

**WAIMATE DISTRICT COUNCIL
COMMUNITRAK™ SURVEY
MARCH / APRIL 2015**

COMMUNITRAK™ SURVEY

PUBLIC PERCEPTIONS AND INTERPRETATIONS OF COUNCIL SERVICES AND REPRESENTATION

PREPARED AS PART OF THE PUBLIC FEEDBACK PROGRAMME FOR:

WAIMATE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MARCH / APRIL 2015



**National Research Bureau Ltd
PO Box 10118, Mt Eden, Auckland, New Zealand
P (09) 6300 655, F (09) 6387 846, www.nrb.co.nz**

CONTENTS

Page No.

A.	SITUATION AND OBJECTIVES	1
B.	COMMUNITRAK™ SPECIFICATIONS	2
C.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	6
D.	MAIN FINDINGS	20
1.	Council Services/Facilities	21
a.	Satisfaction With Council Services And Facilities	22
i.	District Libraries	22
ii.	Parks, Reserves And Gardens	26
iii.	Cemeteries	29
iv.	Public Swimming Pool	32
b.	Satisfaction With Council Services/Facilities - With Reasons For Dissatisfaction	36
i.	Footpaths	36
ii.	Roads In The District (excluding State Highways 1 and 82, as these are not Council roads)	40
iii.	Water Supply And Services	44
iv.	Sewerage System And Service	48
v.	Stormwater Services	51
vi.	Waste Management Service (ie, rubbish collection and recycling)	55
vii.	Standard Of Public Toilets	59
viii.	Camping Facilities (ie, Victoria Park, Knottingley Park, Waitaki Lakes)	63
ix.	Information Centre Services	66
x.	Building Control	69
xi.	Emergency Management	73
xii.	Dog And Animal Control	76
c.	Spend Emphasis On Council Services/Facilities	80
d.	Spend Priority	82
e.	Satisfaction With The Range Of Services And Facilities Provided By Council	83
2.	Rates Issues	86
a.	Satisfaction With The Way Rates Are Spent On The Services And Facilities Provided By Council	87

CONTENTS (continued)

	Page No.
3. Contact With Council.....	90
a. Levels Of Contact.....	91
b. Satisfaction When Contacting The Council Offices By Phone.....	93
c. Satisfaction When Contacting A Council Office In Person	95
d. Satisfaction When Contacting The Council Offices In Writing	97
e. Satisfaction When Contacting The Council Offices By Email.....	99
f. Satisfaction With Overall Service Received When Contacted Council	101
g. Performance Rating Of The Council Staff In The Last Year.....	103
4. Information.....	105
a. Main Source Of Information About Council.....	106
b. The Sufficiency Of The Information Supplied	108
5. Representation	110
a. Emergency Management	111
b. Community Representation	113
6. Local Issues.....	115
a. Top Priorities.....	116
E. APPENDIX	119

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.

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.

A. SITUATION AND OBJECTIVES

The mission statement for Waimate District Council reads ...

"To promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of our community."

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 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2013, and now again in 2015.

The advantages and benefits of this are that Council has the National Average and Peer Group comparisons, as well as the previous readings, against which to analyse perceived performance.

* * * * *

B. COMMUNITRAK™ SPECIFICATIONS

Sample Size

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

The survey was framed on the basis of the Wards as the elected representatives are associated with a particular Ward.

Sampling and analysis was based on the four Wards and the interviews spread as follows:

Hakataramea-Waihaorunga	29
Lower Waihao	41
Waimate	160
Pareora-Otaio-Makikihi	70
Total	<u>300</u>

Interview Type

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

Sample Selection

The white pages of the Timaru, Waimate and Kurow sections of the telephone directory were used as the sample source, with every "xth" number being selected.

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

A target of interviewing approximately 75 residents, aged 18 to 44 years, was also set.

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

Respondent Selection

Respondent selection within the household was also randomised with the eligible person being the man or woman, normally resident, 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 Ward, gender and age group proportions in the area as determined by the 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 Waimate 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 between Friday 27th March and Sunday 12th April (excluding Easter Friday and Monday) 2015.

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 1,003 residents carried out in November 2014.

The Communitrak™ service provides ...

- comparisons with a national sample of 1,003 interviews conducted in November 2014 (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 November 2014 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	±5%	±5%	±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%.

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%	6%	6%	5%	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 Waimate District Council residents and ratepayers to the services and facilities provided for them by their Council and their elected representatives.

The Waimate 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, and a comparison with the results of the 2000 - 2004 and 2013 Communitrak™ surveys.

COUNCIL SERVICES/FACILITIES


Satisfaction With Services/Facilities

	Waimate 2015		Waimate 2014	
	Very/fairly satisfied %	Not very satisfied %	Very / fairly satisfied %	Not very satisfied %
Parks, reserves and gardens	91 =	2 =	86	2
Dog and animal control	81 =	8 =	76	10
Cemeteries	74 =	2 =	74	2
District libraries	74 ↑	2 =	66	3
Water supply and service	74 ↑	10 =	66	14
Camping facilities	73 ↑	2 =	61	2
Waste management service	70 ↑	11 ↓	60	17
Emergency management	67 ↓	3 =	75	3
Information Centre services	64 ↓	1 =	72	2
Footpaths	61 =	29 =	61	28
Roads in the District (excl State Highways 1 & 82)	58 ↓	41 ↑	67	33
Standard of public toilets	54 =	11 =	54	15
Public swimming pool	54 =	4 =	51	5
Sewerage system and service	53 ↑	2 =	46	1
Stormwater services	51 =	8 =	50	12
Building control	48 ↑	12 ↓	39	25


NB: Figures do not always total 100%. The balance is a don't know response.

Key: ↑ above / slightly above 2014 reading
 ↓ below / slightly below 2014 reading
 = similar / on par

Percent Saying They Are Not Very Satisfied With ...



Percent Saying They Are Very Satisfied With ...



Peer Group And National Averages - Comparison

Waimate District is **higher** than the Peer Group and/or National Averages for ...

	Waimate %	Peer Group %	National Average %
• roading	41	27	21
• footpaths	29	19	23

However, the percent not very satisfied in Waimate District is **lower/slightly lower** than the Peer Group and/or National Averages for ...

• building control	12	+20	+19
• standard of public toilets	11	◊15	◊19
• dog and animal control	8	**22	**20
• public swimming pool	4	9	10

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

• waste management service	11	◊11	◊12
• water supply and service	10	◊◊12	◊◊9
• stormwater services	8	13	13
• emergency management	3	5	8
• parks, reserves and gardens	2	*3	*4
• District libraries	2	3	2
• cemeteries	2	1	4
• sewerage system and service	2	◊◊6	◊◊6

◊ percentages refer to ratings for public toilets

◊◊ percentages refer to ratings for water supply

* percentages refer to parks and reserves only

** percentages refer to ratings for dog control only

◊ percentages refer to average ratings for rubbish collection **and** recycling as these are asked separately in the 2014 National Communitrak™ Survey

◊◊ percentages refer to ratings for sewerage system

† percentages refer to ratings for town planning, including planning and inspection services

There are no comparative Peer Group and National Average figures for camping facilities and Information Centre services.

Comparison Between Overall And 'User/Visitor' Satisfaction Readings

Services And Facilities	Overall Satisfaction %	User/Visitor Satisfaction %
Parks, reserves and gardens	91	97
Cemetery	74	94
District libraries	74	86
Camping facilities	73	95
Information Centre services	64	96
Standard of public toilets	54	80
Public swimming pool (user satisfaction refers to Waimate pool users)	54	91

Comparison Between Overall And 'Contacted Council' Satisfaction Readings

Services And Facilities	Overall Satisfaction %	Contacted Council %
Dog and animal control	81	85
Building control	48	74

Comparison Between Overall And 'Receiver Of Service' Satisfaction Readings

Services And Facilities	Overall Satisfaction %	Receivers of Service %
Water supply and service	74	88
Waste management service	70	82
Sewerage system and service	53	99
Stormwater services	51	82

Frequency Of Household Use - Council Facilities And Services

	Usage In The Last Year		
	Three times or more %	Once or twice %	Not at all %
A park, reserve or public garden	55	19	26
District library	46	13	41
A cemetery	24	30	46
Public swimming pool	39	10	51
Information Centre [†]	16	30	53
A public toilet	21	26	53
Contacted Council about dog and/or animal control	5	25	70
Contacted Council about building services [†]	8	17	74
Camping facility	9	14	77

% read across

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

Parks, reserves or public gardens, 74%,

and a District library, 59%,


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

Spend Emphasis On Services/Facilities

In terms of the services / facilities measured, the main ones residents think more should be spent on are ...

