

**CHRISTCHURCH
CITY COUNCIL**

**ANNUAL SURVEY
OF RESIDENTS**

MARCH 2002

**PART 2:
TABLES OF RESULTS**

ANNUAL SURVEY OF RESIDENTS

MARCH 2002

PART 2: TABLES OF RESULTS

COMMISSIONED BY THE:

CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

PREPARED AND CONDUCTED BY:

NATIONAL RESEARCH BUREAU LTD



AUCKLAND

PHONE (09) 6300-655

FAX (09) 6387-846

CONTENTS

Page No.

PART 2: TABLES OF RESULTS	1
LIBRARIES	2
Table 1: Have respondents visited any of the Christchurch City Council public libraries in the last 12 months (Q1)	2
Table 2: Main purpose of visit to library in the last 12 months (Q2)	3
Table 3: Satisfaction with borrowing books from library in the last 12 months (Q3)	4
Table 4: Satisfaction with information obtained from the library (Q4)	5
Table 5: Satisfaction with hours and location of libraries (Q5)	6
LEISURE SPORTS AND EVENTS	7
Table 6a: Have respondents been to any of the Christchurch City Council swimming pools in the last 12 months (Q6a)	7
Table 6b: Total visits to swimming pools in the last 12 months (Q6b)	8
Table 7a: Have respondents been to any of Christchurch City Council stadiums in the last 12 months (Q7a)	9
Table 7: Total visits to stadiums in the last 12 months (Q7b)	9
Table 8: Has respondent taken part in, been a member of any sports club or association, or trained for any physical activity run by a club or association in the last 12 months? (Q8)	10
Table 9: Has respondent taken part in any physical activity away from home in the last 12 months? (Q9)	10
Table 10: Satisfaction with their access to leisure and recreation opportunities, eg, beaches, clubs, sports, cafés, galleries and other leisure activities available to residents (Q10)	11
Table 11: Have respondents been to any of the following ...? (Q11)	12
Table 12: Have you taken part in any physical activity or exercise in the last 4 weeks? (Q12)	14
Table 13: Activities respondents have taken part in, in last 4 weeks (Q13+Q14)	15
Table 14: How many different days did respondents take part in sport or physical activity, for at least 30 minutes over the day, during the last 7 days? (Q15)	19
Table 15: Have respondents taken part in planting days and other environmental activities like beach clean-ups, organised by volunteer environmental groups, in the last 12 months? (Q16a)	20
Table 16: How well informed do residents feel they are about the opportunities to participate in planting days and other environmental activities? (Q16b)	20
CONVENTION AND ENTERTAINMENT VENUES	21
Table 17a: Frequency of visits to the McDougall Art Gallery in the last 12 months (Q17+Q17b)	21
Table 17b: Frequency of visits to the McDougall Art Gallery in the last 12 months (2000 survey: Q29a+Q29b)	21
Table 18: Satisfaction with McDougall Art Gallery in the last 12 months (Q17c)	22
Table 19a: Frequency of visits to the Town Hall in the last 12 months (Q18a+Q18b)	23
Table 19b: Have respondents visited the Town Hall in the last 12 months? (2000 survey Q22)	23
Table 20: Satisfaction with their visit(s) to the Town Hall (Q18c)	24
Table 21: Quality of the service in various parts of the Town Hall in the last 12 months (Q18d)	25
Table 22a: Frequency of visits to the Convention Centre in the last 12 months (Q19a+Q19b)	26
Table 22b: Have respondents visited the Convention Centre in the last 12 months? (2001 Survey Q26)	26
Table 23: Satisfaction with their visit(s) to the Convention Centre (Q19c)	27
Table 24a: Frequency of visits to the Westpac Trust Centre at Addington in the last 12 months (Q20a+Q20b)	28
Table 24b: Have respondents visited the Westpac Trust Centre at Addington in the last 12 months? (2001 Survey Q24)	28
Table 25: Satisfaction with their visit(s) to the Westpac Trust Centre (Q20c)	29
Table 26a: Frequency of visits to the Canterbury Museum in the last 12 months (Q21a+Q21b)	30
Table 26b: Frequency of visits to the Canterbury Museum in the last 12 months (2000 Survey Q35a+Q35b)	30
Table 27: Overall satisfaction with Canterbury Museum in the last 12 months (Q21c)	31

CONTENTS (continued)

Page No.

THE CITY CENTRE	32
Table 28: City workers who have visited the City Centre for purposes other than work in the last 12 months (Q22a+Q22b)	32
Table 29: Respondents who do not work in the City Centre but have visited the City Centre in the last 12 months (Q22a+Q22c)	32
Table 30: Frequency of visits made to City Centre for non-work trips in the last 12 months (Q22a)	33
Table 31a: Reasons for visit to the City Centre for non-work trips in the last 12 months (Q23a)	34
Table 32: Main reason overall for visit to the City Centre for non-work trips in the last 12 months (Q23b)	35
Table 33: Methods of going into the City Centre in the last 12 months (Q24)	36
Table 34: Parking in the City Centre in the last 12 months (Q25a+Q25b)	37
WASTE AND WATER	38
Table 35a: How good or bad do respondents think the green crate recyclables collection service is overall? (Q26a)	38
Table 35b: Why respondents think the green crate recyclables collection service overall is bad/very bad (Q26b)	39
Table 36: How good or bad do respondents think the black bag rubbish collection service is overall? (Q26c)	40
Table 36b: Why respondents think the black bag recyclables collection service overall is bad/very bad (Q26d)	41
Table 37: Satisfaction with water supplied to house/flat (Q27+Q28)	42
PUBLIC TRANSPORT	43
Table 38: Do respondents agree or disagree with the following statements? (Q29a+Q29b+Q29c)	43
Table 39a: How often have respondents used public transport in the last 12 months? (Q30a+Q30b)	43
Table 39b: Why respondents don't use public transport or don't use it more often (Q30c)	44
Table 39c: Reasons why respondents don't use public transport (2001 Survey Q54)	46
CONTACTS YOU MAY HAVE HAD WITH COUNCIL STAFF	47
Table 40a: Frequency of visits to the Council's Tuam Street Office in the last 12 months (Q31a+Q31b) ...	47
Table 40b: Frequency of visits to the Council's Tuam Street Office in the last 12 months (2000 survey: Q70a+Q70b)	47
Table 41a: Frequency of visits to a Service Centre in the last 12 months (Q32a+Q32b)	48
Table 41b: Frequency of visits to a Service Centre in the last 12 months (2000 survey: Q71a+Q71b)	48
Table 42: Service Centre visited most often (Q32c)	49
Table 43a: Frequency of telephoning Council offices in the last 12 months (Q33a+Q33b)	50
Table 43b: Frequency of telephoning Council offices in the last 12 months (2001 survey: Q61a+Q61b) ..	50
E-MAIL AND THE WORLD WIDE WEB	51
Table 44: On average, how often do respondents use e-mail for work, education or personal use? (Q34)	51
Table 45: On average, how often do respondents use the world wide web for work, education or personal use? (Q35)	51
Table 46: Where do respondents use e-mail and/or the world wide web? (Q36)	52
Table 47: How important is the world wide web as a source of information that helps respondents make decisions? (Q37)	52
Table 48: In the last 12 months, have respondents visited a Christchurch City Council web site? (Q38a)	53
Table 49: How did respondents find out about the site? (Q38h)	53
Table 50: Types of information respondents think should be in a Council newsletter (Q39a)	54
Table 51: Are there any other types of information respondents think should be in a Council newsletter? (Q39b)	54
Table 52: Other types of information respondents think should be in a Council newsletter (Q39c)	55
Table 53: Would respondents like to receive an e-mail newsletter that contained some or all of the material mentioned previously? (Q39d)	56

CONTENTS (continued)

Page No.

CITY APPEARANCE	57
Table 54a: Satisfaction with the way the City, as a whole, looks and feels (Q40a)	57
Table 54b: Reasons why respondents are satisfied with the way the City, as a whole, looks and feels (Q40b)	58
Table 54c: Reasons why respondents are dissatisfied with the way the City, as a whole, looks and feels (Q40b)	60
PERCEPTION OF DIVERSITY	61
Table 55a: Rating Christchurch as a place to live, taking into account the diverse nature of the City's population (Q41a)	61
Table 55b: Reasons why respondents feel Christchurch is a worse place to live (Q41b)	62
LEISURE AND RECREATION	63
Table 56: Main things respondents usually do in their leisure time (Q42)	63
COMMUNITY COHESION	64
Table 57: Strength of feeling regarding particular statements (Q43)	64
Table 58a: What kind of contact have respondents had with the people who live on their street during the last 12 months? (Q44)	65
Table 58b: What kind of positive contact have respondents had with the people in their street? (2000 survey Q27)	65
Table 59a: Which group best describes the group or social network that matters most to respondents? (Q45)	66
Table 59b: Where is the group and network that matters most to respondents based? (2000 survey Q28) ..	66
CHILD SAFETY	67
Table 60a: How safe or unsafe do respondents think their local neighbourhood is for their children or other people's children to play in while unsupervised? (Q46a)	67
Table 60b: Why respondents feel their local neighbourhood is unsafe for children to play unsupervised (Q46b)	68
SAFETY	69
Table 61: How safe do respondents feel in their own home? (Q47a.i+Q47a.ii)	69
Table 62: How safe do respondents feel in their neighbourhood? (Q47a.iii+Q47a.iv)	69
Table 63: How safe respondents feel in the City Centre by themselves (Q47a.v+Q47a.vi)	70
Table 64: How big a problem is crime in respondent's local neighbourhood? (Q47b)	70
LOCAL PROBLEMS	71
Table 65a: How much each of the following have been a problem in respondent's local neighbourhood over the last 12 months (Q48)	71
Table 65b: In the last 12 months have there been other kinds of problems in respondent's local neighbourhood? (Q49a)	74
Table 65c: Other problems respondents have had in last 12 months (Q49b)	75
COUNCIL CONSULTATION/COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	76
Table 66a: Satisfaction with the way the Council involves the public in the decisions it makes (Q50a)	76
Table 66b: Reasons why respondents are dissatisfied with the way the Council involves the public in the decisions it makes (Q50b)	77
Table 67a: How much influence do respondents feel the public has on decisions that the Council makes? (Q51a)	78
Table 67b: Reasons why respondents feel the public has a small influence or no influence on decisions that the Council makes (Q51b)	79
Table 68a: How much confidence do respondents have in their local Council to make decisions that are in the best interests of the City? (Q52a)	80
Table 68b: Reasons respondents have very little or no confidence in their local Council (Q52b)	81
Table 69: Strength of feeling regarding specific statements about Council (Q53)	82

CONTENTS (continued)

	Page No.
HEALTH	83
Table 70a: In the last 12 months, have respondents, or a member of their household, experienced stress in relation to any of the following ...? (Q54)	83
Table 70b: In the last 12 months have respondents, or a member of their household, experienced other kinds of stresses? (Q55a)	84
Table 70c: Other stresses respondents have experienced in the last 12 months (Q55b)	85
Table 71: Is there someone respondents feel they can turn to for help in times of stress? (Q56)	86
Table 72: Strength of feeling towards the following statements (Q57)	87
Table 73a: Have respondents ever felt lonely or isolated in the City in the last 12 months? (Q58)	88
Table 73b: How isolated have respondents felt in the last 12 months? (2000 survey Q79)	88
Table 74: How happy or unhappy are respondents on the whole? (Q59)	89
Table 75: How healthy a lifestyle do respondents feel they have? (Q60)	89
Table 76: How do respondents rate their overall quality of life? (Q61)	90
Table 77: Generally speaking, would respondents say that people can be trusted? (Q62)	90
THE CITY	91
Table 78: Satisfaction with Christchurch overall as a place to live, work, and to spend spare time in (Q63)	91
Table 79: Have respondents seen the Chalice, the new sculpture in the Square? (Q64a)	92
Table 80: Do respondents think the Square is a better or worse place for having the Chalice? (Q64b)	92
RATES	93
Table 81: Respondents' ratings of value for money for Council services/facilities (Q66a)	93
Table 82: Respondents' views as to whether the Council should spend more or less on services/facilities (Q66b+Q66c+Q66d+Q66e)	97
Table 83: Respondents' ratings of value for money for Council services/facilities, and whether the Council should spend more or less on services/facilities (Q66a+Q66c+Q66e)	98

PART 2:
TABLES OF RESULTS

LIBRARIES

Table 1: Have respondents visited any of the Christchurch City Council public libraries in the last 12 months (Q1)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
No	33	29	27	24	30
Yes	67	70	73	75	70
Total	100	100	100	100	100

LIBRARIES

Table 2: Main purpose of visit to library in the last 12 months (Q2)

Note: This covers all persons who have visited a Council library in the last 12 months (1998: 681 persons; 2000: 553 persons; 2002: 545 persons).

	1998	2000	2002
To borrow or return books	62	59	65
To borrow or return records, etc.	4	4	3
To get information	19	18	19
To browse and read	4	9	4
To study or do school work	2	1	2
Used the Internet terminals	-	-	2
Attended a library programme or event	-	-	0
Just to have a look	-	-	0
Accompanying a friend	-	-	1
To bring the children	6	6	4
To enjoy the quiet and atmosphere	0	0	-
To use photocopier	-	1	-
To attend the opening	-	1	-
No other reasons	0	0	0
Other reasons (See Q2 responses in Section 3)	3	1	0
Total	100	100	100

- Reasons may have been included in 'other reasons' section of the 1998 survey.
 0 = Less than 0.6% of total responses.

LIBRARIES

Table 3: Satisfaction with borrowing books from library in the last 12 months (Q3)

Note: This covers all persons who have visited a Christchurch City Council library in the last 12 months (percentages) (1998: 576 persons; 1999: 529 persons; 2000: 456 persons; 2001: 589 persons; 2002: 545 persons).

