reasons for dissatisfaction with street lighting included that it is not extensive enough or the area need more buses (79%), it’s too expensive or needs an alternative fare system (13%) and it is under utilised or needs incentives to use public transport (8%).

Close to two-thirds (60%) of residents are satisfied (44%) or very satisfied (16%) with the area’s public transport. There are significantly fewer very satisfied ratings (9% cf. 2014, 36%) and very satisfied ratings (9% cf. 2014, 14%). There are significantly greater dissatisfied ratings when compared with 2014 (15% cf. 2014, 9%). Reasons for dissatisfaction with public transport included that it is not extensive enough or the area need more buses (79%), it’s too expensive or needs an alternative fare system (13%) and it is under utilised or needs incentives to use public transport (8%).

In a new question for 2017, more than half of residents (51%) are satisfied (41%) or very satisfied (10%) with the area’s parking. A further 29% are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 19% are dissatisfied (13%) or very dissatisfied (6%). Reasons for dissatisfaction with parking include that it is too hard to find a park or there is limited disabled parking spaces (34%) and needing more parking (32%) and that it costs too much (16%).

PARKS AND RECREATION

Eighty-two per cent of residents are satisfied (45%) and very satisfied (37%) with parks and recreation in the area.

More than two-thirds of residents (70%) are satisfied (51%) or very satisfied (19%) with recreational opportunities in the area. A further 20% are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 7% are dissatisfied (6%) or very dissatisfied (1%). There has been a significant decrease of 5% in dissatisfied ratings when compared with 2016.

Less than half of residents (41%) have used or visited a pool in the past year. Twelve per cent of residents have used both pools, 20% the Riverside pool and 9% the Nayland pool.

too narrow and dangerous for cyclists to use (61%), needing more cyclelanes (24%), cyclelanes not getting a lot of use (9%), as well as better signage and education on use of cyclelanes (8%).

More than two-thirds of residents’ satisfaction ratings (70%) or very satisfied (26%) with the area’s shared pathways. There are significantly fewer very satisfied ratings when compared with results from three years ago (26% cf. 2014, 37%). Nineteen per cent are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, this result is significantly greater than 2014 (19% cf. 2014, 11%). Reasons for dissatisfaction with shared pathways include that they are difficult and dangerous to use (16 mentions), lack of rules and education around safe use (10 mentions), the area should not have shared pathways or needing more of them (five mentions each).
Overall, 78% of pool users are satisfied (47%) or very satisfied (31%) with the pools in the area. There has been a significant increase in satisfaction ratings (47% cf. 2016, 36%).

SOCIAL
Comparisons to previous years results regarding the Suter Art Gallery are indicative only, as there was a question wording change last year to include its temporary location. This may have contributed to a decrease in satisfaction with the gallery in 2016.

Fifty-nine per cent of residents have visited the Suter Art Gallery in the past two years - either in its temporary location, or the redeveloped gallery. This year’s result is a significant increase in usage from last year (59% cf. 2016, 48%).

Amongst users of the Suter Art Gallery, 85% are satisfied (39%) or very satisfied (46%) with it, resulting in a significant increase in very satisfied ratings (46% cf. 2016, 27%). Also significant, 12% are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, a 15% decrease when compared with last year’s results.

At a total level, 64% of residents are satisfied (32%) or very satisfied (32%) with the Suter Art Gallery. Overall satisfaction has increased 16% from 2016’s results. Notably this year, residents who don’t know how to rate this has decreased significantly (12% cf. 2014, 23%).

Close to half of residents (49%) are satisfied (33%) or very satisfied (16%) with public art in the city. A significant decrease of very satisfied ratings appears to be driven by a significant increase in dissatisfied and very dissatisfied ratings when compared with 2016 results. Reasons for dissatisfaction include residents feeling money could be better spent on other things (56%), they don’t like the art or sculptures (21%) and they would like to see different art (17%).

Close to three-quarters of residents (72%) have used a public library in the past year. The majority of residents indicated the main library they use is the Elma Turner library (80%). Following this, 16% use the Stoke library, and 3% the Tahunanui library.

Overall, 88% of residents are satisfied (42%) or very satisfied (46%) with Council libraries.

Attendance of Council events has increased this year across all events, notably, summer festival events (55% cf. 2016, 43%) and arts festival events (27% cf. 2016, 22%). While not significant, attendance of the masked parade (39%) has also increased by 5% this year.

COUNCIL ACTIVITIES
In 2017, close to three-quarters of residents (72%) are satisfied (46%) or very satisfied (26%) with the area’s water supply. There has been a significant increase of 7% in satisfied ratings when compared with 2014. Reasons for dissatisfaction with the water supply included that the water is dirty and of poor quality, chlorine in the water and the taste (nine mentions each). Other mentions included water restrictions and supply and that it’s overpriced and expensive (both seven mentions). More than half of residents (52%) are satisfied (35%) or very satisfied (17%) with the wastewater service. Reasons for dissatisfaction with the wastewater system included the disposal of wastewater (31%). Other mentions include drainage and flooding issues (22%), wastewater leaks (20%) and the smell (17%).

Close to half of residents (47%) are satisfied (37%) or very satisfied (10%) with the area’s stormwater service. Reasons for dissatisfaction with the stormwater system included flooding (57%), drainage (27%) and the disposal of stormwater (16%).

More than a third of residents (35%) are satisfied (28%) or very satisfied (7%) with flood protection. There has been a significant increase of 7% in satisfied ratings when compared with 2014. Concurrently, there has been a significant decrease in very satisfied ratings (7% cf. 2014, 10%). Reasons for dissatisfaction with flood protection included there is too much flooding occurring (62%). Other mentions included Council not doing enough (26%), the feeling there is limited help and facilities to deal with flooding (19%) and needing more protection (15%).

Sixty-one per cent of residents are satisfied (44%) or very satisfied (17%) with waste management. There has been a significant increase of 7% in satisfied ratings when compared with 2014. Concurrently, there has been a significant decrease in very satisfied ratings (17% cf. 2014, 21%). Reasons for dissatisfaction with waste management included recycling needs improving (62%), the feeling Council not doing enough (21%) and that it’s expensive (21%).

Thirty-nine per cent of residents are satisfied (32%) or very satisfied (7%) with environmental management. A further 36% are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 17% are dissatisfied (15%) and very dissatisfied (2%). There has been a significant increase of 5% in dissatisfied ratings when compared with 2014. Reasons for dissatisfaction with environmental management included the feeling Council is not doing enough (46%), the Maitai waterway (24%) and poison and pest traps (16%).

Thirty-seven per cent of residents are satisfied (29%) or very satisfied (8%) with regulatory compliance. A further 33% are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 23% are dissatisfied (15%) and very dissatisfied (8%). There has been a significant decrease of 4% in dissatisfied ratings when compared with 2014. Reasons for dissatisfaction with regulatory compliance included that it takes too long (25%), it’s too complicated (22%) and that it is over-regulated and there are too many rules (21%).

Half of residents (50%) are satisfied (37%) or very satisfied (13%) with the management of emergencies. There has been a significant decrease of 10% in very satisfied ratings when compared with 2014. Also a significant change, a further 35% are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (35% cf. 2014, 23%). Reasons for dissatisfaction with managing emergencies included Civil Defence needing improvements (12 mentions), flooding responses from Council were limited (eight
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Residents were asked what they felt is the single most important environment issue facing the district. The highest mention was water pollution (18%), followed by traffic and congestion (8%) and rubbish or recycling (7%).

Residents were asked how important they felt it was for Council to focus on a number of different environmental issues. The water quality in local streams and rivers received the highest importance rating with 94% residents indicating this should be a priority for Council focus. This is followed by the coastal environment and beaches (92%), marine water quality (90%), waste minimisation (87%), and the maintenance and restoration of natural habitats and ecosystems (85%).

Close to three-quarters of residents (74%) are satisfied (50%) or very satisfied (24%) with community facilities. Reasons for dissatisfaction with community facilities included public toilets need improving as well as the provision of more toilets (13 mentions), wanting more facilities and sports facilities (12 mentions) and playground upgrades (six mentions).

Fourty-three per cent of residents are satisfied (35%) or very satisfied (8%) with community development. Reasons for dissatisfaction with community development included Council needing to do more (43%). Other mentions included a lack of funding for community-based organisations (23%) and there being not enough for youth to do (15%).

Seventy per cent of residents are satisfied (39%) or very satisfied (31%) with culture, heritage and arts in the area. Reasons for dissatisfaction with culture, heritage and arts included the feeling that Council spend too much money on arts and culture (18 mentions). Other mentions included the arts needing more support (12 mentions) and needing better arts and culture facilities (10 mentions).

Forty-five per cent of residents are satisfied (35%) or very satisfied (10%) with economic and tourism support. Reasons for dissatisfaction with economic and tourism support included dissatisfaction with freedom campers (52%) and the feeling of more needing to be done to attract people to the area (26%).

In 2017, 64% of residents compost their household food waste. However, there has been a significant increase of 5% in residents who do not compost their food waste (36% cf. 2014, 31%). Sixty-seven per cent of residents compost their household garden waste, this is a significant decrease of 6% when compared to 2014 results (67% cf. 2014, 73%).

More than half of residents (57%) put out their household recycling every two weeks, and 20% monthly, both a significant increase from previous years.

HousEhOudWASTE And RECYCLING

More than a third (36%) of residents indicated they would prefer to receive information from Council in articles in newspapers. Following this, residents mention their preferred option is through e-newsletters or email (23%), flyers in the mail and social media (both 15%) as well as the Council website (14%).

