

COMMUNITRAK™ SURVEY

PUBLIC PERCEPTIONS AND INTERPRETATIONS OF COUNCIL SERVICES AND REPRESENTATION

PREPARED AS PART OF THE PUBLIC FEEDBACK PROGRAMME FOR:

WHAKATĀNE DISTRICT COUNCIL

JUNE 2018



**National Research Bureau Ltd
PO Box 10118, Mt Eden, Auckland, New Zealand
P (09) 6300 655, www.nrb.co.nz**

CONTENTS

Page No.

A.	SITUATION AND OBJECTIVES	1
B.	COMMUNITRAK™ SPECIFICATIONS	2
C.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	6
D.	MAIN FINDINGS.....	25
1.	Council Services/Facilities.....	26
a.	Satisfaction With Council Services And Facilities	27
i.	Parks And Reserves.....	27
ii.	Sportsfields	30
iii.	Street Lighting.....	33
iv.	Public Toilets	36
v.	Footpaths	39
vi.	Libraries In The District Overall.....	42
vii.	Stormwater Services.....	46
viii.	Sewerage System	49
ix.	Whakatāne Crematorium Facility	52
x.	Cemeteries Overall, Including Maintenance Of Cemeteries.....	55
xi.	Harbour Facilities, Including The Port And The Surrounding Environment.....	58
xii.	Control Of Dogs.....	61
xiii.	Noise Control	65
xiv.	Tourism Promotion (efforts Council makes to attract visitors or tourists to the area).....	68
xv.	Efforts To Enable And Promote Events	71
xvi.	Parking In Whakatāne	74
xvii.	Whakatāne Exhibition Centre (this includes the galleries and museum display at LEC/Te Koputu).....	77
xviii.	Efforts To Manage The Whakatāne Airport.....	80
xix.	Public Halls	83
xx.	Kerbside Waste Collection Service (this includes rubbish, recycling and green waste).....	86
xxi.	Refuse Transfer Station Facilities.....	89
xxii.	Walking And Cycling Facilities In The District.....	92
xxiii.	Playgrounds	95
xxiv.	Public Swimming Pools.....	98
xxv.	Water Supply	101
xxvi.	Roads (excluding State Highways 2 and 30).....	107
xxvii.	Business Promotion.....	113
b.	Spend Emphasis On Services/Facilities	117
c.	Spend Priority For Services/Facilities	119
2.	Council Policy And Direction.....	120
a.	Recent Actions, Decisions Or Management Approve Of.....	121
b.	Recent Council Actions, Decisions Or Management Residents Disapprove Of.....	125

CONTENTS (continued)

	Page No.
3. Contact With Council.....	129
a. Contacted Councillor Or Mayor In Last 12 Months?.....	130
b. Contacted A Community Board Member In The Last 12 Months?.....	132
c. Front Desk Staff	134
i. Contact?	134
ii. Level Of Satisfaction	136
4. Information.....	138
a. Types Of Published Information Residents Have Seen Or Read In The Last 12 Months.....	139
b. The Sufficiency Of The Information Supplied	141
c. Online Services And Information	143
d. Participation In Council Community Engagement Processes.....	145
e. Whakatāne Ki Mua - Community Vision Project	148
5. Local Issues.....	150
a. Council Consultation And Community Involvement	151
i. Satisfaction With The Way Council Consults The Public In The Decisions It Makes	151
b. Perception Of Safety	153
c. Quality Of Life.....	155
6. Representation	157
a. Performance Rating Of The Mayor And Councillors In The Last Year.....	158
b. Performance Rating Of Community Board Members In The Last Year.....	161
c. Performance Rating Of The Council Staff In The Last Year.....	163
E. APPENDIX	165

NB: Please note the following explanations for this report:

Figures that are comparably lower than percentages for other respondent types.

Figures that are comparably higher than percentages for other respondent types.

Arrows, whenever shown, depict a directional trend.

Please note that unusual or one-off occurrences, such as climatic events, can affect ratings.

In general, where bases are small (<30), no comparisons have been made. For small bases, the estimates of results are not statistically reliable due to the high margins of error.

Icons used in this report made by Freepik from www.flaticon.com

A. SITUATION AND OBJECTIVES

The vision for Whakatāne District Council reads:

To be known as the place of choice for people to live, work or play.

Council has engaged a variety of approaches, both to seeking public opinion and to communicating its decisions and programmes to the people resident in the area. One of these approaches was to commission the National Research Bureau's Communitrak™ survey in May/June 2014, May/June 2015, May/June 2016, June 2017 and June 2018.

Communitrak™ determines how well Council is performing in terms of services / facilities offered and representation given to its citizens.

The advantages and benefits are that Council has the National Average and Peer Group Average comparisons against which, where applicable, they can analyse perceived performance in Whakatāne District.

* * * * *

B. COMMUNITRAK™ SPECIFICATIONS

Sample Size

This Communitrak™ survey was conducted with 300 residents of the Whakatāne District.

The survey is framed on the basis of the Community Boards, as the elected representatives are associated with a particular Community Board.

Interviews were spread across the five Community Boards as follows:

Whakatāne	131
Ōhope Beach	30
Rangitāiki	78
Tāneatua	30
Murupara	31
Total	<u>300</u>

Interview Type

Interviewing was conducted mainly by telephone, with calls being made between 4.30pm and 8.30pm on weekdays and 9.30am and 8.30pm weekends.

Sample Selection

The white pages of the telephone directory were used as the sample source, with every "xth" number being selected; that is, each residential (non-business) number selected was chosen in a systematic, randomised way (in other words, at a regular interval), in order to spread the numbers chosen in an even way across all relevant phone book pages.

Quota sampling was used to ensure an even balance of male and female respondents, with the sample also stratified according to Community Board. Sample sizes for each Community Board were predetermined to ensure a sufficient number of respondents within each Community Board, so that analysis could be conducted on a Community Board-by-Community Board basis.

A target of interviewing 90 residents aged 18 to 44 years was also set.

This year, nine interviews were done face-to-face in the Whakatāne Ward with residents aged 18-44 years as this group, in particular, is increasingly difficult to obtain over the phone.

Households were screened to ensure they fell within the Whakatāne District Council's geographical boundaries.

Respondent Selection

Respondent selection within the household was also randomised, with the eligible person being the man/woman normally resident in the household, aged 18 years or over, who had the next birthday.

Call Backs

Three call backs, ie, four calls in all, were made to a residence before the number was replaced in the sample. Call backs were made on a different day or, in the case of a weekend, during a different time period, ie, at least four hours later.

Sample Weighting

Weightings were applied to the sample data, to reflect the actual Community Board, gender and age group proportions in the area as determined by Statistics New Zealand 2013 Census data. The result is that the total figures represent the adult population's viewpoint as a whole across the entire Whakatāne District. Bases for subsamples are shown in the Appendix.

Where we specify a "base", we are referring to the actual number of respondents interviewed.

Survey Dates

All interviews were conducted from Friday 1 June to Sunday 17 June (excluding Queen's Birthday) 2018.

Comparison Data

Communitrak™ offers to Councils the opportunity to compare their performance with those of Local Authorities across all of New Zealand as a whole (National Average) and with similarly constituted Local Authorities (Peer Group Average), through a National Survey of 1,000 residents carried out in July 2016.

The Communitrak™ service provides ...

- comparisons with a national sample of 1,000 interviews conducted in July 2016 (the National Average),
- comparisons with other provincial Council norms (the Peer Group Average).

Where comment has been made regarding respondents more or less likely to represent a particular opinion or response, the comparison has been made between respondents in each socio-economic group, and not between each socio-economic group and the total.

Weightings have been applied to this comparison data to reflect the actual adult population in Local Authorities as determined by Statistics NZ 2013 Census data.

Comparisons With National Communitrak™ Results

Where survey results have been compared with Peer Group and/or National Average results from the July 2016 National Communitrak™ Survey, NRB has used the following for comparative purposes, for a sample of 300 residents:

above/below	±8% or more
slightly above/below	±6% to 7%
on par with	±3% to 5%
similar to	±1% to 2%

Margin Of Error

The survey is a quota sample, designed to cover the important variables within the population. Therefore, we are making the assumption that it is appropriate to use the error estimates that would apply to a simple random sample of the population.

The following margins of error are based on a simple random sample. The maximum likely error limits occur when a reported percentage is 50%, but more often than not the reported percentage is different, and margins of error for other reported percentages are shown below. The margin of error approaches 0% as a reported percentage approaches either 100% or 0%.

Margins of error rounded to the nearest whole percentage, at the 95 percent level of confidence, for different sample sizes and reported percentages are:

Sample Size	Reported Percentage				
	50%	60% or 40%	70% or 30%	80% or 20%	90% or 10%
500	±4%	±4%	±4%	±4%	±3%
450	±4%	±4%	±4%	±4%	±3%
400	±5%	±5%	±5%	±4%	±3%
300	±6%	±6%	±5%	±5%	±3%
200	±7%	±7%	±6%	±6%	±4%

The margin of error figures above refer to the **accuracy** of a result in a survey, given a 95 percent level of confidence. A 95 percent level of confidence implies that if 100 samples were taken, we would expect the margin of error to contain the true value in all but five samples. At the 95 percent level of confidence, the margin of error for a sample of 300 respondents, at a reported percentage of 50%, is plus or minus 6%.

Response Rate

The response rate for the 2018 Whakatāne District Council was **58%**, which is much higher than seen typically in web or mail-out surveys (often in the 5%-30% range). With a decreasing response rate there is an increasing likelihood that the sample is less and less representative of the District.

Significant Difference

This is a test to determine if the difference in a result between two separate surveys is significant. Significant differences rounded to the nearest whole percentage, at the 95 percent level of confidence, for different sample sizes and midpoints are:

Sample Size	Midpoint				
	50%	60% or 40%	70% or 30%	80% or 20%	90% or 10%
500	6%	6%	6%	5%	4%
450	7%	7%	6%	6%	4%
400	7%	7%	6%	6%	4%
300	8%	8%	7%	6%	5%
200	10%	10%	9%	8%	6%

The figures above refer to the difference between two results that is required, in order to say that the difference is significant, given a 95 percent level of confidence. Thus the significant difference, for the same question, between two separate surveys of 300 respondents is 8%, given a 95 percent level of confidence, where the midpoint of the two results is 50%.

Please note that while the Communitrak™ survey report is, of course, available to residents, the Mayor and Councillors, and Council staff, it is not available to research or other companies to use or leverage in any way for commercial purposes.

* * * * *



C. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report summarises the opinions and attitudes of Whakatāne District Council residents and ratepayers to the services and facilities provided for them by their Council and their elected representatives.

The Whakatāne District Council commissioned Communitrak™ as a means of measuring their effectiveness in representing the wishes and viewpoints of their residents. Understanding residents' and ratepayers' opinions and needs will allow Council to be more responsive towards its citizens.

Communitrak™ provides a comparison for Council on major issues, on their performance relative to the performance of their Peer Group of similarly constituted Local Authorities, to Local Authorities on average throughout New Zealand.

SNAPSHOT




91% of residents are satisfied with kerbside waste collection services.



Whilst 34% are not very satisfied with stormwater services.



68% of residents say that Council provides more than enough/enough information to the community.




94% of residents feel Whakatāne District is definitely/mostly a safe place to live.


SERVICES

a. Satisfaction Measures For Council Services And Facilities

Percent Saying They Are Not Very Satisfied With ...



Very Satisfied With ...