- roads in the District, 62% of all residents (45% in 2013)
- footpaths, 35% (32% in 2013)
- property, eg, stadium, 26% (34% in 2013)


Satisfaction With Range Of Services And Facilities



RATES

89% of residents identified themselves, or members of their household, as ratepayers.

Satisfaction With How Rates Are Spent On Existing Services And Facilities Provided By Council



Waimate District is slightly below the Peer Group Average and below the National Average; in terms of the percent not very satisfied with the way rates are being spent.

The main reasons given by those who were not very satisfied are ...


- roads/bridges/footpaths need attention 5% of all residents
- unfair allocation of rates money /paying for other areas 4%
- waste money /spend too much /priorities wrong 3%
- other services /facilities needing attention /expenditure 3%

CONTACT WITH COUNCIL

42% of residents have contacted the Council offices in the last 12 months by phone (45% in 2013), with 38% contacting the Council offices in person (47% in 2013), 6% contacting them in writing (7% in 2013) and 9% by email (8% in 2013).

Overall, 58% of residents have contacted the Council offices in the last 12 months (66% in 2013).

Satisfaction With The Overall Service Received When Contacted The Council Offices




Base = 177

Rating Performance Of Council Staff

		Very good / Fairly good %	Just acceptable %	Not very good / Poor %	Don't know / No opinion %
Council Staff	2015	66	14	4	16
	2013	60	18	10	12

INFORMATION

Sources[†] Of Information About Council



[†] multiple responses allowed


Those residents who mention newspapers give the following as the newspapers they read*:

Waimate News & Views	47% of residents [†] who mention newspapers as their source of information about Council
Timaru Herald	47%
The Courier newspaper	30%
Waimate Trader	20%
High Country Herald/ South Canterbury Herald	13%
Otago Daily Times	7%
Others	4%

[†] Base = 249

* multiple responses allowed

Sufficiency Of Information Council Supplies To Community




Waimate District residents are on par with Peer Group residents and above residents nationwide, in feeling there is enough/ more than enough information supplied.

CIVIL DEFENCE

Before now, 84% of residents said they were aware that Council was the organisation responsible for co-ordinating Civil Defence in the District.

COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION

Satisfaction With Councillor Accessibility



LOCAL ISSUES

Top Priority

The main priorities* residents think rates money should be spent on are ...

- roads, mentioned by 54% of all residents,
- water supply, 19%,
- footpaths, 18%,
- sewerage, 9%,
- general infrastructure/basic core services, 9%,
- stadium, 8%.

11% of residents are unable to comment, while 2% say 'doing a good job/leave it to Council'.

* multiple responses allowed - respondents could mention up to three top priorities

* * * * *

D. MAIN FINDINGS

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

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

NRB has defined the Rural Peer Group as those Territorial Authorities where less than 66% of dwellings are in urban meshblocks, as classified by Statistics New Zealand's 2013 Census data.

Included in this Peer Group are ...

Buller District Council
 Carterton District Council
 Central Hawke's Bay District Council
 Central Otago District Council
 Clutha District Council
 Far North District Council
 Hauraki District Council
 Hurunui District Council
 Kaikoura District Council
 Kaipara District Council
 MacKenzie District Council
 Manawatu District Council
 Matamata Piako District Council
 Opotiki District Council
 Otorohanga District Council
 Rangitikei District Council

Ruapehu District Council
 Selwyn District Council
 South Taranaki District Council
 Southland District Council
 South Wairarapa District Council
 Stratford District Council
 Tararua District Council
 Tasman District Council
 Waikato District Council
 Waimakariri District Council
 Wairoa District Council
 Waitaki District Council
 Waitomo District Council
 Western Bay of Plenty District Council
 Westland District Council




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 that service or facility.

i. District Libraries

Overall




Users




Base = 179

Waimate Library



Base = 153

Library *Mainly* Visited/Used In Last 12 Months



Base = 179

Overall, 74% of Waimate District residents are satisfied with District libraries (66% in 2013), including 50% who are very satisfied. 2% are not very satisfied with this service and 24% are unable to comment (31% in 2013).

The percent not very satisfied is similar to like Districts, the National Average and the 2013 reading.

59% of households have visited a District library (including Timaru and Oamaru libraries) in the last 12 months, with 86% being satisfied, 3% not very satisfied and 11% unable to comment. 84% of these residents have mainly used/visited the Waimate Library. 91% of those who have used/visited the Waimate Library are satisfied, including 71% who are very satisfied.

There are no notable differences between Ward residents and between socio-economic groups, in terms of those not very satisfied with the library service.


Satisfaction With District Libraries

	Very Satisfied %	Fairly Satisfied %	Very/Fairly Satisfied %	Not Very Satisfied %	Don't Know %
Overall					
Total District					
2015	50	24	74	2	24
2013	46	20	66	3	31
2004	61	17	78	2	20
2003	58	15	73	2	25
2002	49	24	73	1	26
2001	51	20	71	3	26
2000	48	21	69	2	29
Users	62	24	86	3	11
Waimate Library	71	20	91	2	7
Comparison					
Peer Group (Rural)	62	23	85	3	12
National Average	69	21	90	2	8
Ward					
Hakataramea-Waihaorunga ^o	24	39	63	-	37
Lower Waihao	28	25	53	-	47
Waimate	66	20	86	2	12
Pareora-Otaio-Makikihi	35	25	60	5	35

% read across

^o caution: small base N=29


District Libraries



Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:

Total District	=	74%
Users	=	86%
Waimate Library Users	=	91%

ii. Parks, Reserves And Gardens



Overall, 91% of residents are satisfied with the District's parks, reserves and gardens (86% in 2013), including 59% who are very satisfied (54% in 2013), while 6% are unable to comment (11% in 2013).

74% of households have used or visited parks, reserves or gardens in the last 12 months. Satisfaction levels amongst these users/visitors of parks, reserves and gardens is on par with residents overall, at 97%.

The percent not very satisfied (2%) is similar to the Peer Group and National Averages for parks and reserves.

There are no notable differences, in terms of those not very satisfied, between Wards or between socio-economic groups.

Satisfaction With Parks, Reserves And Gardens

	Very Satisfied %	Fairly Satisfied %	Very/Fairly Satisfied %	Not Very Satisfied %	Don't Know %
Overall					
Total District 2015 [†]	59	32	91	2	6
2013 [†]	54	32	86	4	11
2004	69	22	91	1	8
2003	61	28	89	2	9
2002	51	37	88	1	11
2001	54	35	89	1	10
2000	49	35	84	2	14
Users/Visitors	68	29	97	1	2
Comparison*					
Peer Group (Rural)	54	38	92	3	5
National Average	62	31	93	4	3
Ward					
Hakataramea-Waihaorunga [°]	51	28	79	9	11
Lower Waihao	52	37	89	4	7
Waimate	68	29	97	1	2
Pareora-Otaio-Makikihi	48	39	87	-	13


% read across

* the Peer Group and National Averages are based on ratings of parks and reserves only

° caution: small base N=29


† does not add to 100% due to rounding

Parks, Reserves And Gardens



Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:
 Total District = 91%
 Users/Visitors = 97%

iii. Cemeteries



Overall, 74% of District residents are satisfied with cemeteries, including 50% who are very satisfied. 24% of residents are unable to comment. These readings are similar to the 2013 results.

The percent not very satisfied (2%) is similar to the Peer Group Average and on par with the National Average.

54% of households have visited a cemetery in the last year, with 94% of these say they are satisfied.