CounCIL oVERALL

Forty-two per cent of residents are satisfied (33%) or very satisfied (9%) with opportunities to provide feedback. While not significant, there has been a 6% increase in satisfied ratings. Reasons for satisfaction with opportunities to provide feedback included feeling happy with the consultation process or receiving positive feedback (38%), while reasons for dissatisfaction with opportunities to provide feedback included a feeling there isn’t a lot of communication or consultation from Council (14%).

In a new question for 2017, residents were asked if they have had direct contact with Council staff in the past 12 months. More than half of residents (53%) indicated they had. Residents who had direct contact with Council staff in the past 12 months were asked what their contact was about. Reasons included general enquiries or information (20%), rates information (15%), building consents (14%) and information on Council services (13%).

Following this, residents were asked how satisfied they were with the service they received. Sixty-seven per cent of residents are satisfied (33%) or very satisfied (34%).

Overall, 55% of residents are satisfied (47%) or very satisfied (8%) with Council, 32% are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, a significant decrease of 5% when compared with 2014 results. Eleven per cent are dissatisfied (9%) or very dissatisfied (2%). Dissatisfaction ratings have significantly increased (9% cf. 2014, 6%), however this does not appear to be driven by a decrease in satisfied ratings.
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BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

Versus Research was commissioned by Nelson City Council (Council) to conduct Council’s Resident Satisfaction Survey. This survey identifies the perceptions that residents of Nelson (residents) have on a wide range of measures, including services and facilities provided by Council.

The Resident Satisfaction Survey asked residents about their:
- Satisfaction with Council services and facilities
- Satisfaction and usage of transport network
- Perceptions on environmental issues facing the region
- Usage and satisfaction of arts and cultural facilities and Council events

Interviewing for this research was conducted by telephone (using computer-assisted telephone interviewing) in-house at Versus Research, with a supplementary survey conducted online. All interviewing was carried out between the 12th and 30th of May. Interviews were, on average twenty minutes. Phone numbers were called a maximum of five times before being removed from the sample.

INCLUSION OF ONLINE SAMPLE

This year, a mixed-method approach was used for data collection. This involved both computer-aided telephone interviewing (CATI) and online interviewing. A total of n=400 was achieved using CATI and n=120 was achieved online.

With an increasing number of households opting not to have a landline at home, Council included a portion of online interviewing this year to target those who are unable to be reached by landline, particularly younger residents. This helped to ensure that a representative sample was achieved overall. Online interviewing was chosen over other forms of interviewing, such as intercept interviewing, as it is a cost-effective way of reaching a vast number of residents. After completion of fieldwork, all responses from both CATI and online were combined with a review of both samples to ensure any differences were a result of sample rather than method. Sample breakdown by method is included overleaf.

WEIGHTING

Age and gender weightings have been applied to the final data set for this project. Weighting ensures that specific demographic groups are not under or over represented in the final data set and that each group is represented as it would be in the population. Weighting gives greater confidence that the final results are representative of the Nelson City population overall and are not skewed by a particular demographic group. The proportions used for the age and gender weights are taken from the 2013 Census (Statistics NZ). These proportions are outlined in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-39</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-64</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MARGIN OF ERROR

Margin of error (MOE) is a statistic used to express the amount of random sampling error present in a survey’s results. The MOE is particularly relevant when analysing a subset of the data as smaller sample sizes incur a greater MOE.

The final sample size for this particular study is n= 520, which gives a maximum margin of error of +/- 4.3 per cent at the 95 per cent confidence interval; that is, if the observed result on the total sample of n=520 respondents is 50 per cent (point of maximum margin of error), then there is a 95 per cent probability that the true answer falls between 45.7 per cent and 54.3 per cent.
REPORTING OF RESULTS

Results are shown at the total level for all measures. Where applicable, previous year’s results are also shown in the chart. As in previous reports, results for 2011 and 2012 satisfaction ratings have been presented as a combined satisfied and very satisfied rating. Base sizes for each question are shown below the chart.

Significance testing has been applied to these results. A significant difference means that the results show an actual change and that this is not due to chance. This testing compares the previous year’s result to the total and is conducted at the 95% confidence interval. Green shading indicates this year’s result is significantly higher than the previous year’s results, while purple shading indicates this year’s result is significantly lower than the previous year’s result. It should also be noted that not all questions have been asked of residents each year, and there are no comparisons to 2015.

Significance testing has also been applied to the age, gender, and area results. Any significant differences have been noted here.

It should also be noted that not all percentages shown add up to 100%. This is due to rounding and/or occurs where questions allow multiple responses (rather than a single response).

Labels on charts for small proportions (less than 2%) are not shown as they overlap the area allocated to them, making the labels unreadable.

REASONS FOR DISSATISFACTION

Dissatisfied residents were asked why they are dissatisfied; these results were recorded verbatim and post-coded by theme. Reasons for dissatisfaction were collected verbatim and post-coded by theme. Where the base size is <n=30, verbatim responses have not been coded and instead are commented on in the text. When the base size is between n=30 and n=50, the actual, unweighted number of mentions is shown.
SATISFACTION WITH TRANSPORT ACTIVITIES

Close to half of residents (48%) are satisfied (34%) or very satisfied (14%) with transport activities including roads, cycleways, footpaths, and public transport. A quarter of residents (25%) are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, a significant increase in neutral ratings compared to last year. Twenty-seven per cent are dissatisfied (20%), or very dissatisfied (7%); a significant increase in dissatisfaction compared with 2016.

AREA DIFFERENCES

STOKE
No significant differences noted

TAHUNANUI
No significant differences noted

N. CENTRAL
No significant differences noted

N. NORTH
No significant differences noted

DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES

AGED 16-39
More likely to be very dissatisfied 10%

AGED 40-64
Less likely to be very satisfied 11%

AGED 65+
More likely to give a neutral rating 31%

No significant differences noted
REASONS FOR DISSATISFACTION

Dissatisfied residents were asked why they are dissatisfied, these results were recorded verbatim and post-coded by theme. Residents cite their main reason for dissatisfaction with transport activities is public transport being limited (51%). Other mentions include the roads being poor and need improving (35%) and the cycleways need improving (21%). This year, the Southern Link and parking appear to be new areas of concern with residents.

AREA DIFFERENCES

STOKE
No significant differences noted

TAHUNANUI
No significant differences noted

N. CENTRAL
More likely to mention cycleways need improving 29%

N. NORTH
More likely to mention Southern Link 21%

DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES

AGED

16-39
No significant differences noted

40-64
No significant differences noted

65+
More likely to mention footpaths need to be improved 11%

No significant differences noted
WORK STATUS

The work status of residents remains fairly similar to previous years, with close to half of residents (45%) indicating they are employed fulltime. Twenty-three per cent of residents work part-time, while 31% are not in the workforce, this is a significant decrease when compared with last year (31% cf. 2016, 37%). The decrease of those not in the workforce is due to an increase in a younger sample size this year. One per cent of respondents refused to answer this question.

AREA DIFFERENCES

STOKE
No significant differences noted

TAHUNANUI
More likely to not be in the workforce 44%

N. CENTRAL
Less likely to work part time 19%

N. NORTH
No significant differences noted

DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES

More likely to work fulltime 52%
More likely to work fulltime 58% and/or more likely to work part time 27%
More likely to not be in the workforce 77%
More likely to work fulltime 58%

Base size: 2017 n=520; 2016 n=400; 2014 n=400; 2013 n=400.
TRANSPORT | TRAVELLED TO WORK

MAIN WAY TRAVELLED TO WORK

Of residents who are in the workforce, more than half (58%) travel to work in a private vehicle. Following this, residents indicated they travel to work by bicycle (10%) and walk or run to work (9%). Excluding those who work from home, 11% travel via bicycle and 10% walk or run. While not significant, there has been an increase of residents who work from home (8% cf. 2016, 5%) and residents who use public transport (3% cf. 2016, 1%).

AREA DIFFERENCES

STOKE
Less likely to walk or run 2% and/or to work at home 4%

TAHUNANUI
Less likely to walk or run 2%

N. CENTRAL
More likely to run or walk 17% and/or less likely to drive a private car 52%

N. NORTH
No significant differences noted

DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES

AGED 16-39
No significant differences noted

AGED 40-64
No significant differences noted

AGED 65+
No significant differences noted

More likely to drive a private vehicle, car, truck, or van 66%

More likely to drive a company car 12%
SATISFACTION WITH ROADS AND STREETS

More than half of residents (52%) are satisfied (42%) or very satisfied (10%) with roads and streets in the area. There has been a significant decrease of 4% in very satisfied ratings when compared with 2014. A further 32% are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 16% are dissatisfied (13%) or very dissatisfied (3%). One per cent of residents were unsure how to answer this question.

AREA DIFFERENCES

STOKE
Less likely to be satisfied 36%

TAHUNANUI
No significant differences noted

N. CENTRAL
No significant differences noted

N. NORTH
No significant differences noted

DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES

AGED 16-39
No significant differences noted

AGED 40-64
No significant differences noted

AGED 65+
No significant differences noted

No significant differences noted
**REASONS FOR DISSATISFACTION**

Dissatisfied residents were asked why they are dissatisfied, these results were recorded verbatim and post-coded by theme. Residents indicated their main reason for dissatisfaction with roads and streets was the general condition of the roads (57%). Other mentions include roads which aren’t repaired properly (37%) and the length of time taken for repairs (16%).