	Year	Very satisfied	Satisfied	No feeling	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Don't know
Range of books	1998	37	49	4	8	0	2
	1999	33	47	9	6	1	4
	2000	31	55	6	7	0	1
	2001	35	47	6	6	1	5
	2002	35	46	5	3	0	11
Ease of finding a book	1998	29	53	8	7	1	2
	1999	29	48	8	10	1	4
	2000	26	58	6	7	1	2
	2001	26	55	7	8	0	4
	2002	24	54	5	7	0	10
Time taken to issue book	1998	39	50	5	1	0	5
	1999	42	45	5	1	0	7
	2000	44	44	7	1	0	4
	2001	41	44	6	1	0	8
	2002	46	35	4	0	0	15
Time taken for reserved books or requested an interloan	1998	11	30	13	3	0	43
	1999	13	28	11	3	1	44
	2000	14	29	11	3	2	41
	2001	12	30	12	3	-	43
	2002	15	24	7	3	1	50
Helpfulness of staff	1998	58	35	4	0	0	3
	1999	52	39	4	1	0	4
	2000	54	35	6	1	0	4
	2001	53	35	4	2	0	6
	2002	51	33	4	0	0	12
Politeness and courteousness of staff †	1998	61	34	2	1	0	2
	1999	55	36	4	1	-	4
	2000	56	35	5	1	0	3
	2001	50	38	6	1	0	5
	2002	52	32	4	0	0	12

† In previous years, respondents were asked to say how satisfied they were with the politeness of staff.

LIBRARIES

Table 4: Satisfaction with information obtained from the library (Q4)

Note: This covers all persons who have visited a Christchurch City Council library in the last 12 months to get information (percentages) (1998: 289 persons; 1999: 209 persons; 2000: 249 persons; 2001: 221 persons; 2002: 98 persons).

	Year	Very satisfied	Satisfied	No feeling	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Don't know
Ease of finding information	1998	32	51	8	9	0	0
	1999	29	51	7	10	3	0
	2000	35	51	8	6	0	0
	2001	32	51	8	7	1	1
	2002	37	55	4	1	3	0
Quality of information	1998	33	53	6	5	1	2
	1999	30	55	7	5	2	1
	2000	36	54	6	4	0	0
	2001	37	46	8	6	2	1
	2002	42	44	8	4	2	0
How Quick to get help	1998	32	46	12	2	0	8
	1999	37	41	10	6	2	4
	2000	39	45	9	3	0	4
	2001	40	42	11	3	1	3
	2002	33	46	8	0	1	12
Helpfulness of staff	1998	46	39	6	1	0	8
	1999	57	32	6	2	0	3
	2000	51	39	4	1	0	5
	2001	55	30	11	0	1	3
	2002	43	40	2	0	0	15
Politeness and courteousness of staff †	1998	49	36	7	1	0	7
	1999	63	28	6	0	0	3
	2000	54	37	3	1	0	5
	2001	56	33	7	1	0	3
	2002	46	40	2	0	0	12

† In previous years, respondents were asked to say how satisfied they were with the politeness of staff.

LIBRARIES

Table 5: Satisfaction with hours and location of libraries (Q5)

Note: This covers all persons who have been to a Christchurch City Council library in the last 12 months (percentages) (1998: 681 persons; 2000: 553 persons; 2002: 545 persons).

	Very satisfied			Satisfied			No feeling			Dissatisfied			Very dissatisfied			Don't know		
	1998	2000	2002	1998	2000	2002	1998	2000	2002	1998	2000	2002	1998	2000	2002	1998	2000	2002
Hours libraries are open	25	26	25	51	49	52	9	9	6	10	11	12	1	0	1	4	5	4
Days libraries are open	24	25	30	56	52	56	8	8	5	7	9	6	1	1	0	4	5	3
Location of libraries	32	34	43	55	56	49	6	7	4	4	2	3	1	0	0	2	1	1

LEISURE SPORTS AND EVENTS

Table 6a: Have respondents been to any of the Christchurch City Council swimming pools in the last 12 months (Q6a)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	1998	2000	2002
Yes	49	46	52
No	51	54	48
Total	100	100	100

LEISURE SPORTS AND EVENTS

Table 6b: Total visits to swimming pools in the last 12 months (Q6b)

Note: This covers all persons who have been to one or more swimming pools (percentages of visits) (1998: 508 persons, 838 visits; 2000: 349 persons, 570 visits; 2002: 358 persons, 715 visits).

	1998	2000	2002
Sockburn Pool	5	8	4
Halswell Aquatic Centre	7	5	5
Centennial Leisure Centre	1	14	17
Waltham Lido Pools	7	6	4
Jellie Park Aqualand	26	21	16
QEII Pools	39	33	21
Wharenui Pool	10	8	7
Papanui Pool	1	1	1
Templeton Pool	1	1	-
Edgware Pool	2	2	1
Woolston Pool	1	1	1
Pioneer Leisure Centre	NA	NA	23
Belfast Pool	NA	NA	-
Been to one or more, but can't remember which	NA	NA	-
Don't know	0	-	0
Total	100	100	100

NA: Not asked in previous years.

- = Less than 0.5% of total responses.

LEISURE SPORTS AND EVENTS

Table 7a: Have respondents been to any of Christchurch City Council stadiums in the last 12 months (Q7a)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	1998	1999	2000	2002
Yes	43	51	43	62
No	57	49	57	38
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 7: Total visits to stadiums in the last 12 months (Q7b)

Note: This covers all persons who have been to one or more stadiums (percentages of visits)
 (1998: 416 persons, 657 visits; 1999: 352 persons, 573 visits;
 2000: 311 persons, 449 visits; 2002: 434 persons, 910 visits).

	1998	1999	2000	2002
Porritt Park	9	10	9	5
Cuthberts Green Softball Complex	6	5	5	3
Denton Oval	6	5	4	2
English Park	4	7	4	3
Cowles Stadium	9	9	10	6
Pioneer Stadium	24	21	25	13
QEII Stadium	31	29	29	12
Jade Stadium	NA	NA	NA	28
Westpac Trust Sport & Entertainment Centre	NA	NA	NA	25
Another stadium	10	14	13	3
Can't remember which	1	0	1	-
Total	100	100	100	100

NA: Not asked in previous years.

- = Less than 0.5% of total responses.

LEISURE SPORTS AND EVENTS

Table 8: Has respondent taken part in, been a member of any sports club or association, or trained for any physical activity run by a club or association in the last 12 months? (Q8)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	1998	1999	2000	2002 [†]
No	65	66	68	65
Yes	35	34	32	35
Total	100	100	100	100

† In previous years, this question was worded slightly differently, in that the phrase "been a member of any sports club or association" was not mentioned.

Table 9: Has respondent taken part in any physical activity away from home in the last 12 months? (Q9)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	1998	1999	2000	2002
No	26	27	26	26
Yes	74	73	74	74
Don't know	0	0	0	0
Total	100	100	100	100

LEISURE SPORTS AND EVENTS

Table 10: Satisfaction with their access to leisure and recreation opportunities, eg, beaches, clubs, sports, cafés, galleries and other leisure activities available to residents (Q10)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2002
Very satisfied	43
Satisfied	47
No feeling either way	6
Dissatisfied	3
Very dissatisfied	0
Don't know	1
Total	100

LEISURE SPORTS AND EVENTS

Table 11: Have respondents been to any of the following ...? (Q11)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	Year	Yes	No	Total
Coca Cola Christmas in the Park*	2001	32	68	100
	2002	14	86	100
Buskers Festival**	1999	24	76	100
	2000	27	73	100
	2001	32	68	100
	2002	27	73	100
Festival of Flowers (the Floral Festival)†	1998	29	71	100
	1999	26	74	100
	2000	31	69	100
	2001	34	66	100
	2002	19	81	100
The Summer-Time Classical Sparks Concerts††	1998	27	73	100
	1999	22	78	100
	2000	22	78	100
	2001	33	67	100
	2002	18	82	100
Other Summer-Time Festival Events:	1998	26	74	100
	1999	37	63	100
	2000	33	67	100
	2001	NA	NA	NA
	2002	15	85	100
Festival of Romance ♦	2002	6	94	100
Showtime Canterbury (Show Week)	1998	36	64	100
	1999	26	74	100
	2000	23	77	100
	2001	NA	NA	NA
	2002	16	84	100

* In 2001, referred to as Christmas in the Park.

** In 2001, referred to as the International Buskers Festival.

† In 2001, referred to as the International Festival of Flowers.

†† In 2001 referred to as the Classical Sparks Concert.

♦ Not specifically asked in previous years.

NA: Not asked in 2001

LEISURE SPORTS AND EVENTS

Table 12: Have you taken part in any physical activity or exercise in the last 4 weeks? (Q12)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2001	2002
Yes	91	92
No	9	8
Don't know	0	0
Total	100	100

LEISURE SPORTS AND EVENTS

Table 13: Activities respondents have taken part in, in last 4 weeks (Q13+Q14)

Note: This covers all persons who have taken part in any physical activity or exercise in last 4 weeks (2001: 709 persons; 2002: 719 persons).

		Number	Percent* (Based on respondents)	Average No. of Days
Gardening	2002	426	59	7
	2001	399	56	8
Walking for enjoyment and/or exercise: over 30 minutes	2002	340	47	11
	2001	312	43	11
Walking for enjoyment and/or exercise: 10-30 minutes	2002	305	43	12
	2001	315	44	12
Exercising at home	2002	151	21	13
	2001	144	20	15
Swimming	2002	134	19	4
	2001	156	22	5
Cycling - recreational (not mountain biking)	2002	118	17	10
	2001	126	18	11
Golf	2002	114	16	4
	2001	80	11	4
Running/jogging/marathon/cross-country	2002	102	14	8
	2001	73	10	9
Exercise classes/going to the gym/ weight training	2002	86	12	9
	2001	98	14	10
Fishing	2002	61	9	3
	2001	45	6	4
Cricket - outdoors	2002	50	7	6
	2001	45	6	3
Mountain biking	2002	49	7	3
	2001	45	6	5

* To allow comparison with the Hillary Commission results.

Cont'd

LEISURE SPORTS AND EVENTS

Table 13: Activities respondents have taken part in, in last 4 weeks (Q13+Q14) (Cont'd)

Note: This covers all persons who have taken part in any physical activity or exercise in last 4 weeks (2001: 709 persons; 2002: 719 persons).

		Number	Percent* (Based on respondents)	Average No. of Days
Tennis	2002	45	6	3
	2001	53	7	4
Tramping	2002	42	6	3
	2001	23	3	3
Touch football	2002	40	6	5
	2001	59	8	3
Motor sports (motorcycling, trail biking, motor-racing)	2002	27	4	4
	2001	17	2	5
Surfing/body boarding	2002	26	4	4
	2001	27	4	5
Squash	2002	26	4	3
	2001	18	3	6
Aerobics	2002	24	3	6
	2001	37	5	8
Basketball	2002	22	3	5
	2001	31	4	6
Netball	2002	22	3	3
	2001	26	4	3
Rugby Union	2002	21	3	4
	2001	21	3	5
Soccer	2002	17	2	4
	2001	23	3	5
Yachting/sailing/dinghy sailing	2002	15	2	2
	2001	13	2	3

* To allow comparison with the Hillary Commission results.

Cont'd

LEISURE SPORTS AND EVENTS

Table 13: Activities respondents have taken part in, in last 4 weeks (Q13+Q14) (Cont'd)

Note: This covers all persons who have taken part in any physical activity or exercise in last 4 weeks (2001: 709 persons; 2002: 719 persons).

		Number	Percent* (Based on respondents)	Average No. of Days
Shooting (rifle and pistol)	2002	14	2	3
	2001	11	2	2
Bowls - outdoor/lawn	2002	13	2	8
	2001	15	2	7
Bowls - indoor	2002	12	2	2
	2001	9	1	4
Cricket - indoors	2002	10	1	5
	2001	8	1	3
Volleyball	2002	9	1	3
	2001	11	2	4
Triathlon	2002	8	1	2
	2001	0	0	1
Badminton	2002	8	1	5
	2001	17	2	3
Hockey	2002	7	1	5
	2001	4	1	2
Athletics (track and field)	2002	7	1	3
	2001	9	1	3
Rugby League	2002	6	1	4
	2001	7	1	2
Aquarobics (aqua jogging, water jogging)	2002	6	1	4
	2001	26	4	3

* To allow comparison with the Hillary Commission results.

Cont'd

LEISURE SPORTS AND EVENTS

Table 13: Activities respondents have taken part in, in last 4 weeks (Q13+Q14) (Cont'd)

Note: This covers all persons who have taken part in any physical activity or exercise in last 4 weeks (2001: 709 persons; 2002: 719 persons).

		Number	Percent* (Based on respondents)	Average No. of Days
Softball	2002	6	1	5
	2001	5	1	4
Horse riding/Equestrian	2002	4	1	5
	2001	8	1	7
Skiing - snow, grass	2002	3	1	10
	2001	1	0	1
Cycling - competitive	2002	2	0	1
	2001	2	0	6
Surf lifesaving	2002	1	0	8
	2001	2	0	5
Rowing	2002	1	0	28
	2001	8	1	12
Other sports/physical activities	2002	61	9	6
	2001	75	11	9
Total	2002	2,441	343	+6
	2001	2,404	335	†6

* To allow comparison with the Hillary Commission results.

0 = Mentioned by less than 0.5% of total respondents.

† Average no. of days.

