

**Mayor and Councillors**  
COUNCIL

10 AUGUST 2017

Meeting Status: **Public**

Purpose of Report: For Information

## **RESIDENT OPINION SURVEY 2016/17 - OVERVIEW**

### **PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1 This report provides the Council with an overview of the results of the Resident Opinion Survey for the 2016/17 financial year

### **DELEGATION**

- 2 The Council has the authority to consider this matter.

### **BACKGROUND**

- 3 The Resident Opinion Survey is an important tool for ensuring that Council understands and responds to community views on the services it provides. It is also the core method used to collect data for a number of our Key Performance Indicators.
- 4 The approach in recent years has been to undertake an annual survey of 400 individuals via landline telephone surveys. Surveying this number of individuals provided an acceptable margin of error (5%) and allowed the Council to report achievement against a range of KPI's contained in the current Long Term Plan and reported on annually through Annual Reports.
- 5 Last year the Council re-tendered the contract for the provision of the Residents Opinion Survey and this provided an opportunity for the Council to look at a range of improvements such as, how it might increase the survey sample size over time, moving to undertake the survey more frequently than once every twelve months and to start to improve our benchmarking ability with other similar local authorities.
- 6 The Council entered into a contract with a Christchurch based research company, Research First, in early 2017.
- 7 Two surveys were undertaken in February and May 2017, as part of moving to a quarterly cycle. Both survey's combined covered a total of 413 landline respondents, ensuring that we have the same number of respondents as we did for the annual survey that occurred in 2015/16 as referred to above.
- 8 As part of beginning to increase the overall reach of the survey, we provided an opportunity for the community to provide their feedback on-line. Respondents accessed the survey through Council's social media and other communication channels. While this increased engagement, the results for the 2016/17 financial year only reflects the feedback received through the landline survey, to maintain comparability with previous year's results. This is due to the online survey being based on self-selection, rather than a randomly selected research sample that matches the population (or demographic of Kapiti) as determined through the

last Census. We are currently working with Research First to develop an online panel that over time will match the demographic make-up of Kapiti and will in turn allow the results from the on-line survey to be included. This work will progressively happen throughout 2017/18 financial year.

- 9 The feedback received from the on-line surveys, along with the land line results will be disseminated across the Council for use in Council's on-going efforts to improve how it delivers its services.
- 10 For the 2017/18 financial year the survey will run quarterly and will seek feedback from over 800 respondents during the course of the year.

## Summary of Performance for 2016/17

- 11 Attached as Appendix 1 is the 2017 Residents Opinion Survey. The results of the survey will allow a number of Key Performance Indicators for the year to be reported on in the 2016/17 Annual Report, which is planned to come to Council in late September.
- 12 Overall satisfaction with the services that the Council provides has increased slightly from last year moving to an adjusted satisfaction score of 82% in 2017 from 79% in 2016 and the analysis undertaken shows that people's perceptions of the Council's overall performance have continued to improve in the period since 2014.
- 13 The survey also rated aspects of people's interactions with the Council. Residents were most satisfied with how well Council understood their enquiry, with 82% either satisfied or very satisfied, while the least satisfactory aspect was how Council kept them informed about the progress of their enquiry where 36% of respondents were satisfied or very satisfied.
- 14 In previous years the Resident's Opinion Survey has included a series of questions on the importance of various services and facilities. To improve the overall length of the survey and lessen the burden placed on people to respond to a significant number of questions, the new research provider has moved to estimate importance using a Key Driver Analysis. Page 41 of this Appendix 1 provides a summary of the outcome of this analysis by showing how a number of the key services provided by the Council are rated as important by the residents who took part in the landline survey.
- 15 The 2017 Residents Opinion Survey also provides some benchmarking information, where this Council's results are compared with Councils of a similar size across the Country. These results can be found on pages 43-46 of the 2017 Residents Opinion Survey attached as Appendix 1. Those results show that the Council compares well with those other Councils.
- 16 Results have also been broken down by Community Board. These results are shown on page 52 of Appendix 1.
- 17 Attached to this paper as Appendix 2 is a table which compares the results of the last years Resident Satisfaction Survey with this year with respect to a number of the key performance indicators contained in the 2015-2018 Long Term Plan. These results will be reported in the 2016/17 Annual Report.

- 18 The data contained in this report will be used to inform the achievement or otherwise of a number of Key Performance Indicators contained in the 2015-2035 Long Term Plan and will be reported on in the 2016/17 Annual Report.
- 19 A representative from Research-First will be providing an overview of the results at this Council meeting.