Summary Table: Satisfaction With Services/Facilities - Comparison

	Whakatāne 2018		Whakatāne 2017	
	Very/Fairly satisfied %	Not very satisfied %	Very/Fairly satisfied %	Not very satisfied %
Kerbside waste collection service	91 =	7 =	90	7
Parks & reserves	90 =	7 =	89	7
Council roads overall	86 =	13 =	85	15
Safety of Council roads	84 =	15 =	85	15
Sportsfields	82 =	5 =	85	5
Libraries in the District	81 =	3 =	84	3
Playgrounds	81 =	7 =	84	8
Walking & cycling facilities in the District	79 ↓	13 =	86	9
Water supply overall	77 =	10 =	75	13
Harbour facilities	77 =	13 =	78	9
Parking in Whakatāne	77 =	21 =	73	23
Footpaths	75 =	20 =	72	24
Public swimming pools	74 =	10 =	77	7
Whakatāne Exhibition Centre	73 =	5 =	73	5
Refuse transfer station facilities**	72 ↓	9 =	86	8
Efforts to enable & promote events†	72 =	19 =	72	14
Tourism promotion	71 =	21 =	71	16
Street lighting	70 ↓	22 =	76	17
Public halls	70 =	10 =	73	8
Dog control	69 =	22 =	73	20
Cemeteries overall	68 ↓	3 =	74	1
Sewerage system	65 =	13 =	65	14
Noise control	64 =	8 =	66	10
Public toilets	64 ↑	23 =	58	26
Efforts to manage the Whakatāne Airport*	63 =	10 =	62	9
Quality of drinking water	62 =	28 =	62	25
Whakatāne Crematorium facility	55 ↑	3 =	47	-
Stormwater services	55 ↓	34 =	62	29
Efforts to attract & expand business [◊]	51 =	29 =	49	30

Key: ↑ above/slightly above 2017 reading
 ↓ below/slightly below 2017 reading
 = similar/on par

NB: does not show 'don't know' readings

* 2017 reading refers to 'Council's efforts to manage the Whakatāne Airport'

** 2017 reading refers to 'refuse disposal'

† 2017 reading refers to 'Council's efforts to enable & promote events'

◊ 2017 reading refers to 'Council's efforts to attract & expand business'

Overall Satisfaction with Council Services/Facilities

	Very satisfied %	Fairly satisfied %	Very/Fairly satisfied %	Not very satisfied %	Don't know / Unable to say %
Kerbside waste collection service	58	33	91	7	2
Parks and reserves	40	50	90	7	3
Council roads overall	24	62	86	13	1
Safety of Council roads	26	58	84	15	1
Sportsfields	35	47	82	5	13
Libraries in the District	55	26	81	3	16
Playgrounds [†]	45	36	81	7	13
Walking & cycling facilities in the District	42	37	79	13	8
Water supply overall	39	38	77	10	13
Harbour facilities	31	46	77	13	10
Parking in Whakatāne	32	45	77	21	2
Footpaths [†]	23	52	75	20	4
Public swimming pools	34	40	74	10	16
Whakatāne Exhibition Centre [†]	43	30	73	5	23
Refuse transfer station facilities	43	29	72	9	19
Efforts to enable & promote events	26	46	72	19	9
Tourism promotion	29	42	71	21	8
Street lighting	34	36	70	22	8
Public halls [†]	22	48	70	10	19
Dog control [†]	26	43	69	22	10
Cemeteries overall [†]	40	28	68	3	30
Sewerage system	28	37	65	13	22
Noise control	26	38	64	8	28
Public toilets	19	45	64	23	13
Efforts to manage the Whakatāne Airport	21	42	63	10	27
Quality of drinking water	28	34	62	28	10
Whakatāne Crematorium facility	33	22	55	3	42
Stormwater services	16	39	55	34	11
Business promotion	8	43	51	29	20

[†] does not add to 100% due to rounding

User/Visitor Satisfaction With Council Services/Facilities

	Base	Very satisfied %	Fairly satisfied %	Very/Fairly satisfied %	Not very satisfied %	Don't know %
Whakatāne Crematorium facility	94	66	29	95	4	1
Libraries in the District overall	201	70	24	94	2	4
Cemeteries overall	163	59	33	92	2	6
Sportsfields	168	39	53	92	5	3
Parks and reserves	246	42	50	92	6	2
Whakatāne Exhibition Centre	171	62	29	91	5	4
Public swimming pools	149	41	48	89	10	1
Playgrounds	172	49	38	87	8	5
Refuse transfer station facilities	186	55	30	85	11	4
Public halls	176	31	50	81	13	6
Public toilets	220	22	50	72	26	2

Service Provided - Satisfaction With Council Services/Facilities

	Base	Very satisfied %	Fairly satisfied %	Very/Fairly satisfied %	Not very satisfied %	Don't know %
Kerbside waste collection services	276	60	33	93	6	1
Water supply overall [†]	217	46	44	90	9	2
Sewerage system [†]	183	40	47	87	10	4
Quality of drinking water [†]	217	32	40	72	26	1
Stormwater services	181	20	47	67	30	3

Contacted Council - Satisfaction With Council Services/Facilities

	Base	Very satisfied %	Fairly satisfied %	Very/Fairly satisfied %	Not very satisfied %	Don't know %
Dog control [†]	63	28	40	68	29	2
Noise control*	25	23	33	56	39	5

NB: for the following services/facilities only **overall** results are available (see page 10): Council roads overall, safety of roads, walking and cycling facilities, harbour facilities, street lighting, footpaths, parking in Whakatāne, tourism promotion, Council's efforts to enable and promote events, Council's efforts to manage the Whakatāne Airport and Council's efforts to attract and retain residents and business promotion.

* caution: small base

[†] does not add to 100% due to rounding

The percent not very satisfied in Whakatāne District is **higher/slightly higher** than the Peer Group and/or National Averages for ...

	Whakatāne %	Peer Group %	National Average %
• stormwater services	34	16	14
• public toilets	23	19	17
• street lighting	22	14	14
• tourism promotion	21	14	16
• sewerage system	13	7	6

The percent not very satisfied in Whakatāne District is **lower** than the Peer Group and National Averages for ...

• parking in Whakatāne	21	31	42
• roads	13	31	25
• refuse transfer station facilities	9	18	17

The comparison for the following show Whakatāne **on par with/similar to** the Peer Group and/or the National Averages for ...

• business promotion	29	28	24
• dog control	22	23	19
• footpaths	20	25	23
• water supply overall	10	11	9
• public halls	10	5	7
• public swimming pools	10	9	8
• noise control	8	5	10
• playgrounds	7	**6	**5
• kerbside waste collection service	7	*12	*12
• parks and reserves	7	2	4
• sportsfields	5	**6	**5
• libraries in the District overall	3	1	3
• cemeteries overall	3	2	4

* these percentages are the averaged ratings for rubbish collection **and** recycling as these were asked separately in the 2016 National Communitrak™ Survey

** these percentages are the readings for sportsfields **and** playgrounds

b. Frequency Of Use - Council Services And Facilities

	Used/ Visited In Last Year	
	Yes %	No %
Park and reserve	87	13
Public toilet	76	24
District library	69	31
Public playground	66	34
Public sportsfield	64	36
Transfer station facility	63	37
Public hall	61	39
Whakatāne Exhibition Centre	60	40
Public swimming pool	59	41
Cemetery in the District	55	45
Whakatāne Crematorium facility	33	67
Contacted Council about dogs	25	75
Contacted Council about noise	9	91

% read across

Parks and reserves, 87%,

Public toilets, 76% and,

District library, 69%,

... are the facilities or services surveyed which have been most frequently used by residents or other members of their household, in the last year.

c. Spend Emphasis On Services/Facilities

	Spend More
Business promotion	50% of all residents
Tourism promotion	44%
Council's efforts to enable and promote events	38%
Walking and cycling facilities in the District	37%
Public toilets	34%
Council roads in the District	31%
Harbour facilities	31%
Stormwater services	30%
Water supply	29%
Dog control	28%
Parking in Whakatāne	28%
Street lighting	27%
Whakatāne Airport	26%
Public swimming pools	25%
Footpaths	25%
Public halls	19%
Sewerage system	18%
Playgrounds	16%
District libraries overall	15%
Parks and reserves	14%
Sportsfields	11%
Kerbside waste collection service	8%
Noise control	8%

Spend Priority: In 2018, business promotion, stormwater services and tourism promotion are the top priorities for Council in terms of spend.

(spend priority = mean spend x percentage not very satisfied)

COUNCIL POLICY AND DIRECTION

It is important for Council to understand where public sentiment presently lies in terms of Council policy and direction. Council is, of course, not forced to adopt the most “popular” policies or direction. Rather, through understanding where people’s opinions and attitudes lie, Council is able to embark on information, education, persuasion or communication strategies on particular topics if it is felt necessary to **lead** the public to fulfil Council’s legitimate community leadership role.

40% of Whakatāne District residents have in mind a recent Council action, decision or management they **approve** of (47% in 2017). This is below the Peer Group Average and slightly below the National Average.

The main actions/decisions/management mentioned are ...

Māori Wards	5%
parks/reserves/playgrounds/recreation areas	5%
positive comments about Mayor	5%
walkways/river walks/cycleways	4%
Council do a good job/good service	4%
handling of Edgecumbe floods/good response/support	4%
good communication/keep us informed/ involvement with community	4%
appearance of town/beautification/improvements	4%
promotion of area/tourism	4%

47% of residents have in mind a recent Council action, decision or management they **disapprove** of (52% in 2017). This is on par with the Peer Group Average and similar to the National Average.

The main actions/decisions/management mentioned are ...

roading/traffic/footpaths	5%
water supply issues	5%
Wairaka Park playground and pool	5%
Council performance/service	4%
lack of communication/information/consultation/don't listen	4%
wasting ratepayers' money/overspending	4%


CONTACT WITH COUNCIL

23% of residents have contacted a Councillor or the Mayor in the last 12 months (26% in 2017), while 10% have contacted a member of a Community Board (15% in 2017).

58% of residents have contacted the customer service front desk staff by phone and/or in person, in the last 12 months (64% in 2017).

Satisfaction With The Overall Service Received From Customer Service Front Desk Staff

Contacted Customer Service Front Desk Staff In Last 12 Months[†]




(does not add to 100% due to rounding)

[†]Base = 176


(those residents who have contacted the customer service front desk staff by phone and/or in person in last 12 months)

INFORMATION

In The Last 12 Months, Residents Have Seen/Read ...




Amount Of Information That The Council Supplies To The Community Is ...



(does not add to 100% due to rounding)

Satisfaction With Provision Of Online Services And Information



[†]Base = 259
 (90% of residents have access to the internet)
 (does not add to 100% due to rounding)

Participation In Council Community Engagement Process

In the past years residents have participated in the following community engagement processes* ...

talking to Council representative at public events	19%	of all residents
responded to a Council survey (excluding this survey)	15%	
making a formal submission online or in writing	12%	
attending a workshop or open day	11%	
participating in a user group or stakeholder forum	10%	
attended a hearing	8%	
providing feedback on Facebook	5%	
visiting Council's 'have a say' section on the website	4%	

* multiple responses allowed

60% of residents said they have not participated in any of these processes.

Preferred Process For Participating In Council's Decision Process


The most preferred methods are ...

public meetings / public forum / open forum	14%	of all residents
personal contact / face-to-face	13%	
online / internet / social media	13%	
postal notifications / write a letter	7%	

12% of residents say they have heard or been involved in the Whakatāne Ki Mua - Community Vision Project.

LOCAL ISSUES

Council Consultation And Community Involvement




(does not add to 100% due to rounding)

Perception Of Safety

Do residents feel Whakatāne District is generally a safe place to live?


Yes definitely	41% of all residents (29% in 2017)
Yes mostly	53% (64% in 2017)
Not really	5% (5% in 2017)
Definitely not	1% (1% in 2017)
Don't know	0% (1% in 2017)

Quality Of Life



REPRESENTATION


a. Performance Rating Of The Mayor And Councillors



(does not add to 100% due to rounding)

Whakatāne District is on par with the Peer Group Average and similar to the National Average, in terms of rating the Mayor and Councillors' performance as **very/fairly good**, and similar to the 2017 reading.


b. Performance Rating Of Community Board Members



(does not add to 100% due to rounding)

There are no comparative Peer Group and National Averages for this reading, however, the 2018 very good/fairly good reading is similar to the 2017 result.

c. Performance Rating Of The Council Staff



Whakatāne District is similar to the Peer Group Average and on par with the National Average and the 2017 reading, in terms of rating the performance of Council staff as **very/fairly good**.

* * * * *



D. MAIN FINDINGS

Throughout this Communitrak™ report, comparisons are made with the National Average of Local Authorities and with a Peer Group of similar Local Authorities.

For Whakatāne District Council, this Peer Group of similar Local Authorities are those comprising a provincial city or town(s), together with a rural component.

NRB has defined the **Provincial Peer Group** as those Territorial Authorities where from 66% to 91% of dwellings are in urban meshblocks, as classified by Statistics New Zealand's 2013 Census data.

In this group are ...

Ashburton District Council
 Gisborne District Council
 Gore District Council
 Grey District Council
 Hastings District Council
 Horowhenua District Council
 Marlborough District Council
 Masterton District Council
 New Plymouth District Council

Queenstown Lakes District Council
 Rotorua Lakes Council
 South Waikato District Council
 Taupo District Council
 Thames Coromandel District Council
 Timaru District Council
 Waipa District Council
 Whangarei District Council

The population density in all these Council areas is relatively similar.

2013 survey not conducted by NRB. In 2013 respondents were asked to rank their level of satisfaction from 0-10, with 0 being very dissatisfied and 10 being very satisfied.

To allow comparison between the two surveys the following analogy has been made:

Very satisfied / fairly satisfied = 6-10
 Not very satisfied = 0-5




1. COUNCIL SERVICES/FACILITIES

A. SATISFACTION WITH COUNCIL SERVICES AND FACILITIES

Residents were read out a number of Council functions and asked whether they are very satisfied, fairly satisfied or not very satisfied with the provision of that service or facility.

i. Parks And Reserves



90% of Whakatāne District residents are satisfied with their parks and reserves, including 40% who are very satisfied (37% in 2017), while 7% are not very satisfied with these facilities.

The percent not very satisfied is on par with the Peer Group and National Averages and similar to the 2017 result.

87% of households have used/visited parks or reserves in the last 12 months. 92% of these "users/visitors" are satisfied, with 6% not very satisfied.

There are no notable differences between Community Boards and between socio-economic groups, in terms of those residents not very satisfied with their parks and reserves.