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

Satisfaction With The Cemeteries

	Very Satisfied %	Fairly Satisfied %	Very/Fairly Satisfied %	Not Very Satisfied %	Don't Know %
Overall					
Total District 2015	50	24	74	2	24
2013*	48	26	74	2	24
2004	58	16	74	1	25
2003	49	23	72	-	28
2002	42	30	72	1	27
2001	44	23	67	2	31
2000	44	22	66	1	33
Visitors	70	24	94	3	3
Comparison**					
Peer Group (Rural)	48	35	83	1	16
National Average	37	35	72	4	24
Ward					
Hakataramea-Waihaorunga ^o	33	44	77	4	19
Lower Waihao	48	13	61	-	39
Waimate	60	22	82	3	15
Pareora-Otaio-Makikihi	36	25	61	1	38


% read across

* readings prior to 2013 refer to Waimate Cemetery

** Peer Group and National Averages refer to cemeteries, including maintenance of cemeteries

^o caution: small base N=29

Cemeteries




* readings prior to 2013 refer to Waimate Cemetery

Recommended Satisfaction Measure for Reporting Purposes:


Total District = 74%
 Visited A Cemetery = 94%

iv. Public Swimming Pool

Overall




Users/Visitors




Base = 132

Waimate Pool



Base = 62

Swimming Pool *Mainly* Visited/Used



Base = 132

(Does not add to 100% due to rounding)

54% of Waimate District residents express satisfaction with the District's swimming pool, including 29% who are very satisfied. A large percentage (43%) are unable to say whether they are satisfied or not. This may well be due to usage, with 49% of households having visited or used a public swimming pool in the last 12 months. Of these "users/visitors", 69% are satisfied.

The percent not very satisfied (4%) is on par with like residents and slightly below residents nationwide, in terms of those not very satisfied with public swimming pools.

48% of households who use or visit a pool, mainly use or visit the Waimate Pool. Of these, 91% are satisfied, including 58% who are very satisfied. 3% are not very satisfied, and 6% are unable to comment.

There are no notable differences between Wards and between socio-economic groups, in terms of those residents not very satisfied with the District's swimming pool.

Satisfaction With Public Swimming Pool

	Very Satisfied %	Fairly Satisfied %	Very/Fairly Satisfied %	Not Very Satisfied %	Don't Know %
Overall					
Total District 2015 [†]	29	25	54	4	43
2013*	26	25	51	5	44
2004	43	24	67	3	30
2003	34	29	63	4	33
2002	31	29	60	2	38
2001	29	31	60	4	36
2000	35	22	57	3	40
Users/Visitors	37	32	69	5	26
Waimate Pool Users	58	33	91	3	6
Comparison					
Peer Group (Rural)	37	28	65	9	26
National Average	38	31	69	10	21
Ward					
Hakataramea-Waihaorunga [°]	5	34	39	9	52
Lower Waihao	24	17	41	-	59
Waimate	38	25	63	4	33
Pareora-Otaio-Makikihi	20	25	45	4	51


% read across

* readings prior to 2013 refer to satisfaction with public swimming pools

[°] caution: small base N=29

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

Public Swimming Pool



* readings prior to 2013 refer to satisfaction with public swimming pools


Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:

Total District	=	54%
Users/Visitors	=	69%
Waimate Pool Users/Visitors	=	91%

B. SATISFACTION WITH COUNCIL SERVICES/FACILITIES - WITH REASONS FOR DISSATISFACTION

Residents were read out 12 Council functions and asked whether they are very satisfied, fairly satisfied or not very satisfied with the provision of each particular service / facility. Those residents not very satisfied were asked to say why they feel this way.

i. Footpaths



61% of Waimate residents are satisfied with footpaths in their District, while 29% are not very satisfied. 10% are unable to comment. These readings are similar to the 2013 results.

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

Residents more likely to be not very satisfied with footpaths are ...

- Waimate Ward residents*,
- urban residents,
- women,
- residents who live in a one or two person household.

* caution required as base for Hakataramea-Waihaorunga Ward is small

Satisfaction With Footpaths

	Very Satisfied %	Fairly Satisfied %	Very/Fairly Satisfied %	Not Very Satisfied %	Don't Know %
Overall					
Total District 2015	14	47	61	29	10
2013 [†]	12	49	61	28	12
2004	14	56	70	21	9
2003	13	47	60	24	16
2002	12	51	63	22	15
2001	15	41	56	29	15
2000	10	46	56	24	20
Comparison					
Peer Group (Rural)	18	55	73	19	8
National Average	21	52	73	23	4
Ward					
Hakataramea-Waihaorunga [°]	18	35	53	22	25
Lower Waihao	18	55	73	15	12
Waimate	12	47	59	39	2
Pareora-Otaio-Makikihi	16	46	62	15	23
Area					
Urban	12	45	57	42	1
Rural	17	48	65	14	21
Gender					
Male	15	50	65	23	12
Female	13	43	56	35	9
Household Size					
1-2 person household	11	42	53	37	10
3+ person household	20	53	73	16	11

% read across

[°] caution: small base N=29

The main reasons residents are not very satisfied with footpaths are ...

- uneven/rough/potholes/bumpy/cracked,
- poor condition/need maintenance/improving,
- no footpaths/not enough footpaths.


Summary Table: Main Reasons* For Being Not Very Satisfied With Footpaths

	Total District 2015 %	Ward			
		Hakataramea-Waihaorunga [°] %	Lower Waihao %	Waimate %	Pareora-Otaio-Makikihi %
Percent Who Mention ...					
Uneven/rough/potholes/bumpy/cracked	18	10	3	28	6
Poor condition/need maintenance/improving	10	5	9	14	3
No footpaths/not enough footpaths	3	12	2	1	2

* multiple responses allowed


[°] caution: small base N=29

Footpaths



Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:
Total District = 61%

ii. Roads In The District (excluding State Highways 1 and 82, as these are not Council roads)



58% of residents are satisfied with roads in the District, excluding State Highways (67% in 2013), while 41% are not very satisfied.

The percent not very satisfied is above the Peer Group and National Averages and 8% above the 2013 reading.

Residents more likely to feel not very satisfied are ...

- Hakataramea-Waihaorunga Ward residents^o,
- rural residents,
- residents aged 18 to 64 years.

^o caution: small base N=29

Satisfaction With Roads In The District (excluding State Highways 1 and 82)

	Very Satisfied %	Fairly Satisfied %	Very/Fairly Satisfied %	Not Very Satisfied %	Don't Know %
Overall					
Total District 2015	12	46	58	41	1
2013**	16	51	67	33	1
2004	32	49	81	19	-
2003	20	54	74	25	1
2002	18	59	77	23	-
2001	19	58	77	21	2
2000	19	57	76	23	1
Comparison					
Peer Group (Rural)†	18	55	73	27	1
National Average	20	58	78	21	1
Ward					
Hakataramea-Waihaorunga°	1	9	10	90	-
Lower Waihao	12	36	48	50	2
Waimate	17	51	68	30	2
Pareora-Otaio-Makikihi	5	56	61	39	-
Area					
Urban	16	51	67	31	2
Rural	7	40	47	53	-
Age					
18-44 years†	13	47	60	41	-
45-64 years	8	38	46	52	2
65+ years	17	53	70	28	2

% read across

* readings prior to 2013 do not specifically exclude State Highways

° caution: small base N=29

† does not add to 100% due to rounding

The main reasons residents are not very satisfied with roads in the District are ...

- potholes/uneven/rough/bumpy,
- poor condition/need upgrading/attention,
- poor quality of work/materials/too much patching/poor grading,
- lack of maintenance/slow to repair.

Summary Table: Main Reasons* For Being Not Very Satisfied With Roads In The District (excluding State Highways 1 and 82)


	Total District 2015 %	Ward			
		Hakataramea-Waihaorunga [°] %	Lower Waihao %	Waimate %	Pareora-Otaio-Makikihi %
Percent Who Mention ...					
Potholes/uneven/rough/bumpy	19	52	16	16	12
Poor condition/need upgrading/attention	15	42	9	12	16
Poor quality of work/materials/too much patching/poor grading	13	25	7	11	17
Lack of maintenance/slow to repair	11	34	21	6	8

* multiple responses allowed

[°] caution: small base N=29

NB: no other reason is mentioned by more than 5% of all residents


Roads In The District (excluding State Highways 1 and 82)



* readings prior to 2013 do not specifically exclude State Highways

Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:
 Total District = 58%

iii. Water Supply And Services



74% of residents are satisfied with the water supply and service (66% in 2013), with 41% being very satisfied (33% in 2013). 10% are not very satisfied and 16% are unable to comment (20% in 2013).

The percentage not very satisfied (10%) is similar to the Peer Group and National Average readings for water supply.

75% of residents say they are provided with a piped water supply and, of these, 88% are satisfied (81% in 2013) and 11% are not very satisfied (18% in 2013).

There are no notable differences between Wards and between socio-economic groups, in terms of those residents not very satisfied with the water supply and service. However, it appears that residents who live in a one to two person household are **slightly more** likely to feel this way, than those who live in a three or more person household.