## **CONSIDERATIONS**

### Policy considerations

- 20 There are no policy considerations associated with this report.

### Legal considerations

- 21 The Council has met its statutory obligations to measure the key activities it is responsible for (Local Government Act 2002)

### Financial considerations

- 22 There are no financial considerations associated with this report.

### Tāngata whenua considerations

- 23 There are no issues for consideration in relation to iwi associated with this report.

## **SIGNIFICANCE AND ENGAGEMENT**

### Significance policy

- 24 This matter has a low level of significance under Council Policy.

### Publicity

- 25 The Council intends to formally release the results of the 2016/17 surveys following this meeting. The results will also be available on the Councils' website following this meeting.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 26 That the Council notes that:
  - 26.1 Results of the Resident Opinion survey are provided as *Appendix 1* of this Report SP-17-283, which includes a breakdown of results at both the district and community board level.
  - 26.2 Council will be using these results as part of reporting against relevant Key Performance indicators in the 2016/17 Annual Report which will be coming to Council for consideration in late September 2017.
  - 26.3 Council will undertake the Resident Opinion Survey four times during the 2017/18 financial year.

**Report prepared by**

**Approved for submission**

**Approved for submission**

Kevin Black  
**Manager, Corporate Planning  
and Reporting**

Max Pedersen  
**Group Manager  
Community Services**

Sarah Stevenson  
**Group Manager  
Strategy and Planning**

**ATTACHMENTS**

Appendix 1: 2017 Resident's Opinion Survey

Appendix 2: Comparison of 2016 and 2017 Survey Key Performance Indicator Results



# 2017 RESIDENTS' OPINION SURVEY



# Contents



RESEARCH FIRST



Executive Summary	3
Research Design	6
Overall Satisfaction	11
Results in Detail	14
Derived Importance	39
Appendix 1: Benchmarking	42
Appendix 2: Results by Age	47
Appendix 3: Results by Gender	49
Appendix 4: Results by Community Board	51

Research First notes that the views presented in the report do not necessarily represent the views of Kāpiti Coast District Council. In addition, the information in this report is accurate to the best of the knowledge and belief of Research First Ltd. While Research First Ltd has exercised all reasonable skill and care in the preparation of information in this report, Research First Ltd accepts no liability in contract, tort, or otherwise for any loss, damage, injury or expense, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, arising out of the provision of information in this report.



RESEARCH FIRST



# 1 Executive Summary

## 1.1 Executive Summary

---

This document reports the results of the 2017 Residents' Opinion Survey. The survey was conducted for Kāpiti Coast District Council by Research First in two waves, over February and May 2017, and includes 413 Kāpiti residents.

The key finding of this research is that in most areas of service, Council's performance has **improved** or is **steady** compared to 2016 results.



RESEARCH FIRST




Ma Huri Whakamuri, Ka Tiro Whakamua





RESEARCH FIRST





RESEARCH FIRST



Ma Huri Whakamuri, Ka Tiro Whakamua



## 2 Research Design

## 2.1 Research Context

Kāpiti Coast District Council (Council) is the local government authority for Kāpiti Coast District. Each year Council surveys residents in Kāpiti about their opinions on a wide range of services delivered to the district.

The information provided by the survey results helps Council determine its work programme and budget priorities in the future.

In 2017, Council contracted Research First to conduct the Residents' Opinion Survey.



RESEARCH FIRST



Ma Huri Whakamuri, Ka Tiro Whakamua

## 2.2 Research Method



The research was conducted using a telephone survey design. This method was the best choice because:

- Keeping the method the same as that used in previous years means that results can be compared;
- It provides better quality results (because the presence of a telephone interviewer reduces errors and addresses potential biases resulting from interpretation problems on behalf of the participants);
- It provides results that are representative of the views of a geographically dispersed population; and
- It provides results that can be extrapolated to an audience with a high degree of accuracy (because of the use of probability samples).

The survey was conducted in two waves, in February and May 2017. The total sample for this annual report is 413 respondents.

Note that in both waves, data was simultaneously collected online, with respondents accessing the survey through Council's social media and other communication channels. This increases engagement but the online results have been kept separate from the telephone results, and are not reported in this document; this is because the sample was self-selected rather than randomly-selected and the demographic does not match the profile of Kāpiti. The results therefore may not match the actual proportion of sentiment across the District. The feedback received from the online survey, with the telephone results, will be disseminated across Council for use in Council's on-going efforts to improve how it delivers its services.