Satisfaction With Parks And Reserves

		Very satisfied %	Fairly satisfied %	Very/Fairly satisfied %	Not very satisfied %	Don't know %
Overall						
Total District	2018	40	50	90	7	3
	2017	37	52	89	7	4
	2016 [†]	45	45	90	7	4
	2015 [†]	45	45	90	7	2
	2014	36	50	86	10	4
Users/Visitors	2018	42	50	92	6	2
	2017	40	52	92	6	2
	2016	49	42	91	7	2
	2015 [†]	49	45	94	6	1
	2014	39	50	89	10	1
Comparison						
Peer Group (Provincial)		67	28	95	2	3
National Average [†]		59	34	93	4	2
Community Board						
Whakatāne		43	49	92	6	2
Ōhope Beach		52	26	78	16	6
Rangitāiki		41	53	94	3	3
Tāneatua		28	60	88	10	2
Murupara [†]		21	62	83	12	6
Area						
Urban		42	48	90	8	2
Rural		38	53	91	6	3

% read across


[†] does not add to 100% due to rounding

Parks And Reserves



Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:
 Total District = 90%
 Users / Visitors = 92%

ii. Sportsfields



82% of residents are satisfied with their local sportsfields (85% in 2017), including 35% who are very satisfied, while 5% are not very satisfied with these facilities. 13% are unable to comment (10% in 2017).

The percent not very satisfied is similar to the Peer Group and National Averages for **sportsfields and playgrounds** and the 2017 reading.

64% of households have used / visited a public sportsfield in the last 12 months and of these "users / visitors", 92% are satisfied, and 5% not very satisfied.

There are no notable differences between Community Boards and between socio-economic groups, in terms of those residents not very satisfied with sportsfields. However, it appears that NZ Māori residents are slightly more likely to feel this way, than NZ European residents.

Satisfaction With Sportsfields


		Very satisfied %	Fairly satisfied %	Very/Fairly satisfied %	Not very satisfied %	Don't know %
Overall						
Total District	2018	35	47	82	5	13
	2017	36	49	85	5	10
	2016	39	45	84	4	12
	2015 [†]	42	44	86	7	8
	2014	49	33	82	5	13
Users/Visitors	2018	39	53	92	5	3
	2017	44	46	90	7	3
	2016	44	46	90	4	6
	2015	48	43	91	7	2
	2014	40	50	90	6	4
Comparison*						
	Peer Group (Provincial) [†]	59	28	87	6	8
	National Average	56	32	88	5	7
Community Board						
	Whakatāne [†]	40	42	82	6	13
	Ōhope Beach [†]	35	38	73	4	24
	Rangitāiki	38	51	89	1	10
	Tāneatua	25	56	81	10	9
	Murupara [†]	11	63	74	11	16
Area						
	Urban	37	44	81	5	14
	Rural	31	53	84	5	11
Ethnicity						
	NZ European	34	48	82	3	15
	NZ Māori [†]	30	51	81	12	6

% read across

* these figures are based on the ratings of sportsfields **and** playgrounds

[†] does not add to 100% due to rounding

Sportsfields




Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:

Total District = 82%

Users/Visitors = 92%

iii. Street Lighting



70% of Whakatāne residents are satisfied with street lighting (76% in 2017), including 34% who are very satisfied, while 22% are not very satisfied (17% in 2017). 8% are unable to comment.

The percent not very satisfied is above the Peer Group and National Averages.

Residents more likely to be not very satisfied with street lighting are ...

- NZ Māori residents,
- residents aged 18 to 64 years,
- residents with an annual household income of \$40,000 to \$70,000.

Satisfaction With Street Lighting


	Very satisfied %	Fairly satisfied %	Very/Fairly satisfied %	Not very satisfied %	Don't know %
Overall*					
Total District 2018	34	36	70	22	8
2017	32	44	76	17	7
2016	34	40	74	17	9
2015	32	45	77	13	10
2014	29	43	72	17	12
Comparison					
Peer Group (Provincial)	39	37	76	14	10
National Average [†]	39	42	81	14	6
Community Board					
Whakatāne	37	43	80	19	1
Ōhope Beach	48	18	66	30	4
Rangitāiki	32	32	64	22	14
Tāneatua	18	41	59	26	15
Murupara [†]	25	27	52	29	20
Area					
Urban	39	38	77	22	1
Rural	25	34	59	22	19
Ethnicity					
NZ European [†]	40	37	77	14	10
NZ Māori	19	31	50	46	4
Age					
18-44 years	30	39	69	29	2
45-64 years	34	29	63	22	15
65+ years	41	44	85	9	6
Household Income					
Less than \$40,000 pa [†]	33	45	78	16	7
\$40,000-\$70,000 pa [†]	26	34	60	36	5
More than \$70,000 pa	42	34	76	19	5

% read across

* 2013 adequate street lighting scores 6-10 = 68%, scores 0-5 = 24%


[†] does not add to 100% due to rounding

Street Lighting



Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:
Total District = 70%

iv. Public Toilets



64% of residents are satisfied with public toilets in the District (58% in 2017), while 23% are not very satisfied and 13% are unable to comment (16% in 2017).

The percent not very satisfied is on par with the Peer Group Average, slightly above the National Average and on par with the 2017 reading.

76% of households have used a public toilet in the last 12 months (79% in 2017). Of these, 72% are satisfied (66% in 2017) and 26% are not very satisfied (29% in 2017).

There are no notable differences between Community Board residents and between socio-economic groups, in terms of those residents not very satisfied with public toilets. However, it appears that NZ Māori residents are slightly more likely to feel this way, than NZ European residents.


Satisfaction With Public Toilets

		Very satisfied %	Fairly satisfied %	Very/Fairly satisfied %	Not very satisfied %	Don't know %
Overall						
Total District	2018	19	45	64	23	13
	2017	14	44	58	26	16
	2016	15	46	61	24	15
	2015 [†]	18	42	60	24	17
	2014	18	41	59	23	18
Users/Visitors	2018	22	50	72	26	2
	2017	18	48	66	29	5
	2016 [†]	18	54	72	25	2
	2015 [†]	21	48	69	25	5
	2014	22	49	71	24	5
Comparison						
Peer Group (Provincial)		32	37	69	19	12
National Average		26	41	67	17	16
Community Board						
Whakatāne		17	43	60	25	15
Ōhope Beach		29	33	62	24	14
Rangitāiki		18	58	76	17	7
Tāneatua		19	46	65	20	15
Murupara		24	18	42	38	20
Area						
Urban		20	42	62	24	14
Rural		17	50	67	22	11
Ethnicity						
NZ European		18	46	64	21	15
NZ Māori		22	37	59	32	9

% read across

[†] does not add to 100% due to rounding

Public Toilets




Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:

Total District = 64%

Users = 72%

v. Footpaths



75% of Whakatāne residents are satisfied with footpaths in their District, while 20% are not very satisfied.

The percent not very satisfied is on par with the Peer Group and National Averages and the 2017 reading.

There are no notable differences between Community Boards and between socio-economic groups, in terms of those residents not very satisfied with footpaths. However, it appears that the following residents are slightly more likely to feel this way ...

- women,
- residents aged 45 years or over,
- longer term residents, those residing in the District more than 10 years.


Satisfaction With Footpaths

	Very satisfied %	Fairly satisfied %	Very/Fairly satisfied %	Not very satisfied %	Don't know %
Overall					
Total District 2018 [†]	23	52	75	20	4
2017 [†]	20	52	72	24	5
2016	24	47	71	25	4
2015	25	47	72	25	3
2014 [†]	21	50	71	24	6
Comparison					
Peer Group (Provincial)	20	47	67	25	8
National Average	23	49	72	23	5
Community Board					
Whakatāne [†]	28	50	78	20	1
Ōhope Beach	37	43	80	20	-
Rangitāiki	19	56	75	19	6
Tāneatua [†]	9	56	65	23	13
Murupara	10	58	68	23	9
Area					
Urban	28	50	78	22	-
Rural	14	56	70	19	11
Gender[†]					
Male	20	59	79	16	6
Female	25	47	72	24	3
Age					
18-44 years	23	60	83	13	4
45-64 years	24	45	69	24	7
65+ years [†]	19	51	70	29	2
Length of Residence					
Lived there 10 years or less	35	50	85	12	3
Lived there more than 10 years	20	53	73	22	5

% read across

[†] does not add to 100% due to rounding


Footpaths




Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:
Total District = 75%

vi. Libraries In The District Overall

Overall




Users/Visitors



Base = 201

Mainly Use Whakatāne Library



Base = 176

81% of residents are satisfied with libraries in the District overall (84% in 2017), including 55% who are very satisfied (51% in 2017). 3% are not very satisfied and 16% are unable to comment (13% in 2017).

The percent not very satisfied is similar to the Peer Group and National Averages and the 2017 reading.

69% of households have used or visited a District library in the last 12 months (72% in 2017). Of these, 94% are satisfied and 2% not very satisfied.

89% of library users / visitors have many used / visited the Whakatāne Library. Of these, 95% are satisfied and 1% not very satisfied.

There are no notable differences between Community Boards and between socio-economic groups, in terms of those residents not very satisfied with public libraries. However, it appears that Rural residents, are slightly more likely to feel this way, than Urban residents.

Satisfaction With Libraries In The District Overall


		Very satisfied %	Fairly satisfied %	Very/Fairly satisfied %	Not very satisfied %	Don't know %
Overall*						
Total District	2018	55	26	81	3	16
	2017	51	33	84	3	13
	2016	61	18	79	3	18
	2015	58	24	82	2	16
	2014	42	24	66	5	29
Users/Visitors	2018	70	24	94	2	4
	2017 [†]	59	36	95	4	2
	2016	76	16	92	3	5
	2015 [†]	69	23	92	2	7
	2014	57	28	85	8	7
Whakatāne Library Users		74	21	95	1	4
Comparison						
Peer Group (Provincial)		69	17	86	1	13
National Average		69	17	86	3	11
Community Board						
Whakatāne		66	25	91	-	9
Ōhope Beach		78	13	91	-	9
Rangitāiki		44	28	72	7	21
Tāneatua		48	10	58	7	35
Murupara [†]		20	53	73	6	20
Area						
Urban		63	25	88	-	12
Rural		43	26	69	8	23

% read across

* in 2014 also asked satisfaction with Library and Exhibition Centre

[†] does not add to 100% due to rounding

Library In The District Overall




* in 2014 also asked satisfaction with Library and Exhibition Centre

Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:

Total District	=	81%
Users/Visitors	=	94%
Whakatāne Library Users/Visitors	=	95%

vii. Stormwater Services



55% of residents are satisfied with stormwater services (62% in 2017), while 34% are not very satisfied and 11% are unable to comment.

The percent not very satisfied is above the Peer Group and National Averages, and 5% above the 2017 reading.

60% of residents are provided with a piped stormwater collection and, of these, 67% are satisfied (74% in 2017) and 30% are not very satisfied (26% in 2017).

Residents more likely to be not very satisfied with stormwater services are ...

- Rural residents,
- women,
- residents aged 18 to 64 years,
- NZ Māori residents.

It also appears that Murupara Community Board residents are **slightly less** likely to feel this way, than other Community Board residents.

Satisfaction With Stormwater Services


		Very satisfied %	Fairly satisfied %	Very/Fairly satisfied %	Not very satisfied %	Don't know %
Overall*						
Total District	2018	16	39	55	34	11
	2017 [†]	16	46	62	29	10
	2016	15	44	59	32	9
	2015	16	37	53	36	11
	2014	10	34	44	43	13
Service Provided	2018	20	47	67	30	3
	2017 [†]	21	53	74	26	1
	2016 [†]	20	49	69	29	3
	2015	20	41	61	36	3
	2014	14	39	53	45	2
Comparison						
Peer Group (Provincial)		37	32	69	16	15
National Average		36	39	75	14	11
Community Board						
Whakatāne		23	43	66	31	3
Ōhope Beach		20	44	64	33	3
Rangitāiki [†]		7	34	41	41	19
Tāneatua		8	28	36	49	15
Murupara		14	46	60	16	24
Area						
Urban		22	46	68	29	3
Rural [†]		7	28	35	43	23
Gender						
Male		15	44	59	29	12
Female		17	35	52	39	9
Age						
18-44 years		14	42	56	37	7
45-64 years [†]		16	33	49	37	15
65+ years [†]		21	44	65	24	10
Ethnicity						
NZ European		17	40	57	30	13
NZ Māori [†]		10	38	48	47	6

% read across

* 2013 scores 6-10 = 50%, scores 0-5 = 32%


[†] does not add to 100% due to rounding

Stormwater Services



Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:
 Total District = 55%
 Service Provided = 67%

viii. Sewerage System



65% of residents are satisfied with the District's sewerage system, including 28% who are very satisfied (25% in 2017), while 13% are not very satisfied and 22% are unable to comment.

The percent not very satisfied is slightly above the Peer Group and the National Averages and similar to the 2017 reading.

59% of residents are provided with a sewerage system (62% in 2017). Of these, 87% are satisfied and 10% are not very satisfied.

NZ Māori residents are more likely to be not very satisfied with the sewerage system, than NZ European residents. It also appears that Rural residents are slightly more likely, than Urban residents, to feel this way.


Satisfaction With Sewerage System

		Very satisfied %	Fairly satisfied %	Very/Fairly satisfied %	Not very satisfied %	Don't know %
Overall						
Total District	2018	28	37	65	13	22
	2017	25	40	65	14	21
	2016	28	44	72	8	20
	2015	26	40	66	12	22
	2014	22	42	64	10	26
Service Provided	2018 [†]	40	47	87	10	4
	2017	37	49	86	13	1
	2016	39	52	91	6	3
	2015	34	49	83	12	5
	2014 [†]	34	58	92	8	1
Comparison						
Peer Group (Provincial)		46	26	72	7	21
National Average		48	33	81	6	13
Community Board						
Whakatāne		39	47	86	9	5
Ōhope Beach		51	35	86	9	5
Rangitāiki [†]		13	29	42	17	42
Tāneatua [†]		23	17	40	26	35
Murupara		6	35	41	17	42
Area						
Urban		39	46	85	10	5
Rural		10	22	32	19	49
Ethnicity						
NZ European		32	32	64	11	25
NZ Māori		18	46	64	24	12

% read across


[†] does not add to 100% due to rounding

Sewerage System



Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:
Total District = 65%
Service Provided = 87%

ix. Whakatāne Crematorium Facility



55% of residents are satisfied with the Whakatāne Crematorium facility (47% in 2017), including 33% who are very satisfied (25% in 2017), while 3% are not very satisfied.

