

# STRATEGIC GROUP

## *Key Performance Indicators – Part 2*

*July 2004*

Safety of town centres  
Experience of crime  
Awareness and standard of community buildings  
Transport to work  
Safety of pedestrian crossings  
Satisfaction with public transport  
Safety and accessibility of trains  
Safety and accessibility of bus stops  
Attitudes to housing situation  
Conservation and environmental protection  
Injury occurrence and concerns



**Waitakere City Council**  
*Te Taiao o Waitakere*

# CONTENTS

<b>1. SUMMARY: KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>2. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>3. MAIN FINDINGS</b> .....	<b>7</b>
3.1 <i>Safety in Town Centres</i> .....	7
3.2 <i>Experience of crime</i> .....	8
3.3 <i>Awareness And Standard of Community Buildings</i> .....	9
3.4 <i>Paid Work, and Work Transport</i> .....	10
3.5 <i>Safety of Pedestrian Crossings</i> .....	12
3.6 <i>Public transport in Waitakere City</i> .....	13
3.7 <i>Train Usage, Safety and Accessibility</i> .....	18
3.8 <i>Bus Usage, Bus Stop Safety and Accessibility</i> .....	23
3.9 <i>Attitude to Housing situation</i> .....	28
3.10 <i>Conservation and Environmental Protection</i> .....	29
3.11 <i>Injury occurrence and concerns</i> .....	30

# 1. SUMMARY: KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

## Urban and Rural Villages

AP measure	Question	Criteria/ Scale	Target	Result	Sample base	Margin of Error
Residents perceive town centres to be safe. (86% in 2002 92% in 2002/03)	<p>Q. Have you used any of the following town centres in the last six months?</p> <p>Q. You mentioned [NAME]. Do you think the [NAME] centre is Very safe, reasonably safe, somewhat unsafe, very unsafe, or have you no opinion?</p>	<p>Very Safe + Reasonably Safe <i>of</i> Very safe Reasonably safe Somewhat unsafe Very unsafe No opinion</p>	85%	<b>83%</b>	<p>Result is an average of ratings of each of the following Centres, weighted by the proportion of residents visiting each in the last 6 months:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Henderson (rated 79% by 257)</li> <li>• New Lynn (rated 83% by 186)</li> <li>• West Gate (rated 90% by 189)</li> </ul>	± 4%
Residents satisfied with the current housing situation (39% in 2001/ 02 46% in 2002/ 03)	Q. Council is able to play a role in housing issues by planning rules and by discussing local needs with central government. How satisfied are you with the current housing situation in Waitakere City right now?	<p>Very/ reasonably satisfied <i>of</i> Very satisfied Reasonably satisfied Somewhat dissatisfied Very dissatisfied No opinion</p>	40% or more	<b>47%</b> (total sample)	Total sample 302 residents	± 5½%

## Transport and Communications

AP measure	Question	Criteria/ Scale	Target	Result	Sample base	Margin of Error
Work from home, or travel to work by walking, cycling, passenger transport, or as vehicle passengers. (23% in 2001/02 22% in 2002/03)	Q. Do you do most of your work from home, or from some other location? <i>Combined with</i> Q. I'm going to read out some means of transport. Which <u>one</u> do you mainly use to get to and from work?	Main transport mode itemised, plus incidence of working at home	23%	<b>22%</b>	Workers aged 18+, in paid employment or in own business N=212	±6%
Increase the proportion of residents going to work by bus or train (3% in 2001/02 6½% in 2002/03 )	As above	Bus or train itemised as main transport to work	Above 3%	<b>7½%</b>	Work travellers, aged 18+, in paid employment or in own business, and do not work at home N=212	±3½%
People crossing main roads on pedestrian crossings feel safe (from traffic) (66% in 2001/02 64% in 2002/03)	Q. How safe do you feel using pedestrian crossings on main roads in Waitakere City?	Very Safe + Reasonably Safe <i>of</i> Very safe Reasonably safe Somewhat unsafe Very unsafe No opinion	70% or more	<b>67%</b>	302 residents	± 5½%