## 2.3 Notes On This Report



RESEARCH FIRST



When reading this report, it is important to consider:

- The maximum margin of error for the achieved sample of 413 respondents is +/-4.7% at the 95% confidence interval. This means that Council can have confidence in the results for the sample as a whole, but the results for subsamples such as community board, age and gender are less precise;
- The 2016 results are from a telephone survey of 399 respondents conducted in March 2016;
- In some cases, respondents chose to answer 'don't know' rather than rate a service or facility. Where this is the case, these responses have been removed from the analysis and a subtotal of respondents calculated;
- For each service or facility, an 'adjusted satisfaction score' has been calculated. This is in line with the way Council has previously analysed its satisfaction results. The adjusted satisfaction score is calculated by removing neutral and don't know responses, and recalculating the percentage of satisfied respondents from the reduced base size;
- Where a result is significantly different from results recorded in previous years, this is noted with a yellow (positive) or blue (negative) arrow; and
- Results have also been analysed against Long Term Plan targets. An achieved score is denoted with a tick, while not achieved scores are denoted with a cross.

## 2.4 Research Sample



RESEARCH FIRST



The demographics of the research sample were matched to the population of Kāpiti as captured by the 2013 Census.

<i>Age Group</i>	n	%	Census 2013
18-29	44	11%	12%
30-39	38	9%	12%
40-49	80	19%	18%
50-59	73	18%	18%
60-64	38	9%	8%
65+	140	34%	32%
Total	413	100%	

<i>Gender</i>	n	%	Census 2013
Male	185	45%	46%
Female	228	55%	54%
Total	413	100%	

<i>Town</i>	n	%
Paraparaumu	103	25%
Waikanae	96	23%
Ōtaki	76	18%
Paekākāriki	44	11%
Paraparaumu Beach	30	7%
Raumati South	25	6%
Raumati Beach	19	5%
Waikanae Beach	11	3%
Te Horo	4	1%
Ōtaki Beach	2	0%
Reikorangi	2	0%
Otaihanga	1	0%
Total	413	100%

### *Community Board*

	n	%
Ōtaki	82	20%
Waikanae	109	26%
Paraparaumu	178	43%
Paekākāriki	44	11%
Total	413	100%



RESEARCH FIRST




## 3 Overall Satisfaction

### 3.1 Overall Satisfaction, 2017




Respondents were asked how satisfied or dissatisfied they are with the overall performance of Council.

Results show that 53% of respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with the overall performance of Council. The adjusted satisfaction score is 82%. This is a slight increase on the 2016 score, 79%.






## 3.2 Overall Satisfaction, Over Time



When analysed over time, results show that perceptions of Council performance have been continually improving since 2014.



# 4 Results in Detail

## 4.1 Ease of Movement



Respondents were asked how satisfied or dissatisfied they are that Council roads allow for easy movement around the District.

Overall, 58% of respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with ease of movement in Kāpiti. The adjusted satisfaction score is 74%. This is a significant improvement on the 2016 score of 61%, although it falls short of the targeted 85% in the Long Term Plan 2015-35.



RESEARCH FIRST





Respondents were asked how satisfied they are with the condition of roads in the District.

Overall, 57% of respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with the condition of roads in Kāpiti. The adjusted satisfaction score is 83%. This score is in line with the result achieved in 2016. Satisfaction with roading conditions met the Long Term Plan 2015-35 target of 70%.



RESEARCH FIRST



## 4.3 Condition of Footpaths



Respondents were asked how satisfied they are with the condition of footpaths in the District.


Overall, 46% of respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with the condition of roads in Kāpiti. The adjusted satisfaction score is 67%. This score is in line with the result achieved in 2016. Satisfaction with roading conditions did not meet the Long Term Plan 2015-35 target of 70%.



RESEARCH FIRST



## 4.4 Street Lighting



Respondents were asked how satisfied they are with street lighting in the District.


Overall, 58% of respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with the condition of roads in Kāpiti. The adjusted satisfaction score is 79%. This score has declined from 89% achieved in 2016. Satisfaction with street lighting did not meet the Long Term Plan 2015-35 target of 85%.



RESEARCH FIRST



## 4.5 Cycle Lanes



Respondents were asked how satisfied they are with the safety and availability of cycle lanes in the District.