A large percentage, 42%, are unable to comment (53% in 2017) and this is probably due to only 33% of residents saying they, or a member of their household, have visited the Whakatāne Crematorium facility in the last 12 months (26% in 2017). Of these 'visitors', 95% are satisfied.

There are no comparative Peer Group and National Average readings for this facility, however the not very satisfied reading is on par with last year's findings.

There are no notable differences between Community Board residents and between socio-economic groups, in terms of those residents who are not very satisfied with Whakatāne Crematorium facility.


Satisfaction With Whakatāne Crematorium Facility

		Very satisfied %	Fairly satisfied %	Very/Fairly satisfied %	Not very satisfied %	Don't know %
Overall						
Total District	2018	33	22	55	3	42
	2017	25	22	47	-	53
	2016	30	19	49	1	50
	2015	26	15	41	1	58
	2014	17	15	32	1	67
Visitor	2018	66	29	95	4	1
	2017 [†]	58	34	92	-	7
	2016 [†]	66	27	93	2	6
	2015	73	17	90	1	9
	2014	64	21	85	2	13
Community Board						
Whakatāne [†]		39	20	59	4	36
Ōhope Beach		40	18	58	-	42
Rangitāiki		29	26	55	2	43
Tāneatua		33	26	59	4	37
Murupara		13	15	28	-	72
Area[†]						
Urban		36	22	58	2	39
Rural		29	21	50	4	47

% read across

[†] does not add to 100% due to rounding

Whakatāne Crematorium Facility




Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:

Total District = 55%

Visitors = 95%

x. Cemeteries Overall, Including Maintenance Of Cemeteries



68% of residents are satisfied with cemeteries overall, including maintenance of a cemeteries (74% in 2017), with 40% being very satisfied. 3% are not very satisfied and a large percentage 30% are unable to comment (25% in 2017).

The percent not very satisfied is similar to the Peer Group and the National Averages and the 2017 reading.

55% of households have visited a cemetery in the last 12 months, and of these 92% are satisfied and 2% not very satisfied.

There are no notable differences between Community Board residents and between socio-economic groups, in terms of those residents who are not very satisfied with cemeteries.


Satisfaction With Cemeteries Overall, Including Maintenance Of Cemeteries

		Very satisfied %	Fairly satisfied %	Very/Fairly satisfied %	Not very satisfied %	Don't know %
Overall						
Total District	2018 [†]	40	28	68	3	30
	2017	43	31	74	1	25
	2016	49	27	76	2	22
	2015 [†]	47	26	73	1	27
	2014 [†]	43	25	68	1	30
Visitors	2018	59	33	92	2	6
	2017	60	37	97	2	1
	2016	67	29	96	2	2
	2015	59	35	94	1	5
	2014	65	25	90	2	8
Comparison						
Peer Group (Provincial)		57	26	83	2	15
National Average [†]		41	30	71	4	24
Community Board						
Whakatāne		49	24	73	3	24
Ōhope Beach		40	14	54	-	46
Rangitāiki [†]		35	29	64	5	32
Tāneatua		31	42	73	-	27
Murupara		18	42	60	-	40
Area[†]						
Urban		44	28	72	3	26
Rural		33	28	61	2	36

% read across

[†] does not add to 100% due to rounding

Cemeteries Overall




Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:

Total District = 68%

Visitors = 92%

xi. Harbour Facilities, Including The Port And The Surrounding Environment



77% of residents are satisfied with harbour facilities, including 31% who are very satisfied (34% in 2017). 13% are not very satisfied and 10% are unable to comment (13% in 2017).

There are no comparative Peer Group and National Averages for this reading, however the not very satisfied reading is on par with the 2017 result.

There are no notable differences between Community Boards and between socio-economic groups, in terms of those residents not very satisfied with harbour facilities.


Satisfaction With Harbour Facilities

	Very satisfied %	Fairly satisfied %	Very/Fairly satisfied %	Not very satisfied %	Don't know %
Overall*					
Total District 2018	31	46	77	13	10
2017	34	44	78	9	13
2016	33	42	75	13	12
2015	42	33	75	13	12
2014	34	39	73	12	15
Community Board					
Whakatāne	36	41	77	14	9
Ōhope Beach	33	36	69	22	9
Rangitāiki†	22	56	78	16	7
Tāneatua	39	49	88	1	11
Murupara	24	49	73	1	26
Area					
Urban	37	42	79	13	8
Rural	22	52	74	13	13



% read across

* 2013 harbour facilities Whakatāne CBD (users) scores 6-10 = 93%, scores 0-5 = 6%


† does not add to 100% due to rounding

Harbour Facilities

Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:
Total District = 77%

*xii. Control Of Dogs**Overall**Contacted Council*

Base = 63

Dog Owners

Base = 122

69% of residents express satisfaction with the dog control (73% in 2017), while 22% are not very satisfied with this service. 10% are unable to comment (7% in 2017).

The percent not very satisfied is similar to the Peer Group Average and the 2017 reading and on par with the National Average.

25% of households have contacted Council regarding dog control in the last 12 months (28% in 2017) and of these, 68% are satisfied, and 29% are not very satisfied.

43% of households have a dog, and of these 74% are satisfied and 17% not very satisfied.

Residents with an annual household income of \$40,000 to \$70,000 are more likely to be not very satisfied with dog control, than other income groups. It also appears that Urban residents are slightly more likely to feel this way, than Rural residents.


Satisfaction With Control Of Dogs

		Very satisfied %	Fairly satisfied %	Very/Fairly satisfied %	Not very satisfied %	Don't know %
Overall						
Total District	2018 [†]	26	43	69	22	10
	2017	23	50	73	20	7
	2016	20	42	62	30	8
	2015	25	39	64	21	15
	2014 [†]	24	38	62	26	11
Contacted Council	2018 [†]	28	40	68	29	2
	2017 [†]	21	44	65	33	3
	2016	23	24	47	49	4
	2015	33	31	64	33	3
	2014	29	27	56	42	2
Dog Owners		31	43	74	17	9
Comparison						
Peer Group (Provincial) [†]		28	42	70	23	6
National Average		32	41	73	19	8
Community Board						
Whakatāne [†]		25	43	68	26	7
Ōhope Beach		39	29	68	21	11
Rangitāiki [†]		22	50	72	14	15
Tāneatua [†]		23	36	59	38	2
Murupara		32	44	76	10	14
Area						
Urban		27	41	68	25	7
Rural		24	46	70	16	14
Household Income						
Less than \$40,000 pa		30	42	72	17	11
\$40,000-\$70,000 pa [†]		24	36	60	38	3
More than \$70,000 pa		27	50	77	14	9

% read across

[†] does not add to 100% due to rounding



Control Of Dogs



Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:

Total District = 69%
Contacted Council = 68%
Dog Owners = 74%

xiii. Noise Control



* Base = 25
Margin of error $\pm 19.6\%$

64% of residents are satisfied with noise control, while 8% are not very satisfied with this aspect of the District. A large percentage, 28%, are unable to comment (24% in 2017).

The percent not very satisfied is on par with the Peer Group Average, and similar to the National Average and the 2017 reading.

9% of households have contacted the Council about noise* in the last year, with 56% being satisfied with noise control and 39% being not very satisfied.

There are no notable differences between Community Boards and between socio-economic groups, in terms of those residents not very satisfied with noise control.

* caution: small base

Satisfaction With Noise Control


		Very satisfied %	Fairly satisfied %	Very/Fairly satisfied %	Not very satisfied %	Don't know %
Overall						
Total District	2018	26	38	64	8	28
	2017	21	45	66	10	24
	2016	23	44	67	8	25
	2015 [†]	25	37	62	11	28
	2014	23	37	60	10	30
Contacted Council	2018*	23	33	56	39	5
	2017	17	33	50	46	4
	2016 [†]	24	43	67	22	10
	2015	18	37	55	36	9
	2014**	44	25	69	32	-
Comparison						
Peer Group (Provincial)		34	43	77	5	18
National Average [†]		36	43	79	10	12
Community Board						
Whakatāne		30	41	71	8	21
Ōhope Beach [†]		52	33	85	3	13
Rangitāiki		16	35	51	8	41
Tāneatua [†]		34	32	66	7	28
Murupara		7	46	53	15	32
Area						
Urban		32	43	75	7	18
Rural		17	30	47	9	44

% read across

* caution: small base

[†] does not add to 100% due to rounding

Noise Control




Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:

Total District = 64%

Contacted Council* = 56%

* caution: small base

xiv. Tourism Promotion (efforts Council makes to attract visitors or tourists to the area)



71% of residents are satisfied with tourism promotion, including 29% who are very satisfied, while 21% are not very satisfied (16% in 2017). 8% are unable to comment (13% in 2017).

The percent not very satisfied is slightly above the Peer Group Average and on par with the National Average.

Longer term residents, those residing in the District more than 10 years, are more likely to be not very satisfied with tourism promotion, than shorter term residents.


Satisfaction With Tourism Promotion

	Very satisfied %	Fairly satisfied %	Very/Fairly satisfied %	Not very satisfied %	Don't know %
Overall					
Total District 2018	29	42	71	21	8
2017	29	42	71	16	13
2016	32	43	75	18	7
2015	29	41	70	21	9
2014	22	47	69	22	9
Comparison					
Peer Group (Provincial)	40	38	78	14	8
National Average	28	38	66	16	18
Community Board					
Whakatāne [†]	29	40	69	21	9
Ōhope Beach	26	49	75	19	6
Rangitāiki	29	45	74	20	6
Tāneatua	29	54	83	8	9
Murupara	30	22	52	37	11
Area					
Urban [†]	27	43	70	21	8
Rural	32	41	73	19	8
Length of Residence					
Lived there 10 years or less	44	30	74	11	15
Lived there more than 10 years	26	45	71	23	6

% read across


[†] does not add to 100% due to rounding

Tourism Promotion



Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:
Total District = 71%

xv. Efforts To Enable And Promote Events



72% of residents are satisfied with efforts to enable and promote events, including 26% who are very satisfied, while 19% are not very satisfied (14% in 2017). 9% are unable to comment (14% in 2017).

There are no comparative Peer Group and National Averages for this reading.

Residents more likely to be not very satisfied with efforts to enable and promote events are ...

- NZ Māori residents,
- residents with an annual household income of less than \$40,000.

It also appears that Rural residents are slightly more likely to feel this way, than Urban residents.

Satisfaction With Efforts To Enable And Promote Events


	Very satisfied %	Fairly satisfied %	Very/Fairly satisfied %	Not very satisfied %	Don't know %
Overall					
Total District 2018*	26	46	72	19	9
2017	26	46	72	14	14
2016	27	46	73	17	10
2015	27	44	71	18	11
2014	17	46	63	24	13
Community Board					
Whakatāne	24	50	74	17	9
Ōhope Beach	25	48	73	19	8
Rangitāiki [†]	24	42	76	22	11
Tāneatua [†]	34	45	79	11	9
Murupara [†]	33	35	68	26	5
Area					
Urban	25	50	75	16	9
Rural	26	40	66	24	10
Ethnicity					
NZ European	25	49	74	16	10
NZ Māori	25	34	59	33	8
Household Income					
Less than \$40,000 pa	24	35	59	29	12
\$40,000-\$70,000 pa [†]	27	52	79	12	8
More than \$70,000 pa	37	38	75	14	11

% read across

* readings prior to 2018 refer to "Council's efforts to enable and promote events"

[†] does not add to 100% due to rounding


Efforts To Enable And Promote Events



* readings prior to 2018 refer to "Council's efforts to enable and promote events"

Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:
 Total District = 72%

xvi. Parking In Whakatāne



77% of residents are satisfied with Whakatāne (73% in 2017), including 32% who are very satisfied (26% in 2017). 21% are not very satisfied and 2% are unable to comment.

The percent not very satisfied is below the Peer Group and National Averages and similar to the 2017 result.

There are no notable differences between Community Boards and between socio-economic groups, in terms of those residents not very satisfied with parking in Whakatāne. However, it appears that Rural residents are slightly more likely to be not very satisfied, than Urban residents.