LEISURE SPORTS AND EVENTS

Table 14: How many different days did respondents take part in sport or physical activity, for at least 30 minutes over the day, during the last 7 days? (Q15)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2002	
	Number	Percent
None	125	16
One	61	8
Two	111	14
Three	120	15
Four	70	9
Five	68	9
Six	40	5
Seven	181	23
Don't know/Can't remember	4	1
Total	780	100

PARKS AND WATERWAYS

Table 15: Have respondents taken part in planting days and other environmental activities like beach clean-ups, organised by volunteer environmental groups, in the last 12 months? (Q16a)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2002
Yes	5
No	95
Don't know	0
Total	100

Table 16: How well informed do residents feel they are about the opportunities to participate in planting days and other environmental activities? (Q16b)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2002
Very well informed	4
Well informed	25
No feeling either way	19
Poorly informed	37
Very poorly informed	13
Don't know	2
Total	100

CONVENTION AND ENTERTAINMENT VENUES

Table 17a: Frequency of visits to the McDougall Art Gallery in the last 12 months (Q17+Q17b)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2002*
Did not visit	69
One to two times	23
Three to four times	5
More than four times	3
Total	100

* In previous years, the frequency scale differed: see table below for relevant data.

In 2001, respondents were only asked if they did or did not visit the Gallery. 69% said they did not and 31% said they did.

Table 17b: Frequency of visits to the McDougall Art Gallery in the last 12 months (2000 survey: Q29a+Q29b)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	1998	1999	2000
Did not visit	66	63	64
One or two times	25	23	25
Three times or more	9	14	11
Total	100	100	100

CONVENTION AND ENTERTAINMENT VENUES

Table 18: Satisfaction with McDougall Art Gallery in the last 12 months (Q17c)

Note: This covers all persons who have visited the Art Gallery in the last 12 months (percentages). (2001: 252 persons; 2002: 235 persons).

	2001	2002
Very satisfied	30	26
Satisfied	54	53
No feeling either way	10	18
Dissatisfied	6	3
Very dissatisfied	0	0
Don't know	0	0
Total	100	100

CONVENTION AND ENTERTAINMENT VENUES

Table 19a: Frequency of visits to the Town Hall in the last 12 months (Q18a+Q18b)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2002*
Did not visit	55
One to two times	33
Three to four times	8
More than four times	4
Total	100

* In previous years, respondents were not asked how often they visited the Town Hall. The table below shows data on whether respondents did or did not visit the Town Hall in a 12 month period.

Table 19b: Have respondents visited the Town Hall in the last 12 months? (2000 survey Q22)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2000	2001*
Yes	54	50
No	46	49
Don't know	0	1
Total	100	100

* In 2001 and 2002 it was emphasised that this did not include the Convention Centre.

CONVENTION AND ENTERTAINMENT VENUES

Table 20: Satisfaction with their visit(s) to the Town Hall (Q18c)

Note: This covers all persons who have visited the Town Hall in the last 12 months (percentages). (2001: 397 persons; 2002: 367 persons).

	2001	2002
Very satisfied	37	37
Satisfied	51	54
No feeling either way	8	5
Dissatisfied	4	3
Very dissatisfied	0	1
Don't know	0	0
Total	100	100

CONVENTION AND ENTERTAINMENT VENUES

Table 21: Quality of the service in various parts of the Town Hall in the last 12 months (Q18d)

Note: This covers all persons who have been to part of the Town Hall (percentages)
(see below for respondents).

	Year	Respondents	Very good	Good	Neither good or bad	Bad	Very bad	Don't know
Box office, or main reception staff	1998	413	32	46	13	4	1	4
	1999	298	30	53	13	2	0	2
	2002*	236	31	54	10	3	1	1
Ushers or security staff	1998	439	27	57	15	0	0	1
	1999	324	27	58	10	2	0	3
	2002*	252	28	54	16	1	1	0
Catering staff, for example, the ice-creams, banquet and bar staff	1998	327	15	51	19	3	0	12
	1999	207	18	48	16	4	1	13
	2002*	161	18	42	24	12	2	2
Restaurant/ Coffee Bar staff	1998	275	14	46	15	5	1	19
	1999	171	16	47	18	5	2	12
	2002*	110	17	45	21	6	2	9
Other Town Hall staff	1998	287	18	52	15	1	0	14
	1999	216	21	57	13	0	0	9
	2002*	153	22	50	18	1	0	9

* Not asked in 2000 and 2001.

CONVENTION AND ENTERTAINMENT VENUES

Table 22a: Frequency of visits to the Convention Centre in the last 12 months (Q19a+Q19b)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2002*
Did not visit	76
One to two times	21
Three to four times	2
More than four times	1
Total	100

* In 2001, respondents were not asked how often they visited the Convention Centre, only whether they did or did not visit it in the last 12 months. (See table below)

Table 22b: Have respondents visited the Convention Centre in the last 12 months? (2001 Survey Q26)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2001
Yes	26
No	74
Total	100

CONVENTION AND ENTERTAINMENT VENUES

Table 23: Satisfaction with their visit(s) to the Convention Centre (Q19c)

Note: This covers all persons who have visited the Convention Centre in the last 12 months (percentages). (2001: 194 persons; 2002: 182 persons).

	2001	2002
Very satisfied	32	37
Satisfied	47	46
No feeling either way	15	17
Dissatisfied	6	0
Very dissatisfied	0	0
Don't know	0	0
Total	100	100

CONVENTION AND ENTERTAINMENT VENUES

Table 24a: Frequency of visits to the Westpac Trust Centre at Addington in the last 12 months (Q20a+Q20b)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2002*
Did not visit	62
One to two times	33
Three to four times	4
More than four times	1
Total	100

* In 2000 and 2001, respondents were not asked how often they visited the Centre, only whether they did or did not visit it in the last 12 months. (See table below)

Table 24b: Have respondents visited the Westpac Trust Centre at Addington in the last 12 months? (2001 Survey Q24)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2001	2002
Yes	40	34
No	60	66
Total	100	100

CONVENTION AND ENTERTAINMENT VENUES

Table 25: Satisfaction with their visit(s) to the Westpac Trust Centre (Q20c)

Note: This covers all persons who have visited the Convention Centre in the last 12 months (percentages). (2001: 194 persons; 2002: 259 persons).

	2001	2002
Very satisfied	32	38
Satisfied	48	51
No feeling either way	10	8
Dissatisfied	10	3
Very dissatisfied	0	0
Don't know	0	0
Total	100	100

CONVENTION AND ENTERTAINMENT VENUES

Table 26a: Frequency of visits to the Canterbury Museum in the last 12 months (Q21a+Q21b)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2002*
Did not visit	55
One to two times	32
Three to four times	8
More than four times	5
Total	100

* In previous years the frequency scale differed; see table below for relevant data.

Table 26b: Frequency of visits to the Canterbury Museum in the last 12 months (2000 Survey Q35a+Q35b)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	1998	2000
Have not visited	55	51
One or two times	33	34
Three or more times	12	15
Don't know	0	0
Total	100	100

CONVENTION AND ENTERTAINMENT VENUES

Table 27: Overall satisfaction with Canterbury Museum in the last 12 months (Q21c)

Note: This covers all persons who have visited the museum (percentages)
(1998: 467 persons; 2000: 376 persons; 2002: 337 persons).

	1998	2000	2002
Very satisfied	38	41	47
Satisfied	48	47	46
No feeling	6	8	4
Dissatisfied	8	4	3
Very dissatisfied	0	0	0
Total	100	100	100

THE CITY CENTRE

Table 28: City workers who have visited the City Centre for purposes other than work in the last 12 months (Q22a+Q22b)

Note: This covers all persons who work in the City Centre (percentages)
(1998: 365 persons; 1999: 295 persons; 2000: 280 persons; 2002: 276 persons).

	1998	1999	2000	2001*	2002
Have not visited the City centre other than for work	2	1	2	4	4
Have visited the City centre for other purposes	96	98	96	94	94
Respondent lives or lived in the City centre	2	1	2	2	2
Don't know	0	0	0	0	0
Total	100	100	100	100	100

*All respondents were asked this question

Table 29: Respondents who do not work in the City Centre but have visited the City Centre in the last 12 months (Q22a+Q22c)

Note: This covers all persons who do not work in the City Centre (percentages)
(1998: 666 persons; 1999: 464 persons; 2000: 475 persons; 2002: 505 persons).
Not asked in 2001.

	1998	1999	2000	2002
Have not visited the City centre	4	5	5	3
Have visited the City centre	94	94	95	97
Respondent lives or lived in the City centre	2	1	0	0
Don't know	0	0	0	0
Total	100	100	100	100

THE CITY CENTRE

Table 30: Frequency of visits made to City Centre for non-work trips in the last 12 months (Q22d)

Note: This covers all persons who have visited the City Centre for non-work trips (percentages) (1998: 974 persons; 1999: 717 persons; 2000: 711 persons; 2001: 736 persons; 2002: 737 persons).

	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
Once a week or more often	48	57	51	45	45
Once a month or more	33	27	31	37	34
Once every three months or more	14	11	12	13	15
Less often than that	5	5	6	5	6
Don't know	0	0	0	0	0
Total	100	100	100	100	100

THE CITY CENTRE

Table 31a: Reasons for visit to the City Centre for non-work trips in the last 12 months (Q23a)

Note: This covers all persons who have been to the City Centre for non-work trips (percentages) (1998: 974 persons; 2000: 711 persons; 2002: 737 persons).
See Q23b responses in Section 3.

	1998	2000	2002
Shopping	25	26	25
To see or hear entertainment	16	16	18
Business or to pay a bill	17	17	14
To socialise or meet friends	20	21	20
To attend a meeting or class	6	6	6
To visit the Central Library	12	10	11
Look around/see the changes/an outing	-	1	1
Dining out/visiting restaurants/cafés	-	0	0
Visit hospital/dentist etc.	-	0	3
To go to church/cathedral	-	0	0
To go to the gym/other sports reasons	-	0	0
Collecting/dropping off family/friends	-	0	1
To use the buses/public transport	-	0	0
To visit specified places	-	0	0
Others (See Q23a responses in Section 3)	4	3	1
Don't know	0	0	0
Total	100	100	100

0 = Less than 0.6% of total responses.

- Responses may have been included in 'other reasons' section of the 1998 survey.

THE CITY CENTRE

Table 32: Main reason overall for visit to the City Centre for non-work trips in the last 12 months (Q23b)

Note: this covers all persons who have been to the City Centre for non-work trips (percentages) (1998: 974 persons; 2000: 711 persons; 2002: 737 persons). See Q23b responses in Section 3.

	1998	2000	2002
Shopping	40	38	39
To see or hear entertainment	8	8	11
Business or to pay a bill	14	15	9
To socialise or meet friends	21	25	24
To attend a meeting or class	6	5	4
To visit the Central Library	5	3	5
To go to the gym/other sports reasons	-	1	1
Look around/see the changes/an outing	-	1	0
Dining out/visiting restaurants/cafés	-	0	0
Visit hospital/dentist etc	-	1	4
Collecting/dropping off family/friends	-	1	2
To go to church/cathedral	-	0	0
To catch connecting public transport	-	0	0
To visit specified places	-	0	1
Others (See Q23b responses in Section 3)	6	1	0
Don't know	0	1	0
Total	100	100	100

- Responses may have been included in 'other reasons' sections of the 1998 survey.
0 = Less than 0.6% of total responses.

THE CITY CENTRE

Table 33: Methods of going into the City Centre in the last 12 months (Q24)

Note: This covers all responses from persons who have come into the City Centre on non-work trips (percentages of responses) (1998: 974 persons, 1552 responses; 2000: 711 persons, 1199 responses; 2002: 737 persons, 1177 responses).

	1998	2000	2002
By driving or riding in car, van or truck	57	54	58
By bus	22	23	21
By motorcycle	1	1	2
By bicycle	7	7	6
By walking	11	12	11
Other ways	2	3	2
Total	100	100	100

THE CITY CENTRE

Table 34: Parking in the City Centre in the last 12 months (Q25a+Q25b)

Note: This covers all persons who have been to the City Centre on non-work trips by driving or riding in a car, van or truck (percentages)
(1998: 883 persons; 2000: 652 persons; 2002: 682 persons).

	Year	Have not or don't know if hard to find a park	Ease of finding a park					
			Very easy	Easy	Neither easy nor hard	Hard	Very hard	Don't know
Kerbside carpark between 8am-6pm Monday to Friday	1998	18	1	10	15	34	22	0
	2000	21	1	9	16	33	20	0
	2002	27	1	10	14	28	19	1
Off-street parking between 8am-6pm Monday to Friday	1998	25	9	39	14	9	3	1
	2000	26	9	39	14	9	3	0
	2002	26	15	36	12	7	4	0
Anywhere in the City centre between 8am-6pm Saturday or Sunday	1998	25	4	24	20	19	7	1
	2000	24	5	27	19	20	5	0
	2002	27	5	29	17	16	6	0
Anywhere in the City centre after 6pm any day of the week	1998	29	3	21	21	18	7	1
	2000	28	5	24	19	18	5	1
	2002	36	5	24	15	16	4	0

WASTE AND WATER

Table 35a: How good or bad do respondents think the green crate recyclables collection service is overall? (Q26a)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2000	2001	2002
Very good	44	52	54
Good	42	39	34
No feeling either way	3	3	4
Bad (See Table 35b & Q26b responses in Section 3)	8	3	4
Very bad (See Table 35b & Q26b responses in Section 3)	1	1	2
Don't know	2	2	2
Total	100	100	100

WASTE AND WATER

Table 35b: Why respondents think the green crate recyclables collection service overall is bad/very bad (Q26b)

Note: This covers all persons who said they think the green crate recyclables collection service overall is bad or very bad (2002: 47 persons, 67 responses)
See Q26b responses in Section 3.