**General condition of the roads** 57%

**Roads aren’t repaired properly / only patched up** 37%

**Length of time for repairs** 16%

**Cyclelanes / safety** 7%

**Footpaths need improving** 3%

**Waimea Road needs improving** 2%

**Other** 8%

*Base size: n=91.*

**AREA DIFFERENCES**

- **STOKE**: No significant differences noted
- **TAHUNANUI**: No significant differences noted
- **N. CENTRAL**: No significant differences noted
- **N. NORTH**: No significant differences noted

**DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES**

- **AGED 16-39**: No significant differences noted
- **AGED 40-64**: No significant differences noted
- **AGED 65+**: No significant differences noted

No significant differences noted
SATISFACTION WITH FOOTPATHS AND WALKWAYS

Close to two-thirds of residents (63%) are satisfied (50%) or very satisfied (13%) with footpaths and walkways. There has been a significant decrease of 4% in very satisfied ratings when compared with 2014. A further 27% are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 8% are dissatisfied (6%) or very dissatisfied (2%). Two per cent of residents were unsure how to answer this question.

AREA DIFFERENCES

STOKE
No significant differences noted

TAHUNANUI
More likely give a neutral rating 43%

N. CENTRAL
No significant differences noted

N. NORTH
No significant differences noted

DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES

AGED 16-39
No significant differences noted

AGED 40-64
No significant differences noted

AGED 65+
More likely give a neutral rating 34%

Base size: 2017 n=520 2014 n=400.
REASONS FOR DISSATISFACTION

Dissatisfied residents were asked why they are dissatisfied, these results were recorded verbatim and post-coded by theme. Residents cited main reasons for dissatisfaction with footpaths is there is not enough of them (42%), and they are in bad condition (41%). Another mention was footpaths which are not maintained (17%).

Not enough of them / need more footpaths and walkways 42%
In bad condition / potholes / uneven 41%
Not maintained well enough 17%
Bikes / skateboarders on footpaths 6%
Cars parked on footpath 2%
Other 9%
Don't know 3%

**Base size: n=52.**

AREA DIFFERENCES

**STOKE**
More likely to mention bikers/ skateboarders on footpaths 23%

**TAHUNANUI**
More likely to mention cars parked on footpaths 26%

**N. CENTRAL**
No significant differences noted

**N. NORTH**
No significant differences noted

DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES

**AGED 16-39**
Less likely to mention bad condition/ potholes/ uneven 10%

**AGED 40-64**
No significant differences noted

**AGED 65+**
No significant differences noted

**FEMALE**
No significant differences noted
**SATISFACTION WITH CYCLELANES**

Fifty-four per cent of residents are satisfied (38%) or very satisfied (16%) with the area’s cyclelanes, which are defined as the separate lanes for bicycles on the roadway. There has been a significant decrease of 6% in very satisfied ratings when compared with 2014. A further 26% are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, and 18% are dissatisfied (15%) or very dissatisfied (3%). There has been a significant increase of 5% in dissatisfied ratings when compared with 2014. Three per cent of residents were unsure how to answer this question.

### AREA DIFFERENCES

**STOKE**
Less likely to be very dissatisfied 1%

**TAHUNANUI**
No significant differences noted

**N. CENTRAL**
More likely to be very dissatisfied 5%

**N. NORTH**
More likely to be satisfied 48%

### DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES

**AGED 16-39**
More likely to give a neutral rating 32%

**AGED 40-64**
No significant differences noted

**AGED 65+**
More likely to not know 5%

**Female**
No significant differences noted

*Base size: 2017 n=520; 2014 n=400; 2012 n=400; 2011 n=400.*
Dissatisfied residents were asked why they are dissatisfied, these results were recorded verbatim and post-coded by theme. Residents cited their main reason for dissatisfaction with cyclelanes is they are too narrow and dangerous for cyclists to use (61%). Other mentions included needing more cyclelanes (24%), cyclelanes not getting a lot of use (9%) as well as better signage and education on use of cyclelanes (8%).

**AREA DIFFERENCES**

- **STOKE**: No significant differences noted
- **TAHUNANUI**: No significant differences noted
- **N. CENTRAL**: No significant differences noted
- **N. NORTH**: No significant differences noted

**DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES**

- **AGED 16-39**: More likely to mention they do not seem to get a lot of use 19%
- **AGED 40-64**: No significant differences noted
- **AGED 65+**: No significant differences noted
- **Gender**: No significant differences noted

Base size: n=108.
Seventy per cent of residents are satisfied (44%) or very satisfied (26%) with the area’s shared pathways, such as the Railway Reserve. There has been a significant decrease of 11% in very satisfied ratings when compared with 2014. A further 19% are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, a significant increase of 8% when compared with 2014. Seven per cent are dissatisfied (6%) or very dissatisfied (1%). Four per cent of residents were unsure how to answer this question.

**AREA DIFFERENCES**

- **STOKE**: More likely to be very satisfied 37%
- **TAHUNANUI**: No significant differences noted
- **N. CENTRAL**: More likely to be dissatisfied 8%
- **N. NORTH**: No significant differences noted

**DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES**

- **AGED 16-39**: Less likely to be dissatisfied 3%
- **AGED 40-64**: More likely to be dissatisfied 9%
- **AGED 65+**: More likely to give a neutral rating 27% and/or to not know 7%
REASONS FOR DISSATISFACTION

Dissatisfied residents were asked why they are dissatisfied, these results were recorded verbatim and post-coded by theme. Residents cited their main reason for dissatisfaction with shared pathways was they are difficult and dangerous to use (16 mentions). Other mentions included rules needed as well as education around safe use (10 mentions), the area should not have shared pathways, or needing more of them (five mentions each).

Area Differences

No significant differences noted

Demographic Differences

No significant differences noted
More likely to mention should not have shared pathways 26%
More likely to mention they are difficult or dangerous to use 70%
More likely to mention should not have shared pathways 32%
Thirty-six per cent of residents are satisfied (27%) or very satisfied (9%) with the area’s public transport. There has been a significant decrease of 9% in satisfied ratings and 5% in very satisfied ratings when compared with 2014. A further 30% are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 22% are dissatisfied (15%) or very dissatisfied (7%). There has been a significant increase of 9% in dissatisfied ratings when compared with 2014. Twelve per cent of residents were unsure how to answer this question.

**AREA DIFFERENCES**

- **STOKE**: More likely to be satisfied 34%
- **TAHUNANUI**: No significant differences noted
- **N. CENTRAL**: No significant differences noted
- **N. NORTH**: More likely to give a neutral rating 41%

**DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES**

- **AGED 16-39**: More likely to be very dissatisfied 10%
- **AGED 40-64**: No significant differences noted
- **AGED 65+**: More likely to not know 17%

*Base size: 2017 n=520; 2014 n=400; 2012 n=400; 2011 n=400.*
REASONS FOR DISSATISFACTION

Dissatisfied residents were asked why they are dissatisfied, these results were recorded verbatim and post-coded by theme. Residents cited their main reason for dissatisfaction with public transport is that it is not extensive enough and there needs to be more buses (79%). Other mentions included it is too expensive or needs an alternative fare system (13%) and it is under utilised and need incentives to use public transport (8%).

AREA DIFFERENCES

- **STOKE**: More likely to mention buses are under utilised 17%
- **TAHUNANUI**: No significant differences noted
- **N. CENTRAL**: No significant differences noted
- **N. NORTH**: More likely to mention there are no buses where I live 11%

DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES

- **AGED 16-39**: More likely to mention questionable bus drivers 6%
- **AGED 40-64**: More likely to mention buses are under utilised 14%
- **AGED 65+**: More likely to mention there are no buses where I live 13%
- **Female**: No significant differences noted

*Base size: n=123.*
Sixty per cent of residents are satisfied (44%) or very satisfied (16%) with the area’s street lighting. There has been a significant decrease of 5% in very satisfied ratings when compared with 2014. Close to a third of residents (31%) are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 7% are dissatisfied (6%) or very dissatisfied (1%). Two per cent of residents were unsure how to answer this question. These results remain fairly similar to results in 2014.

**AREA DIFFERENCES**

- **STOKE**: No significant differences noted
- **TAHUNANUI**: More likely to give a neutral rating 45%
- **N. CENTRAL**: No significant differences noted
- **N. NORTH**: No significant differences noted

**DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES**

- **AGED 16-39**: No significant differences noted
- **AGED 40-64**: No significant differences noted
- **AGED 65+**: More likely to be very satisfied 24%
- **Female**: More likely to be very dissatisfied 2% or dissatisfied 8%

*Base size: 2017 n=520; 2014 n=400; 2012 n=400; 2011 n=400.*
Dissatisfied residents were asked why they are dissatisfied, these results were recorded verbatim and post-coded by theme. Residents cited their main reason for dissatisfaction with street lighting is that it is not bright enough (24 mentions). Other mentions included needing more lighting generally (18 mentions) and the positioning of street lighting needing improving (two mentions).

**AREA DIFFERENCES**

- **STOKE**: No significant differences noted
- **TAHUNANUI**: No significant differences noted
- **N. CENTRAL**: No significant differences noted
- **N. NORTH**: No significant differences noted

**DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES**

- **AGED 16-39**: No significant differences noted
- **AGED 40-64**: No significant differences noted
- **AGED 65+**: No significant differences noted

*Base size: n=46.*
Satisfaction with Parking

In a new question for 2017, more than half of residents (51%) are satisfied (41%) or very satisfied (10%) with the area’s parking. A further 29% are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 19% are dissatisfied (13%) or very dissatisfied (6%). Two per cent were unsure how to answer this question.

Area Differences

No significant differences noted

Stoke

No significant differences noted

Taunui

No significant differences noted

N. Central

Less likely to be satisfied 30%

N. North

Demographic Differences

Aged 16-39

No significant differences noted

Aged 40-64

More likely to give a neutral rating 34%

Aged 65+

More likely to be very satisfied 17%

No significant differences noted
REASONS FOR DISSATISFACTION

Dissatisfied residents were asked why they are dissatisfied, these results were recorded verbatim and post-coded by theme. Residents cited their main reasons for dissatisfaction with parking is needing more parking (32%) and that it is difficult to find a park (31%). Other mentions were parking costs too much and there needs to be free parking (16%), needing a multi-rise carpark (14%) and it being difficult to park if you work in town (13%).