Overall, 36% of respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with the condition of roads in Kāpiti. The adjusted satisfaction score is 55%. This score is in line with the result from 2016. Satisfaction with cycle lane safety and availability did not meet the Long Term Plan 2015-35 target of 85%.



RESEARCH FIRST





## 4.6 Kerbside Collection



Respondents who had access to kerbside rubbish collection services were asked how satisfied they are with them.

In total, 77% of respondents had access to kerbside rubbish collection services. Of these respondents, 76% were satisfied or very satisfied with the standard of collection. The adjusted satisfaction score is 89%, which meets the Long Term Plan 2015-35 target of 85%.







Respondents who were aware of Council's waste minimisation programmes were asked how satisfied they are with them.

In total, 26% of respondents were aware of waste minimisation programmes. Of these respondents, 54% were satisfied or very satisfied with the programmes. The adjusted satisfaction score is 82%, which meets the Long Term Plan 2015-35 target of 75%.




RESEARCH FIRST



Service Awareness


26%

## 4.8 Water Supply



Respondents who were provided with Council water supply were asked about their satisfaction with the quality.

In total, 88% of respondents had access to a Council-provided water supply. Of these respondents, 66% were satisfied or very satisfied with the quality of the water. The adjusted satisfaction score is 81%, which meets the Long Term Plan 2015-35 target of 80%.



Service Usage  
88%

## 4.9 Stormwater, Protecting Properties & Gardens



Respondents were asked how satisfied they are with the ability of the stormwater system to protect their property and garden from flooding.

Overall, 55% of respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with how the stormwater system protects their property and garden. The adjusted satisfaction score is 77%. This score is in line with the result from 2016.



RESEARCH FIRST



## 4.10 Stormwater, Protecting Homes



Respondents were asked how satisfied they are with the ability of the stormwater system to protect their home from flooding.

Overall, 52% of respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with how the stormwater system protects their home. The adjusted satisfaction score is 75%. This score has declined since 2016.



RESEARCH FIRST




## 4.11 Swimming Pools



Respondents who had used a Council-owned swimming pool were asked how satisfied they are with the services and facilities.

In total, 56% of respondents had used a Council-owned swimming pool. Of these respondents, 81% were satisfied or very satisfied with the pools. The adjusted satisfaction score is 94%, which is an improved score since 2016. The score meets the Long Term Plan 2015-35 target of 85%.





Service Usage  
56%

## 4.12 Libraries




Respondents who had visited a Council-owned library were asked how satisfactory the service was.

In total, 72% of respondents had visited a Council-owned library. Of these respondents, 93% were satisfied or very satisfied with the service. The adjusted satisfaction score is 99%, in line with the 2016 score. The score meets the Long Term Plan 2015-35 target of 85%.



## 4.13 Public Toilets



Respondents who had used a public toilet in the District were asked how satisfied they are with public toilets.

In total, 62% of respondents had used a public toilet. Of these respondents, 63% were satisfied or very satisfied with the toilets. The adjusted satisfaction score is 88%, which is an improved score since 2016. The score meets the Long Term Plan 2015-35 target of 75%.



Service Usage

62%

## 4.14 Access Points to Beaches



Respondents were asked how satisfied they are with access points to beaches in the District.

Overall, 75% of respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with access points to beaches. The adjusted satisfaction score is 92%. This is in line with the 2016 score. The score meets the Long Term Plan 2015-35 target of 85%.



## 4.15 Pathways



Respondents were asked how satisfied they are with pathways for cycling, walking, and bridleways.

Overall, 71% of respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with access points to beaches. The adjusted satisfaction score is 92%. This is in line with the 2016 score. The score meets the Long Term Plan 2015-35 target of 85%.



RESEARCH FIRST




## 4.16 Community Support




Respondents who were aware of Council's community support services were asked how satisfied they are with them.

In total, 70% of respondents were aware of community support services. Of these respondents, 54% were satisfied or very satisfied with the programmes. The adjusted satisfaction score is 92%, which meets the Long Term Plan 2015-35 target of 85%.



Service Usage  
48%

## 4.17 Value for Money



Respondents were asked how satisfied they are that they receive good value for the money they spend in rates and other fees, considering all the services Council provides.

Overall, 42% of respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with value for money. The adjusted satisfaction score is 69%. This score has decreased compared to 2016.

## 4.18 District Development



Respondents were asked if they agree or disagree that the District is developing in a way that takes into account its unique character and natural environment.