Satisfaction With Parking In Whakatāne

	Very satisfied %	Fairly satisfied %	Very/Fairly satisfied %	Not very satisfied %	Don't know %
Overall*					
Total District 2018	32	45	77	21	2
2017	26	47	73	23	4
2016 [†]	30	43	73	23	3
2015 [†]	34	35	69	26	6
2014	27	43	70	26	4
Comparison*					
Peer Group (Provincial)	31	37	68	31	1
National Average	19	35	54	42	4
Community Board					
Whakatāne [†]	34	43	77	21	1
Ōhope Beach	52	32	84	16	-
Rangitāiki	32	44	76	24	-
Tāneatua	20	54	74	26	-
Murupara [†]	18	58	76	9	16
Area					
Urban	36	44	80	18	2
Rural [†]	27	46	73	26	2


% read across

• 2013 reading relates to 'users' satisfaction scores 6-10 = 81%, scores 0-5 = 19%

* Peer Group and National Averages refer to parking in CBD of city / town


[†] does not add to 100% due to rounding

Parking In Whakatāne



Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:
Total District = 77%

xvii. Whakatāne Exhibition Centre (this includes the galleries and museum display at LEC/Te Koputu)



73% of residents are satisfied with Whakatāne Exhibition Centre, including 43% who are very satisfied, while 5% are not very satisfied. These readings are similar to the 2017 results.

There are no comparative Peer Group and National Averages.

A large percentage (23%) are unable to comment and this is probably due to 60% of households saying they have visited the Whakatāne Exhibition Centre in the last 12 months. Of these 'Visitors', 91% are satisfied and 5% not very satisfied.

There are no notable differences between Community Board residents and between socio-economic groups, in terms of those residents not very satisfied with Whakatāne Exhibition Centre.

Satisfaction With Whakatāne Exhibition Centre


		Very satisfied %	Fairly satisfied %	Very/Fairly satisfied %	Not very satisfied %	Don't know %
Overall						
Total District	2018 [†]	43	30	73	5	23
	2017	43	30	73	5	22
	2016 [†]	49	23	72	4	23
	2015*	40	28	68	4	28
	2014 [†]	43	16	59	3	39
Visitors	2018	62	29	91	5	4
	2017	57	31	88	7	5
	2016	74	20	94	5	1
	2015	56	32	88	6	6
	2014	69	19	88	4	8
Community Board						
	Whakatāne	46	28	74	4	22
	Ōhope Beach	54	35	89	-	11
	Rangitāiki	37	28	65	8	27
	Tāneatua	50	40	90	7	3
	Murupara	27	24	51	-	49
Area						
	Urban	48	30	78	3	19
	Rural	35	29	64	7	29

% read across

* in 2015 residents advised that this "includes the galleries and museums display spaces"

[†] does not add to 100% due to rounding

Whakatāne Exhibition Centre




* in 2015 residents advised that this "includes the galleries and museums display spaces"

Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:

Total District = 73%

Visitors = 91%

xviii. Efforts To Manage The Whakatāne Airport



63% of residents are satisfied with efforts to manage Whakatāne Airport, while 10% are not very satisfied. A large percentage, 27%, are unable to comment. These readings are similar to the 2017 results.

There are no comparative Peer Group and National Averages for this reading.

Rural residents are more likely to be not very satisfied with efforts to manage the Whakatāne Airport, than Urban residents.

Satisfaction With Efforts To Manage The Whakatāne Airport


	Very satisfied %	Fairly satisfied %	Very/Fairly satisfied %	Not very satisfied %	Don't know %
Overall					
Total District 2018*	21	42	63	10	27
2017	17	45	62	9	29
2016 [†]	30	36	66	11	24
2015	29	34	63	15	22
2014	14	40	54	7	39
Community Board					
Whakatāne	25	45	70	9	21
Ōhope Beach	25	37	62	8	30
Rangitāiki	15	42	57	15	28
Tāneatua	25	46	71	7	22
Murupara	7	30	37	7	56
Area					
Urban	23	48	71	5	24
Rural [†]	17	33	50	18	31

% read across

* readings prior to 2018 refer to "Council's efforts to manage the Whakatāne Airport"

[†] does not add to 100% due to rounding


Efforts To Manage The Whakatāne Airport



* readings prior to 2018 refer to "Council's efforts to manage the Whakatāne Airport"

Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:
Total District = 63%

xix. Public Halls



70% of residents are satisfied with public halls (73% in 2017), while 10% are not very satisfied. 19% are unable to comment.

The percent not very satisfied is on par with the Peer Group and National Averages and similar to the 2017 reading.

61% of households have used a public hall in the last 12 months (67% in 2017). Of these residents, 81% are satisfied and 13% are not very satisfied.

There are no notable differences between Community Board residents and between socio-economic groups, in terms of those residents not very satisfied with public halls. However, it appears that NZ Māori residents are slightly more likely to feel this way, than NZ European residents.

Satisfaction With Public Halls


		Very satisfied %	Fairly satisfied %	Very/Fairly satisfied %	Not very satisfied %	Don't know %
Overall*						
Total District	2018 [†]	22	48	70	10	19
	2017	24	49	73	8	19
	2016	25	51	76	9	15
	2015 [†]	27	49	76	11	14
	2014	32	35	67	13	20
Users	2018	31	50	81	13	6
	2017	31	53	84	9	7
	2016 [†]	30	56	86	10	5
	2015	32	51	83	13	4
	2014 [†]	37	40	77	16	6
Comparison						
Peer Group (Provincial)		28	39	67	5	28
National Average		25	37	62	7	31
Community Board						
Whakatāne		26	49	75	8	17
Ōhope Beach		23	55	78	5	17
Rangitāiki		22	47	69	13	18
Tāneatua		13	48	62	22	17
Murupara [†]		14	46	60	5	36
Area						
Urban		24	49	73	9	18
Rural		19	48	67	11	22
Ethnicity						
NZ European		22	49	71	8	21
NZ Māori [†]		17	49	66	18	17

% read across

* 2013 scores 6-10 = 79%, scores 0-5 = 18%

† does not add to 100% due to rounding

Public Halls




Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:

Total District = 70%

Users = 81%

xx. Kerbside Waste Collection Service (this includes rubbish, recycling and green waste)



91% of residents are satisfied with kerbside waste collection service, including 58% who are very satisfied (63% in 2017). 7% are not very satisfied and 2% are unable to comment.

The percent not very satisfied is on par with the Peer Group[†] and National Averages[†] and similar to the 2017 result.

94% of residents are provided with a regular waste collection service and kerbside recycling services in the last 12 months. Of these, 93% are satisfied and 6% are not very satisfied.

There are no notable differences between Community Boards and between socio-economic groups, in terms of those residents not very satisfied with kerbside waste collection service.

[†] Peer Group and National Averages refer to the **averaged** ratings for rubbish collection **and** recycling as these were asked separately in the 2016 National Communitrak™ Survey.

Satisfaction With Kerbside Waste Collection Service


	Very satisfied %	Fairly satisfied %	Very/Fairly satisfied %	Not very satisfied %	Don't know %
Overall					
Total District					
2018	58	33	91	7	2
2017	63	27	90	7	3
2016	59	28	87	9	4
2015	61	24	85	8	7
2014	62	25	87	8	5
Service Provided					
2018	60	33	93	6	1
2017	67	26	93	6	1
2016	61	28	89	9	2
2015	64	25	89	8	3
2014	65	26	91	7	2
Comparison*					
Peer Group (Provincial)	59	20	79	12	9
National Average [†]	53	28	81	12	8
Community Board					
Whakatāne	69	25	94	6	-
Ōhope Beach	82	3	85	10	5
Rangitāiki	38	52	90	7	3
Tāneatua	52	32	84	10	6
Murupara	56	40	96	3	1
Area					
Urban [†]	70	24	94	6	1
Rural	41	46	87	9	4

% read across

* Peer Group and National Averages refer to the **averaged** ratings for rubbish collection **and** recycling as these were asked separately in the 2016 National Communitrak™ Survey

[†] does not add to 100% due to rounding

Kerbside Waste Collection Service




Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:

Total District = 91%

Provided With A Regular Waste Collection Service = 93%

xxi. Refuse Transfer Station Facilities



72% of residents are satisfied with the refuse transfer station facilities (86% in 2017), including 43% who are very satisfied. 9% are not very satisfied with this service and 19% are unable to comment (6% in 2017).

The percent not very satisfied with refuse transfer station facilities is below the Peer Group and National Averages.

63% of households have used a transfer station facility in the District, in the last 12 months (70% in 2017). Of these, 85% are satisfied (92% in 2017) and 11% not very satisfied (7% in 2017).

Residents with an annual household income of more than \$70,000 are more likely to be not very satisfied with refuse transfer station facilities, than other income groups.

Satisfaction With Refuse Transfer Station Facilities


		Very satisfied %	Fairly satisfied %	Very/Fairly satisfied %	Not very satisfied %	Don't know %
Overall						
Total District	2018*	43	29	72	9	19
	2017	44	42	86	8	6
	2016	45	35	80	12	8
	2015	44	33	77	10	13
	2014	40	39	79	10	11
Users	2018	55	30	85	11	4
	2017	46	46	92	7	1
	2016	49	36	85	14	1
	2015	54	32	86	10	4
	2014	48	39	87	12	1
Comparison						
Peer Group (Provincial)		29	32	61	18	21
National Average		31	33	64	17	19
Community Board						
Whakatāne		46	27	73	10	17
Ōhope Beach		68	22	90	5	5
Rangitāiki		26	33	59	15	26
Tāneatua		47	36	83	1	16
Murupara		47	33	80	1	19
Area[†]						
Urban		51	26	77	9	15
Rural		29	36	65	11	25
Household Income						
Less than \$40,000 pa [†]		42	25	67	7	27
\$40,000-\$70,000 pa		40	36	76	4	20
More than \$70,000 pa [†]		42	20	62	22	15

% read across

* readings prior to 2018 refer to "refuse disposal, that is, transfer station facilities"

† does not add to 100% due to rounding

Refuse Transfer Station Facilities




* readings prior to 2018 refer to "refuse disposal, that is, transfer station facilities"

Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:

Total District = 72%

Users = 85%

xxii. Walking And Cycling Facilities In The District



79% of residents are satisfied with walking and cycling facilities in the District (86% in 2017), including 42% who are very satisfied. 13% are not very satisfied and 8% are unable to comment.

There are no comparative Peer Group and National Averages for this reading, however this year's not very satisfied reading is on par with the 2017 result.

Residents more likely to be not very satisfied with walking and cycling facilities in the District are ...

- Rural residents,
- NZ Māori residents.


Satisfaction With Walking And Cycling Facilities In The District

	Very satisfied %	Fairly satisfied %	Very/Fairly satisfied %	Not very satisfied %	Don't know %
Overall					
Total District 2018	42	37	79	13	8
2017	43	43	86	9	5
2016	53	34	87	9	4
2015	60	28	88	9	3
2014	52	30	82	12	6
Community Board					
Whakatāne	46	42	88	8	4
Ōhope Beach	56	28	84	13	3
Rangitāiki [†]	38	30	68	21	12
Tāneatua	37	44	81	10	9
Murupara	24	31	55	19	26
Area					
Urban	(47)	(40)	(87)	9	4
Rural	34	30	64	(20)	16
Ethnicity					
NZ European	43	37	80	10	10
NZ Māori	33	38	71	(24)	5

% read across


[†] does not add to 100% due to rounding

Walking And Cycling Facilities In The District



Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:
 Total District = 79%

xxiii. Playgrounds



81% of Whakatāne District residents are satisfied with playgrounds (84% in 2017), including 45% who are very satisfied, with 7% being not very satisfied. 13% are unable to comment (8% in 2017).

The percent not very satisfied is similar to the Peer Group Average and the National Average readings for **sportsfields and playgrounds** and similar to the 2017 result.

66% of households have used or visited a public playground in the last 12 months (74% in 2017). Of these, 87% are satisfied with these facilities and 8% are not very satisfied.

There are no notable differences between Community Board residents and between socio-economic groups, in terms of those residents not very satisfied with playgrounds.

Satisfaction With Playgrounds


		Very satisfied %	Fairly satisfied %	Very/Fairly satisfied %	Not very satisfied %	Don't know %
Overall						
Total District	2018 [†]	45	36	81	7	13
	2017	43	41	84	8	8
	2016 [†]	49	36	85	6	10
	2015	54	29	83	7	10
	2014	40	35	75	8	17
Users/Visitors	2018	49	38	87	8	5
	2017 [†]	49	41	90	10	1
	2016	58	36	94	4	2
	2015	62	28	90	8	2
	2014	48	39	87	10	3
Comparison*						
Peer Group (Provincial) [†]		59	28	87	6	8
National Average		56	32	88	5	7
Community Board						
Whakatāne		44	36	80	7	13
Ōhope Beach [†]		74	19	93	5	3
Rangitāiki		37	40	77	7	16
Tāneatua		52	28	80	7	13
Murupara		37	45	82	6	12
Area						
Urban		52	31	83	7	10
Rural [†]		33	44	77	6	18

% read across

* Peer Group and National Average readings are based on rating for sportsfields **and** playgrounds

[†] does not add to 100% due to rounding

Playgrounds




Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:

Total District = 81%

Users/Visitors = 87%

xxiv. Public Swimming Pools



74% of residents are satisfied with public swimming pools (77% in 2017), including 34% who are very satisfied, with 10% being not very satisfied. 16% are unable to comment.

The percent not very satisfied is similar to the Peer Group and National Averages and on par with the 2017 result.

59% of households have used/visited a public swimming pool in the District in the last 12 months (53% in 2017). Of these residents, 89% are satisfied with these facilities and 10% are not very satisfied.

Women are more likely to be not very satisfied with public swimming pools, than men.