Satisfaction With Water Supply And Service

	Very Satisfied %	Fairly Satisfied %	Very/Fairly Satisfied %	Not Very Satisfied %	Don't Know %
Overall*					
Total District 2015	41	33	74	10	16
2013	33	33	66	14	20
2004	42	33	75	14	11
2003	29	38	67	20	13
2002	28	40	68	20	12
2001	22	42	64	19	17
2000	29	41	70	11	19
Service provided	51	37	88	11	1
Comparison**					
Peer Group (Rural)	32	34	66	12	22
National Average	48	35	83	9	8
Ward					
Hakataramea-Waihaorunga°	17	21	38	6	56
Lower Waihao	32	46	78	6	16
Waimate	55	30	85	12	3
Pareora-Otaio-Makikihi	27	36	63	8	29
Household Size					
1-2 person household	44	31	75	13	12
3+ person household	37	35	72	5	23

% read across

* Prior to 2002, residents were asked to say how satisfied they were with water service and delivery, and water quality separately. The percentages from 2000 to 2001 are an **average** of these two readings. 2003 and 2004 readings refer to water only

** Peer Group and National Averages refer to satisfaction with water supply

° caution: small base N=29

The main reasons residents are not very satisfied with the water supply and service are ...

- poor quality / needs to be improved,
- poor taste (excluding chlorine comments),
- needs to be boiled / filtered,
- chlorine content / chemical.

Summary Table:


Main Reasons* For Being Not Very Satisfied With Water Supply And Service

	Total District 2015 %	Ward			
		Hakataramea- Waihaorunga [°] %	Lower Waihao %	Waimate %	Pareora- Otaio- Makikihi %
Percent Who Mention ...					
Poor quality / needs to be improved	4	4	-	4	4
Poor taste (excluding chlorine comments)	3	2	-	5	3
Needs to be boiled / filtered	3	2	2	3	4
Chlorine content / chemical	2	-	4	2	3

* multiple responses allowed

[°] caution: small base N=29



Water Supply And Service



* Prior to 2002, residents were asked to say how satisfied they were with water service and delivery, and water quality separately. The percentages from 2000 to 2001 are an **average** of these two readings. 2003 and 2004 readings refer to water only

Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:
 Total District = 74%
 Receivers Of Service = 88%

iv. Sewerage System And Service



Base = 139

53% of residents are satisfied with the sewerage system and service in the District (46% in 2013), including 35% who are very satisfied (26% in 2013).

A large percentage (45%) are unable to comment (53% in 2013). This is probably due to 54% of residents saying they **are not** provided with a sewerage system. For those who are provided with the service, only 1% are unable to comment and satisfaction rises to 99%.

2% of residents overall say they are not very satisfied with the sewerage system and service, with 1% of those provided with a sewerage system being not very satisfied.

The percent not very satisfied is on par with the Peer Group and National Average readings for the sewerage system.

There are no notable differences between Wards and between socio-economic groups, in terms of those residents who are not very satisfied with the District's sewerage system and service.

Satisfaction With The Sewerage System And Service

	Very Satisfied %	Fairly Satisfied %	Very/Fairly Satisfied %	Not Very Satisfied %	Don't Know %
Overall					
Total District 2015	35	18	53	2	45
2013*	26	20	46	1	53
2004	32	20	52	3	45
2003	30	23	53	5	42
2002	20	27	47	10	43
2001	17	30	47	5	48
2000	21	23	44	5	51
Service Provided [†]	67	32	99	1	1
Comparison*					
Peer Group (Rural) [†]	34	31	65	6	30
National Average	51	32	83	6	11
Ward					
Hakataramea-Waihaorunga [°]	4	4	8	15	77
Lower Waihao [†]	14	15	29	3	67
Waimate	57	27	84	-	16
Pareora-Otaio-Makikihi	9	6	15	-	85

% read across

* readings prior to 2013 and Peer Group and National Averages refer to sewerage system only

° caution: small base N=29

† does not add to 100% due to rounding

The reasons* residents are not very satisfied with the sewerage system and service are ...


"Pay rates but get no sewerage service."

"System doesn't work for us in Morven. Each year we have to call in a plumber, backs up."

"Unhappy that we were told we had to have a septic tank and we paid for it and then two years later they said that a consent was not needed."

* multiple responses allowed

Sewerage System And Service




** readings prior to 2013 refer to sewerage system only

Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:

Total District = 53%

Receivers Of Service = 99%

v. Stormwater Services



Overall, 51% of Waimate District residents are satisfied with stormwater services, while 8% are not very satisfied with this service.

A large percentage (41%) are unable to comment and this is probably due to only 45% of residents saying they are provided with a piped stormwater collection, where they live. Of these, 82% are satisfied.

The percent not very satisfied is on par with like Districts and the National Average.

There are no notable differences between Wards and between socio-economic groups, in terms of those residents not very satisfied with stormwater services. However, it appears that urban residents are slightly more likely to be not very satisfied with stormwater services, than rural residents.

Satisfaction With Stormwater Services

	Very Satisfied %	Fairly Satisfied %	Very/Fairly Satisfied %	Not Very Satisfied %	Don't Know %
Overall*					
Total District 2015	22	29	51	8	41
2013 [†]	19	31	50	12	39
2000	15	33	48	13	39
Service Provided	40	42	82	11	7
Comparison[†]					
Peer Group (Rural)	28	35	63	13	23
National Average	35	40	75	13	11
Ward					
Hakataramea-Waihaorunga [°]	-	5	5	5	90
Lower Waihao	13	31	44	7	49
Waimate	35	36	71	12	17
Pareora-Otaio-Makikihi	7	22	29	1	70
Area					
Urban	36	39	75	12	13
Rural	6	18	24	3	73

% read across

* prior 2013 last asked in 2000

° caution: small base N=29

† does not add to 100% due to rounding

The main reasons residents are not very satisfied with stormwater services are ...

- flooding,
- blockages / drains / gutters, culverts need clearing regularly.

Summary Table: Main Reasons* For Being Not Very Satisfied With Stormwater Services


	Total District 2015 %	Ward			
		Hakataramea- Waihaorunga [°] %	Lower Waihao %	Waimate %	Pareora- Otaio- Makikihi %
Percent Who Mention ...					
Flooding	4	-	6	6	-
Blockages / drains / gutters, culverts need clearing regularly	3	3	1	5	1

* multiple responses allowed

[°] caution: small base N=29



NB: no other reason is mentioned by more than 1% of all residents

Stormwater Services



Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:
Total District = 51%
Service Provided = 82%

vi. Waste Management Service (ie, rubbish collection and recycling)



Base = 237

Overall, 70% of residents are satisfied with waste management services (60% in 2013), including 43% who are very satisfied (30% in 2013). 11% are not very satisfied and 19% are unable to comment (23% in 2013).

The percent not very satisfied reading is similar to the averaged Peer Group and National Average readings for rubbish collection and recycling.

78% of residents say they receive a rubbish collection (71% in 2013). Of these, 82% are satisfied, and 13% not very satisfied.

There are no notable differences between Wards and between socio-economic groups, in terms of those not very satisfied with waste management service.

Satisfaction With Waste Management Service

	Very Satisfied %	Fairly Satisfied %	Very/Fairly Satisfied %	Not Very Satisfied %	Don't Know %
Overall*					
Total District 2015	43	27	70	11	19
2013	30	30	60	17	23
2004	38	24	62	14	24
2003	45	20	65	11	24
2002	38	26	64	12	24
2001	45	23	68	12	20
2000	34	24	58	17	25
Service Provided	51	31	82	13	5
Comparison**^{o+}					
Peer Group (Rural)	47	31	78	11	12
National Average	56	28	84	12	5
Ward					
Hakataramea-Waihaorunga ^o	11	11	22	4	74
Lower Waihao ⁺	29	31	60	14	27
Waimate ⁺	58	29	87	10	2
Pareora-Otaio-Makikihi ⁺	30	27	57	14	30

% read across

* readings prior to 2013 refer to ratings for rubbish collection. In 2013 service did not specify that this was rubbish collection and recycling.

^o caution: small base N=29

^{oo} Peer Group and National Averages refer to **average** ratings for rubbish collection and recycling as these are asked separately in the 2014 National Communitrak™ Survey

⁺ does not add to 100% due to rounding

The main reasons residents are not very satisfied with waste management service are ...

- too expensive / cost involved,
- need collections more often,
- provide bigger / more recycling bins / bins with lids.