	2002	
	Number	Percent
Items left behind/ not taken	14	21
Fussy about what they take/limited range of items	10	15
Streets untidy/ stuff dropped	9	14
More work needed by Council on recycling	6	9
Did not get a green crate	6	8
Green crates thrown everywhere	5	8
Green crates too small	4	6
No service here/ have to take crates to collection point	4	6
Not constant/delayed collection times	3	4
Don't use the recycling service	2	3
Crates divided/ or separate crates better	2	3
Trucks get in the way/ dangerous	1	1
Others (See Q35b responses in Section 3)	1	2
Total	67	100

WASTE AND WATER

Table 36: How good or bad do respondents think the black bag rubbish collection service is overall? (Q26c)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2000	2001	2002
Very good	31	37	35
Good	49	45	42
No feeling either way	6	6	8
Bad (See Table 36b & Q26d responses in Section 3)	11	8	11
Very bad (See Table 36b & Q26d responses in Section 3)	2	3	3
Don't know	1	1	1
Total	100	100	100

WASTE AND WATER

Table 36b: Why respondents think the black bag recyclables collection service overall is bad/very bad (Q26d)

Note: This covers all persons who said they think the black bag rubbish collection service overall is bad or very bad (2002: 105 persons, 168 responses)
See Q26d responses in Section 3.

	2002	
	Number	Percent
Bags are too small	32	19
Not enough bags issued	26	15
Bags are not strong enough/ too flimsy	21	12
Animals get into bags	18	11
Would prefer wheelie bins	16	9
Bags not biodegradable/ add to the rubbish	6	4
Cost of extra bags is too high	6	4
Streets untidy with rejected bags	6	4
Inconsistent/ late to collect bags	5	3
Didn't receive any bags	5	3
Dislike handles on bags	5	3
Bags not so hygienic	4	2
Weight of bags a problem	3	2
Private wheelie bin service used	3	2
Missed collection bags/ sometimes not picked up	3	2
Service not available/ have to take to collection point	2	1
Limited to Council bags only	2	1
Early collection time difficult	1	0
Others	4	3
Total	168	100

0 = Less than 0.6% of total responses.

WASTE AND WATER

Table 37: Satisfaction with water supplied to house/flat (Q27+Q28)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	Year	Not on water supply	Very satisfied	Satisfied	No feeling	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Don't know	Total
Taste	1998	4	50	38	3	4	1	0	100
	1999	4	58	31	3	3	1	0	100
	2000	4	52	36	2	4	1	1	100
	2002*	3	55	36	3	2	1	0	100
Appearance	1998	4	45	40	5	5	1	0	100
	1999	4	53	33	4	5	1	0	100
	2000	4	47	40	4	4	1	0	100
	2002*	3	50	37	4	5	1	0	100
Pressure	1998	4	39	43	3	8	3	0	100
	1999	4	44	36	4	10	2	0	100
	2000	4	39	41	3	10	3	0	100
	2002*	3	44	42	4	6	1	0	100
Reliability of supply	2002†	3	61	34	1	1	0	0	100

* Not asked in 2001.

† Not asked in previous years.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

**Table 38: Do respondents agree or disagree with the following statements?
(Q29a+Q29b+Q29c)**

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

		Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know / no opinion	Total
Fares are affordable	2000	9	54	11	6	1	19	100
	2002	14	49	12	4	0	21	100
Public transport is convenient	2000	9	52	12	13	2	12	100
	2002	15	53	11	11	2	8	100
Public transport is safe	2000	9	66	11	3	1	10	100
	2002	17	59	11	6	0	7	100

**Table 39a: How often have respondents used public transport in the last 12 months?
(Q30a+Q30b)**

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2000	2001	2002
Did not use public transport (See Table 39b & Q30b responses in Section 3)	43	42	45
Every day or almost every day (155 times or more often)	5	7	6
Once a week or more often (25 - 154 times)	9	11	10
Once a month or more often (6 - 24 times)	14	14	12
Less than once a month (1 - 5 times) (See Table 39b & Q30b responses in Section 3)	29	26	27
Don't know	0	0	0
Total	100	100	100

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Table 39b: Why respondents don't use public transport or don't use it more often (Q30c)

Note: This covers all persons who said, in the last 12 months, they have not used public transport or have used it less than once a month (2002: 572 persons, 1188 responses). See Q30c responses in Section 3.

	2002*	
	Number	Percent
Have own car / prefer to use own car	186	16
Car more convenient than public transport	141	12
Quicker by car	104	9
More flexibility by car	74	6
Routes not convenient	65	5
Have a work vehicle provided	60	5
Don't like waiting at bus stops	50	4
Car better with baby / children	45	4
Inconvenient timetables	44	4
Health reasons / mobility reasons	38	3
Prefer to cycle	35	3
Don't need to use public transport	34	3
Have to catch two or more buses	33	3
Car better for carrying stuff / shopping, etc	32	2
Prefer to walk	29	2
Don't go to town / don't go out	28	2
No public transport near us / live in rural area	22	2
Lazy / can't be bothered	20	2

* In previous years, only those respondents who did not use public transport in the last 12 months were asked this question. See Table 39c for relevant data.

0 = Less than 0.5% of total responses.

Cont'd

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Table 39b: Why respondents don't use public transport or don't use it more often (Q30c) (continued)

Note: This covers all persons who said, in the last 12 months, they have not used public transport or have used it less than once a month (2002: 572 persons, 1188 responses). See Q30c responses in Section 3.

	2002*	
	Number	Percent
Work unsociable hours/shiftworker	20	2
Cost of public transport	18	1
Carpool/get lifts from other people	15	1
Unpleasant experience to use public transport	13	1
Lack of knowledge of routes etcetera	12	1
Safety concerns	12	1
Only use on odd occasions	11	1
Use taxis	10	1
Car gives me independence/freedom	8	1
Carpark provided/car parking no issue so use car	7	1
Don't like public transport	7	1
Taken by my family instead	5	0
Other reasons (See Q.30c responses in Section 3)	8	1
Don't know	2	0
Total	1188	100

* In previous years, only those respondents who did not use public transport in the last 12 months were asked this question. See next table for relevant data.
0 = Less than 0.5% of total responses.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Table 39c: Reasons why respondents don't use public transport (2001 Survey Q54)

Note: This covers those persons who don't use public transport
(2000: 340 persons, 586 responses; 2001: 339 persons, 658 responses).
See Q54 responses in Section 3.

	2000		2001	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Have own car/prefer to use own car	181	31	177	27
Car more convenient than public transport	78	13	62	9
Quicker by car	22	4	42	6
Routes not convenient	27	5	38	6
Prefer to walk	17	3	38	6
Don't need to use public transport	27	5	37	6
Have a work vehicle provided	23	4	31	5
Prefer to cycle	18	3	30	5
More flexibility with car	41	7	23	4
Inconvenient timetables	20	3	21	3
Live in rural area/too far out	10	2	20	3
Have to catch 2 or more buses	14	2	18	3
Health reasons/mobility reasons	16	3	17	2
Don't like waiting at bus stops	9	2	14	2
Car better with baby/children	9	1	13	2
Don't like public transport	6	1	10	1
Use taxis	9	1	9	1
Cost of public transport	4	1	9	1
Shift worker/work unsociable hours	10	2	8	1
Too much to carry	-	-	7	1
Taken by my family instead	4	1	6	1
Lack of knowledge of routes, etc	-	-	6	1
Carpool/get lifts from other people	-	-	5	1
Don't go to town/don't go out	9	1	5	1
Lazy/can't be bothered	3	1	3	1
Car gives me independence/freedom	8	1	1	0
Others	21	3	8	1
Total	586	100	658	100

0 = Less than 0.5% of total responses.

CONTACTS YOU MAY HAVE HAD WITH COUNCIL STAFF

Table 40a: Frequency of visits to the Council's Tuam Street Office in the last 12 months (Q31a+Q31b)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2002*
Did not visit	76
One to two times	15
Three to four times	5
More than four times	4
Total	100

* In previous years, the frequency scale differed: see table below for relevant data. Note this question was not asked in 2001.

Table 40b: Frequency of visits to the Council's Tuam Street Office in the last 12 months (2000 survey: Q70a+Q70b)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	1998	1999	2000
Did not visit	70	73	75
One or two times	20	17	16
Three times or more	10	10	9
Don't know how many times	0	0	0
Total	100	100	100

CONTACTS YOU MAY HAVE HAD WITH COUNCIL STAFF

Table 41a: Frequency of visits to a Service Centre in the last 12 months (Q32a+Q32b)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2002*
Did not visit	64
One to two times	19
Three to four times	11
Five or more times	6
Total	100

* In previous years, the frequency scale differed: see table below for relevant data.
Note this question was not asked in 2001.

Table 41b: Frequency of visits to a Service Centre in the last 12 months (2000 survey: Q71a+Q71b)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	1998	1999	2000
Did not visit	54	52	57
One or two times	23	30	24
Three to eleven times	19	16	17
Twelve or more times	4	2	2
Don't know how many times	0	0	0
Total	100	100	100

CONTACTS YOU MAY HAVE HAD WITH COUNCIL STAFF

Table 42: Service Centre visited most often (Q32c)

Note: This covers all persons who visited a Service Centre in the last 12 months (2002: 299 persons).

	2002
Beckenham	14
Fendalton	15
Lynwood	20
Papanui	12
Riccarton	7
Shirley	15
Sockburn	17
Can't recall which one	0
Total	100

CONTACTS YOU MAY HAVE HAD WITH COUNCIL STAFF

Table 43a: Frequency of telephoning Council offices in the last 12 months (Q33a+Q33b)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2002*
Did not telephone Council	59
One to two times	25
Three to four times	8
Five or more times	8
Don't know	0
Total	100

* In previous years, the frequency scale differed: see table below for relevant data.

Table 43b: Frequency of telephoning Council offices in the last 12 months (2001 survey: Q61a+Q61b)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	1998	1999	2000	2001
Did not telephone Council	58	53	54	53
One or two times	26	29	29	27
Three to eleven times	14	14	13	15
Twelve or more times	2	4	4	5
Don't know how many times	0	0	0	0
Total	100	100	100	100

E-MAIL AND THE WORLD WIDE WEB

Table 44: On average, how often do respondents use e-mail for work, education or personal use? (Q34)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2001	2002
Daily	31	35
Several times a week	14	14
Once a week	4	3
Several times a month	4	5
Once a month	1	1
Less often than once a month	5	3
Never used e-mail	41	39
Total	100	100

Table 45: On average, how often do respondents use the world wide web for work, education or personal use? (Q35)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2001	2002
Daily	18	22
Several times a week	16	16
Once a week	8	6
Several times a month	6	7
Once a month	3	3
Less often than once a month	7	7
Never used the world wide web	42	39
Total	100	100

E-MAIL AND THE WORLD WIDE WEB

Table 46: Where do respondents use e-mail and/or the world wide web? (Q36)

Note: This covers all persons who have used e-mail and/or the world wide web (2001: 438 persons, 785 responses; 2002: 442 persons, 814 responses).

	2000		2001	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
At home	329	42	367	45
At work	225	29	228	28
At a friend's or relative's house	89	11	79	10
At school or other educational institution	87	11	77	10
At a library	37	5	35	4
At an internet café or similar	18	2	26	3
Other (See Q36 responses in Section 3)	-	-	2	0
Total	785	100	814	100

- Not mentioned in 2001.

0 = Less than 0.5% of total responses.

Table 47: How important is the world wide web as a source of information that helps respondents make decisions? (Q37)

Note: This covers all persons who have used the world wide web (2001: 406 persons; 2002: 414 persons).

	2001	2002
Very important	26	37
Important	40	31
Neither important nor unimportant	22	22
Unimportant	10	8
Very unimportant	2	2
Don't know	0	0
Total	100	100

E-MAIL AND THE WORLD WIDE WEB

Table 48: In the last 12 months, have respondents visited a Christchurch City Council web site? (Q38a)

Note: This covers all persons who have used e-mail and/or the world wide web for work, education or personal use (2002: 414 persons).

	2002
Yes	28
No	72
Don't know	0
Total	100

Table 49: How did respondents find out about the site? (Q38h)

Note: This covers all persons who have visited a Christchurch City Council web site (2002: 118 persons, 144 responses).

	2002	
	Number	Percent
Through my work	19	13
Told about it by another person	17	12
Saw an address in a Council printed publication	16	11
Through the library	15	11
Assumed it was there and found it	13	9
Linked from another site	12	8
Saw the address in a newspaper	12	8
Through my education/training	10	7
Searched/surfed for it	9	6
Found it through a search engine	8	6
Told about it by the Council staff	7	5
Other ways	4	3
Don't know/can't remember	2	1
Total	144	100

E-MAIL AND THE WORLD WIDE WEB

Table 50: Types of information respondents think should be in a Council newsletter (Q39a)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	Yes	No	Don't know	Total
Information about upcoming events and festivals organised by the Council	86	6	8	100
Information about development proposals, proposed new buildings and similar	80	11	9	100
Information about upcoming Council meetings, including information about items to be discussed	57	31	12	100
Information about issues open for public consultation	83	9	8	100

Table 51: Are there any other types of information respondents think should be in a Council newsletter? (Q39b)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2002
Yes (See Table 52 and Q39c responses in Section 3)	26
No	74
Don't know	0
Total	100

E-MAIL AND THE WORLD WIDE WEB

Table 52: Other types of information respondents think should be in a Council newsletter (Q39c)

Note: This covers all persons who said there were other types of information they think should be in a Council newsletter (2002: 193 persons, 278 responses).
See Q39c responses in Section 3.