Satisfaction With Public Swimming Pools

		Very satisfied %	Fairly satisfied %	Very/Fairly satisfied %	Not very satisfied %	Don't know %
Overall						
Total District	2018	34	40	74	10	16
	2017	35	42	77	7	16
	2016	40	33	73	10	17
	2015 [†]	32	37	69	17	15
	2014	27	36	63	16	21
Users/Visitors	2018	41	48	89	10	1
	2017	46	46	92	7	1
	2016 [†]	49	36	85	13	3
	2015	46	36	82	14	4
	2014	40	35	75	22	3
Comparison						
Peer Group (Provincial)		43	28	71	9	20
National Average		38	30	68	8	24
Community Board						
Whakatāne		33	45	78	11	11
Ōhope Beach		55	32	87	-	13
Rangitāiki		25	41	66	13	21
Tāneatua [†]		35	31	66	3	30
Murupara [†]		45	30	75	12	14
Area						
Urban		37	41	78	9	13
Rural [†]		29	39	68	12	21
Gender						
Male		35	43	78	4	18
Female [†]		35	38	71	14	14

% read across

[†] does not add to 100% due to rounding


Public Swimming Pools



Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:
Total District = 74%
Users/Visitors = 89%

xxv. Water Supply

1. The Quality Of Drinking Water



62% of residents are satisfied with the quality of drinking water, including 28% who are very satisfied. 28% are not very satisfied (25% in 2017) and 10% are unable to comment (13% in 2017).

71% of residents receive a piped supply (75% in 2017). Of these, 72% are satisfied and 26% are not very satisfied.

Residents more likely to be not very satisfied with the quality of the drinking water are ...

- all Community Board residents except Murupara Community Board residents (they are more likely to be unable to comment),
- women.


Satisfaction With Quality Of Drinking Water

		Very satisfied %	Fairly satisfied %	Very/Fairly satisfied %	Not very satisfied %	Don't know %
Overall						
Total District	2018	28	34	62	28	10
	2017	27	35	62	25	13
	2016	31	36	67	25	8
	2015	41	23	64	22	14
	2014	27	31	58	27	15
Service Provided	2018 [†]	32	40	72	26	1
	2017	33	39	72	26	2
	2016	30	41	71	28	1
	2015	49	27	76	22	2
	2014 [†]	32	38	70	30	1
Community Board						
Whakatāne		25	40	65	34	1
Ōhope Beach [†]		37	43	80	19	2
Rangitāiki		20	34	54	29	17
Tāneatua [†]		38	23	61	25	13
Murupara		51	8	59	-	41
Area						
Urban		32	41	73	26	1
Rural		21	24	45	31	24
Gender						
Male		32	36	68	20	12
Female [†]		25	33	58	35	8

% read across


[†] does not add to 100% due to rounding

Quality Of Drinking Water



Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:
 Total District = 62%
 Service Provided = 72%

2. Water Supply Overall



77% of residents are satisfied with water supply overall, including 39% who are very satisfied (32% in 2017). 10% are not very satisfied (13% in 2017) and 13% are unable to comment.

Whakatāne District residents are similar to Peer Group counterparts and residents nationwide, with regards to the percent not very satisfied with the water supply.

Of those residents provided with a piped water supply, 90% are satisfied and 9% are not very satisfied.

There are no notable differences between Community Boards and between socio-economic groups, in terms of those residents not very satisfied with water supply. However, it appears that Rural residents are slightly more likely to feel this way, than Urban residents.


Satisfaction With Water Supply Overall

	Very satisfied %	Fairly satisfied %	Very/Fairly satisfied %	Not very satisfied %	Don't know %
Overall					
Total District					
2018	39	38	77	10	13
2017	32	43	75	13	12
2016	36	40	76	16	8
2015	44	28	72	13	15
2014	29	37	66	19	15
Service Provided					
2018 [†]	46	44	90	9	2
2017	38	49	87	12	1
2016	36	46	82	17	1
2015	52	33	85	13	2
2014 [†]	35	44	79	20	-
Comparison					
Peer Group (Provincial) [†]	47	27	74	11	16
National Average	50	31	81	9	10
Community Board					
Whakatāne	44	45	89	8	3
Ōhope Beach	55	37	92	6	2
Rangitāiki	26	39	65	14	21
Tāneatua [†]	28	29	57	17	25
Murupara	51	8	59	-	41
Area					
Urban	49	42	91	7	2
Rural	22	32	54	15	31

% read across

[†] does not add to 100% due to rounding

Water Supply Overall




Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:

Total District = 77%

Service Provided = 90%

xxvi. Roads (excluding State Highways 2 and 30)

1. Safety Of Council Roding



84% of residents are satisfied with the safety of Council roads, including 26% who are very satisfied (21% in 2017), while 15% are not very satisfied.

Residents more likely to be not very satisfied with the safety of Council roads are ...

- Rural residents,
- NZ Māori residents.

It also appears that Murupara Community Board residents are slightly more likely to feel this way, than other Community Board residents.

Satisfaction With Safety Of Council Roads


	Very satisfied %	Fairly satisfied %	Very/Fairly satisfied %	Not very satisfied %	Don't know %
Overall*					
Total District 2018	26	58	84	15	1
2017	21	64	85	15	-
2016 [†]	29	55	84	16	1
2015	33	53	86	13	1
2014 [†]	25	59	84	15	-
Community Board					
Whakatāne [†]	23	63	86	12	3
Ōhope Beach	36	62	98	2	-
Rangitāiki	27	56	83	17	-
Tāneatua	34	48	82	17	1
Murupara	19	48	67	33	-
Area					
Urban [†]	28	61	89	10	2
Rural	23	54	77	23	-
Ethnicity					
NZ European	27	61	88	11	1
NZ Māori [†]	20	47	67	30	2

% read across

* 2013 safety of roads scores 6-10 = 74%, scores 0-5 = 22%


[†] does not add to 100% due to rounding

Safety Of Council Roothing



Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:
Total District = 84%

2. Council Roads Overall



86% of residents are satisfied with Council roads overall, while 13% are not very satisfied. These readings are similar to the 2017 results.

The percent not very satisfied is below the Peer Group and National Averages.


There are no notable differences between Community Boards and between socio-economic groups, in terms of those residents not very satisfied with Council roads overall.

Satisfaction With Council Roads Overall


	Very satisfied %	Fairly satisfied %	Very/Fairly satisfied %	Not very satisfied %	Don't know %
Overall					
Total District 2018	24	62	86	13	1
2017	23	62	85	15	-
2016	23	61	84	15	1
2015 [†]	31	58	89	12	-
2014 [†]	23	68	91	8	-
Comparison					
Peer Group (Provincial)	20	49	69	31	-
National Average	21	54	75	25	-
Community Board					
Whakatāne	26	59	85	13	2
Ōhope Beach	30	53	83	17	-
Rangitāiki	18	72	90	10	-
Tāneatua	32	49	81	17	2
Murupara	22	68	90	10	-
Area					
Urban	29	58	87	12	1
Rural	17	69	86	13	1

% read across

[†] does not add to 100% due to rounding



Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:
Total District = 86%

xxvii. Business Promotion

51% of residents are satisfied with efforts to attract and expand business, while 29% are not very satisfied and 20% are unable to comment. These readings are similar to the 2017 results.

The percent not very satisfied is similar to the Peer Group Average and on par with the National Average.

There are no notable differences between Community Board and between socio-economic groups, in terms of those residents not very satisfied with efforts to attract and expand business. However, it appears that longer term residents, those residing in the District more than 10 years, are slightly more likely to feel this way, than shorter term residents.

Satisfaction With Efforts To Attract And Expand Business

	Very satisfied %	Fairly satisfied %	Very/Fairly satisfied %	Not very satisfied %	Don't know %
Overall					
Total District 2018*	8	43	51	29	20
2017	9	40	49	30	21
2016 [†]	13	38	51	31	19
2015	15	37	52	30	18
2014	8	28	36	37	27
Comparison					
Peer Group (Provincial) [†]	18	36	54	28	19
National Average	13	34	47	24	29
Community Board					
Whakatāne	7	39	46	35	19
Ōhope Beach	5	55	60	17	23
Rangitāiki	7	51	58	22	20
Tāneatua	16	39	55	19	26
Murupara	9	29	38	41	21
Area					
Urban	7	43	50	31	19
Rural	9	44	53	25	22
Length of Residence					
Lived there 10 years or less	4	55	59	21	20
Lived there more than 10 years	9	41	50	30	20

% read across

* readings prior to 2018 read "Council's efforts to attract and expand business"

[†] does not add to 100% due to rounding

The main reasons residents are not very satisfied with efforts to attract and expand business are ...

- need more new businesses/encouragement to business,
- nothing has changed/not effective,
- town is dead/loss of businesses/empty shops.

Summary Table:


Main Reasons* Being Not Very Satisfied With Efforts To Attract And Expand Business

	Total District 2018 %	Community Board Area				
		Whaka-tāne %	Ōhope Beach %	Rangi-tāiki %	Tāne-atua %	Muru-para %
Percent Who Mention ...						
Need more new businesses/encouragement to business	7	10	13	1	5	4
Nothing has changed/not effective	5	7	-	3	7	-
Town is dead/loss of businesses/empty shops	4	6	-	4	7	-

* multiple responses allowed

NB: 24% of Murupara Community Board residents mention "not happening/never seen anything/no promotion or advertising" (3% of residents overall mention this reason)

Efforts To Attract And Expand Business



* readings prior to 2018 read "Council's efforts to attract and expand business"

Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:
 Total District = 51%

B. SPEND EMPHASIS ON SERVICES/FACILITIES

Residents were asked if they would like to see more, about the same or less spent on each of these services/ facilities, given that more cannot be spent on everything without increasing rates and/or user charges.

Summary Table: Spend Emphasis For Services/Facilities


	More %	About the same %	Less %	Don't know %
Business promotion	50	38	5	7
Tourism promotion	44	47	5	4
Efforts to enable & promote events	38	57	2	3
Walking & cycling facilities in the District [†]	37	50	10	4
Public toilets	34	57	1	8
Council roads in the District [†]	31	61	5	2
Harbour facilities including the port & the surrounding environment	31	56	5	8
Stormwater services [†]	30	61	3	6
Water supply	29	64	2	5
Dog control	28	66	3	3
Parking in Whakatāne	28	66	4	2
Street lighting	27	66	2	5
Whakatāne Airport	26	56	4	14
Public swimming pools	25	66	2	7
Footpaths	25	65	6	4
Public halls [†]	19	69	3	8
Sewerage system	18	70	1	11
Playgrounds	16	74	5	5
District libraries overall [†]	15	75	4	7
Parks & reserves	14	82	2	2
Sportsfields [†]	11	77	1	10
Kerbside waste collection service [†]	8	88	2	1
Noise control	8	77	6	9

[†] does not add to 100% due to rounding

Summary Table: Eight Services/Facilities With The Highest "Spend More" Readings

	Total District 2018 %	Community Board Area				
		Whaka-tāne %	Ōhope Beach %	Rangi-tāiki %	Tāne-atua %	Muru-para %
Percent Who Mention ...						
Business promotion	50	53	67	41	35	67
Tourism promotion	44	45	63	34	23	76
Efforts to enable & promote events	38	36	48	35	32	53
Walking & cycling facilities in the District	37	34	46	34	44	47
Public toilets	34	34	36	25	57	39
Council roads in the District	31	26	33	37	32	40
Harbour facilities including the port & the surrounding environment	31	27	59	29	36	22
Stormwater services	30	29	36	28	54	7

C. SPEND PRIORITY FOR SERVICES/FACILITIES



(Spend priority = mean spend x percentage not very satisfied).

The graph shows the priorities for spending for Council for the 23 services /facilities where **both** the mean spend and not very satisfied readings are available.

The spend priority factor is gained by multiplying the mean spend (where spend more = +1, spend about the same = 0 and spend less = -1) by the percentage not very satisfied.

In 2018, business promotion, stormwater services and tourism promotion are the top priorities for Council in terms of spend, while noise control, kerbside waste collection service and District libraries overall are the lowest priorities in terms of spend.



2. COUNCIL POLICY AND DIRECTION

It is important for Council to understand where public sentiment presently lies in terms of Council policy and direction. Council is, of course, not forced to adopt the most "popular" policies or direction, rather by understanding where people's opinions and attitudes currently lie, Council is able to embark on information, education, persuasion or communication strategies on particular topics if it is felt necessary to lead the public to fulfil Council's legitimate community leadership role.

Residents were asked whether there is any recent Council action, decision or management that they ...

- like or approve of,
- dislike or disapprove of.


This was asked in order to gauge the level of support Whakatāne District residents had for Council's actions and decisions. "Support" is a mixture of agreement with the activity or decision, and /or whether District residents have been adequately informed of the proposed action/decision/management.

A. RECENT ACTIONS, DECISIONS OR MANAGEMENT APPROVE OF


Overall, 40% of Whakatāne District residents have in mind a recent Council action, decision or management they approve of (47% in 2017). This reading is below the Peer Group Average and slightly below the National Average.

Residents with an annual household income of \$40,000 to \$70,000 are **less** likely to have in mind an action/decision/management they approve of, than other income groups. It appears that Taneatua Community Board residents are slightly more likely to do so, than other Community Board residents.


Percent Approving - Comparison




Percent Approving - By Community Board



Percent Approving - By Area



Percent Approving - Comparing Different Types Of Residents



Main actions/decisions/management residents approve of are ...