AREA DIFFERENCES

STOKE
No significant differences noted

TAHUNANUI
No significant differences noted

N. CENTRAL
No significant differences noted

N. NORTH
Less likely to mention too hard to find a park 9%

DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES

AGED 16-39
More likely to mention need a multi-rise carpark 22%

AGED 40-64
Less likely to mention need a multi-rise carpark 4%

AGED 65+
No significant differences noted

No significant differences noted

Base size: n=109.
SATISFACTION WITH PARKS AND RECREATION

The majority of residents (82%) are satisfied (45%) or very satisfied (37%) with parks and recreation, including gardens, sports grounds, sports venues, pools, playgrounds and reserves. A further 11% are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, and 6% are dissatisfied (4%) or very dissatisfied (2%). One per cent of residents were unsure how to answer this question. These results remain fairly similar to last year’s results. The 2011 and 2012 results show the average result across both questions for each rating. Comparisons to earlier years are indicative only, as in previous years this was asked as two questions about parks and open spaces, and recreation and leisure. Indicative comments for reasons for dissatisfaction with parks and recreation show dissatisfaction revolves around being rundown and not maintained enough.

AREA DIFFERENCES

- **STOKE**: No significant differences noted
- **TAHUNANUI**: No significant differences noted
- **N. CENTRAL**: More likely to give a neutral rating 14%
- **N. NORTH**: No significant differences noted

DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES

- **AGED 16-39**: No significant differences noted
- **AGED 40-64**: No significant differences noted
- **AGED 65+**: No significant differences noted

Base size: 2017 n=520; 2014 n=400; 2012 n=400; 2011 n=400.
Seventy per cent of residents are satisfied (51%) or very satisfied (19%) with recreational opportunities in the area. Although not significant, this is a 5% increase in satisfaction ratings when compared with last year’s results. A further 20% are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, a significant decrease of 5% when compared to last year. Seven per cent are dissatisfied (6%) or very dissatisfied (1%). Three per cent of residents were unsure how to answer this question.

**Satisfaction with Recreation Opportunities**

**Area Differences**

- **STOKE**: No significant differences noted
- **TAHUNANUI**: No significant differences noted
- **N. CENTRAL**: No significant differences noted
- **N. NORTH**: No significant differences noted

**Demographic Differences**

- **Aged 16-39**: Less likely to be very satisfied 11% or more likely to not know 6%
- **Aged 40-64**: No significant differences noted
- **Aged 65+**: More likely to be very satisfied 27%
- **Female**: No significant differences noted
USE OF POOLS

Forty-one percent of residents have used or visited a pool in the past year. Although not significant, this is a decrease from previous year’s results. Residents were also asked which pool they used or visited, 12% of residents have used both pools, 20% the Riverside pool and 9% the Nayland pool. More than half of residents (59%) have not used or visited a pool in the past 12 months.

AREA DIFFERENCES

STOKE
More likely to have used Nayland pool 20%

TAHUNANUI
No significant differences noted

N. CENTRAL
More likely to have used Riverside pool 26%

N. NORTH
More likely to have used Riverside pool 34%

DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES

Aged 16-39
No significant differences noted

Aged 40-64
No significant differences noted

Aged 65+
More likely to have not used a pool 72%

No significant differences noted

More likely to have not used a pool 64%
SATISFACTION WITH POOLS

Overall, 78% of pool users are satisfied (47%) or very satisfied (31%) with the pools in the area. There has been a significant increase in satisfaction ratings (47% cf. 2016, 36%), and while not significant, there has been a 7% decrease in very satisfied ratings (31% cf. 2016, 38%). Fifteen per cent are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, while 5% are dissatisfied. One percent of pool users were unsure how to answer this question. Indicative comments show reasons for dissatisfaction with the pools revolve around the cleanliness and maintenance of the pool and its facilities.

Base size: 2017 n=255; 2016 n=143; 2014 n=184.

AREA DIFFERENCES

STOKE
No significant differences noted

TAHUNANUI
No significant differences noted

N. CENTRAL
Less likely to be very satisfied with the pools 22%

N. NORTH
No significant differences noted

DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES

No significant differences noted

No significant differences noted

No significant differences noted

No significant differences noted
SOCIAL
USE OF SUTER ART GALLERY

More than half of residents (59%) visited the Suter Art Gallery in the past two years, either at its temporary location or the redeveloped gallery. This year, there has been a significant increase in use of the gallery (59% cf. 2016, 48%). Concurrently, there are significantly fewer residents who had not visited the Suter Art Gallery (41% cf. 2016, 52%). In 2016, the question wording regarding the Suter Art Gallery was edited to include the temporary location of the gallery, therefore, comparisons with previous years are indicative only.

AREA DIFFERENCES

- **STOKE**: Less likely to have visited the gallery (42%)
- **TAHUNANUI**: No significant differences noted
- **N. CENTRAL**: More likely to have visited the gallery (68%)
- **N. NORTH**: More likely to have visited the gallery (70%)

DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES

- **AGED 16-39**: Less likely to have visited the gallery (52%)
- **AGED 40-64**: No significant differences noted
- **AGED 65+**: No significant differences noted

*Base size: 2017 n=520; 2016 n=400; 2014 n=400; 2011 n=400.*
The majority of Suter Art Gallery users (85%) are satisfied (39%) or very satisfied (46%) with the gallery. This year there has been a significant increase in very satisfied ratings (46% cf. 2016, 27%). Twelve per cent are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, significantly less than last year (12% cf. 2016, 27%). Two per cent of users are dissatisfied and 1% were unsure how to answer the question. As mentioned, comparisons with previous years are indicative due to the question wording change encompassing the temporary location of the gallery in 2016. Indicative comments show user dissatisfaction with the Suter Art Gallery revolves around the layout of the gallery, the variation of art and the cost.

**AREA DIFFERENCES**

- **STOKE**: No significant differences noted
- **TAHUNANUI**: More likely to be very satisfied with the gallery 8%
- **N. CENTRAL**: No significant differences noted
- **N. NORTH**: No significant differences noted

**DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES**

- **Aged 16-39**: More likely to be dissatisfied with the gallery 6%
- **Aged 40-64**: No significant differences noted
- **Aged 65+**: More likely to be very satisfied with the gallery 58%

RESIDENT SATISFACTION WITH SUTER ART GALLERY

At a total level, 64% of residents are satisfied (32%) or very satisfied (32%). This is a significant increase when compared to last year (32% cf. 2016, 17%). A further 21% are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, while 3% are dissatisfied (2%) or very dissatisfied (1%). This year, 12% of residents were unsure how to answer the question, a significant decrease of 11% compared to last year. Comparisons with previous years are indicative due to the question wording change in 2016.

Base size: 2017 n=520; 2016 n=400; 2014 n=400; 2011 n=400.

AREA DIFFERENCES

STOKE

Less likely to be very satisfied 25% or more likely to not know 17%

TAHUNANUI

No significant differences noted

N. CENTRAL

More likely to be very satisfied 37%

N. NORTH

No significant differences noted

DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES

AGED 16-39

Less likely to be very satisfied 23% or more likely to give a neutral rating 26%

AGED 40-64

No significant differences noted

AGED 65+

More likely to be very satisfied 46%

No significant differences noted
SATISFACTION WITH PUBLIC ART

Close to half of residents (49%) are satisfied (33%) or very satisfied (16%) with public art in the area. There is a significant decrease of 5% in very satisfied ratings when compared with last year’s results. A further 26% of residents are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, while 23% are dissatisfied (15%) or very dissatisfied (8%). There is a significant increase in dissatisfied and very dissatisfied (both 5%) when compared to 2016. Two per cent of residents were unsure how to answer the question.

AREA DIFFERENCES

STOKE
More likely to be very dissatisfied 11%

TAHUNANUI
More likely to be dissatisfied 32%

N. CENTRAL
Less likely to be very dissatisfied 4%

N. NORTH
More likely to be very dissatisfied 13%

DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES

AGED 16-39
No significant differences noted

AGED 40-64
No significant differences noted

AGED 65+
No significant differences noted

Base size: 2017 n=520 2016 n=400.
DISSATISFACTION WITH PUBLIC ART

Dissatisfied residents were asked why they are dissatisfied, these results were recorded verbatim and post-coded by theme. Residents cited their main reasons for dissatisfaction with public art is that it is a waste of money and money should be spent on other things (56%), they do not like the art or sculptures (21%) or they would like to see different art or use local artists (17%).

**Waste of money / money should be spent on other things**
- 56%

**Don't like the art / sculptures**
- 21%

**Would like to see different art / use local artists**
- 17%

**No consultation**
- 6%

**Not interested in the art**
- 4%

**Too much art / not needed**
- 1%

**Other**
- 7%

Base size: n=139.

AREA DIFFERENCES

- **STOKE**: More likely to mention not interested in the art 10%
- **TAHUNANUI**: More likely to mention would like to see different art 38%
- **N. CENTRAL**: No significant differences noted
- **N. NORTH**: No significant differences noted

DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES

- **AGED 16-39**: No significant differences noted
- **AGED 40-64**: No significant differences noted
- **AGED 65+**: More likely to mention they do not like the art/sculptures 35%
- **SEX**: No significant differences noted
SOCIAL | LIBRARIES

USE OF PUBLIC LIBRARIES

Close to three-quarters of residents (72%) have used a public library in the past 12 months. While not significant, this is a 3% increase from last year.