	2002	
	Number	Percent
Environmental issues/group activities	34	12
Local community news/events/clubs	29	11
Roading/roadworks/traffic information	28	10
Any changes to Council services/facilities	20	7
Budgets and financial reports	19	7
Information about Council/Council staff	14	5
Council decisions/what way Councillors voted	14	5
Sporting information	14	5
General information on Council services/facilities	12	4
Public transport	11	4
Recycling education/information	10	4
General Council information not specified	9	3
Long term planning/City Plan information	8	3
Proposed rate increases/other rates issues	7	3
Allow for public opinions/feedback/comment	7	2
Bylaw information and changes to bylaws	3	1
Other reasons (See Q39c responses in Section 3)	39	14
Total	278	100

E-MAIL AND THE WORLD WIDE WEB

Table 53: Would respondents like to receive an e-mail newsletter that contained some or all of the material mentioned previously? (Q39d)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2002
Yes	51
No	45
Don't know	4
Total	100

CITY APPEARANCE

Table 54a: Satisfaction with the way the City, as a whole, looks and feels (Q40a)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2000	2001	2002
Very satisfied (See Table 54b & Q40b responses in Section 3)	27	17	22
Satisfied (See Table 54b & Q40b responses in Section 3)	56	62	55
No feeling either way	8	9	8
Dissatisfied (See Table 54c & Q40b responses in Section 3)	9	10	14
Very dissatisfied (See Table 54c & Q40b responses in Section 3)	0	1	1
Don't know /No opinion	0	1	0
Total	100	100	100

CITY APPEARANCE

Table 54b: Reasons why respondents are satisfied with the way the City, as a whole, looks and feels (Q40b)

Note: This covers all persons who are satisfied/very satisfied with the way the City looks and feels (2002: 597 persons, 1887 responses). See Q40b responses in Section 3.

	2002	
	Number	Percent
Clean city/no litter/clean and tidy	193	10
Beautiful parks/lots of parks	133	7
Beautiful city/attractive/pretty	119	6
Attractive gardens/lovely flowers	112	6
Love the trees/large English trees	81	4
Not too much traffic/easy to get around	72	4
Love Christchurch/like it/nice place	65	3
Great place to live/always lived here	58	3
Nice green city/clean green looking	57	3
Compared well with other NZ/overseas cities	56	3
Many attractions/activities	50	3
Good facilities and services	49	3
Reasonably safe city/trouble-free	47	3
Helpful, friendly people/welcoming	47	3
Well laid out/spacious	46	2
The Avon/the river flowing through City	44	2
Council are doing a good job	43	2
Most things convenient/handy	41	2
Feels good/feels comfortable	39	2
Slow pace/no rush/relaxed/quiet, etcetera	34	2
Attractive buildings/old buildings preserved	32	2
Good size/right population size	30	2
Like the City Centre	28	1
Go ahead/progressive place/positive place	23	1
Good roading/roads well maintained	22	1
Lives up to its Garden City image	21	1
Good Council events/festivals	21	1

0 = Less than 0.6% of total responses.

CITY APPEARANCE

Table 54b: Reasons why respondents are satisfied with the way the City, as a whole, looks and feels (Q40b) (continued)

Note: This covers all persons who are satisfied/very satisfied with the way the City looks and feels (2002: 597 persons, 1887 responses). See Q40b responses in Section 3.

	2002	
	Number	Percent
Good sporting facilities/activities/opportunities	20	1
Good transport/bus service very good	19	1
Nice beaches/good access to beaches	19	1
Good cultural amenities/activities	18	1
Great place to shop/nice shopping malls	17	1
Looks bright/colourful	16	1
Improving the Square	14	1
Oxford Terrace/bars/the café scene	14	1
Good water supply/nice water to drink	14	1
Good reputation/visitors like it	14	1
The Port Hills/nice to see the hills	13	1
Good weather/nice climate	13	1
Access to mountains/skiing opportunities	13	1
Flat	13	1
People are proud of the City	12	1
Buzzy/vibrant/lively/exciting place	11	1
Has an old English traditional character	9	0
Low cost of living/not an expensive place to live	8	0
Clean air/no pollution	8	0
People take a pride in houses/gardens	7	0
Nice atmosphere/good atmosphere	6	0
Good educational facilities	5	0
Different cultures and lifestyles	2	0
No complaints/nothing bothers me	14	1
Other (See Q40b responses in Section 3)	20	1
Don't know/no particular reason/no reply	5	0
Total	1887	100

0 = Less than 0.6% of total responses.

CITY APPEARANCE

Table 54c: Reasons why respondents are dissatisfied with the way the City, as a whole, looks and feels (Q40b)

Note: This covers all persons who are dissatisfied/very dissatisfied with the way the City looks and feels (2000: 71 persons, 124 responses; 2001: 94 persons, 141 responses; 2002: 121 persons, 212 responses).
See Q40b responses in Section 3.

	2000		2001		2002	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Looks dirty/rubbish everywhere	17	13	16	11	38	18
Square redevelopment a disaster	14	11	25	18	37	17
Roading issues/roadworks/traffic problems*	2	2	2	1	24	12
Safety concerns	5	4	16	11	16	8
Graffiti/vandalism	6	5	8	6	10	5
Loss of trees/need more trees planted	5	4	5	4	10	5
Drab/dowdy looking/needs sprucing up	10	8	13	9	9	4
Better maintenance/tidy up needed	9	7	10	7	9	4
Old buildings pulled down	8	7	4	3	6	3
Inadequate shopping in City Centre	-	-	-	-	6	3
Empty buildings/closed shops	1	1	4	3	5	2
Loss of green areas	-	-	-	-	5	2
Level of attention/standards vary	3	2	11	8	4	2
State of footpaths	6	5	0	0	4	2
New buildings/big buildings/high rises	4	3	7	5	3	1
Smog/air pollution	8	7	0	0	2	1
Others (See Q40b responses in Section 3)	26	21	20	14	24	11
Total	124	100	141	100	212	100

- Responses may have been included in 'others' section of the 2000/2001 surveys.

* In previous surveys this referred to roadworks only.

PERCEPTION OF DIVERSITY

Table 55a: Rating Christchurch as a place to live, taking into account the diverse nature of the City's population (Q41a)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	1999*	2000	2002
A much better place to live	11	18	16
A better place to live	35	39	33
Makes no difference	39	32	34
A worse place to live (See Table 55b & Q41b responses in Section 3)	13	10	15
A much worse place to live (See Table 55b & Q41b responses in Section 3)	1	0	1
Don't know	1	1	1
Total	100	100	100

* In 1999 the respondents were asked: "Christchurch is becoming home for an increasing number of people from different nations and races".

In 2000 and 2002 the question was worded slightly differently: "Christchurch is becoming home for an increasing number of people with different lifestyles and cultures, and from different countries".

PERCEPTION OF DIVERSITY

Table 55b: Reasons why respondents feel Christchurch is a worse place to live (Q41b)

Note: This covers all persons who say Christchurch is a worse/much worse place to live in (2002: 113 persons, 228 responses).
See Q41b responses in Section 3.

	2002	
	Number	Percent
Lack of integration into NZ society / don't mix	38	17
Causes racial disharmony / racial tension	21	9
Increase in crime / gangs	20	9
Immigrants not helped enough / no follow-up	19	9
Poor driving skills	18	8
Taking us over / taking our shops, etcetera	15	7
Arrogant / disrespectful / ill mannered people	14	6
Use our welfare / education systems, etcetera	13	6
Too many Asian immigrants	11	5
Too many foreigners / too many different cultures	11	5
Inability to communicate / speak English	9	4
Don't contribute to our economy	8	3
Creates unemployment / take our jobs	6	2
Allowing the wrong kind of people in	6	2
Christchurch is becoming overcrowded / overpopulated	3	1
Others (See Q41b responses in Section 3)	16	7
Total	228	100

LEISURE AND RECREATION

Table 56: Main things respondents usually do in their leisure time (Q42)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages). See Q42 responses in Section 3.

	2001		2002	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Watching TV / videos	661	14	613	13
Reading	564	12	519	11
Socialising with friends in cafés, bars etc.	472	10	487	10
Gardening	448	10	478	10
Shopping or window shopping	446	10	470	10
Taking part in sports or other physical activity individually or with an informal group (including walking, swimming, etc.)	330	7	429	9
Family or child-focused activities	361	8	375	8
Attending theatre, concerts or going to see films	319	7	365	8
Creative activity such as arts, crafts, music	206	4	219	5
Taking part in sports or other physical activity with a club, team or organised group	194	4	213	5
Surfing the net	213	5	184	4
Church or religious activities	152	3	139	3
Voluntary or unpaid community work	145	3	128	3
Attending community education / evening classes	73	2	69	1
Home entertaining	6	0	15	0
Club/group membership	5	0	13	0
Playing computer games	6	0	8	0
Home renovation/decorating	4	0	6	0
Watching live sport	3	0	5	0
Playing cards	7	0	4	0
Listening to radio/music	7	0	4	0
Working on cars/boats	4	0	4	0
Animal-focused activities	4	0	3	0
Other (See Q42 responses in Section 3)	16	1	16	0
None of the above	1	0	0	0
Total	4,647	100	4,766	100

0 = Mentioned by less than 0.5 of total responses.

COMMUNITY COHESION

Table 57: Strength of feeling regarding particular statements (Q43)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

		Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know / No opinion	Total
I feel a sense of community with others in my local neighbourhood - eg, share interests and concerns with them	2001	10	37	24	23	5	1	100
	2002	11	35	27	22	4	1	100
It's important to me to feel a sense of community with people in my local neighbourhood	2001	17	52	22	9	0	0	100
	2002	15	52	23	9	1	0	100
People across the City work together and support each other	2001	3	37	29	23	4	4	100
	2002	3	36	30	24	1	6	100

COMMUNITY COHESION

Table 58a: What kind of contact have respondents had with the people who live on their street during the last 12 months? (Q44)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2001	2002
Positive contact - visit, chat when I see them, ask small favours, tell them if I'm going away	56	57
Limited positive contact - nod or say hello	34	34
No particular contact	8	8
Limited negative contact - we don't get on	1	1
Negative contact - there's outright tension or disagreement	0	0
Don't know	1	0
Total	100	100

NB: A similar question was asked in 2000. The following are the relevant results:

Table 58b: What kind of positive contact have respondents had with the people in their street? (2000 survey Q27)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2000
Lots of positive contact (eg, socialise with neighbours, part of social network)	20
Some positive contact (eg, stop and chat, tell them when going away, asking small favours)	45
Limited positive contact (eg, give a nod, sometimes say hello)	27
No positive contact	8
Total	100

COMMUNITY COHESION

Table 59a: Which group best describes the group or social network that matters most to respondents? (Q45)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2001	2002
It is mostly made up of people who live in the same area as me (ie, my local neighbourhood)	14	14
It is mostly made up of people who have the same interests, culture or beliefs as me, but who don't necessarily live in my area	62	61
It is mostly made up of people I work with	9	8
There are no particular groups or networks that I feel I belong to	14	17
Other (See Q45 responses in Section 3)	1	0
Total	100	100

0 = Less than 0.5% of total respondents.

NB: A similar question was asked in 2000. The corresponding results are as follows:

Table 59b: Where is the group and network that matters most to respondents based? (2000 survey Q28)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2000
Mainly based around where they live (ie, local neighbourhood)	28
Mainly based on their interests, ethnic group, beliefs, lifestyle or social networks	60
There is no community that I feel I belong to	12
Total	100

CHILD SAFETY

Table 60a: How safe or unsafe do respondents think their local neighbourhood is for their children or other people's children to play in while unsupervised? (Q46a)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2001	2002
Very safe	8	10
Safe	45	52
Unsafe (See Table 60b and Q46a responses in Section 3)	33	29
Very unsafe (See Table 60b and Q46a responses in Section 3)	7	6
Don't know	7	3
Total	100	100

CHILD SAFETY

Table 60b: Why respondents feel their local neighbourhood is unsafe for children to play unsupervised (Q46b)

Note: This covers all persons who said they think their local neighbourhood is unsafe/ very unsafe for children to play unsupervised (2001: 314 persons, 520 responses; 2002: 258 persons, 471 responses).
See Q46b responses in Section 3.

	2001		2002	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Busy roads/heavy traffic/fast cars	195	38	181	39
Strange people/unsavoury people	63	12	83	18
Children should always be supervised	68	13	51	11
Read/hear of incidents	34	7	28	6
Teenage hooligans/bullying youths	26	5	27	6
Rough neighbourhood	24	5	19	4
Lack of safe areas to play	11	2	15	3
Unsafe parks/playgrounds/high shrubs	17	3	14	3
River/beach/marshland/open drains	13	3	13	3
Reflection of the times we live in	13	3	9	2
Lots of flats/transient population	-	-	7	1
Undesirable residents in area	13	2	5	1
Dogs/stray animals are a worry*	5	1	4	1
Lack of pedestrian crossings	8	1	2	0
Accidents/injury may happen during play	5	1	1	0
Poor street lighting	8	1	-	-
Railway lines/crossings	3	1	-	-
Others (See Q46b responses in Section 3)	13	2	11	2
Don't know/no reply	1	0	1	0
Total	520	100	471	100

0 = Less than 0.6% of all responses.

- Responses may have been included in 'others' section of the 2001 or 2002 surveys.

* In 2001 the response was 'dogs are a worry'.

SAFETY

Table 61: How safe do respondents feel in their own home? (Q47a.i+Q47a.ii)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	During the daytime				After dark			
	1999*	2000	2001	2002	1999*	2000	2001	2002
Very safe	34	48	36	42	20	29	21	25
Safe	57	48	60	54	56	61	68	65
Unsafe	8	4	4	3	19	8	10	9
Very unsafe	1	0	0	1	5	2	1	1
Don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

* In 1999 respondents were asked how safe they feel in their own home from outside intruders.