Overall, 58% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed. The adjusted agreement score is 79%. This score has improved compared to 2016. The score meets the Long Term Plan 2015-35 target of 75%.



RESEARCH FIRST



## 4.19 Clarity of Information



Respondents were asked how satisfied they are that Council provides clear information on issues where decisions are coming up.

Overall, 48% of respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with the clarity of information. The adjusted satisfaction score is 72%. Note that the question wording has changed since 2016, which means the results cannot be compared over time.



RESEARCH FIRST



## 4.20 Ease of Participation



Respondents were asked how satisfied they are that Council makes it easy for them to have their say and participate in decision-making that affects the District.

Overall, 49% of respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with the ease of participating in decision-making. The adjusted satisfaction score is 73%. Note that the question wording has changed since 2016, which means the results cannot be compared over time.

## 4.21 Interactions with Council

<i>Who Was Contacted</i>	n	%
A Council staff member	77	87%
An elected member	3	3%
Can't recall/other	9	10%
Total	89	100%

<i>How Contact Was Made</i>	n	%
Phone	52	58%
In person at an office or service centre	23	26%
Email	13	15%
Written letter	6	7%
Online (including website and social media)	1	1%
Other	3	3%
Total	89	100%

Respondents were asked if they had made a request for service or a complaint about Council service in the past 12 months.

In total, 22% of respondents had interacted with Council.

Of these respondents, most had interacted with Council staff over the phone.

## 4.22 Interactions with Council, Overall



Respondents who had interacted with Council were asked to rate how well their enquiry was handled overall.


In total, 22% of respondents had interacted with Council. Of these respondents, 53% were satisfied or very satisfied with the interaction. The adjusted satisfaction score is 63%, in line with the 2016 score.



Service Usage  
22%



## 4.23 Interactions with Council, In Detail




Respondents also rated aspects of their interaction with Council. The most satisfactory part of interactions was how well Council understood enquiries (82% satisfied or very satisfied), while the least satisfactory aspect was how Council kept residents informed about the progress of their enquiry (36% satisfied or very satisfied).



Service Usage  
22%

## 4.24 Sources of Information



Service Usage  
22%

Respondents were asked to name their main source of information about Council, and any other sources they used.



RESEARCH FIRST



## 5 Derived Importance

## 5.1 About Derived Importance

In previous years, the Residents' Opinion Survey has included a series of questions on the importance of various services and facilities. This data has been used to create a 'performance-importance matrix', showing the relationship between performance and importance of services and facilities.



In 2017, those questions were removed from the survey to improve brevity and lessen the burden of response. Instead, importance has been estimated using **Key Driver Analysis**. This is an analysis technique using a multinomial logit model.



RESEARCH FIRST



Kāpiti Coast  
DISTRICT COUNCIL  
Ma Huri Whakamuri, Ka Tiro Whakamua





RESEARCH FIRST



Ma Huri Whakamuri, Ka Tiro Whakamua

## 6 Appendix One: Benchmarking




Comparisons between results recorded by Councils in similar areas are provided to add context to results. When viewing the results there are a number of factors to bear in mind that may influence recorded results:

- Councils in this group were identified as being similar in terms of some key identifiers: split of urban/rural residential areas, district size, median age, population density, and population size. The districts are very different in other areas that may impact on results;
- Sample sizes and data collection methods differ slightly between Councils; and
- Question wording and response scales differ between Councils.