## Passenger Transport - *continued*

AP measure	Question	Criteria/ Scale	Target	Result	Sample base	Margin of Error
Residents are satisfied with level of service of public transport - particularly safety, accessibility and affordability. (40% in 2002/03)	<p>Q. Think about public transport in <u>Waitakere City</u>. Whether you are using these services or not, how satisfied are you with the following I'll read out.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o taking you to places where you want to go</li> <li>o convenience of times</li> <li>o affordability of public transport</li> <li>o public transport safety</li> </ul>	Very/ reasonably satisfied	45% (aggregate)	<p>taking you to places where you want to go: 42%</p> <p>convenience of times: 39%</p> <p>affordability of public transport: 52%</p> <p>public transport safety: 71%</p> <p><u>Aggregate</u> (based on simple average of the above): <b>51%</b></p>	302 residents	± 5½%
Residents perceive that train and bus stations in Waitakere City are accessible and safe (36% for trains, 49% for bus shelters in 2001/02 ; 45% for trains, 76% for bus stops in 2002/03)	<p>Q. How safe are the train stations in Waitakere city? Whether you have used them or not, do you feel they are...</p> <p>Q. How safe are bus stops in Waitakere City? Whether you have used them or not, do you feel they are...</p> <p>Q. And how accessible are the train stations to the public in Waitakere City?</p> <p>Q. Taking into account how many bus stops are available and whether they are located in convenient places, are they...</p>	<p>Safety: Very Safe + Reasonably Safe</p> <p><i>As above</i></p> <p>Accessibility: Very accessible + reasonably accessible</p> <p><i>of</i></p> <p>Very accessible Reasonably accessible Somewhat inaccessible Very inaccessible Unsure/ no opinion</p>	65% or more	<p><u>Safety</u>: Train station: 36% Bus stop: 60%</p> <p><u>Accessibility</u>: Train station: 63% Bus stop: 76%</p> <p><u>Aggregate</u> (average of safety and accessibility): Train station: <b>50%</b> Bus stop: <b>68%</b> Grand aggregate(train and bus safety and accessibility): <b>59%</b></p>	302 residents	± 5½%

NOTE: change of measure wording from *bus shelter* to *bus stop*

## Passenger Transport - continued

AP measure	Question	Criteria/ Scale	Target	Result	Sample base	Margin of Error
Users perceive that train stations in Waitakere City are accessible and safe. (71% in 2001/02 64% in 2002/03)	As above	Safety: Very Safe + Reasonably Safe	80% or more	Train station safety: 45%	Users of trains in Waitakere City last 6 months (N=117)	± 9%
		As above		Train station accessibility: 72%		
		Accessibility: Very accessible + reasonably accessible		<u>Aggregate</u> (average of safety and accessibility): <b>59%</b>		
Users perceive that bus stops in Waitakere City are accessible and safe (76% in 2001/02 88% in 2002/03)	As above	Safety: Very Safe + Reasonably Safe	75% or more	Bus stop safety: 76%	Users of buses in Waitakere City last 6 months (N=87)	± 8%
		As above		Bus stop accessibility: 72%		
		Accessibility: Very accessible + reasonably accessible		<u>Aggregate</u> (average of safety and accessibility): <b>83%</b>		
		As above				

## Green Network

AP measure	Question	Criteria/ Scale	Target	Result	Sample base	Margin of Error
Increase in residents who have deliberately taken actions during the past year, with the intent of improving the natural environment (63% in 2000/01: 61% in 2001/02 40% in 2002/03)	In the past year, have you taken any actions either on your own property or elsewhere, to improve the natural environment?	Yes/ No	50% or more	<b>47%</b>	302 residents	± 5½%