AREA DIFFERENCES

No significant differences noted

STOKE

TAHUNANUI

N. CENTRAL

N. NORTH

DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES

More likely to have visited a library 77%

Less likely to have visited a library 67%

0% 20% 40% 60% 80%

2017 2016

Yes

No

Base size: 2017 n=520; 2016 n=400.
MAIN LIBRARY USED

The majority of library users cited the main public library they use is the Elma Turner library (80%). Following this, 16% of users mainly use the Stoke library and 3% use the Tahunanui library. One per cent of residents were unsure how to answer this question. These results remain on par with last year’s results.

AREA DIFFERENCES

STOKE
More likely to have visited Stoke library 57%

TAHUNANUI
More likely to have visited Tahunanui library 15%

N. CENTRAL
More likely to have visited Elma Turner library 97%

N. NORTH
More likely to have visited Elma Turner library 99%

DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES

AGED 16-39
No significant differences noted

AGED 40-64
No significant differences noted

AGED 65+
More likely to have visited Tahunanui library 6%

No significant differences noted

Base size: 2017 n=453; 2016 n=261.
The majority of residents (88%) are satisfied (42%) or very satisfied (46%) with the public library service. Ten per cent are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, while 3% are dissatisfied (2%) or very dissatisfied (1%). Year-on-year results remain fairly similar. With regards to library users, 94% are satisfied (42%) or very satisfied (52%) with the public library service. Four per cent are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, while 2% are dissatisfied (1%) or very dissatisfied (1%). Results for Stoke and Elma Turner libraries remain consistent year-on-year, with only slight decreases in total satisfaction noted. Indicative comments revolve around the location and accessibility, other library users and resources available.

**AREA DIFFERENCES**

- **STOKE**: No significant differences noted
- **TAHUNANUI**: More likely to be very satisfied 56%
- **N. CENTRAL**: No significant differences noted
- **N. NORTH**: No significant differences noted

**DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES**

- **AGED 16-39**: Less likely to be very satisfied 36%
- **AGED 40-64**: No significant differences noted
- **AGED 65+**: More likely to be very satisfied 56%
- **Women**: More likely to be satisfied 47%
Residents’ overall attendance at Council events has increased this year. Attendance at summer festival events (55% cf. 2016, 43%), and arts festival events (27% cf. 2016, 22%) has increased significantly this year. While not significant, residents attendance of the masked parade has also increased (39% cf. 2016, 34%). Residents citing they have not attended any Council events has decreased, although not significantly (33% cf. 2016, 38%).

**AREA DIFFERENCES**

- **STOKE**: More likely to have attended masked parade 46%
- **TAHUNANUI**: No significant differences noted
- **N. CENTRAL**: More likely to have attended any summer festival event 34%
- **N. NORTH**: No significant differences noted

**DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES**

- **AGED 16-39**: More likely to have attended masked parade 46%
- **AGED 40-64**: No significant differences noted
- **AGED 65+**: More likely to have not attended any of these events 45%
- **No significant differences noted**
COUNCIL ACTIVITIES | OVERALL RATINGS

TRANSPORT RATINGS

- Public transport: 7% Very dissatisfied, 15% Dissatisfied, 30% Neutral, 27% Satisfied, 9% Very satisfied, 12% Don't know
- Roads / streets: 3% Very dissatisfied, 13% Dissatisfied, 32% Neutral, 42% Satisfied, 9% Very satisfied, 10% Don't know
- Parking: 6% Very dissatisfied, 13% Dissatisfied, 29% Neutral, 41% Satisfied, 10% Very satisfied, 10% Don't know
- Cyclelanes: 3% Very dissatisfied, 15% Dissatisfied, 26% Neutral, 38% Satisfied, 16% Very satisfied, 3% Don't know
- Street lighting: 6% Very dissatisfied, 31% Dissatisfied, 44% Neutral, 16% Satisfied, 13% Very satisfied, 3% Don't know
- Footpaths and walkways: 6% Very dissatisfied, 27% Dissatisfied, 50% Neutral, 13% Satisfied, 13% Very satisfied, 4% Don't know
- Shared pathways: 6% Very dissatisfied, 19% Dissatisfied, 44% Neutral, 26% Satisfied, 4% Very satisfied, 4% Don't know

COUNCIL ACTIVITIES RATINGS

- Parks and recreation: 4% Very dissatisfied, 11% Dissatisfied, 45% Neutral, 37% Satisfied, 37% Very satisfied, 9% Don't know
- Community facilities: 7% Very dissatisfied, 18% Dissatisfied, 50% Neutral, 24% Satisfied, 24% Very satisfied, 9% Don't know
- Water supply: 6% Very dissatisfied, 20% Dissatisfied, 46% Neutral, 26% Satisfied, 26% Very satisfied, 4% Don't know
- Culture, heritage and arts: 5% Very dissatisfied, 20% Dissatisfied, 39% Neutral, 31% Satisfied, 31% Very satisfied, 6% Don't know
- Solid waste management: 3% Very dissatisfied, 11% Dissatisfied, 23% Neutral, 44% Satisfied, 17% Very satisfied, 6% Don't know
- Wastewater: 9% Very dissatisfied, 35% Dissatisfied, 31% Neutral, 35% Satisfied, 17% Very satisfied, 6% Don't know
- Managing emergencies and natural hazards: 5% Very dissatisfied, 35% Dissatisfied, 31% Neutral, 35% Satisfied, 17% Very satisfied, 6% Don't know
- Transport: 7% Very dissatisfied, 20% Dissatisfied, 25% Neutral, 34% Satisfied, 14% Very satisfied, 9% Don't know
- Stormwater: 4% Very dissatisfied, 11% Dissatisfied, 34% Neutral, 37% Satisfied, 10% Very satisfied, 3% Don't know
- Economic and tourism support: 4% Very dissatisfied, 10% Dissatisfied, 36% Neutral, 35% Satisfied, 10% Very satisfied, 4% Don't know
- Community development and wellbeing: 10% Very dissatisfied, 37% Dissatisfied, 36% Neutral, 35% Satisfied, 8% Very satisfied, 8% Don't know
- Environmental management: 15% Very dissatisfied, 36% Dissatisfied, 32% Neutral, 29% Satisfied, 7% Very satisfied, 8% Don't know
- Regulatory compliance: 8% Very dissatisfied, 15% Dissatisfied, 33% Neutral, 28% Satisfied, 8% Very satisfied, 7% Don't know
- Flood protection: 4% Very dissatisfied, 11% Dissatisfied, 41% Neutral, 28% Satisfied, 7% Very satisfied, 8% Don't know
Satisfaction with Water Supply

Seventy-two per cent of residents are satisfied (46%) or very satisfied (26%) with the area’s water supply. There has been a significant increase of 7% in satisfied ratings when compared with 2014. A further 20% are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 7% are dissatisfied (6%) or very dissatisfied (1%). Two per cent of residents were unsure how to answer this question.

Area Differences

Stoke
No significant differences noted

Tahunanui
No significant differences noted

N. Central
No significant differences noted

N. North
No significant differences noted

Demographic Differences

Aged 16-39
No significant differences noted

Aged 40-64
More likely to give a neutral rating 24% or less likely to be very satisfied 21%

Aged 65+
More likely to be very satisfied 36%

Women
No significant differences noted

Base size: 2017 n=520; 2014 n=400; 2012 n=400; 2011 n=400.
REASONS FOR DISSATISFACTION

Dissatisfied residents were asked why they are dissatisfied, these results were recorded verbatim and post-coded by theme. Residents indicated their main reasons for dissatisfaction with the water supply were that the water is dirty and of poor quality, chlorine in the water as well as the taste (nine mentions each). Other mentions included water restrictions and supply (seven mentions), and that it’s overpriced and expensive (seven mentions).

AREA DIFFERENCES

No significant differences noted

N. CENTRAL

No significant differences noted

N. NORTH

No significant differences noted

DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES

16-39

No significant differences noted

40-64

No significant differences noted

65+

More likely to mention taste of water 27%

No significant differences noted

Base size: n=44.
More than half of residents (52%) are satisfied (35%) or very satisfied (17%) with the wastewater service, including sewage treatment and disposal. A further 31% are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 11% are dissatisfied (9%) or very dissatisfied (2%). Six per cent of residents were unsure how to answer this question. There are no significant differences when compared to 2014.

**AREA DIFFERENCES**

- **STOKE**: No significant differences noted
- **TAHUNANUI**: No significant differences noted
- **N. CENTRAL**: No significant differences noted
- **N. NORTH**: No significant differences noted

**DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES**

- **16-39**: More likely to not know 9%
- **40-64**: More likely to be satisfied 41%
- **65+**: More likely to be very satisfied 22%
- **Female**: More likely to be dissatisfied 12%
REASONS FOR DISSATISFACTION

Dissatisfied residents were asked why they are dissatisfied, these results were recorded verbatim and post-coded by theme. Residents indicated their main reason for dissatisfaction was the disposal of wastewater (31%). Other mentions include drainage and flooding issues (22%), wastewater leaks (20%) and the smell (17%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disposal of wastewater into the harbour</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage / flooding issues</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater leak</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smell</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old / drainage system upgrade</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponds</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base size: n=64.

AREA DIFFERENCES

STOKE: No significant differences noted
TAHUNANUI: No significant differences noted
N. CENTRAL: More likely to mention ponds 17%
N. NORTH: No significant differences noted

DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES

AGED 16-39: No significant differences noted
AGED 40-64: No significant differences noted
AGED 65+: No significant differences noted

More likely to mention drainage/flooding issues 40%
Forty-seven per cent of residents are satisfied (37%) or very satisfied (10%) with the area’s stormwater service, including the pipes to collect and discharge rainwater. A further 34% are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 15% are dissatisfied (11%) or very dissatisfied (4%). Three per cent of residents were unsure how to answer this question. There are no significant differences when compared to 2014.