Table 62: How safe do respondents feel in their neighbourhood? (Q47a.iii+Q47a.iv)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	During the daytime				After dark			
	1999*	2000	2001	2002	1999*	2000	2001	2002
Very safe	34	40	32	35	13	16	10	13
Safe	60	56	65	62	50	56	57	57
Unsafe	5	4	3	2	29	22	28	24
Very unsafe	1	0	0	1	7	4	4	4
Don't know	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	2
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

SAFETY

Table 63: How safe respondents feel in the City Centre by themselves (Q47a.v+Q47a.vi)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	During the daytime				After dark			
	1998	2000	2001	2002	1998	2000	2001	2002
Very safe	28	21	16	23	2	3	2	2
Safe	59	66	73	67	16	26	24	30
Neither safe nor unsafe	7	-	-	-	19	-	-	-
Unsafe	5	8	7	6	35	42	47	44
Very unsafe	1	1	2	1	26	21	22	19
Don't know	0	4	2	3	2	8	5	5
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

- Not asked in 2000, 2001 & 2002

Table 64: How big a problem is crime in respondent's local neighbourhood? (Q47b)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2001	2002
Crime is a very big problem	4	5
Crime is a fairly big problem	16	23
Crime is not a big problem	58	60
Crime is not a problem at all	17	10
Don't know	5	2
Total	100	100

LOCAL PROBLEMS

Table 65a: How much each of the following have been a problem in respondent's local neighbourhood over the last 12 months (Q48)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

		Very big problem	Fairly big problem	Not a big problem	Not a problem at all	Don't know	Not applicable	Total
Rubbish or litter lying about on streets	2001	5	17	53	25	0	0	100
	2002	6	20	52	22	0	0	100
Graffiti on walls, schools, shops	2001	13	16	42	28	0	1	100
	2002	12	25	41	21	1	0	100
Broken windows in shops, public buildings, or other vandalism	2001	3	10	38	46	2	1	100
	2002	4	12	46	36	2	0	100
House burglaries, break-ins or prowlers	2001	4	17	44	33	2	0	100
	2002	7	23	48	17	5	0	100
Car theft, damage to cars or theft from cars	2001	6	13	41	36	3	1	100
	2002	7	23	45	19	5	1	100
Dangerous driving, including drink driving, speeding or hoons	2001	19	29	38	13	0	1	100
	2002	25	34	32	8	1	0	100
Risk from traffic for pedestrians or cyclists	2001	12	28	37	22	1	0	100
	2002	14	31	40	14	1	0	100
People who you feel unsafe around because of their behaviour, attitude or appearance	2001	4	9	42	44	0	1	100
	2002	4	11	51	33	1	0	100
Assaults, including sexual assaults	2001	3	5	30	58	4	0	100
	2002	3	6	38	44	8	1	100
Drug dealing or drug use in the neighbourhood	2001	4	8	25	55	7	1	100
	2002	5	7	32	42	14	0	100
Not enough street lighting	2001	5	15	35	44	1	0	100
	2002	4	14	39	42	1	0	100

Cont'd

LOCAL PROBLEMS

Table 65a: How much each of the following have been a problem in respondent's local neighbourhood over the last 12 months (Q48) (continued)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

		Very big problem	Fairly big problem	Not a big problem	Not a problem at all	Don't know	Not applicable	Total
Lack of public open spaces or parks	2001	1	3	29	67	0	0	100
	2002	2	4	26	67	1	0	100
Increase in the number of new houses, townhouses or apartments in the neighbourhood	2001	4	8	31	56	1	0	100
	2002	3	9	38	47	2	1	100
Footpaths in bad condition	2001	7	15	38	38	0	2	100
	2002	5	18	42	34	1	0	100
Smoke from indoor fires in your neighbourhood	2001	5	16	34	44	1	0	100
	2002	7	16	36	37	3	1	100
Barking dogs	2001	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	5	11	41	43	0	0	100
Wandering dogs†	2001	5	15	39	41	0	0	100
	2002	4	10	43	43	0	0	100
Dogs fouling or other dog nuisance	2001	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	6	16	43	34	1	0	100
Loud music	2001	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	3	8	44	44	1	0	100
Noise from parties*	2001	3	7	41	49	0	0	100
	2002	3	7	40	50	0	0	100
Other noise from people	2001	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	2	5	43	50	0	0	100
Noise from industry or commercial activity**	2001	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	1	4	21	73	0	1	100

† In 2001, problem was described as wandering or uncontrolled dogs.

* In 2001, problem was described as noisy neighbours or loud parties.

- Not asked in 2001.

Cont'd

LOCAL PROBLEMS

Table 65a: How much each of the following have been a problem in respondent's local neighbourhood over the last 12 months (Q48) (continued)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

		Very big problem	Fairly big problem	Not a big problem	Not a problem at all	Don't know	Not applicable	Total
Noise from traffic**	2001	5	13	33	48	0	1	100
	2002	7	13	36	43	1	0	100
Speeding cars	2001	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	19	29	34	18	0	0	100
Smoke or fumes from industry	2001	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	2	4	21	72	1	0	100
Smoke from backyard fires	2001	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	2	3	24	70	1	-	100
Smoke from indoor fires	2001	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	13	27	28	29	2	1	100
Fumes from motor vehicles	2001	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	6	18	32	43	0	1	100
Any other smells	2001	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	4	8	24	62	1	1	100
Burglar or car alarms	2001	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2002	2	4	39	54	0	1	100

- Not asked in 2001.

** In 2001, problem was described as street noise (from traffic, business or factories). In 2002, these problems were asked separately, ie, noise from traffic, noise from industry or commercial activity.

LOCAL PROBLEMS

Table 65b: In the last 12 months have there been other kinds of problems in respondent's local neighbourhood? (Q49a)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2001	2002
Yes (See Table 65c and Q49b responses in Section 3)	13	14
No	87	86
Total	100	100

LOCAL PROBLEMS

Table 65c: Other problems respondents have had in last 12 months (Q49b)

Note: This covers all persons who said there were other problems in their local neighbourhood.

(2001: 105 persons, 115 responses; 2002: 116 persons, 117 responses).

See Q49b responses in Section 3.

	2001		2002	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Roading/traffic problems/proposed roading changes*	18	16	20	17
Flooding/drainage problems	4	3	18	15
Behaviour of kids, teenagers, students, youth	-	-	13	11
Overgrown trees	14	13	12	10
Cats that are a nuisance	15	13	10	9
Problems with parking/parked vehicles	-	-	7	6
Problems with neighbours	-	-	7	6
Poor standard of work/maintenance/upkeep	-	-	6	5
Lack of cleaning of gutters/drains	11	9	-	-
Heavy traffic/traffic congestion*	11	9	*	*
Ugly overhead powerlines	5	5	-	-
Kids on bikes/skateboards	3	3	-	-
Refused to say	-	-	1	1
Other problems (See Q49b responses in Section 3)	34	29	23	20
Total	115	100	117	100

- Responses may have been included in 'other problems' section of the 2001 or 2002 surveys.

* In 2001 this was split into two: roads in poor condition (16%) and heavy traffic/traffic congestion (9%).

COUNCIL CONSULTATION/COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Table 66a: Satisfaction with the way the Council involves the public in the decisions it makes (Q50a)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2000*	2001	2002
Very satisfied	3	4	5
Satisfied	34	33	30
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	24	28	32
Dissatisfied (See Table 66b & Q50b responses in Section 3)	25	22	23
Very dissatisfied (See Table 66b & Q50b responses in Section 3)	6	5	4
Don't know / no opinion	8	8	6
Total	100	100	100

* In 2000, respondents were asked: "Are you satisfied with the way the Council involves people in decision making?". In 2001 and 2002, respondents were asked: "How satisfied are you with the way Council involves the public in the decisions it makes?".

COUNCIL CONSULTATION/COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Table 66b: Reasons why respondents are dissatisfied with the way the Council involves the public in the decisions it makes (Q50b)

Note: This covers all persons who said they were dissatisfied/very dissatisfied with the way the Council involves the public in the decisions it makes (2001: 212 persons, 296 responses; 2002: 203 persons, 297 responses). See Q50b responses in Section 3.

	2001		2002	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Lack of publicity/information	18	6	54	18
No consultation/involvement	40	13	54	18
Do what they want/have own agendas	43	15	34	11
Don't listen to public opinion	58	19	29	10
Don't involve public early enough	17	6	22	8
Specific actions/decisions by Council	25	8	19	7
Waste money/spend money too freely	17	6	19	6
Not enough consultation	33	11	16	5
Should be more open	10	3	14	5
Lack of consultation with all parties affected	-	-	10	3
Suggestions for improving communication	17	6	6	2
Not given enough time for submissions	-	-	5	2
Submission process unclear	5	2	-	-
Others (See Q50b responses in Section 3)	11	4	15	5
No particular reason/just dissatisfied	2	1	0	0
Total	296	100	297	100

- Responses may have been included in 'others' section of the 2001 or 2002 surveys.

COUNCIL CONSULTATION/COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Table 67a: How much influence do respondents feel the public has on decisions that the Council makes? (Q51a)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2000*	2001	2002
Large influence	8	6	4
Some influence	38	41	41
Small influence (See Table 67b and Q51b responses in Section 3)	36	37	39
No influence (See Table 67b and Q51b responses in Section 3)	12	10	11
Don't know / no opinion	6	6	5
Total	100	100	100

* In 2000, respondents were asked: "How do you rate the public's ability to influence Council decision making?". In 2001 and 2002, respondents were asked "How much influence do you feel the public has on decisions that the Council makes?".

COUNCIL CONSULTATION/COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Table 67b: Reasons why respondents feel the public has a small influence or no influence on decisions that the Council makes (Q51b)

Note: This covers all persons who said they thought that the public had a small influence or no influence on the decisions that the Council makes (2001: 374 persons, 474 responses; 2002: 395 persons, 533 responses). See Q51b responses in Section 3.

	2001		2002	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Do what they want/mind is made up	111	23	132	25
Don't listen to public opinion	104	22	94	17
No contact/consultation	59	13	57	11
Lack of communication/publicity/information	30	6	50	10
Not necessary to have influence	26	6	32	6
Only find out after it has happened	24	5	24	4
Have to battle/group together to influence	20	4	23	4
Actions/decisions by Council cause problems	30	6	23	4
Particular individuals/groups exert more influence	-	-	18	3
Public should have more say/influence	12	2	14	3
Only have influence at election time	8	2	12	2
Should be more open	5	1	9	2
No evidence of changes	-	-	5	1
Cost influences decisions more than public opinion	-	-	5	1
Others (See Q51b responses in Section 3)	30	7	26	5
Don't know	15	3	9	2
Total	474	100	533	100

- Responses may have been included in 'others' section of the 2001 or 2002 surveys.

COUNCIL CONSULTATION/COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Table 68a: How much confidence do respondents have in their local Council to make decisions that are in the best interests of the City? (Q52a)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2001	2002
Complete confidence	3	3
A lot of confidence	23	24
Some confidence	49	51
A little confidence	12	13
Very little confidence (See Table 68b and Q52b responses in Section 3)	7	6
No confidence (See Table 68b and Q52b responses in Section 3)	3	1
Don't know	3	2
Total	100	100

COUNCIL CONSULTATION/COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Table 68b: Reasons respondents have very little or no confidence in their local Council (Q52b)

Note: This covers all persons who said they had very little or no confidence in their local Council to make decisions that are in the best interests of the City (2001: 82 persons, 105 responses; 2002: 66 persons, 90 responses). See Q52b responses in Section 3.

	2001		2002	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Wasting/spending too much money	15	14	15	17
Don't listen to residents	16	15	11	12
The bad decisions/mistakes they have made	24	23	11	12
Not doing what they should/going downhill	-	-	9	10
Do what they want/mind is made up	15	14	8	9
Incompetence of City Councillors	6	6	7	8
Political or personal agendas	-	-	7	8
Don't consult/involve residents/public	14	13	6	6
Arguing/infighting/childish behaviour	-	-	5	5
Outside influences on the Council	-	-	3	4
Sneaky decisions/not open enough	-	-	3	4
Too much vested interest	3	3	-	-
Others	12	12	5	5
Total	105	100	90	100

- Responses may have been included in 'others' section of the 2001 or 2002 surveys.

COUNCIL CONSULTATION/COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Table 69: Strength of feeling regarding specific statements about Council (Q53)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

		Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know	Total
The Council doesn't really affect me	2001	1	18	15	53	11	2	100
	2002	1	17	15	56	10	1	100
Voting in Council elections gives people like me a chance to influence decisions made about my community	2001	6	57	19	13	3	2	100
	2002	9	53	21	13	3	1	100
I don't really understand how my Council works	2001	3	34	24	34	5	0	100
	2002	3	35	22	35	4	1	100
The Council has a big impact around here	2001	5	45	28	17	1	4	100
	2002	8	43	31	14	1	3	100
I'm not very interested in what the Council does, as long as they do their job	2001	2	31	16	44	7	0	100
	2002	3	31	16	42	7	1	100
I like to know what the Council is doing, but I'm happy to let them get on with it	2001	4	64	17	13	2	0	100
	2002	5	63	16	13	2	1	100
I would like to have more of a say in what the Council does	2001	6	39	35	19	1	0	100
	2002	6	36	33	24	0	1	100
The Council has a big impact outside of our City (eg, at the national government level)	2001	2	19	31	30	3	15	100
	2002	2	20	30	30	4	14	100

HEALTH

Table 70a: In the last 12 months, have respondents, or a member of their household, experienced stress in relation to any of the following ...? (Q54)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2001			2002		
	Yes	No	Declined to answer	Yes	No	Declined to answer
Moving house	19	81	0	23	77	0
Serious illness (eg, yourself, family, flatmate)	32	68	0	37	63	0
Problems in a relationship	20	79	1	18	81	1
Divorce or separation	7	92	1	7	92	1
A child left or returned home	8	91	1	11	89	0
Difficulty at school or on a training programme, at university, etcetera	11	89	0	13	87	0
General family problems	23	76	1	23	77	0
Drug or alcohol problems	4	95	1	6	93	1
Death of a family member or friend	24	75	1	31	69	0
Lost a job	8	91	1	7	92	1
Demoted at work / taken a pay cut	4	96	0	4	95	1
Changed jobs	18	82	0	20	79	1
Financial problems	24	75	1	25	74	1

HEALTH

Table 70b: In the last 12 months have respondents, or a member of their household, experienced other kinds of stresses? (Q55a)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2001*	2002
Yes (See Table 70c and Q55b responses in Section 3)	9	18
No	91	82
Total	100	100

* In 2001 all respondents were not asked separately if they, or a member of their household had experienced any other stressful situations. Instead they were asked if there were any other problems at the end of the question outlining a range of stressful situations.