Summary Table:


Main Reasons* For Being Not Very Satisfied With Waste Management Service

	Total District 2015 %	Ward			
		Hakataramea-Waihaorunga [°] %	Lower Waihao %	Waimate %	Pareora-Otaio-Makikihi %
Percent Who Mention ...					
Too expensive / cost involved	3	-	8	4	1
Need collections more often	2	-	-	-	10
Provide bigger / more recycling bins / bins with lids	2	-	-	2	4

* multiple responses allowed

[°] caution: small base N=29

Waste Management Service



* readings prior to 2013 refer to ratings for rubbish collection


** in 2013 service did not specify that this was rubbish collection and recycling

Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:

Total District = 70%

Service Provided = 82%

vii. Standard Of Public Toilets



54% of residents are satisfied with the standard of public toilet facilities, while a large percentage are unable to comment (36%, 31% in 2013).

11% of residents are not very satisfied (15% in 2013). This is on par with Peer Group Districts and below the National Average for public toilets.

47% of households say they have used a public toilet in the last 12 months. Compared to residents overall, "users" are more likely to be satisfied (80%), similar in terms of being not very satisfied (13%), and less likely to be unable to comment (6%).

There are no notable differences between Wards and between socio-economic groups, in terms of those residents not very satisfied with the standard of public toilets. However, it appears that women are slightly more likely to be not very satisfied, than men.

Satisfaction With The Standard Of Public Toilets

	Very Satisfied %	Fairly Satisfied %	Very/Fairly Satisfied %	Not Very Satisfied %	Don't Know %
Overall*					
Total District 2015 [†]	23	31	54	11	36
2013	19	35	54	15	31
2004	14	29	43	21	36
2003	13	32	45	20	35
2002	10	33	43	18	39
2001	17	32	49	15	36
2000	20	27	47	13	40
Users [†]	33	47	80	13	6
Comparison*					
Peer Group (Rural) [†]	33	41	74	15	12
National Average	22	44	66	19	15
Ward					
Hakataramea-Waihaorunga [°]	18	34	52	13	35
Lower Waihao [†]	24	38	62	8	31
Waimate	25	28	53	11	36
Pareora-Otaio-Makikihi	20	32	52	9	39
Gender					
Male	21	39	60	6	34
Female	24	24	48	15	37

% read across

* readings prior to 2013 and Peer Group and National Averages refer to ratings for public toilets

[°] caution: small base N=29

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

The main reasons residents are not very satisfied with the standard of public toilets are ...

- dirty/lack of cleanliness,
- need improving/upgrading,
- not enough toilets/need more,
- not enough privacy.

Summary Table:


Main Reasons* For Being Not Very Satisfied With The Standard Of Public Toilets

	Total District 2015 %	Ward			
		Hakataramea- Waihaorunga [°] %	Lower Waihao %	Waimate %	Pareora- Otaio- Makikihi %
Percent Who Mention ...					
Dirty/lack of cleanliness	3	6	-	4	1
Need improving/upgrading	3	7	-	2	4
Not enough toilets/need more	3	2	-	3	3
Not enough privacy	2	2	-	3	-

* multiple responses allowed

[°] caution: small base N=29

Standard Of Public Toilets




* readings prior to 2013 refer to ratings for public toilets

Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:

Total District = 54%

Users = 80%

viii. Camping Facilities (ie, Victoria Park, Knottingley Park, Waitaki Lakes)



Overall, 73% of Waimate District residents are satisfied with camping facilities in the District (61% in 2013), including 45% who are very satisfied (34% in 2013), while 2% are not very satisfied.

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

A large percentage (25%) are unable to comment (37% in 2013) and this is probably due to only 23% of households having used a camping facility in the last 12 months (13% in 2013). Of these users, 95% are satisfied.

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

Satisfaction With Camping Facilities

	Very Satisfied %	Fairly Satisfied %	Very/Fairly Satisfied %	Not Very Satisfied %	Don't Know %
Overall*					
Total District 2015	45	28	73	2	25
2013	34	27	61	2	37
Users [†]	67	28	95	2	4
Ward					
Hakataramea-Waihaorunga [°]	37	41	78	-	22
Lower Waihao [†]	33	34	67	-	34
Waimate	52	25	77	3	20
Pareora-Otaio-Makikihi	40	26	66	1	33

% read across

* not asked prior to 2013 (in 2013 the specific camping facilities were not mentioned)


° caution: small base N=29

† does not add to 100% due to rounding

The reasons* are not very satisfied with camping facilities are ...

- need upgrading, mentioned by 1% of all residents,
- others, 1%.

* multiple responses allowed




* not asked prior to 2013 (in 2013 the specific camping facilities were not mentioned)

Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:

Total District = 73%

Users = 95%

ix. Information Centre Services



64% of Waimate District residents are satisfied with Information Centre services (72% in 2013), including 47% who are very satisfied, while 1% are not very satisfied and 35% are unable to comment (27% in 2013).

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

47% of residents say they, or a member of their household, have used or visited the Information Centre, in the last 12 months (51% in 2013). Of these 'users/visitors', 96% are satisfied.

There are no notable differences between Wards and between socio-economic groups, in terms of those not very satisfied with Information Centre services.

Satisfaction With Information Centre Services

	Very Satisfied %	Fairly Satisfied %	Very/Fairly Satisfied %	Not Very Satisfied %	Don't Know %
Overall*					
Total District 2015	47	17	64	1	35
2013 [†]	47	25	72	2	27
Users/Visitors [†]	76	20	96	1	3
Ward					
Hakataramea-Waihaorunga [°]	18	17	35	4	(61)
Lower Waihao	(54)	18	(72)	-	28
Waimate	(61)	18	(79)	1	20
Pareora-Otaio-Makikihi [†]	22	14	36	1	(62)

% read across

* not asked prior to 2013


° caution: small base N=29

† does not add to 100% due to rounding

The reasons** residents are not very satisfied with Information Centre services are ...

- staff not helpful/lack knowledge, mentioned by 1% of all residents,
- others, 1%.

** multiple responses allowed




* not asked prior to 2013

Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:

Total District = 64%

Users/Visitors = 96%

x. Building Control



48% of residents are satisfied with building control (39% in 2013), while 12% are not very satisfied (25% in 2013).

A significant percentage (39%) are unable to comment and this may be due to only 26% of households having contacted Council about building services in the last 12 months. Of these, 74% are satisfied (50% in 2013) and 20% not very satisfied (46% in 2013).

The percent not very satisfied (12%) is below the Peer Group Average and slightly below the National Average readings for town planning, including planning and inspection services.

There are no notable differences between Wards and between socio-economic groups, in terms of those residents who are not very satisfied with building control.

Satisfaction With Building Control

	Very Satisfied %	Fairly Satisfied %	Very/Fairly Satisfied %	Not Very Satisfied %	Don't Know %
Overall*					
Total District 2015 [†]	17	31	48	12	39
2013	10	29	39	25	36
Users	31	43	74	20	6
Comparison**					
Peer Group (Rural)	10	40	50	20	30
National Average	11	37	48	19	33
Ward					
Hakataramea-Waihaorunga [°]	30	23	53	19	28
Lower Waihao	23	33	56	9	35
Waimate	14	28	42	12	46
Pareora-Otaio-Makikihi [†]	17	42	59	11	31

% read across

* not asked prior to 2013

** Peer Group and National Averages refer to ratings for town planning, including planning and inspection services

[°] caution: small base N=29

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

The main reasons residents are not very satisfied with building control are ...


- too much red tape/bureaucratic/restrictive,
- delays/process takes too long,
- fees/charges too expensive,
- difficult to deal with/disharmony with inspection services,
- poor customer service/hard to get information/incompetent staff.

Summary Table: Main Reasons* For Being Not Very Satisfied With Building Control

	Total District 2015 %	Ward			
		Hakataramea- Waihaorunga [°] %	Lower Waihao %	Waimate %	Pareora- Otaio- Makikihi %
Percent Who Mention ...					
Too much red tape/bureaucratic/restrictive	3	13	-	2	2
Delays/process takes too long	2	4	7	1	1
Fees/charges too expensive	2	-	-	3	4
Difficult to deal with/ disharmony with inspection services	2	2	-	2	1
Poor customer service/ hard to get information/incompetent staff	2	-	-	2	2

* multiple responses allowed

[°] caution: small base N=29

Building Control


* not asked prior to 2013

Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:

Total District = 48%

Users/Visitors = 74%

xi. Emergency Management



67% of residents are satisfied with emergency management (75% in 2013), including 38% who are very satisfied, while 29% are unable to comment (22% in 2013).