**AREA DIFFERENCES**

**STOKE**
More likely to be very satisfied 15%

**TAHUNANUI**
No significant differences noted

**N. CENTRAL**
More likely to be very dissatisfied 6%

**N. NORTH**
No significant differences noted

**DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES**

**AGED 16-39**
No significant differences noted

**AGED 40-64**
Less likely to be very satisfied 8%

**AGED 65+**
More likely to be very satisfied 15%

Less likely to be very satisfied 7%
Dissatisfied residents were asked why they are dissatisfied, these results were recorded verbatim and post-coded by theme. Residents indicated their main reason for dissatisfaction with the stormwater service was flooding (57%). Other mentions included drainage (27%) and the disposal of stormwater (16%).

**AREA DIFFERENCES**

**STOKE**
- More likely to mention drainage 53%

**TAHUNANUI**
- No significant differences noted

**N. CENTRAL**
- No significant differences noted

**N. NORTH**
- No significant differences noted

**DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES**

**AGED 16-39**
- No significant differences noted

**AGED 40-64**
- No significant differences noted

**AGED 65+**
- More likely to mention disposal of stormwater 30%

**No significant differences noted**
SATISFACTION WITH FLOOD PROTECTION

More than a third of residents (35%) are satisfied (28%) or very satisfied (7%) with flood protection. There has been a significant increase of 7% in satisfied ratings when compared with 2014. Concurrently, there has been a significant decrease in very satisfied ratings (7% cf. 2014, 10%). Forty-one per cent are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 15% are dissatisfied (11%) or very dissatisfied (4%). Eight per cent of residents were unsure how to answer this question.

AREA DIFFERENCES

No significant differences noted

STOKE

TAHUNANUI

N. CENTRAL

N. NORTH

DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES

No significant differences noted

AGED 16-39

AGED 40-64

AGED 65+

No significant differences noted

More likely to give a neutral rating 46%

No significant differences noted

No significant differences noted

No significant differences noted

Base size: 2017 n=520; 2014 n=400; 2012 n=400; 2011 n=400.
REASONS FOR DISSATISFACTION

Dissatisfied residents were asked why they are dissatisfied, these results were recorded verbatim and post-coded by theme. Residents indicated their main reason for dissatisfaction with flood protection was that there is too much flooding occurring (62%). Other mentions included Council not doing enough (26%), the feeling there is limited help and facilities to deal with flooding (19%), and needing more protection (15%).

AREA DIFFERENCES

STOKE
No significant differences noted

TAHUNANUI
More likely to mention need more protection 40%

N. CENTRAL
No significant differences noted

N. NORTH
No significant differences noted

DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES

AGED 16-39
No significant differences noted

AGED 40-64
No significant differences noted

AGED 65+
Less likely to mention too much flooding occurring 42%
COUNCIL ACTIVITIES | WASTE MANAGEMENT

SATISFACTION WITH WASTE MANAGEMENT

Sixty-one per cent of residents are satisfied (44%) or very satisfied (17%) with solid waste management, including the landfill and recycling. There has been a significant increase of 7% in satisfied ratings when compared with 2014. Concurrently, there has been a significant decrease in very satisfied ratings (17% cf. 2014, 21%). A further 23% are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, significantly less than 2014, 14% are dissatisfied (11%) or very dissatisfied (3%). Two per cent of residents were unsure how to answer this question.

AREA DIFFERENCES

STOKE

No significant differences noted

TAHUNANUI

No significant differences noted

N. CENTRAL

No significant differences noted

N. NORTH

Less likely to be very satisfied 8%

DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES

AGED 16-39

No significant differences noted

AGED 40-64

Less likely to be very satisfied 13%

AGED 65+

More likely to be very satisfied 25%

More likely to not know 3%

No significant differences noted

Base size: 2017 n=520; 2014 n=400; 2012 n=400; 2011 n=400.
REASONS FOR DISSATISFACTION

Dissatisfied residents were asked why they are dissatisfied, these results were recorded verbatim and post-coded by theme. Residents indicated their main reason for dissatisfaction with waste management was that recycling needs improving (62%). Other mentions included the feeling Council is not doing enough and that it’s expensive (both 21%).

![Bar chart showing reasons for dissatisfaction](chart)

- Recycling needs improvement: 62%
- Council is not doing enough: 21%
- Expensive: 21%
- Waste sewage smell / leaks: 8%
- Wastewater / drainage issues: 5%
- Other: 5%
- Don’t know: 3%

Base size: n=83.

AREA DIFFERENCES

- **STOKE**: No significant differences noted
- **TAHUNANUI**: No significant differences noted
- **N. CENTRAL**: No significant differences noted
- **N. NORTH**: No significant differences noted

DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES

- **Aged 16-39**: No significant differences noted
- **Aged 40-64**: No significant differences noted
- **Aged 65+**: No significant differences noted
- **Sex**: No significant differences noted
Thirty-nine per cent of residents are satisfied (32%) or very satisfied (7%) with environmental management, planning and environmental monitoring. A further 36% are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 17% are dissatisfied (15%) or very dissatisfied (2%). There has been a significant increase of 5% in dissatisfied ratings when compared with 2014. Eight per cent of residents were unsure how to answer this question.

**AREA DIFFERENCES**

- **STOKE**: More likely to not know 12%
- **TAHUNANUI**: No significant differences noted
- **N. CENTRAL**: No significant differences noted
- **N. NORTH**: Less likely to be very satisfied 1%

**DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES**

- **AGED 16-39**: No significant differences noted
- **AGED 40-64**: Less likely to be very satisfied 4%
- **AGED 65+**: No significant differences noted
- **Female**: No significant differences noted
REASONS FOR DISSATISFACTION

Dissatisfied residents were asked why they are dissatisfied, these results were recorded verbatim and post-coded by theme. Residents indicated their main reason for dissatisfaction with environmental management was Council not doing enough and needs improvement (46%). Other mentions included the Maitai waterway (24%) and poison and pest traps (16%).

Area Differences

- **STOKE**: More likely to mention Maitai waterway 41%
- **TAHUNANUI**: No significant differences noted
- **N. CENTRAL**: No significant differences noted
- **N. NORTH**: No significant differences noted

Demographic Differences

- **AGED 16-39**: No significant differences noted
- **AGED 40-64**: More likely to mention not being able to use wood burners 7%
- **AGED 65+**: No significant differences noted
- **Gender**: More likely to mention Maitai waterway 32%

*Base size: n=103.*
Satisfaction with Regulatory Compliance

Thirty-seven per cent of residents are satisfied (29%) or very satisfied (8%) with regulatory compliance, such as building consents and public health work including noise levels, food premises, pollution and dog control. A further 33% are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 23% are dissatisfied (15%) or very dissatisfied (8%). There has been a significant decrease of 4% in dissatisfied ratings when compared with 2014. Seven per cent of residents were unsure how to answer this question.

Area Differences

Stoke: More likely to be satisfied 37%
Tahunaunui: No significant differences noted
N. Central: More likely to not know 10% or less likely to be satisfied 24%
N. North: No significant differences noted

Demographic Differences

No significant differences noted for all age groups.

Base size: 2017 n=520; 2014 n=400; 2012 n=400; 2011 n=400.
REASONS FOR DISSATISFACTION

Dissatisfied residents were asked why they are dissatisfied, these results were recorded verbatim and post-coded by theme. Residents indicated their main reasons for dissatisfaction with regulatory compliance were that it takes too long (25%), it’s too complicated (22%) and that it is over-regulated and there’s too many rules (21%).

AREA DIFFERENCES

STOKE
More likely to mention pollution 12%

TAHUNANUI
More likely to mention over-regulated 65% and/or noise control 8%

N. CENTRAL
No significant differences noted

N. NORTH
No significant differences noted

DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES

AGED 16-39
More likely to mention conflicting Council information 26%

AGED 40-64
No significant differences noted

AGED 65+
More likely to mention noise control 6%

More likely to mention costly/ too expensive 22%
Half of residents (50%) are satisfied (37%) or very satisfied (13%) with the management of emergencies and natural hazards, including Civil Defence. There has been a significant decrease of 10% in very satisfied ratings when compared with 2014. Significantly, a further 35% are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (35% cf. 2014, 23%). Six per cent are dissatisfied (5%) or very dissatisfied (1%), while 9% of residents were unsure how to answer this question.

**AREA DIFFERENCES**

- **STOKE**: More likely to be very satisfied 20%
- **TAHUNANUI**: More likely to be very dissatisfied 5%
- **N. CENTRAL**: No significant differences noted
- **N. NORTH**: No significant differences noted

**DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES**

- **AGED 16-39**: More likely to be very satisfied 18%
- **AGED 40-64**: More likely to give a neutral rating 40%
- **AGED 65+**: No significant differences noted
- **Female**: More likely to be very dissatisfied 2%

*Base size: 2017 n=520; 2014 n=400; 2012 n=400; 2011 n=400.*
REASONS FOR DISSATISFACTION

Dissatisfied residents were asked why they are dissatisfied, these results were recorded verbatim and post-coded by theme. Residents indicated their main reason for dissatisfaction with managing emergencies was Civil Defence needing improvements (12 mentions). Other mentions included flooding responses from Council were limited (eight mentions) as well as wanting more information regarding tsunamis and earthquake alerts (five mentions).

![Bar chart showing reasons for dissatisfaction](chart.png)

Base size: n=35.