HEALTH

Table 70c: Other stresses respondents have experienced in the last 12 months (Q55b)

Note: This covers all persons who have experienced other stresses in the last 12 months (2001: 76 persons, 73 responses*; 2002: 129 persons, 151 responses).

* Less than 76 due to weightings which have been applied.

See Q55b responses in Section 3.

	2001		2002	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Stress at work	17	23	46	30
Birth of a baby/new baby	-	-	10	7
Loss/death of a pet/other pet problems	-	-	9	6
Problems with neighbours	2	3	8	5
Home burglary/thefts/vandalism, etcetera	-	-	8	5
School/university examinations	-	-	7	5
Car accident	-	-	5	4
Buying/selling a home	-	-	5	3
Problems with Council	7	9	5	3
Dealings with Government departments	4	6	2	1
Home maintenance/alterations	3	4	2	1
Refused to say	-	-	7	5
Others (See Q55b responses in Section 3)	40	55	37	25
Total	73	100	151	100

- Responses may have been included in 'others' section of the 2001 surveys.

HEALTH

Table 71: Is there someone respondents feel they can turn to for help in times of stress? (Q56)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2001	2002
Always	64	57
Most of the time	24	29
Sometimes	7	9
Rarely	3	3
Never	1	2
Don't know	1	0
Total	100	100

HEALTH

Table 72: Strength of feeling towards the following statements (Q57)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

		Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Not applicable	Don't know	Total
I plan to slow down in the coming year	2001	3	23	16	51	5	1	1	100
	2002	4	25	14	48	8	0	1	100
I think I spend too much time working	2001	8	29	16	40	3	4	0	100
	2002	10	28	15	40	4	0	3	100
I think I spend too much time looking after children or other dependants	2001	2	6	12	52	11	16	1	100
	2002	2	7	12	49	17	0	13	100
When I need more time, I tend to cut back on sleep	2001	7	38	8	41	5	1	0	100
	2002	6	35	8	44	6	0	1	100
At the end of the day, I often feel that I haven't accomplished what I set out to do	2001	7	44	16	30	2	0	1	100
	2002	6	38	19	33	3	0	1	100
I worry I don't spend enough time with family and friends	2001	5	31	14	44	4	1	1	100
	2002	5	35	13	41	5	0	1	100
I feel trapped in a daily routine	2001	5	23	14	51	6	1	0	100
	2002	5	22	16	49	7	0	1	100
I just feel I don't have time for fun any more	2001	3	15	14	57	9	1	1	100
	2002	3	13	17	58	9	0	0	100
I want to spend more time alone	2001	2	12	16	59	10	0	1	100
	2002	1	12	14	59	14	0	0	100

HEALTH

Table 73a: Have respondents ever felt lonely or isolated in the City in the last 12 months? (Q58)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2001	2002
Always	1	0
Most of the time	1	1
Sometimes	19	18
Rarely	24	29
Never	54	52
Don't know / No opinion	1	0
Total	100	100

NB: In 2000, a similar question was asked. The following are the relevant results:

Table 73b: How isolated have respondents felt in the last 12 months? (2000 survey Q79)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2000
Always felt lonely or isolated	1
Usually felt lonely or isolated	2
Sometimes felt lonely or isolated	18
Hardly ever or never felt lonely or isolated	78
Don't know	1
Total	100

HEALTH

Table 74: How happy or unhappy are respondents on the whole? (Q59)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2001	2002
Very happy	31	36
Happy	62	59
Not very happy	6	5
Not at all happy	0	0
Don't know /No opinion	1	0
Total	100	100

Table 75: How healthy a lifestyle do respondents feel they have? (Q60)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2001	2002
Very healthy	22	25
Healthy	64	62
Not very healthy	12	12
Very unhealthy	1	1
Don't know	1	0
Total	100	100

HEALTH

Table 76: How do respondents rate their overall quality of life? (Q61)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2001	2002
Very good	38	40
Good	49	49
Fair	10	9
Not very good	3	2
Poor	0	0
Don't know	0	0
Total	100	100

Table 77: Generally speaking, would respondents say that people can be trusted? (Q62)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2002
People can almost always be trusted	5
People can usually be trusted	56
You can't be too careful	34
You almost always can't be too careful	4
Don't know	1
Total	100

THE CITY

Table 78: Satisfaction with Christchurch overall as a place to live, work, and to spend spare time in (Q63)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
Very satisfied	46	49	41	37	35
Satisfied	48	44	52	55	58
No feeling either way	4	5	5	6	5
Dissatisfied	2	2	2	2	2
Very dissatisfied	0	0	0	0	0
Don't know	0	0	0	0	0
Total	100	100	100	100	100

THE CITY

Table 79: Have respondents seen the Chalice, the new sculpture in the Square? (Q64a)

Note: This covers all persons (percentages).

	2002
Yes	82
No	18
Don't know	0
Total	100

Table 80: Do respondents think the Square is a better or worse place for having the Chalice? (Q64b)

Note: This covers all persons who said they have seen the Chalice (2002: 629 persons).

	2002
The Square is a much better place for having the Chalice	9
The Square is a better place for having the Chalice	26
The Chalice doesn't make the Square better or worse	41
The Square is a worse place for having the Chalice	12
The Square is a much worse place for having the Chalice	6
No opinion one way or another	6
Total	100

RATES

Table 81: Respondents' ratings of value for money for Council services/facilities (Q66a)

Note*: This excludes all persons who live in Council or pensioner housing
(1999: 607 persons; 2000: 731 persons; 2001: 780 persons; 2002: 744 persons).

	Year	Very good	Good	No feeling	Bad	Very bad	Don't know	Total
Looking after roads and footpaths	1998	8	60	14	13	2	3	100
	1999	9	50	21	16	2	2	100
	2000	8	53	16	16	2	5	100
	2001	7	61	14	13	2	3	100
	2002	7	52	18	17	2	4	100
Making sure traffic moves smoothly and safely	1998	6	59	15	16	2	2	100
	1999	4	45	27	19	3	2	100
	2000	9	49	18	18	4	2	100
	2001	5	52	17	21	2	3	100
	2002	6	50	17	20	3	4	100
Overall City and environmental planning	1998	7	55	23	9	1	5	100
	1999	6	47	29	13	2	3	100
	2000	9	50	27	9	1	4	100
	2001	5	50	28	11	1	5	100
	2002	7	51	26	8	1	7	100
Regulating activities and investigating nuisances	1998	5	43	32	11	1	8	100
	1999	5	42	36	12	2	3	100
	2000	3	41	36	11	2	7	100
	2001	3	40	35	13	1	8	100
	2002	4	39	32	13	1	11	100
Sewage disposal In years prior to 2001, this also included land drainage.	1998	11	65	15	5	1	3	100
	1999	18	55	18	6	2	1	100
	2000	12	58	17	7	1	5	100
	2001	16	62	13	4	1	4	100
	2002	16	53	17	6	2	6	100

* In 1999, persons who were unable to give an estimation of the annual rates on their property were excluded.

Continued

RATES

Table 81: Respondents' ratings of value for money for Council services/facilities (Q66a) (continued)

Note*: This excludes all persons who live in Council or pensioner housing
(1999: 607 persons; 2000: 731 persons; 2001: 780 persons; 2002: 744 persons).

	Year	Very good	Good	No feeling	Bad	Very bad	Don't know	Total
Refuse collection and disposal	1998	16	63	9	10	1	1	100
	1999	29	53	10	6	1	1	100
	2000	19	62	8	6	2	3	100
	2001	24	59	8	5	1	3	100
	2002	24	53	13	4	2	4	100
Water supply services	1998	24	66	6	2	1	1	100
	1999	30	51	13	3	1	2	100
	2000	25	61	8	3	0	3	100
	2001	22	64	7	2	1	4	100
	2002	30	52	11	1	1	5	100
Entertainment and convention facilities (Westpac Trust Centre, Town Hall, Convention Centre) NB: surveys before 2000 relate to the Town Hall only.	1998	15	56	21	2	1	5	100
	1999	12	47	31	7	0	3	100
	2000	18	53	18	5	1	5	100
	2001	23	54	15	4	0	4	100
	2002	25	49	16	3	1	6	100
The Art Gallery	1998	9	52	25	5	1	8	100
	1999	9	42	37	7	2	3	100
	2000	11	47	28	6	1	7	100
	2001	9	51	25	5	1	9	100
	2002	12	43	29	7	1	8	100
Public libraries	1998	22	60	11	2	1	4	100
	1999	20	51	19	8	1	1	100
	2000	22	54	14	5	0	5	100
	2001	27	52	10	6	1	4	100
	2002	28	48	15	4	1	4	100

* In 1999, persons who were unable to give an estimation of the annual rates on their property were excluded.

Continued

RATES

Table 81: Respondents' ratings of value for money for Council services/facilities (Q66a) (continued)

Note*: This excludes all persons who live in Council or pensioner housing
(1999: 607 persons; 2000: 731 persons; 2001: 780 persons; 2002: 744 persons).

	Year	Very good	Good	No feeling	Bad	Very bad	Don't know	Total
Putting on events and festivals	1998	38	48	9	3	0	2	100
	1999	29	49	16	4	1	1	100
	2000	31	51	10	4	1	3	100
	2001	34	49	11	3	1	2	100
	2002	33	46	13	3	1	4	100
Parks and playing fields	1998	20	64	10	4	0	2	100
	1999	22	57	14	5	1	1	100
	2000	20	61	13	3	0	3	100
	2001	22	61	10	4	1	2	100
	2002	26	54	10	6	1	3	100
Swimming pools In surveys prior to 2001, this also included stadiums.	1998	13	65	15	3	0	4	100
	1999	17	53	24	4	0	2	100
	2000	17	61	15	3	0	4	100
	2001	18	59	14	3	0	6	100
	2002	21	54	16	3	0	6	100
Promoting and supporting sport and recreation	1998	14	59	16	7	0	4	100
	1999	11	50	28	9	0	2	100
	2000	13	54	20	6	1	6	100
	2001	10	58	19	7	0	6	100
	2002	16	52	20	7	0	5	100
Getting tourists to come to Christchurch	1998	12	54	20	9	1	4	100
	1999	8	49	29	11	1	2	100
	2000	15	44	22	10	2	7	100
	2001	15	48	20	11	2	4	100
	2002	17	49	18	9	1	6	100

* In 1999, persons who were unable to give an estimation of the annual rates on their property were excluded.

Continued

RATES

Table 81: Respondents' ratings of value for money for Council services/facilities (Q66a) (continued)

Note*: This excludes all persons who live in Council or pensioner housing
(1999: 607 persons; 2000: 731 persons; 2001: 780 persons; 2002: 744 persons).

	Year	Very good	Good	No feeling	Bad	Very bad	Don't know	Total
Getting businesses to create new jobs in Christchurch	1998	8	40	25	17	1	9	100
	1999	7	32	30	23	3	5	100
	2000	5	33	28	22	4	8	100
	2001	5	36	27	18	4	10	100
	2002	6	37	30	16	1	10	100
Supporting voluntary groups and community organisations	1998	12	56	20	5	1	6	100
	1999	9	50	30	7	1	3	100
	2000	10	49	25	9	0	7	100
	2001	7	50	28	6	1	8	100
	2002	9	47	29	5	1	9	100
Recycling programmet	2001	26	55	8	7	1	3	100
	2002	26	54	11	4	1	4	100
Looking after waterways, wetlands and land drainage†	2001	10	57	19	7	1	6	100
	2002	14	49	23	6	1	7	100
Stadiumst	2001	8	56	22	6	1	7	100
	2002	17	53	19	4	1	6	100
Promoting and developing the City Centre**	2002	6	43	23	19	3	6	100
Landscaping the City's streets**	2002	10	55	20	9	1	5	100
Supporting the Canterbury Museum**	2002	11	56	22	4	0	7	100

* In 1999, persons who were unable to give an estimation of the annual rates on their property were excluded.

† Not asked, or not asked separately, prior to 2001.

** Not asked, or not asked separately, prior to 2002.

RATES

Table 82: Respondents' views as to whether the Council should spend more or less on services/facilities (Q66b+Q66c+Q66d+Q66e)

Note*: This excludes all persons who live in Council or pensioner housing
(1999: 607 persons; 2000: 731 persons; 2001: 780 persons; 2002: 744 persons).

	Spend more					Spend less					No preference expressed				
	'98	'99	2000	2001	2002	'98	'99	2000	2001	2002	'98	'99	2000	2001	2002
Looking after roads and footpaths	9	13	13	13	12	4	2	3	3	2	87	85	84	84	86
Making sure traffic moves smoothly and safely	12	17	18	15	21	1	1	1	1	1	87	82	81	84	78
Overall City and environmental planning	7	6	11	5	5	1	3	1	2	2	92	91	88	93	93
Regulating activities and investigating nuisances	4	4	5	4	3	3	1	4	1	3	93	95	91	95	94
Sewage disposal (Prior to 2001, this included land drainage.)	4	4	5	4	8	1	2	1	2	1	95	94	94	94	91
Refuse collection and disposal	12	5	6	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	88	95	94	96	95
Water supply services	2	4	1	3	2	1	0	0	1	0	97	96	99	96	98
Entertainment & convention facilities NB: surveys before 2000 relate to the Town Hall only	0	1	1	2	1	3	5	8	4	5	97	94	91	94	94
The Art Gallery	4	2	3	1	2	7	9	7	8	6	89	89	90	91	92
Public libraries	3	3	2	2	2	3	6	7	12	6	94	91	91	86	92
Putting on events and festivals	6	8	6	5	6	3	4	3	2	4	91	88	91	93	90
Parks and playing fields	5	3	5	4	4	2	2	3	3	4	93	95	92	93	92
Swimming pools (Prior to 2001, this included stadiums.)	4	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	95	96	96	96	97
Promoting and supporting sport and recreation	9	3	4	4	4	2	5	2	3	3	89	92	94	93	93
Getting tourists to come to Christchurch	16	16	17	17	12	2	3	3	2	2	82	81	80	81	86
Getting businesses to create new jobs in Christchurch	23	23	25	20	15	2	4	3	2	4	75	73	72	78	81
Supporting voluntary groups and community organisations	8	10	10	6	8	4	3	1	1	3	88	87	89	93	89
Recycling programmet	-	-	-	18	11	-	-	-	0	0	-	-	-	82	89
Looking after waterways, wetlands and land drainage†	--	-	-	6	5	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	92	94
Stadiums†	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	5	4	-	-	-	93	94
Promoting & developing the City Centre**	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	86
Landscaping the City's streets**	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	91
Supporting the Canterbury Museum*	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	96

* In 1999, persons who were unable to give an estimation of the annual rates on their property were excluded.