3% of residents are not very satisfied. This is similar to the Peer Group Average and on par with the National Average.

There are no notable differences between Wards and between socio-economic, in terms of those residents not very satisfied with emergency management.

Satisfaction With Emergency Management

	Very Satisfied %	Fairly Satisfied %	Very/Fairly Satisfied %	Not Very Satisfied %	Don't Know %
Overall*					
Total District 2015 [†]	38	29	67	3	29
2013	39	36	75	3	22
Comparison					
Peer Group (Rural)	29	34	63	5	32
National Average	27	36	63	8	29
Ward					
Hakataramea-Waihaorunga [°]	40	34	74	2	24
Lower Waihao [†]	34	30	64	4	31
Waimate [†]	39	27	65	3	31
Pareora-Otaio-Makikihi	38	32	70	4	26

% read across

* not asked prior to 2013


° caution: small base N=29

† does not add to 100% due to rounding

The main reasons** residents are not very satisfied with emergency management are ..

- not equipped for emergency / not handled well, mentioned by 2% of all residents,
- more Civil Defence / emergency training / awareness / more info, 2%.

** multiple responses allowed




* not asked prior to 2013


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

xii. Dog And Animal Control

Overall




Contacted Council Regarding Dog Control In Last 12 Months



Base = 83

Dog Owners



Base = 149

81% of Waimate District residents are satisfied with dog and animal control (76% in 2013), including 43% who are very satisfied (34% in 2013). 8% are not very satisfied and 11% are unable to comment (14% in 2013).

The percent not very satisfied is below the Peer Group and National Average readings for dog control.

30% of households have contacted Council about dog control in the last 12 months (27% in 2013) and 53% identify themselves as dog owners (56% in 2013).

87% of dog owners are satisfied, and 13% are not very satisfied , while 85% of those who have contacted Council about dogs are satisfied and 5% not very satisfied.

There are no notable differences between Wards and between socio-economic groups, in terms of those residents not very satisfied with dog and animal control.

Satisfaction With Dog And Animal Control

	Very Satisfied %	Fairly Satisfied %	Very/Fairly Satisfied %	Not Very Satisfied %	Don't Know %
Overall*					
Total District 2015	43	38	81	8	11
2013	34	42	76	10	14
2004	35	38	73	13	14
2003	31	44	75	10	15
2002	24	43	67	13	20
2001	29	40	69	16	15
2000	25	35	60	18	22
Contacted Council	63	22	85	13	1
Dog Owners [†]	49	38	87	5	8
Comparison*					
Peer Group (Rural)	30	41	71	22	7
National Average	32	41	73	20	7
Ward					
Hakataramea-Waihaorunga ^{o†}	30	47	77	2	22
Lower Waihao	45	34	79	6	15
Waimate	48	34	82	11	7
Pareora-Otaio-Makikihi	39	44	83	6	11

% read across

* readings prior to 2013 and Peer Group and National Averages refer to ratings for dog control only


^o caution: small base N=29

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

The main reasons* residents are not very satisfied with dog and animal control are ...

- need more control, mentioned by 3% of all residents,
- too many roaming/uncontrolled dogs, 2%.

* multiple responses allowed



* readings prior to 2013 refer to ratings for dog control only

Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:	
Total District	= 81%
Contacted Council	= 85%
Dog Owners	= 87%

C. SPEND EMPHASIS ON COUNCIL SERVICES/FACILITIES

Residents were asked to say whether they would like more, about the same or less spent on particular Council services / facilities, given that more cannot be spent on everything, without increasing rates and / or user charges where applicable.

Summary Table: Spend Emphasis

	Spend More %	Spend About The Same %	Spend Less %	Unsure %
Roads in the District (excl State Highways)	62	37	-	1
Footpaths	35	56	1	8
Property, eg, Stadium	26	47	14	13
Community grants	17	60	3	20
Water supply and service	16	72	-	12
Standard of public toilets [†]	16	65	-	18
Waste management services [†]	13	82	2	4
Swimming pools	12	68	1	19
Emergency management	9	78	1	12
Library service [†]	9	78	2	10
Dog and animal control	8	84	1	7
Camping facilities	8	76	2	14
Building control	8	62	6	24
Parks, reserves and gardens [†]	7	88	1	3
Stormwater services	7	76	-	17
Information Centre	5	75	3	17
Sewerage system and service	5	74	-	21
Cemeteries	3	88	-	9

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


Summary Table: Top Six Services/Facilities* - By Ward

Top Six Services/Facilities*	Total District 2015 %	Total District 2013 %	Ward			
			Hakataramea-Waihaorunga [°] %	Lower Waihao %	Waimate %	Pareora-Otaio-Makikihi %
Roads (excluding State Highways)	62	45	87	64	55	64
Footpaths	35	32	13	15	51	17
Property, eg, stadium	26	34	8	29	32	20
Community grants	17	18	13	13	16	23
Water supply and service	16	18	23	11	15	19
Standard of public toilets	16	25	17	15	17	17

* in terms of the percentage of residents who want **more** spent

[°] caution: small base N=29

D. SPEND PRIORITY



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


The graph shows the priorities for spending for Council for those 16 services / facilities where both the not very satisfied reading and mean spend 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 for each service / facility where satisfaction is measured.

Roads in the District and footpaths are the top priorities for Council in terms of spend. Cemeteries, Information Centre, and building control are of lowest priority in terms of spend.

E. SATISFACTION WITH THE RANGE OF SERVICES AND FACILITIES PROVIDED BY COUNCIL

The Waimate District Council is responsible for a number of services and facilities in the District. These range from the basic necessities ensuring good health and quality of life, through to recreational facilities for residents to use and other services that ensure the prosperity and wellbeing of the District.



Overall, 87% of Waimate residents are satisfied with the **range** of services and facilities provided by Council, including 32% who are very satisfied (24% in 2013), while 5% are not very satisfied. 8% are unable to comment (4% in 2013).

It appears that Hakataramea-Waihaorunga Ward residents are more likely to be not very satisfied, than other Ward residents (caution recommended as the base is small, N=29).

Satisfaction With The Range Of Services And Facilities Provided By Council

	Very Satisfied %	Fairly Satisfied %	Very/Fairly Satisfied %	Not Very Satisfied %	Don't Know %
Overall					
Total District 2015	32	55	87	5	8
2013 [†]	24	63	87	8	4
2004	38	57	95	2	3
2003	31	58	89	8	3
2002	24	68	92	5	3
2001	26	68	94	4	2
2000	24	67	91	4	5
Ward					
Hakataramea-Waihaorunga [°]	14	51	65	21	14
Lower Waihao	33	57	90	2	8
Waimate [†]	39	52	91	5	5
Pareora-Otaio-Makikihi	23	65	88	-	12


% read across

[°] caution: small base N=29

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

The main reasons* residents are not very satisfied with the range of services and facilities provided by Council are ...

- facilities/services lacking, mentioned by 2% of all residents,
- facilities/services need improving, 2%,
- dabble in too many things/lot of money spent/waste money, 1%.




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



2. RATES ISSUES

A. SATISFACTION WITH THE WAY RATES ARE SPENT ON THE SERVICES AND FACILITIES PROVIDED BY COUNCIL



89% of residents identify themselves as ratepayers.

Overall, 75% of residents are satisfied with the way rates are spent on the existing services and facilities provided by Council (65% in 2013) and 18% are not very satisfied. 7% are unable to comment.

Waimate District is slightly below the Peer Group Average and below the National Average, in terms of the percent not very satisfied with the way rates are being spent.

Hakataramea-Waihaorunga Ward residents are more likely to be not very satisfied, than other Ward residents (caution recommended as the base is small N=29).

It appears that the following residents are slightly more likely to feel this way ...

- rural residents,
- ratepayers.

Satisfaction With The Way Rates Are Spent On The Services And Facilities Provided By Council

	Very Satisfied %	Fairly Satisfied %	Very/Fairly Satisfied %	Not Very Satisfied %	Don't Know %
Overall					
Total District 2015	13	62	75	18	7
2013	7	58	65	28	7
2004	16	69	85	10	5
2003	9	71	80	16	4
2002	5	66	71	22	7
2001	9	61	70	22	8
2000	9	57	66	26	8
Comparison					
Peer Group (Rural)	9	61	70	24	6
National Average [†]	10	58	68	27	6
Ward					
Hakataramea-Waihaorunga [°]	-	52	52	43	5
Lower Waihao	11	71	82	15	3
Waimate	18	60	78	15	7
Pareora-Otaio-Makikihi	7	68	75	16	9
Area					
Urban	18	60	78	14	8
Rural [†]	7	65	72	23	6
Ratepayer?					
Ratepayer	13	62	75	19	6
Non-ratepayer	7	69	76	6	18

% read across

[°] caution: small base N=29

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

The main reasons* residents are not very satisfied with the way rates are spent are ...