AREA DIFFERENCES

- **STOKE**: No significant differences noted
- **TAHUNANUI**: No significant differences noted
- **N. CENTRAL**: No significant differences noted
- **N. NORTH**: No significant differences noted

DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES

- **16-39**: No significant differences noted
- **40-64**: No significant differences noted
- **65+**: More likely to mention Civil Defence needs improving 55%
- **65+**: No significant differences noted
Close to three-quarters of residents (74%) are satisfied (50%) or very satisfied (24%) with community facilities, including public libraries, halls, toilets, cemeteries and crematorium. A further 18% are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied and 7% are dissatisfied. One per cent of residents were unsure how to answer this question. There are no significant differences when compared with 2014.

**Area Differences**

- **Stoke**: No significant differences noted
- **Tahunanui**: No significant differences noted
- **N. Central**: No significant differences noted
- **N. North**: No significant differences noted

**Demographic Differences**

- **Aged 16-39**: No significant differences noted
- **Aged 40-64**: No significant differences noted
- **Aged 65+**: More likely to be very satisfied 31%
- **Female**: More likely to be satisfied 55%

Base size: 2017 n=520; 2014 n=400; 2012 n=400; 2011 n=400.
COUNCIL ACTIVITIES | COMMUNITY FACILITIES

REASONS FOR DISSATISFACTION

Dissatisfied residents were asked why they are dissatisfied, these results were recorded verbatim and post-coded by theme. Residents indicated their main reasons for dissatisfaction with community facilities were that the public toilets need improving as well as the provision of more toilets (13 mentions) and wanting more facilities and sports facilities (12 mentions). Other mentions included playground upgrades (six mentions).

AREA DIFFERENCES

STOKE
No significant differences noted

TAHUNANUI
More likely to mention more facilities/ sports facilities 85%

N. CENTRAL
No significant differences noted

N. NORTH
No significant differences noted

DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES

AGED 16-39
More likely to mention playground upgrades 40%

AGED 40-64
No significant differences noted

AGED 65+
No significant differences noted

No significant differences noted
Satisfaction with Community Development

Forty-three per cent of residents are satisfied (35%) or very satisfied (8%) with community development and wellbeing, including community projects and partnerships, funding and support for community organisations. A further 37% are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 12% are dissatisfied (10%) or very dissatisfied (2%). Eight per cent of residents were unsure how to answer this question. There are no significant differences when compared with 2014.

Area Differences

- **Stoke**: More likely to be very satisfied 42%
- **Tahunaunui**: No significant differences noted
- **N. Central**: No significant differences noted
- **N. North**: No significant differences noted

Demographic Differences

- **Aged 16-39**: More likely to be very satisfied 12%
- **Aged 40-64**: Less likely to be very satisfied 5%
- **Aged 65+**: More likely to not know 12% or less likely to be dissatisfied 4%
- **Gender**: More likely to give a neutral rating 42%

Base size: 2017 n=520; 2014 n=400; 2012 n=400; 2011 n=400.
COUNCIL ACTIVITIES | COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

REASONS FOR DISSATISFACTION

Dissatisfied residents were asked why they are dissatisfied, these results were recorded verbatim and post-coded by theme. Residents indicated their main reason for dissatisfaction with community development was indicating Council needing to do more (43%). Other mentions included a lack of funding for community-based organisations (23%) and there being not enough for youth (15%).

Base size: n=66.

AREA DIFFERENCES

STOKE
More likely to mention not enough for youth 37%

TAHUNANUI
No significant differences noted

N. CENTRAL
No significant differences noted

N. NORTH
More likely to mention lack of funding for community based organisations 53%

DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES

AGED 16-39
No significant differences noted

AGED 40-64
No significant differences noted

AGED 65+
No significant differences noted

No significant differences noted
Seventy per cent of residents are satisfied (39%) or very satisfied (31%) with culture, heritage and arts, including the provincial museum, art gallery, festivals and historic houses. A further 20% are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 7% are dissatisfied (5%) or very dissatisfied (2%). Two per cent of residents were unsure how to answer this question. There are no significant differences when compared with 2014.

**AREA DIFFERENCES**

- **STOKE**: No significant differences noted
- **TAHUNANUI**: No significant differences noted
- **N. CENTRAL**: No significant differences noted
- **N. NORTH**: No significant differences noted

**DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES**

- **AGED 16-39**: No significant differences noted
- **AGED 40-64**: No significant differences noted
- **AGED 65+**: Less likely to give a neutral rating 14%
- **Female**: No significant differences noted
COUNCIL ACTIVITIES | CULTURE, HERITAGE AND ARTS

REASONS FOR DISSATISFACTION

Dissatisfied residents were asked why they are dissatisfied, these results were recorded verbatim and post-coded by theme. Residents indicated their main reason for dissatisfaction with culture, heritage and arts was the feeling that Council spend too much money on arts and culture (18 mentions). Other mentions included the arts needing more support (12 mentions) and needing better facilities (10 mentions).

![Bar Chart]

Base size: n=45.

AREA DIFFERENCES

- STOKE: More likely to mention Maori culture 18%
- TAHUNANUI: No significant differences noted
- N. CENTRAL: No significant differences noted
- N. NORTH: No significant differences noted

DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES

- AGED 16-39: No significant differences noted
- AGED 40-64: No significant differences noted
- AGED 65+: More likely to mention Maori culture 25%
- FEMALES: No significant differences noted
Satisfaction with Economic and Tourism Support

Forty-five per cent of residents are satisfied (35%) or very satisfied (10%) with economic and tourism support, such as funding to encourage tourists to come to Nelson and economic development. A further 36% are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 14% are dissatisfied (10%) or very dissatisfied (4%). Four per cent of residents were unsure how to answer this question. There are no significant differences when compared with 2014.

**Area Differences**

- **Stoke**: Less likely to be dissatisfied 5%
- **Tahunanui**: More likely to be satisfied 49%
- **N. Central**: Less likely to be satisfied 30%
- **N. North**: More likely to be dissatisfied 17%

**Demographic Differences**

- **Aged 16-39**: No significant differences noted
- **Aged 40-64**: No significant differences noted
- **Aged 65+**: No significant differences noted

*Base size: 2017 n=520; 2014 n=400; 2012 n=400; 2011 n=400.*
REASONS FOR DISSATISFACTION

Dissatisfied residents were asked why they are dissatisfied, these results were recorded verbatim and post-coded by theme. Residents indicated their main reason for dissatisfaction with economic and tourism support was freedom campers (52%). Other mentions included the feeling of more needing to be done to attract people to Nelson (26%).

Base size: n=85.

AREA DIFFERENCES

STOKE
No significant differences noted

TAHUNANUI
No significant differences noted

N. CENTRAL
No significant differences noted

N. NORTH
More likely to mention rates shouldn’t go towards this 46%

DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES

AGED 16-39
More likely to mention more needs to be done to attract people to Nelson 47%

AGED 40-64
More likely to mention rates shouldn’t go towards this 35%

AGED 65+
No significant differences noted

No significant differences noted
HOUSEHOLD WASTE AND RECYCLING
In 2017, close to two-thirds of residents (64%) compost their household food waste. However, there has been a significant increase in residents who do not compost their food waste (36% cf. 2014, 31%).

**AREA DIFFERENCES**

- **STOKE**: Less likely to compost food waste (53%)
- **TAHUNANUI**: No significant differences noted
- **N. CENTRAL**: No significant differences noted
- **N. NORTH**: More likely to compost food waste (75%)

**DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES**

- **AGED 16-39**: No significant differences noted
- **AGED 40-64**: No significant differences noted
- **AGED 65+**: No significant differences noted
- **FEMALE**: No significant differences noted

*Base size: 2017 n=520; 2014 n=400; 2010 n=400; 2009 n=400.*
In 2017, 67% of residents compost their household garden waste, this is a significant decrease from three years ago (67% cf. 2014, 73%).

**AREA DIFFERENCES**

- **STOKE**: Less likely to compost garden waste 59%
- **TAHUNANUI**: No significant differences noted
- **N. CENTRAL**: No significant differences noted
- **N. NORTH**: More likely to compost garden waste 81%

**DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES**

- **AGED 16-39**: Less likely to compost 60%
- **AGED 40-64**: Less likely to not know 1%
- **AGED 65+**: No significant differences noted
- **No significant differences noted**
HOUSEHOLD WASTE AND RECYCLING | RECYCLING

HOUSEHOLD RECYCLING HABITS

More than half of residents (57%) put out their household recycling every two weeks, a significant increase from previous years. Also a significant increase, 20% of residents put out household recycling monthly. Sixteen per cent of residents recycle weekly, a significant decrease when compared with previous years. Also a significant decrease is the 2% of residents who never recycle.

AREA DIFFERENCES

No significant differences noted

STOKE

TAHUNANUI

N. CENTRAL

N. NORTH

DEMOPHOGPHERIC DIFFERENCES

More likely to recycle every week 23%

More likely to recycle every month 28% or never 4%

More likely to recycle every week 20%

No significant differences noted

No significant differences noted

No significant differences noted

No significant differences noted

Base size: 2017 n=520; 2014 n=400; 2012 n=400; 2009 n=400.
ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES AND PLANNING
Residents were asked what they felt is the single most important environmental issue facing the district, these results were recorded verbatim and post-coded by theme. The highest mention was don’t know, with a quarter of residents (25%) unsure what they felt was the single most important environmental issue facing the district. Following this was mentions of water pollution (18%), followed by traffic and congestion (8%) and rubbish and recycling (7%). In 2014, the top three mentions pertained to water pollution, flooding, and air pollution.