# A1.2 Benchmarked Results, Access and Transport




*Footpaths*



*Cycle lanes*



*Street lighting*






## A1.2 Benchmarked Results, Waste & Water




RESEARCH FIRST



### Water supply



### Kerbside collection




## A1.2 Benchmarked Results, Facilities




RESEARCH FIRST



### Libraries



### Public toilets





RESEARCH FIRST



Ma Huri Whakamuri, Ka Tiro Whakamua

## 7 Appendix Two: Results by Age

## A2.1 Results by Age (Adjusted Satisfaction)

	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-64	65+
Ease of movement	81%	70%	60%	61%	69%	92%
Condition of roads	88%	75%	82%	72%	71%	93%
Condition of footpaths	89%	72%	65%	53%	48%	68%
Street lighting	76%	67%	69%	80%	86%	88%
Cycle lanes	78%	57%	42%	53%	43%	60%
Kerbside collection	94%	91%	84%	78%	87%	95%
Waste minimisation	100%	80%	64%	91%	75%	87%
Water supply	79%	77%	80%	69%	87%	87%
Stormwater protection - property	93%	75%	72%	63%	79%	81%
Stormwater protection - home	92%	62%	69%	69%	80%	80%
Swimming pools	100%	85%	93%	94%	100%	98%
Libraries	100%	96%	100%	98%	100%	98%
Public toilets	73%	71%	76%	91%	100%	98%
Access points to beaches	95%	94%	93%	85%	93%	93%
Pathways	88%	93%	89%	96%	88%	95%
Community support	100%	100%	83%	95%	82%	93%
Value for money	91%	67%	71%	64%	54%	69%
District development	97%	83%	69%	67%	87%	83%
Clarity of information	85%	70%	66%	72%	77%	70%
Ease of participation	86%	68%	76%	70%	78%	69%
Interaction overall	50%	100%	69%	57%	50%	63%

Note that where the data are red, the result is significantly lower. Where the result is blue, the result is significantly higher.



RESEARCH FIRST





RESEARCH FIRST



Ma Huri Whakamuri, Ka Tiro Whakamua

## 8 Appendix Three: Results by Gender

## A3.1 Results by Gender (Adjusted Satisfaction)

	Male	Female
Ease of movement	75%	73%
Condition of roads	87%	80%
Condition of footpaths	75%	60%
Street lighting	80%	79%
Cycle lanes	63%	50%
Kerbside collection	90%	87%
Waste minimisation	77%	84%
Water supply	82%	80%
Stormwater protection - property	77%	77%
Stormwater protection - home	77%	74%
Swimming pools	94%	95%
Libraries	100%	98%
Public toilets	88%	87%
Access points to beaches	93%	91%
Pathways	96%	90%
Community support	85%	95%
Value for money	66%	71%
District development	80%	79%
Clarity of information	75%	69%
Ease of participation	76%	71%
Interaction overall	63%	62%

Note that where the data are red, the result is significantly lower. Where the result is blue, the result is significantly higher.



RESEARCH FIRST





RESEARCH FIRST



## 9 Appendix Four: Results by Community Board

## A4.1 Results by Community Board (Adjusted Satisfaction)

	Ōtaki	Waikanae	Paraparaumu /Raumati	Paekākāriki
Ease of movement	78%	80%	68%	77%
Condition of roads	79%	91%	76%	100%
Condition of footpaths	66%	72%	62%	76%
Street lighting	79%	81%	79%	80%
Cycle lanes	53%	52%	59%	54%
Kerbside collection	89%	88%	87%	96%
Waste minimisation	83%	79%	86%	75%
Water supply	89%	77%	77%	94%
Stormwater protection - property	56%	80%	78%	85%
Stormwater protection - home	65%	85%	75%	88%
Swimming pools	94%	100%	92%	93%
Libraries	98%	96%	100%	100%
Public toilets	87%	93%	83%	88%
Access points to beaches	94%	91%	93%	87%
Pathways	84%	93%	93%	100%
Community support	92%	92%	88%	100%
Value for money	55%	60%	75%	92%
District development	87%	77%	77%	82%
Clarity of information	71%	65%	74%	81%
Ease of participation	72%	77%	68%	88%
Interaction overall	67%	50%	69%	57%

Note that where the data are red, the result is significantly lower. Where the result is blue, the result is significantly higher.



RESEARCH FIRST





## Appendix 2: Comparison of 2016 and 2017 Survey Key Performance Indicator Results

Service Attribute	2016 Adjusted satisfaction score	2017 Adjusted satisfaction score	Percentage point increase/decrease (2017 – 2016)
Services at our district's libraries	98%	99%	+1%
Access points to beaches	94%	92%	-2%
Pathways for cycling, walking and bridle ways	93%	92%	-1%
Kerbside collection services	92%	89%	-3%
Street lighting	89%	79%	-10%
Council's community support services	88%	92%	+4%
The services and facilities at our swimming pools	87%	94%	+7%
The condition of Council roads	84%	83%	-1%
The provision of education, information and advice on ways to minimise waste	81%	82%	+1%
That public toilets are clean, well-maintained and safe	78%	88%	+10%
The quality of Council's water supply	68%	81%	+13%
That the district is developing in a way that takes into account its unique character and natural environment	68%	75%	+7%
The condition of Council footpaths	66%	67%	+1%
That Council roads allow for easy movement around the district	61%	74%	+13%
The safety and availability of ( <i>on road</i> ) cycle lanes	54%	55%	+1%