- roads/bridges/footpaths need attention,
- unfair allocation of rates money /paying for other areas,
- waste money/spend too much/priorities are wrong,
- other services/facilities needing attention/expenditure.

Summary Table:

Main Reasons* For Being Not Very Satisfied With The Way Rates Are Spent

	Total District 2015 %	Ward			
		Hakataramea-Waihaorunga [°] %	Lower Waihao %	Waimate %	Pareora-Otaio-Makikihi %
Percent Who Mention ...					
Roads/bridges/footpaths need attention	5	23	6	2	3
Unfair allocation of rates money / paying for other areas	4	19	2	1	5
Waste money/spend too much / priorities are wrong	3	4	3	3	3
Other services / facilities needing attention / expenditure	3	4	-	3	3

* multiple responses allowed

[°] caution: small base N=29


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



3. CONTACT WITH COUNCIL


A. LEVELS OF CONTACT

2015 - Yes, Have Contacted ...




Percent Saying 'Yes' - Comparison


'By Phone'




'In Person'



'In Writing'





42% of residents have contacted Council offices by phone in the last year, while 38% visited a Council office in person (47% in 2013), 6% contacted Council in writing and 9% contacted them by email.

Residents are similar to the Peer Group residents and similar to residents nationwide, to say they have contacted Council by phone.

Residents are on par with Peer Group residents and slightly more likely than residents nationwide, to say they have contacted Council in person.

Waimate District residents are similar to Peer Group residents and residents nationwide, to say they have contacted Council in writing and below the Peer Group residents and residents nationwide, to say they have contacted Council by email.

Residents more likely to contact Council offices by **phone** are ...


- rural residents,
- residents aged 45 to 64 years,
- ratepayers.

Residents more likely to visit a Council office **in person** are ...

- all Ward residents, except Pareora-Otaio-Makikihi Ward residents[†],
- urban residents,
- residents aged 45 years or over,
- residents who live in a one or two person household,
- ratepayers.

There are no notable differences between Wards and between socio-economic groups, in terms of those residents contacting Council **in writing** and/or **by email**.

[†] caution recommended as base for Hakataramea-Waihaorunga Ward is small

B. SATISFACTION WHEN CONTACTING THE COUNCIL OFFICES BY PHONE

Base = 125

91% of residents contacting the Council offices by phone in the last 12 months are satisfied (81% in 2013), including 53% who are very satisfied (38% in 2013), while 7% are not very satisfied (19% in 2013).

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

There are no notable differences between Wards and between socio-economic groups, in terms of those residents who are not very satisfied when contacting the Council offices by phone.

Satisfaction When Contacting Council Offices By Phone

	Very Satisfied %	Fairly Satisfied %	Very/Fairly Satisfied %	Not Very Satisfied %	Don't Know %
Contacted Council By Phone					
2015	53	38	91	7	2
2013	38	43	81	19	-
2004	49	41	90	10	-
2003	45	46	91	8	1
2002	37	48	85	15	-
2001	49	41	90	9	1
2000	40	37	77	20	3
Comparison					
Peer Group (Rural)	49	34	83	17	-
National Average [†]	40	41	81	18	-
Ward					
Hakataramea-Waihaorunga*	35	65	100	-	-
Lower Waihao*	54	32	86	8	6
Waimate	52	40	92	8	-
Pareora-Otaio-Makikihi	56	34	90	7	3

Base = 125

% read across


* caution: small/very small base

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

The main reasons* residents contacting Council offices by phone are not very satisfied are ...

- lack of action, mentioned by 3% of residents contacting Council by phone (3 respondents),
- no reply / don't get back to you, 2% (2 respondents),
- unsatisfactory outcome, 2% (2 respondents).

* multiple responses allowed

c. SATISFACTION WHEN CONTACTING A COUNCIL OFFICE IN PERSON

Base = 117

89% of residents contacting a Council office in person in the last 12 months are satisfied, including 59% who are very satisfied (56% in 2013), while 11% are not very satisfied.

The percent not very satisfied is on par with the Peer Group Average and similar to the National Average and 2013 reading.

Rural residents[†] are more likely to be not very satisfied, than urban residents[†].

[†] residents who have contacted Council office in person, N=117

Satisfaction When Contacting A Council Office In Person

	Very Satisfied %	Fairly Satisfied %	Very/Fairly Satisfied %	Not Very Satisfied %	Don't Know %
Contacted Council In Person					
2015	59	30	89	11	-
2013 [†]	56	35	91	10	-
2004	57	36	93	7	-
2003	53	39	92	8	-
2002	45	48	93	7	-
2001	54	39	93	7	-
2000	55	39	94	6	-
Comparison					
Peer Group (Rural) [†]	55	40	95	6	-
National Average	52	37	89	11	-
Ward					
Hakataramea-Waihaorunga*	30	21	51	49	-
Lower Waihao*	48	52	100	-	-
Waimate	66	26	92	8	-
Pareora-Otaio-Makikihi*	59	34	93	7	-
Area					
Urban [†]	66	30	96	5	-
Rural	48	32	79	21	-

Base = 117

% read across


* caution: small bases

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

The main reasons** residents visiting a Council office in person are not very satisfied are ...

- poor attitude/unhelpful, mentioned by 5% of residents contacting Council by phone (5 respondents),
- lack of action, 4% (5 respondents)

** multiple responses allowed

D. SATISFACTION WHEN CONTACTING THE COUNCIL OFFICES IN WRITING

Base = 22

* caution: small base

83% of residents contacting the Council offices in writing in the last 12 months are satisfied, including 56% who are very satisfied, while 17% are not very satisfied (caution is required as the base is small).

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

As the bases for all Wards and socio-economic groups are very small (<17), no comparisons have been made.

Satisfaction When Contacting Council Offices In Writing

	Very Satisfied %	Fairly Satisfied %	Very/Fairly Satisfied %	Not Very Satisfied %	Don't Know %
Contacted Council In Writing					
2015	56	27	83	17	-
2013	43	26	69	27	4
2004	61	25	86	8	6
2003	43	33	76	15	9
2002	27	57	84	16	-
2001	35	47	82	18	-
2000	19	62	81	19	-
Comparison					
Peer Group (Rural)	35	53	88	12	-
National Average	29	35	64	36	-
Ward*					
Hakataramea-Waihaorunga	58	14	72	28	-
Lower Waihao	70	-	70	30	-
Waimate	45	40	85	15	-
Pareora-Otaio-Makikihi	64	36	100	-	-

Base = 22 (caution: small base)

% read across


* caution: very small bases (all <9)

The reasons** residents contacting Council offices in writing are not very satisfied are ...

- unsatisfactory outcome mentioned by 8% of residents contacting Council in writing (2 respondents),
- issue not resolved, 6% (2 respondents),
- poor attitude, 4% (1 respondent).

** multiple responses allowed

E. SATISFACTION WHEN CONTACTING THE COUNCIL OFFICES BY EMAIL



Base = 26*

* caution: small base

69% of residents contacting the Council offices by email in the last 12 months are satisfied, including 44% who are very satisfied, while 25% are not very satisfied (caution recommended as the base is small).

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

As the bases for all Wards and socio-economic groups are small (<27), no comparisons have been made.

The main reasons** the residents contacting Council by email are not very satisfied are ...

- no reply, mentioned by 14% of residents (3 respondents) contacting Council by email,
- unsatisfactory outcome, 7% (2 respondents),
- issues not resolved, 5% (1 respondent).

** multiple responses allowed

Satisfaction When Contacting Council Offices By Email

	Very Satisfied %	Fairly Satisfied %	Very/Fairly Satisfied %	Not Very Satisfied %	Don't Know %
Contacted Council By Email**					
2015 [†]	44	25	69	25	7
2013	45	45	90	10	-
Comparison					
Peer Group (Rural)	44	42	86	12	2
National Average	26	46	72	28	-
Ward*					
Hakataramea-Waihaorunga	26	37	63	37	-
Lower Waihao [†]	33	33	66	33	-
Waimate	51	13	64	24	12
Pareora-Otaio-Makikihi	42	42	84	16	-

Base = 26 (caution: small base)

% read across


* caution: very small bases (all <14)

** not asked prior to 2013

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

F. SATISFACTION WITH OVERALL SERVICE RECEIVED WHEN CONTACTED COUNCIL

Contacted A Council Office In The Last 12 Months



Base = 177

Of the 58% of residents who have contacted the Council offices in the last 12 months (66% in 2013), 90% are satisfied with service they received, including 52% who are very satisfied (41% in 2013) and 9% are not very satisfied.