† Not asked, or not asked separately prior to 2001.

** Not asked, or not asked separately prior to 2002.

RATES

Table 83: Respondents' ratings of value for money for Council services/facilities, and whether the Council should spend more or less on services/facilities (Q66a+Q66c+Q66e)

Note*: This excludes all persons who live in Council or pensioner housing
(1999: 607 persons; 2000: 731 persons; 2001: 780 persons; 2002: 744 persons).

	Rating	Spend more				Spend less				No preference				Total			
		'99	2000	'01	'02	'99	2000	'01	'02	'99	2000	'01	'02	'99	2000	'01	'02
Looking after roads and footpaths	Very good	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	9	8	6	6	9	8	7	7
	Good	4	3	5	3	0	1	1	0	46	49	55	49	50	53	61	52
	No feeling	2	2	2	2	0	1	1	1	19	13	11	15	21	16	14	18
	Bad	7	7	5	5	1	0	1	1	8	9	7	11	16	16	13	17
	Very bad	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	2	2	2
	Don't know	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4	2	5	3	4
Making sure traffic moves smoothly and safely	Very good	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4	6	4	9	4	6
	Good	3	5	3	7	0	0	0	0	42	44	49	44	45	49	52	51
	No feeling	3	2	2	4	0	0	0	1	24	16	15	12	27	18	17	17
	Bad	9	7	8	8	0	0	0	0	10	11	13	11	19	18	21	19
	Very bad	2	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3	4	2	3
	Don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4	2	2	3	4
Overall City and environmental planning	Very good	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	5	7	6	9	5	7
	Good	2	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	44	45	48	49	47	50	50	51
	No feeling	1	3	2	2	0	0	0	1	28	24	26	23	29	27	28	26
	Bad	2	3	2	1	2	0	1	0	10	6	8	7	14	9	11	8
	Very bad	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	1	1	1
	Don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	7	2	4	5	7
Regulating activities and investigating nuisances	Very good	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	3	2	4	5	3	3	4
	Good	2	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	40	39	39	38	42	41	40	39
	No feeling	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	36	34	34	30	36	36	35	32
	Bad	2	2	2	2	0	1	0	1	10	8	10	10	12	11	12	13
	Very bad	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	1
	Don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	9	11	3	7	9	11

* In 1999, persons who were unable to give an estimation of the annual rates on their property were excluded.

Continued

RATES

Table 83: Respondents' ratings of value for money for Council services/facilities, and whether the Council should spend more or less on services/facilities (Q66a+Q66c+Q66e) (continued)

Note*: This excludes all persons who live in Council or pensioner housing
(1999: 607 persons; 2000: 731 persons; 2001: 780 persons; 2002: 744 persons).

	Rating	Spend more				Spend less				No preference				Total			
		'99	2000	'01	'02	'99	2000	'01	'02	'99	2000	'01	'02	'99	2000	'01	'02
Sewage disposal (Prior to 2001, this included land drainage)	Very good	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	17	11	16	15	17	12	17	16
	Good	2	2	2	3	0	0	1	0	53	56	59	50	55	58	62	53
	No feeling	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	17	16	13	15	18	17	13	17
	Bad	1	1	1	2	1	1	0	0	4	5	3	4	6	7	4	6
	Very bad	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	1	3	1	1	2
	Don't know	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	6	1	5	3	6
Refuse collection and disposal	Very good	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	28	19	24	24	29	19	25	25
	Good	1	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	52	59	58	51	53	62	59	52
	No feeling	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	10	7	7	12	11	8	8	13
	Bad	2	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	2	6	6	5	4
	Very bad	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	3	1	2
	Don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4	1	2	2	4
Water supply services	Very good	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	29	25	21	30	30	25	22	30
	Good	3	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	48	60	62	52	51	61	64	52
	No feeling	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	8	7	11	13	8	7	11
	Bad	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	1	3	3	2	2
	Very bad	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
	Don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	5	2	3	4	5
Entertainment & convention facilities (Westpac Trust Centre, Town Hall, Convention Centre) NB: surveys before 2000 relate to the Town Hall only.	Very good	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	18	22	25	12	18	24	26
	Good	0	0	1	0	1	3	2	1	46	50	52	48	47	53	54	49
	No feeling	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	2	30	16	14	14	31	18	15	16
	Bad	0	0	1	0	2	2	0	1	5	3	3	2	7	5	4	3
	Very bad	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
	Don't know	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4	4	6	3	5	4	6

* In 1999, persons who were unable to give an estimation of the annual rates on their property were excluded.

Continued

RATES

Table 83: Respondents' ratings of value for money for Council services/facilities, and whether the Council should spend more or less on services/facilities (Q66a+Q66c+Q66e) (continued)

Note*: This excludes all persons who live in Council or pensioner housing
(1999: 607 persons; 2000: 731 persons; 2001: 780 persons; 2002: 744 persons).

	Rating	Spend more				Spend less				No preference				Total			
		'99	2000	'01	'02	'99	2000	'01	'02	'99	2000	'01	'02	'99	2000	'01	'02
The Art Gallery	Very good	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	10	9	12	9	11	9	12
	Good	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	1	39	43	48	41	42	47	51	43
	No feeling	0	0	0	0	4	3	3	2	33	25	22	27	37	28	25	29
	Bad	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	2	5	5	3	5	7	6	5	7
	Very bad	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	1
	Don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	8	7	3	7	9	8
Public libraries	Very good	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	19	20	27	27	20	22	28	28
	Good	1	1	1	1	1	3	4	2	49	50	47	45	51	54	52	48
	No feeling	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	1	17	12	7	14	19	14	10	15
	Bad	0	0	0	0	3	1	4	2	4	4	2	2	8	5	6	4
	Very bad	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
	Don't know	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	4	3	4	1	5	3	4
Putting on events and festivals	Very good	4	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	25	29	33	31	29	31	34	33
	Good	3	2	3	2	0	1	1	2	46	48	45	42	49	51	49	46
	No feeling	0	1	0	2	1	1	1	1	15	8	10	10	16	10	11	13
	Bad	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	2	2	2	2	4	4	3	3
	Very bad	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
	Don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	5	1	3	3	5
Parks and playing fields	Very good	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	19	21	26	22	20	22	26
	Good	1	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	55	57	58	50	57	61	62	54
	No feeling	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	14	12	8	9	15	13	9	10
	Bad	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	2	2	3	4	4	3	4	6
	Very bad	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1
	Don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	3	1	3	3	3

* In 1999, persons who were unable to give an estimation of the annual rates on their property were excluded.

Continued

RATES

Table 83: Respondents' ratings of value for money for Council services/facilities, and whether the Council should spend more or less on services/facilities (Q66a+Q66c+Q66e) (continued)

Note*: This excludes all persons who live in Council or pensioner housing
(1999: 607 persons; 2000: 731 persons; 2001: 780 persons; 2002: 744 persons).

	Rating	Spend more				Spend less				No preference				Total			
		'99	2000	'01	'02	'99	2000	'01	'02	'99	2000	'01	'02	'99	2000	'01	'02
Swimming pools Prior to 2001, this included stadiums.	Very good	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	16	17	21	17	17	17	21
	Good	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	52	59	57	53	53	61	59	54
	No feeling	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	22	14	14	16	24	15	15	16
	Bad	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	3	2	3	2	4	3	4	3
	Very bad	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	6	2	4	5	6
Promoting and supporting sport and recreation	Very good	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	11	12	10	15	11	13	10	16
	Good	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	47	52	56	50	50	54	59	52
	No feeling	1	0	0	1	2	0	1	1	25	20	18	18	28	20	19	20
	Bad	0	1	1	1	1	0	6	1	8	5	5	5	9	6	7	7
	Very bad	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
	Don't know	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4	2	6	5	5
Getting tourists to come to Christchurch	Very good	1	3	2	3	0	0	0	0	7	12	13	14	8	15	15	17
	Good	6	5	6	5	1	1	0	0	42	38	42	44	49	44	48	49
	No feeling	3	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	25	19	16	17	29	22	19	19
	Bad	6	6	6	3	1	0	1	0	4	4	5	5	11	10	12	8
	Very bad	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	1
	Don't know	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4	5	2	7	4	6
Getting businesses to create new jobs in Christchurch	Very good	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	6	4	4	5	7	5	5	6
	Good	5	7	4	6	0	1	0	0	27	25	32	31	32	33	36	37
	No feeling	5	5	4	3	1	1	1	1	23	22	23	26	29	28	28	30
	Bad	11	10	8	5	2	1	0	2	11	11	9	9	24	22	17	16
	Very bad	1	2	2	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	2	0	3	4	4	1
	Don't know	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	9	10	5	8	10	10

In 1999, persons who were unable to give an estimation of the annual rates on their property were excluded.

Continued

RATES

Table 83: Respondents' ratings of value for money for Council services/facilities, and whether the Council should spend more or less on services/facilities (Q66a+Q66c+Q66e) (continued)

Note*: This excludes all persons who live in Council or pensioner housing
(1999: 607 persons; 2000: 731 persons; 2001: 780 persons; 2002: 744 persons).

	Rating	Spend more				Spend less				No preference				Total			
		'99	2000	'01	'02	'99	2000	'01	'02	'99	2000	'01	'02	'99	2000	'01	'02
Supporting voluntary groups and community organisations	Very good	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	7	9	6	8	8	10	7	9
	Good	4	4	2	4	1	0	0	1	46	45	48	42	51	49	50	47
	No feeling	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	26	23	26	26	30	25	28	29
	Bad	3	3	2	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4	4	7	9	6	6
	Very bad	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
	Don't know	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	8	8	3	7	8	9
Recycling programmet	Very good	-	-	6	2	-	-	0	0	-	-	20	24	-	-	26	26
	Good	-	-	7	6	-	-	0	0	-	-	48	48	-	-	55	54
	No feeling	-	-	1	1	-	-	0	0	-	-	7	10	-	-	8	11
	Bad	-	-	3	1	-	-	0	0	-	-	4	3	-	-	7	4
	Very bad	-	-	1	0	-	-	0	0	-	-	0	1	-	-	1	1
	Don't know	-	-	0	0	-	-	0	0	-	-	3	4	-	-	3	4
Looking after waterways, wetlands and land drainage†	Very good	-	-	0	1	-	-	0	0	-	-	9	13	-	-	9	14
	Good	-	-	2	2	-	-	0	0	-	-	55	47	-	-	57	49
	No feeling	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	18	21	-	-	20	23
	Bad	-	-	2	1	-	-	1	0	-	-	4	5	-	-	7	6
	Very bad	-	-	1	0	-	-	0	0	-	-	1	1	-	-	2	1
	Don't know	-	-	0	0	-	-	0	0	-	-	5	7	-	-	5	7
Stadium†	Very good	-	-	0	0	-	-	0	0	-	-	7	17	-	-	7	17
	Good	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	55	51	-	-	57	53
	No feeling	-	-	0	0	-	-	2	2	-	-	20	17	-	-	22	19
	Bad	-	-	0	0	-	-	2	1	-	-	4	3	-	-	6	4
	Very bad	-	-	0	0	-	-	0	0	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	1
	Don't know	-	-	0	0	-	-	0	0	-	-	7	6	-	-	7	6

* In 1999, persons who were unable to give an estimation of the annual rates on their property were excluded.

† Not asked, or not asked separately, prior to 2001.

RATES

Table 83: Respondents' ratings of value for money for Council services/facilities, and whether the Council should spend more or less on services/facilities (Q66a+Q66c+Q66e) (continued)

Note*: This excludes all persons who live in Council or pensioner housing
(1999: 607 persons; 2000: 731 persons; 2001: 780 persons; 2002: 744 persons).

	Rating	Spend more				Spend less				No preference				Total			
		'99	2000	'01	'02	'99	2000	'01	'02	'99	2000	'01	'02	'99	2000	'01	02
Promoting and developing the City Centre**	Very good	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	6	-	-	-	6
	Good	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	40	-	-	-	43
	No feeling	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	20	-	-	-	23
	Bad	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	13	-	-	-	19
	Very bad	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	3
	Don't know	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	6	-	-	-	6
Landscaping the City's streets**	Very good	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	10	-	-	-	10
	Good	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	52	-	-	-	55
	No feeling	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	18	-	-	-	20
	Bad	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	6	-	-	-	9
	Very bad	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
	Don't know	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	5
Supporting the Canterbury Museum**	Very good	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	10	-	-	-	11
	Good	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	55	-	-	-	56
	No feeling	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	21	-	-	-	22
	Bad	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	3
	Very bad	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
	Don't know	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	7	-	-	-	7

* In 1999, persons who were unable to give an estimation of the annual rates on their property were excluded.

** Not asked, or not asked separately, prior to 2002.