- Māori Wards,
- parks/reserves/playgrounds/recreation areas,
- positive comments about Mayor,
- walkways/river walks/cycleways,
- Council do a good job/good service,
- handling of Edgumbe floods/good response/support,
- good communication/keep us informed/involvement with community,
- appearance of town/beautification/improvements,
- promotion of area/tourism.

Summary Table: Main Actions/Decisions/Management Residents Approve Of

	Total District 2018 %	Community Board Area				
		Whaka-tāne %	Ōhope Beach %	Rangi-tāiki %	Tāne-atua %	Muru-para %
Percent Who Mention ...						
Māori Wards*	5	5	2	7	14	-
Parks/reserves/playgrounds/recreation areas	5	7	7	3	-	10
Positive comments about Mayor**	5	2	3	9	7	6
Walkways/river walks/cycleways	4	8	3	3	-	-
Council do a good job/good service	4	4	5	2	7	11
Handling of Edgumbe floods/good response/support [◊]	4	3	-	4	14	-
Good communication/keep us informed/involvement with community	4	2	-	5	-	14
Appearance of town/beautification/improvements	4	4	2	2	3	7
Promotion of area/tourism	4	11	2	12	6	8

NB: refer to page 127

* 3% of residents mention 'Māori Wards/against Māori Wards' as an action/decision/management they disapprove of, while 2% mention 'Māori Wards/in favour of Māori Wards' as an action/decision/management they disapprove of

** 1% of residents mention 'negative comments about Mayor' as an action/decision/management they disapprove of

◊ 2% of residents mention 'poor handling of Edgumbe floods' as an action/decision/management they disapprove of

Other actions/ decisions/management finding approval amongst 2% of residents is/are ...

- swimming pool,

by 1% ...

- improved roading/traffic,
- environmental issues/ floods,
- rubbish collection/ transfer station,
- stormwater service,
- Library/Museum.

B. RECENT COUNCIL ACTIONS, DECISIONS OR MANAGEMENT RESIDENTS DISAPPROVE OF


Overall, 47% of Whakatāne District residents have in mind a recent Council action, decision or management they disapprove of (52% in 2017). This is on par with the Peer Group Average and similar to the National Average.

Residents **more** likely to have in mind a recent Council action, decision or management they disapprove are ...


- Rural residents,
- residents aged 45 years or over,
- longer term residents, those residing in the District more than 10 years.

In 2018, 51% of residents who have something they dislike or disapprove of also have something they like or approve of.


Percent Disapproving - Comparison




Percent Disapproving - By Community Board



Percent Disapproving - By Area



Percent Disapproving - Comparing Different Types Of Residents



Main actions/decisions/management residents disapprove of are ...

- roading/traffic/footpaths,
- water supply issues,
- Wairaka Park playground and pool,
- Council performance/service,
- lack of communication/information/consultation/don't listen,
- wasting ratepayers' money/overspending.

Summary Table: Main Actions/Decisions/Management Disapprove Of*

	Total District 2018 %	Community Board Area				
		Whaka- tāne %	Ōhope Beach %	Rangi- tāiki %	Tāne- atua %	Muru- para %
Percent Who Mention ...						
Roading/traffic/footpaths*	5	5	5	2	8	13
Water supply issues	5	2	-	8	14	6
Wairaka Park playground and pool	5	10	2	1	-	-
Council performance/service**	4	4	2	3	4	14
Lack of communication/information/ consultation/don't listen [◇]	4	4	6	4	7	-
Wasting ratepayers' money/overspending	4	1	11	5	7	4

NB: refer to page 123

* 1% of residents mention 'improved roading/traffic' as an issue they **approve** of

** 4% of residents mention 'Council do a good job/good service' as an issue they **approve** of

◇ 4% of residents mention 'good communication/keep us informed/involvement with community' as an issue they **approve** of

Other actions/decisions/management finding disapproval amongst 3% of residents are ...

- town planning issues/land issues/subdivisions/development,
- Māori Wards/against Māori Wards,
- rates too high/increases/too high for services received,

by 2% ...


- poor handling of Edgecumbe floods,
- environmental issues,
- Māori Wards/in favour of Māori Wards,
- stormwater issues/sewerage issues,
- Ohope wharf/Lions Club shed,
- lack of street lighting,

by 1% ...

- public toilets,
- Council facilities/services needed,
- building permits/consents,
- negative comments about Mayor.



3. CONTACT WITH COUNCIL

A. CONTACTED COUNCILLOR OR MAYOR IN LAST 12 MONTHS?

23% of Whakatāne residents say they have contacted a Councillor or the Mayor in the last 12 months (26% in 2017). This is on par with the Peer Group Average and National Averages.

Residents more likely to say 'Yes' are ...


- Rural residents,
- residents aged 65 years or over.

Have Residents Contacted A Councillor Or Mayor In The Last 12 Months?

	Contacted?		
	Yes %	No %	Unsure %
Overall			
Total District 2018	23	77	-
2017	26	74	-
2016	21	79	-
2015	25	75	-
2014	18	82	-
Comparison			
Peer Group (Provincial)	27	73	-
National Average [†]	20	81	-
Community Board			
Whakatāne	19	81	-
Ōhope Beach	30	70	-
Rangitāiki	28	72	-
Tāneatua	23	77	-
Murupara	21	79	-
Area			
Urban	19	81	-
Rural	30	70	-
Age			
18-44 years	19	81	-
45-64 years	21	79	-
65+ years	33	67	-

% read across

[†] does not add to 100% due to rounding

B. CONTACTED A COMMUNITY BOARD MEMBER IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS?

10% of residents say they have contacted a Community Board member in the last 12 months (15% in 2017). This is on par with the Peer Group and National Averages.

Rural residents are more likely to contact a Community Board member, than Urban residents.

Have Residents Contacted A Community Board Member In The Last 12 Months?

	Contacted?		
	Yes %	No %	Unsure %
Overall			
Total District 2018 [†]	10	89	2
2017	15	85	-
2016	10	90	-
2015	8	92	-
2014	9	90	1
Comparison*			
Peer Group (Provincial)	7	74	19
National Average [†]	7	80	12
Community Board			
Whakatāne	3	96	1
Ōhope Beach	12	83	5
Rangitāiki	14	83	3
Tāneatua	12	88	-
Murupara	25	75	-
Area			
Urban	5	94	1
Rural	18	80	2


% read across

* note some Councils do not have any Community Boards, hence the higher 'Don't Know' readings

† does not add to 100% due to rounding

C. FRONT DESK STAFF

i. Contact?



58% of residents have contacted the customer service front desk staff by phone and/or in person, in the last 12 months (64% in 2017).

Residents more likely to say 'Yes' are ...

- NZ European residents,
- longer term residents, those residing in the District more than 10 years.

Summary Table: Contacted Customer Service Front Desk In The Last 12 Months?

	Yes %	No %	Don't know %
Overall			
Total District 2018	58	42	-
2017	64	36	-
2016	56	43	1
2015 [†]	62	37	1
2014 [*]	89	9	2
Community Board			
Whakatāne	57	42	1
Ōhope Beach	63	37	-
Rangitāiki	55	45	-
Tāneatua	68	32	-
Murupara [†]	50	50	-
Area			
Urban	58	41	1
Rural	57	43	-
Ethnicity			
NZ European	61	38	1
NZ Māori	48	52	-
Length of Residence			
Lived there 10 years or less	44	56	-
Lived there more than 10 years	60	39	1


% read across

* 2014 readings related to residents who had contacted Council in last 12 months, N=177

[†] does not add to 100% due to rounding

ii. *Level Of Satisfaction*

Contacted Customer Service Front Desk Staff In Last 12 Months



Base = 176

94% of residents who have contacted Customer Service Front Desk staff in the last 12 months are satisfied with the overall service received, including 66% who are very satisfied.

There are no notable differences between Community Board residents and between socio-economic groups, in terms of those residents[†] who are not very satisfied.

[†] those residents who have contacted Customer Service Front Desk staff in the last 12 months (N=176)

Satisfaction With Overall Service Received From Customer Services Front Desk Staff

	Very satisfied %	Fairly satisfied %	Very/Fairly satisfied %	Not very satisfied %	Don't know %
Contacted Customer Service Front Desk Staff					
2018 [†] (N=176)	66	28	94	5	-
2017 (N=188)	62	33	95	5	-
2016 (N=168)	73	24	97	3	-
2015 (N=191)	66	26	92	8	-
2014* (N=155)	62	31	93	7	-
Community Board					
Whakatāne	72	25	97	3	-
Ōhope Beach*	78	22	100	-	-
Rangitāiki	63	29	92	8	-
Tāneatua*	61	25	86	14	-
Murupara*	39	61	100	-	-
Area					
Urban	71	27	98	2	-
Rural [†]	58	31	89	10	-

Base = 176

% read across

• 2013 reading overall front desk staff (Base = 186) scores 6-10 = 90%, scores 0-5 = 9%

* caution: small bases


† does not add to 100% due to rounding



4. INFORMATION

A. TYPES OF PUBLISHED INFORMATION RESIDENTS HAVE SEEN OR READ IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS

Yes - Have Seen Or Read - 2018



74% of residents have seen or read Council notices or articles in newspapers, while 68% have seen/read information sent with rates notices and 55% have seen/read Council's Annual Plan or Long-Term Plan summary (46% in 2017).

Residents more likely to have seen or read **Council notices or articles in newspapers** are ...

- women,
- residents aged 45 years or over.

There are no notable differences between Community Board and between socio-economic groups, in terms of those residents who have seen or read the **information sent with the rates notice**.

Residents more likely to have seen or read the **Council monthly newsletter - Ko Konei/ Our Place** are ...

- Urban residents,
- residents aged 65 years or over.

Residents **less** likely to have seen or read **information available from Council offices or libraries** are ...

- Rural residents,
- residents aged 45 to 64 years,
- residents with an annual household income of \$40,000 or more.

Residents **more** likely to have seen or read **Council's Annual Plan or Long-Term Plan Summary** are ...

- NZ European residents
- longer term residents, those residing in the District more than 10 years,


There are no notable differences between Community Board and between socio-economic groups, in terms of those residents who have seen or read the **Library, Museum or Council website**.

Residents more likely to have seen or read **Council's Facebook page** are ...

- Rural residents,
- women.

B. THE SUFFICIENCY OF THE INFORMATION SUPPLIED

All residents were asked whether they considered the information supplied by Council to be sufficient.



Summary Table: Comparisons

	Total District 2018 %	Total District 2017 %	Peer Group %	National Average %	Community Board				
					Whaka-tāne %	Ōhope Beach %	Rangi-tāiki %	Tāne-atua %	Muru-para %
<i>Percent Who Mentioned ...</i>									
More than enough	13	8	10	9	16	11	8	14	11
Enough	55	62	53	57	55	62	54	48	55
Not enough	19	20	24	23	16	19	24	10	30
Nowhere near enough	5	4	11	8	4	2	7	11	2
Don't know/Not sure	9	7	2	3	10	6	7	16	2
Total	[†] 101	[†] 101	100	100	[†] 101	100	100	[†] 99	100

[†] does not add to 100% due to rounding

68% of residents feel that there is more than enough/enough information supplied, while 24% feel there is not enough/nowhere near enough information supplied. These readings are similar to the 2017 results.

Whakatāne District residents are on par with the Peer Group residents and similar to residents nationwide, in feeling there is enough/more than enough information supplied to the community.


Residents more likely to say there is **enough/more than enough information** are ...

- Urban residents,
- residents aged 45 years or over,
- NZ European residents.

C. ONLINE SERVICES AND INFORMATION

90% of residents have access to the internet[†].

*Satisfaction With The Provision Of Online Services And Information
Access To Internet*



[†] Base = 259

64% of residents[†] are satisfied with the provision of online services and information, while 5% are not very satisfied.

23% of residents[†] say they have never used the internet for this purpose. Rural residents are more likely, than Urban residents, to say they have never used the internet for this purpose.

The main reasons residents[†] are not very satisfied are ...

- website difficult to use / confusing, mentioned by 35% of residents who are not very satisfied*,
- more information needed, 22%,
- others, 4%.

* Base = 12: caution, small base

[†] those residents who say they have accessed the internet, (N=259)

Satisfaction With Provision Of Online Services And Information

	Very satisfied %	Fairly satisfied %	Very/Fairly satisfied %	Not very satisfied %	Don't know %	Never used %
Residents Who Have Access To Internet						
2018 [†]	22	42	64	5	9	23
Community Board						
Whakatāne	23	39	62	7	11	20
Ōhope Beach**	32	41	73	-	5	21
Rangitāiki [†]	22	35	57	1	8	35
Tāneatua*	21	60	81	4	3	12
Murupara*	9	64	73	13	6	8
Area						
Urban	24	43	67	5	10	18
Rural	20	39	59	5	6	30

Base = 259


% read across

* caution: small bases

[†] does not add to 100% due to rounding
(not asked prior to 2018)

D. PARTICIPATION IN COUNCIL COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PROCESSES

In the past year residents have participated in:



In 2018, 19% of residents said they had, in the past year, talking to a Council representative at public events, 15% had responded to a Council survey, excluding the 2018 Communitrak™ survey, 12% had made a formal submission and 11% had attended a workshop or open day.

Residents more likely to have talked to a **Council representative** are ...

- Murupara Community Board residents,
- Rural residents.

60% of residents said they had not engaged in any of these community engagement processes in the last year.