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

There are no notable differences between Wards and between socio-economic groups, in terms of those residents not very satisfied when they have contacted the Council offices.

Satisfaction With Overall Service Received When Contacted Council

	Very Satisfied %	Fairly Satisfied %	Very/Fairly Satisfied %	Not Very Satisfied %	Don't Know %
Contacted Council					
2015	52	38	90	9	1
2013	41	48	89	11	-
2004	56	36	92	8	-
2003	36	57	93	7	-
2002	39	51	90	9	1
2001	45	47	92	7	1
2000	37	48	85	15	-
Comparison					
Peer Group (Rural)	45	42	87	13	-
National Average	40	45	85	15	-
Ward					
Hakataramea-Waihaorunga ^{o*}	44	46	90	10	-
Lower Waihao	34	56	90	10	-
Waimate	45	45	90	10	-
Pareora-Otaio-Makikihi	35	50	85	15	-

Base = 177

% read across

* caution: small base


^o caution: small base N=29

Recommended Satisfaction Measure For Reporting Purposes:

Contacted Council in last 12 months	=	90%
Contacted Council - by phone	=	91%
- in person	=	89%
- in writing*	=	83%
- by email*	=	69%

* caution: small base

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



66% of Waimate District residents rate the performance of the Council staff, in the last year, as very good or fairly good (60% in 2013). Waimate residents are similar to like residents and above residents nationwide, in terms of rating Council staff performance as very / fairly good.

14% rate their performance as just acceptable (18% in 2013), 4% say it is not very good / poor (10% in 2013) and 16% are unable to comment (12% in 2013).

There are no notable differences between Wards and between socio-economic groups, in terms of those residents who rate Council staff's performance as very / fairly good.

However, it appears that residents who live in a three or more person household are **slightly more** likely to feel this way, than those who live in a one or two person household.

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 2015	66	14	4	16
2013	60	18	10	12
2004	76	11	2	11
2003	69	17	4	10
2002	68	13	6	13
2001	72	14	3	11
2000	64	14	5	17
Comparison				
Peer Group Average	65	17	7	11
National Average	51	22	12	15
Ward				
Hakatamea-Waihaorunga ^{o†}	59	20	2	18
Lower Waihao [†]	73	5	8	15
Waimate	66	16	4	14
Pareora-Otaio-Makikihi	67	11	3	19
Household Size				
1-2 person household	63	18	4	15
3+ person household	72	7	4	17

% read across

^o caution: small base N=29


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



4. INFORMATION


A. MAIN SOURCE OF INFORMATION ABOUT COUNCIL

Sources[†] Of Information About Council



[†] multiple responses allowed


Percent Saying 'Newspapers' - By Ward



[°] caution: small base N=29

The majority of residents (83%) consider newspapers to be their main source of information about Council.

There are no notable differences between Wards and between socio-economic groups, in terms of those residents who consider **newspapers** to be their main source of information about Council.



Base = 249

* multiple responses allowed

47% of residents who get their information about Council mainly from newspapers, get their information from Waimate News & Views, with 47% getting it from the Timaru Herald.

The other newspapers mentioned are ...

"Oamaru Mail."

"Waitaki Herald."

"Free farming magazine that comes in the mail."


"Farmers Weekly."

"Waimate Advertiser."

"Christchurch Press."

B. THE SUFFICIENCY OF THE INFORMATION SUPPLIED

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



Summary Table: Sufficiency Of Information

	Total District 2015 %	Peer Group %	National Average %
More than enough	7	8	8
Enough	65	60	54
Not enough	16	20	26
Nowhere near enough	6	10	9
Don't know / not sure	6	3	4
Total	100	[†] 101	[†] 101

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

72% of residents feel that there is more than enough/enough information supplied, while 22% feel there is not enough/nowhere near enough information supplied.

Waimate District residents are on par with Peer Group residents and above residents nationwide, in feeling there is enough/more than enough information supplied.

There are no notable differences between Wards and between socio-economic groups, in terms of those residents who say there is **enough/more than enough** information. However, it appears that rural residents are slightly more likely to feel this way, than urban residents.





5. REPRESENTATION

A. EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT


Awareness

Before now were residents aware that Council was the organisation responsible for co-ordinating Civil Defence in the District?



^o caution: small base N=29

Percent Saying 'Yes' - Comparing Different Types Of Residents




Before now, 84% of residents said they were aware that Council was the organisation responsible for co-ordinating Civil Defence in the District.

Longer term residents, those residing in the District more than 10 years, are more likely to say 'Yes', than shorter term residents.

B. COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION

Satisfaction With Councillor Accessibility



84% of residents say that, if a situation arose where they wanted to put a viewpoint, problem or issue to an elected member of Council, they would be satisfied that they would be able to access them, including 53% who are very satisfied. 6% are not very satisfied and 10% are unable to comment.

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

Summary Table : Satisfaction With Councillor's Approachability

	Very Satisfied %	Fairly Satisfied %	Very/Fairly Satisfied %	Not Very Satisfied %	Don't Know %
Overall					
Total District 2015	53	31	84	6	10
Ward					
Hakataramea-Waihaorunga ^o	63	29	92	-	8
Lower Waihao	54	37	91	6	3
Waimate [†]	53	27	80	8	11
Pareora-Otaio-Makikihi	48	37	85	2	13

% read across

^o caution: small base N=29

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



6. LOCAL ISSUES

A. TOP PRIORITIES

All residents were asked to consider what are the top priorities for rates money to be spent on. (Up to three mentions allowed).

Please also refer to Spend Emphasis page 70.

The main priorities mentioned are ...

- roads,
- water supply,
- footpaths,
- sewerage,
- general infrastructure/basic/core services,
- stadium.

Summary Table: Top Priorities* For Rates Spend

	Total District 2015 %	Ward			
		Hakataramea- Waihaorunga [°] %	Lower Waihao %	Waimate %	Pareora- Otaio- Makikihi %
Percent Who Mention ...					
Roads	54	78	58	44	62
Water supply	19	19	11	26	7
Footpaths	18	6	9	26	10
Sewerage	9	-	3	15	3
General infrastructure/basic core services	9	8	8	12	1
Stadium	8	5	8	10	3

* residents allowed to mention up to three 'top' priorities

[°] caution: small base N=29

Other top priorities mentioned by 7% of all residents ...

- waste management,
- parks and reserves / playgrounds,

by 5% ...

- beautification / appearance of town / keeping town clean,
- swimming pool,

by 4% ...

- health / medical facilities,
- youth / facilities for younger people / skatepark,

by 3% ...

- wellbeing of the community / activities and facilities,
- library,

by 2% ...

- sports / recreational facilities,
- drainage / stormwater,
- emergency management,
- toilet facilities,

by 1% ...


- elderly / aged care,
- environmental issues,
- schools,
- fairer rating system / allocation of rates money,
- financial issues,
- safety in community / street camera,
- street lighting,
- attracting more business / industry to area,
- promotion of town and district,
- bridges,
- Information Centre.

3% of residents mentioned 'other' priorities, 2% say 'doing a good job / leave it to Council' and 11% are unable to comment.

On average residents[†] mention two top priorities.

[†] excluding those who said 'doing a good job / leave it to Council' or who are unable to comment

We have also grouped these issues to the following categories* showing the overall percentage for each.



(9% of residents also mentioned general infrastructure / basic / core services)

* multiple responses allowed

Groups based on those shown in Waimate District Council Annual Plan 2014-15

* * * * *

E. APPENDIX

Base by Sub-sample

		Actual respondents interviewed	*Expected numbers according to population distribution
Gender	Male	150	148
	Female	150	152
Ward	Hakataramea-Waihaorunga	29	31
	Lower Waihao	41	40
	Waimate	160	162
	Pareora-Otaio-Makikihi	70	67
Age	18-44 years	74	101
	45-64 years	112	113
	65+ years	113	86
(One resident refused to give details of their age)			

* Interviews are intentionally conducted proportional to the population in each Ward, and with an even gender balance overall. 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.

* * * * *