**AREA DIFFERENCES**

- **STOKE**: More likely to not know 33%
- **TAHUNANUI**: No significant differences noted
- **N. CENTRAL**: More likely to mention air pollution 5%
- **N. NORTH**: More likely to mention pests 10% and rubbish/recycling 14%

**DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES**

- **AGED 16-39**: More likely to not know 33%
- **AGED 40-64**: More likely to mention climate change 6%
- **AGED 65+**: No significant differences noted
- **Gender**: More likely to mention flooding 7% and sea level rise 4%
Residents were asked how important or not they felt it was for Council to focus on a number of different environmental issues. This is presented in the chart below as combined important and very important ratings. The water quality in local streams and rivers received the highest rating with 94% residents indicating this should be a priority for Council. This is followed by the coastal environment and beaches (92%), marine water quality (90%), waste minimisation (87%) and the maintenance and restoration of natural habitats and ecosystems (85%). Lower ratings included heritage sites and buildings (64%) and natural landscapes (73%). These results remain fairly similar to 2014.

**AREA DIFFERENCES**

**STOKE**
Less likely to rate water quality as very important 62%

**TAHUNANUI**
No significant differences noted

**N. CENTRAL**
No significant differences noted

**N. NORTH**
More likely to rate natural landscapes as important 49%

**DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES**

**AGED 16-39**
More likely to rate maintenance of natural habitats as very important 58%

**AGED 40-64**
No significant differences noted

**AGED 65+**
More likely to rate the coastal environment and beaches as important 40%

More likely to rate heritage sites and buildings as very important 28%

More likely to rate natural hazards as not important 4%
Heritage sites and buildings

Natural landscapes, such as...hills and coastal views

Natural hazards such as earthquakes and floods

Air quality

Maintenance and restoration of...habitats and ecosystems

Waste minimisation

Marine water quality

The coastal environment and beaches

Water quality in local streams and rivers

Not at all important
Not important
Neutral
Important
Very important
Don't know

Base size: 2017 n=520.
COMMUNICATION | COUNCIL SERVICES

INFORMED ABOUT COUNCIL AND ITS SERVICES

Forty-five per cent of residents indicated they are well informed (36%) or very well informed (9%) with Council and its services. There has been a significant increase of 7% in satisfied ratings when compared with 2016. Concurrently, there has been a significant decrease in neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ratings (33% cf. 2016, 45%). Twenty per cent of residents are dissatisfied (14%) or very dissatisfied (6%) and 2% were unsure how to answer the question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Not very well informed</th>
<th>Not informed</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Informed</th>
<th>Very well informed</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base size: 2017 n=520; 2016 n=400; 2014 n=400; 2012 n=400.

AREA DIFFERENCES

- **STOKE**: No significant differences noted
- **TAHUNANUI**: No significant differences noted
- **N. CENTRAL**: More likely to feel not informed 18%
- **N. NORTH**: No significant differences noted

DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES

- **AGED 16-39**: More likely to feel not informed 21% or to not know 5%
- **AGED 40-64**: No significant differences noted
- **AGED 65+**: More likely to feel informed 44%
- **AGE**: More likely to feel very well informed 11%

No significant differences noted
Residents were asked why they felt well informed or not well informed; these results were recorded verbatim and post-coded by theme. Reasons for feeling well informed included residents feeling positive about newsletters, flyers and newspapers (22%) and information (18%). Reasons for not feeling well informed included residents not hearing anything from Council and that Council needs to communicate more (14%).

**Area Differences**

**Stoke**
- More likely to mention they do not hear anything from Council 19%

**Tahunanui**
- No significant differences noted

**N. Central**
- No significant differences noted

**N. North**
- No significant differences noted

**Demographic Differences**

**Aged 16-39**
- Less likely to be positive about newsletter/flyers/newspaper 13%

**Aged 40-64**
- More likely to mention they do not have enough opportunity to be informed 4%

**Aged 65+**
- More likely to be positive about newsletter/flyers/newspaper 30%

No significant differences noted

**Stoke**
- More likely to mention they do not hear anything from Council 19%

**Tahunanui**
- No significant differences noted

**N. Central**
- No significant differences noted

**N. North**
- No significant differences noted

No significant differences noted
COMMUNICATION | COUNCIL SERVICES

PREFER TO RECEIVE INFORMATION FROM COUNCIL

This year, residents indicated they would prefer to receive information through articles in the newspaper (36%), through e-newsletters or email (23%), flyers in the mail and social media (both 15%) as well as through the Council website (14%). Social media has significantly increased this year, while flyers in the mail has decreased. This year multiple answers were accepted. Comparisons with 2016 results is indicative only, as the question wording was different last year.

**AREA DIFFERENCES**

**STOKE**
More likely to mention social media 21%

**TAHUNANUI**
No significant differences noted

**N. CENTRAL**
No significant differences noted

**N. NORTH**
No significant differences noted

**DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES**

**AGED 16-39**
More likely to mention social media 31%

**AGED 40-64**
More likely to mention e-newsletters 31% and Council publications 6%

**AGED 65+**
More likely to mention articles in the paper 65%

More likely to mention social media 20%

No significant differences noted
CORPORATE
SATISFACTION WITH FEEDBACK OPPORTUNITIES

Overall, 42% of residents are satisfied (33%) or very satisfied (9%) with their opportunities for feedback. A further 34% are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, while 17% are dissatisfied (13%) or very dissatisfied (4%) with feedback opportunities. There are no significant differences noted this year.

**STOKE**
No significant differences noted

**TAHUNANUI**
More likely to be very satisfied 18%

**N. CENTRAL**
No significant differences noted

**N. NORTH**
No significant differences noted

**DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES**

- **AGED 16-39**: No significant differences noted
- **AGED 40-64**: No significant differences noted
- **AGED 65+**: Less likely to be very dissatisfied 1% or dissatisfied 7%

**Base size**: 2017 n=520; 2016 n=400; 2014 n=400; 2012 n=400; 2011 n=400.
Residents were asked why they are satisfied or dissatisfied, these results were recorded verbatim and post-coded by theme. Reasons for satisfaction with feedback opportunities included residents feeling happy with the consultation process as well as receiving positive feedback (38%). Reasons for dissatisfaction with feedback opportunities included residents feeling there is not a lot of communication or consultation from Council (14%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Happy with consultation process / positive feedback</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a lot of communication / consultation from Council</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council don’t care about public feedback</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They don’t listen</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many closed meetings / private conversations</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just don’t participate in giving feedback</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not aware of how to give feedback</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Base size: n=520.*

**AREA DIFFERENCES**
- **STOKE**: No significant differences noted
- **TAHUNANUI**: No significant differences noted
- **N. CENTRAL**: No significant differences noted
- **N. NORTH**: More likely to mention Council do not listen 9%

**DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES**
- **AGED 16-39**: More likely to mention they are not aware of how to give feedback 11%
- **AGED 40-64**: No significant differences noted
- **AGED 65+**: More likely to mention they are happy with consultation process 46%

*No significant differences noted*
CONTACT WITH COUNCIL STAFF

In a new question for 2017, residents were asked if they have had direct contact with Council staff in the past year. More than half of residents (53%) had contact, 46% had not and 1% were unsure if they had direct contact with Council staff in the past 12 months.

AREA DIFFERENCES

STOKE
Less likely to have had direct contact with Council staff 42%

TAHUNANUI
No significant differences noted

N. CENTRAL
More likely to have had direct contact with Council staff 58%

N. NORTH
No significant differences noted

DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES

AGED 16-39
Less likely to have had direct contact with Council staff 35%

AGED 40-64
More likely to have had direct contact with Council staff 64%

AGED 65+
No significant differences noted

No significant differences noted
CONTACT WITH COUNCIL STAFF

Residents who had direct contact with Council staff in the past 12 months were asked what their contact was about. These results were recorded verbatim and post-coded by theme. Residents cited their main reason for contact with Council staff was general enquiries and information (20%), rates information (15%), building consents (14%), and information on Council services (13%).

Base size: n=336.

AREA DIFFERENCES

STOKE
More likely to mention dog control 8% or noise 7% control

TAHUNANUI
More likely to mention flooding 6% or tree removal 10%

N. CENTRAL
No significant differences noted

N. NORTH
No significant differences noted

DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES

AGED 16-39
More likely to mention noise control 7% and/or festivals 10%

AGED 40-64
More likely to mention building consent 18%

AGED 65+
No significant differences noted

More likely to mention dog control 6%
Satisfaction with Council Service

In a new question for 2017, regarding contact with Council staff, residents who had contacted Council in the past 12 months were asked how satisfied they were with the service they received. Sixty-seven per cent of residents were satisfied (33%) or very satisfied (34%). Fourteen per cent were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 17% were dissatisfied (11%) or very dissatisfied (6%). Two per cent were an answer how to answer the question.

Base size: 2017 n=317.

Area Differences

Stoke: No significant differences noted

Taunui: More likely to be dissatisfied 20%

N. Central: More likely to give a neutral rating 21%

N. North: More likely to not know 8%

Demographic Differences

Aged 16-39: No significant differences noted

Aged 40-64: No significant differences noted

Aged 65+: No significant differences noted

No significant differences noted
SATISFACTION WITH COUNCIL PERFORMANCE

Overall, 55% of residents are satisfied (47%) or very satisfied (8%) with Council, 32% are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, while 11% are dissatisfied (9%) or very dissatisfied (2%). Three per cent of residents were unsure how to answer the question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base size: 2017 n=520; 2014 n=400; 2013 n=400; 2012 n=400; 2011 n=400.

AREA DIFFERENCES

STOKE
No significant differences noted

TAHUNANUI
More likely to be very satisfied 15%

N. CENTRAL
No significant differences noted

N. NORTH
More likely to give a neutral rating 41%

DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES

AGED 16-39
No significant differences noted

AGED 40-64
No significant differences noted

AGED 65+
No significant differences noted

No significant differences noted