Residents more likely to say they had **not engaged** are ...

- Urban residents,
- shorter term residents, those residing in the District 10 years or less.

Summary Table: Main Processes Residents Have Engaged In

	Talking to Council representative at public event %	Responded to Council survey (excl. this one) %	Making a formal submission %	Attended a workshop or open day %
Overall				
Total District 2018	19	15	12	11
Community Board				
Whakatāne	14	17	6	11
Ōhope Beach	2	8	23	8
Rangitāiki	22	13	19	10
Tāneatua	24	16	14	10
Murupara [†]	43	14	8	27
Area				
Urban	12	15	9	9
Rural	30	15	18	16

Not asked prior to 2018

Multiple responses allowed

When asked what their preferred process for participating in a Council decision process, the main methods mentioned were ...

- public meeting/public forum/open forum, mentioned by 14% of all residents,
- personal contact/face-to-face, 13%,
- online/internet/social media, 13%,
- postal notifications/write a letter, 7%.

Other methods mentioned by 5% are ...

- phone call/text,

by 4% ...

- not interested/don't want to participate/don't have one,
- voting/referendum,

by 3% ...

- more communication/talk to public/iwi,
- happy with the status quo,
- email,

by 2% ...

- make a submission,
- local media/newspaper/radio,
- survey/questionnaire,


by 1% ...

- visit Council offices.

20% of residents were unable to comment.

E. WHAKATĀNE KI MUA - COMMUNITY VISION PROJECT

Have residents heard or been involved in the Whakatāne Ki Mua - Community Vision Project.



12% of residents have heard or been involved in the Whakatāne Ki Mua - Community Vision Project.

There are no notable differences between Community Board residents and between socio-economic groups, in terms of those residents who said 'Yes'. However, it appears that the following residents are slightly more likely to do so are ...

- women,
- NZ Māori residents.

Have Residents Heard Or Been Involved In Whakatāne Ki Mua?

	Yes %	No %
Overall		
Total District 2018	12	88
Community Board		
Whakatāne	11	89
Ōhope Beach	2	98
Rangitāiki	16	84
Tāneatua	11	89
Murupara [†]	13	87
Area		
Urban	10	90
Rural	15	85
Gender		
Male	8	92
Female	16	84
Ethnicity		
NZ European	10	90
NZ Māori	21	79

% read across


Not asked prior to 2018



5. LOCAL ISSUES

A. COUNCIL CONSULTATION AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

i. *Satisfaction With The Way Council Consults The Public In The Decisions It Makes*



49% of residents are very satisfied/satisfied with the way Council consults the public in the decisions it makes (39% in 2017), while 18% are dissatisfied/very dissatisfied. 29% are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (36% in 2017) and 5% are unable to comment.

The very satisfied/satisfied reading (49%) is similar to the Peer Group Average and on par with the National Average.

Residents more likely to be very satisfied/satisfied are ...

- Urban residents,
- residents with an annual household income of less than \$40,000,
- shorter term residents, those residing in the District 10 years or less.

Summary Table: Level Of Satisfaction With The Way Council Consults The Public In The Decisions It Makes

	Very satisfied / Satisfied %	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied %	Dissatisfied / Very dissatisfied %	Don't know %
Overall*				
Total District 2018 [†]	49	29	18	5
2017	39	36	19	6
2016	48	27	20	5
2015	41	29	23	7
2014 [†]	33	39	26	3
Comparison				
Peer Group (Provincial)	47	29	20	4
National Average	45	28	22	5
Community Board				
Whakatāne	52	25	18	5
Ōhope Beach	53	28	13	6
Rangitāiki	42	30	23	5
Tāneatua [†]	45	33	18	3
Murupara [†]	50	42	9	-
Area				
Urban	52	28	16	4
Rural	42	31	22	5
Household Income				
Less than \$40,000 pa [†]	59	14	24	4
\$40,000-\$70,000 pa	45	33	18	4
More than \$70,000 pa	45	36	17	2
Length of Residence				
Lived there 10 years or less	61	27	6	6
Lived there more than 10 yrs	46	29	21	4

% read across

* 2013 opportunities for involvement in decision making scores 6-10 = 58%, scores 0-5 = 34%

[†] does not add to 100% due to rounding

B. PERCEPTION OF SAFETY

Is Whakatāne District Generally A Safe Place To Live?

	Yes, definitely %	Yes, mostly %	Not really %	No, definitely not %	Don't know %
Overall					
Total District 2018	41	53	5	1	-
2017	29	64	5	1	1
2016 [†]	41	55	4	-	1
2015	40	53	5	1	1
2014	29	64	6	1	-
Comparison					
Peer Group (Provincial) [†]	40	53	6	1	1
National Average	36	54	7	2	1
Community Board					
Whakatāne	45	47	7	1	-
Ōhope Beach	46	52	2	-	-
Rangitāiki	29	68	2	1	-
Tāneatua [†]	41	48	7	4	1
Murupara	54	39	7	-	-
Area					
Urban	47	46	5	1	1
Rural [†]	31	63	5	-	-
Ethnicity					
NZ European	37	56	6	1	-
NZ Māori	51	44	3	1	1

% read across

* caution: small/very small bases

[†] does not add to 100% due to rounding


41% of residents feel that generally Whakatāne District is definitely a safe place to live (29% in 2017), 53% say it is mostly (64% in 2017), 5% of residents think the District is not really a safe place to live and 1% say it is definitely not.

The percent saying 'yes, definitely' (41%) is similar to the Peer Group Average and on par with the National Average.

Residents more likely to feel that Whakatāne District is **definitely** a safe place to live are ...

- Urban residents,
- NZ Māori.

C. QUALITY OF LIFE



60% of residents think that, overall, the quality of life in their District is very good (57% in 2017), while 30% say it is good (37% in 2017), 7% feel it is fair and 3% say it is poor (0% in 2017).

Whakatāne District residents are above Peer Group residents and residents nationwide, in rating the quality of life in their District as **very good**.

Residents more likely to feel the quality of life is **very good** are ...

- all Community Board residents, except Taneatua Community Board residents,
- women.

Rating The Quality Of Life In The District

	Very good %	Good %	Fair %	Poor %	Don't know %
Overall*					
Total District 2018	60	30	7	3	-
2017	57	37	6	-	-
2016	67	27	5	1	-
2015	64	30	6	-	-
2014 [†]	60	32	6	1	-
Comparison					
Peer Group (Provincial)	49	38	10	3	-
National Average [†]	41	43	14	2	1
Community Board					
Whakatāne	62	29	6	3	-
Ōhope Beach	76	16	8	-	-
Rangitāiki [†]	62	32	4	3	-
Tāneatua	37	33	23	7	-
Murupara	60	36	2	2	-
Area					
Urban	60	28	9	3	-
Rural	61	33	3	3	-
Gender					
Male [†]	55	36	6	4	-
Female	66	25	7	2	-

% read across

• 2013 rating Whakatāne as a place to live scores 6-10 = 93%, scores 0-5 = 7%


[†] does not add to 100% due to rounding



6. REPRESENTATION

The success of democracy in the Whakatāne District Council depends on the Council both influencing and encouraging the opinions of its citizens and representing these views and opinions in its decision making. Council wishes to understand the perceptions that its residents have on how easy or how difficult it is to have their views heard. It is understood that people's perceptions can be based either on personal experience or on hearsay.

A. PERFORMANCE RATING OF THE MAYOR AND COUNCILLORS IN THE LAST YEAR



49% of Whakatāne District residents rate the performance of the Mayor and Councillors over the past year as very or fairly good, while 31% rate their performance as just acceptable (28% in 2017). 10% rate the performance of the Mayor and Councillors as not very good / poor (14% in 2017) and 11% are unable to comment (8% in 2017).

Whakatāne District residents rate the performance of the Mayor and Councillors on par with the Peer Group Average and similar to the National Average, in terms of their performance being very / fairly good.

47% of those who have contacted a Councillor or the Mayor in the last year, rate the performance of the Mayor and Councillors as very or fairly good.

Residents **more** likely to rate the performance of the Mayor and Councillors over the past year as very / fairly good are ...

- Urban residents,
- shorter term residents, those residing in the District 10 years or less.

It also appears that Whakatāne and Murupara Community Board residents are slightly more likely to feel this way, than other Community Board residents.


Summary Table: Performance Rating Of The Mayor And Councillors In The Last Year

	Rated as ...			
	Very good/ Fairly good %	Just acceptable %	Not very good/Poor %	Don't know %
Overall				
Total District 2018 [†]	49	31	10	11
2017 [†]	51	28	14	8
2016	49	26	10	15
2015	40	37	12	11
2014 [†]	47	34	10	10
Contacted the Mayor/a Councillor in last 12 months (N=75)	47	31	18	4
Comparison				
Peer Group (Provincial)	53	22	18	7
National Average	49	27	17	7
Community Board				
Whakatāne	57	26	10	7
Ōhope Beach	42	30	14	14
Rangitāiki	41	38	9	12
Tāneatua	33	33	12	22
Murupara	59	25	2	14
Area				
Urban	55	26	10	9
Rural	39	38	9	14
Length of Residence				
Lived there 10 years or less	65	24	2	9
Lived there more than 10 years	45	32	11	12


% read across

[†] does not add to 100% due to rounding

Comparison Between Mayor And Councillors Performance And Other Key Questions




[†] 93% of residents who say there is an action/decision management they dislike/disapprove of in last 12 months, rate Mayor and Councillors performance as not very good/poor



[†] 90% of residents who rate the quality of life in Whakatāne District as very good/good, rate Mayor and Councillors performance as very/fairly good

B. PERFORMANCE RATING OF COMMUNITY BOARD MEMBERS IN THE LAST YEAR



40% of residents rate the performance of Community Board members as very or fairly good, 20% rate their performance as just acceptable, and 6% say it is not very good or poor. A large percentage, 33%, are unable to comment. These readings are similar to the 2017 results.

There are no Peer Group and National Average readings.

59% of residents who have contacted a Community Board member in the last 12 months, rate their performance as very / fairly good.

Residents more likely to rate the performance of the Community Board members as very / fairly good are ...

- Murupara Community Board residents,
- women.


Summary Table: Performance Rating Of Community Board Members In The Last Year

	Rated as ...			
	Very good/ Fairly good %	Just acceptable %	Not very good/Poor %	Don't know %
Overall				
Total District 2018 [†]	40	20	6	33
2017 [†]	41	20	5	33
2016	42	14	4	40
2015 [†]	35	22	5	39
2014	39	15	4	42
Contacted Community Board member in last 12 months (N=34) [†]	59	22	12	8
Community Board				
Whakatāne	40	19	3	38
Ōhope Beach	30	21	2	47
Rangitāiki [†]	42	25	9	25
Tāneatua [†]	20	25	25	29
Murupara	(76)	4	-	20
Area				
Urban	39	21	3	(37)
Rural [†]	44	20	12	25
Gender				
Male [†]	36	23	4	(38)
Female	(46)	18	8	28

% read across

[†] does not add to 100% due to rounding

C. PERFORMANCE RATING OF THE COUNCIL STAFF IN THE LAST YEAR



61% of residents rate the performance of the Council staff as very or fairly good (64% in 2017), 19% rate their performance as just acceptable, and 9% say it is not very good / poor (5% in 2017). 12% are unable to comment.

Whakatāne District Council staff's performance is on par with staff nationwide and the 2017 reading and similar to Peer Group Councils' staff, in terms of it being rated very / fairly good.

Residents more likely to rate the performance of Council staff over the past year as very / fairly good are ...

- NZ European residents,
- residents with an annual household income of \$40,000 or more.

Summary Table: Performance Rating Of The Council Staff In The Last Year

	Rated as ...			
	Very good/ Fairly good %	Just acceptable %	Not very good/Poor %	Don't know %
Overall				
Total District 2018 [†]	61	19	9	12
2017	64	17	5	14
2016	62	15	3	20
2015	65	17	4	14
2014	64	16	4	16
Comparison				
Peer Group (Provincial)	63	18	11	8
National Average [†]	57	21	10	11
Community Board				
Whakatāne	62	20	9	9
Ōhope Beach	54	28	2	16
Rangitāiki	61	15	11	13
Tāneatua	60	11	8	21
Murupara	63	25	4	8
Area				
Urban	64	19	7	10
Rural [†]	56	18	10	15
Ethnicity				
NZ European	65	20	6	9
NZ Māori	49	16	15	20
Household Income				
Less than \$40,000 pa	49	26	13	12
\$40,000-\$70,000 pa [†]	66	15	4	14
More than \$70,000 pa	73	20	3	4

% read across

[†] does not add to 100% due to rounding

E. APPENDIX

Base by Sub-sample

		Actual respondents interviewed	*Expected numbers according to population distribution
Community Board			
	Whakatāne	131	134
	Ōhope Beach	30	26
	Rangitāiki	78	87
	Tāneatua	30	29
	Murupara	31	25
Gender	Male	150	142
	Female	150	158
Age	18-44 years	79	123
	45-64 years	92	113
	65+ years	129	64

* Interviews are intentionally conducted proportional to the population in each Community Board. Post stratification (weighting) is then applied to adjust back to population proportions in order to yield correctly balanced overall percentages. This is accepted statistical procedure. Please see also pages 2 to 4 regarding quotas and weighting for this survey.

* * * * *