## Strong Communities

AP measure	Question	Criteria/ Scale	Target	Result	Sample base	Margin of Error
Residents satisfied with provision and quality of community buildings for use or hire in the city. (62% in 1999/2000 56% in 2002/03).	By community buildings we mean both Council owned facilities such as community centres, community houses and community halls, and also non-council community buildings such as school halls, churches and other buildings and halls for community use. Thinking about <u>both</u> Council and non-Council community buildings in terms of whether there are <u>enough of them</u> , and if they are of a <u>good enough quality</u> . Even if you don't currently need to hire one, how satisfied are you with what is provided in Waitakere City?	Very/ reasonably satisfied	70% or more	<b>63%</b>	302 residents	± 5½%

## 2. INTRODUCTION

This research has been undertaken for performance reporting purposes. Results will be reported in the Year 2004 Waitakere City Council Annual Report.

Telephone interviews of 302 Waitakere City residents aged 18 years and over were conducted during late May and June 2004 by trained, fully briefed interviewers contracted from Phoenix Research Limited, a reputable Auckland Research House. The research was designed to meet Audit New Zealand and industry standards. Full details of the method and sample are in Appendix A.

Note that for each measure, a random sampling error applies. This should be taken into account when interpreting performance measures.

<b>Sample Size</b>	<b>Approximate Random Sampling Error ±</b>
<b>300</b>	5.5%
<b>200</b>	7%
<b>150</b>	8%
<b>100</b>	9.5%
<b>50</b>	14%

### 3. MAIN FINDINGS

#### 3.1 Safety in Town Centres

*Q. Have you used any of the following town centres in the last six months?*  
*Q. You mentioned [NAME]. Do you think the [NAME] centre is Very safe, reasonably safe, somewhat unsafe, very unsafe, or have you no opinion?*

Overall ratings of safety by users of the centres are as follows:

	<b>“very safe”</b>	<b>“very” + “reasonably safe”</b>	<b>“very” + “reasonably safe” + “no opinion”<sup>1</sup></b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Te Atatu Peninsula</b>	24	81	94
<b>Glen Eden</b>	8	61	71
<b>New Lynn</b>	26	83	88
<b>Henderson</b>	22	79	83
<b>Westgate</b>	31	90	96
<b>Weighted average of New Lynn, Henderson, Westgate (2003/04)</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>88</b>
<b>Weighted average of New Lynn, Henderson, Westgate (2002/03)</b>	59	92	93

\* decimal rounding

<b>TRENDS</b>	<b>“very” + “reasonably safe”</b>				
	<b>%</b>				
	<b>1999/00</b>	<b>2000/01</b>	<b>2001/02</b>	<b>2002/03</b>	<b>2003/04</b>
<b>Te Atatu Peninsula</b>	81	92	89	93	81
<b>Glen Eden</b>	67	72	82	88	61
<b>New Lynn</b>	75	84	89	95	83
<b>Henderson</b>	75	88	78	87	79
<b>Westgate</b>	nm	93	92	95	90
<b>Weighted average of New Lynn, Henderson, Westgate</b>	<b>nm</b>	<b>nm</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>83</b>

nm: not measured

The only statistically significant demographic differences to show are:

- Massey Ward residents more inclined to rate New Lynn Town Centre as “somewhat or very unsafe” (24% vs. 9% for the other Wards combined)<sup>2</sup>.
- Massey Ward residents more inclined to rate Henderson Town Centre as “somewhat or very unsafe” (24% vs. 14% for the other Wards combined)<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Not overtly “unsafe”

<sup>2</sup> Statistically significant:  $Z=2.8 > 1.96$  at 0.05 level of significance

<sup>3</sup> Statistically significant:  $Z=1.99 > 1.96$  at 0.05 level of significance

### 3.2 Experience of crime

- |                                                                                           |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Q. In the last 12 months, have you personally been the direct victim of any crime?</i> |
| <i>Q. Which of these categories I'll read out best describes what happened?</i>           |
| <i>Q. Was that reported to the police?</i>                                                |

15% of residents say they have personally been the direct victim of some crime. 12% had reported at least one to the police. A breakdown of the types of crime and proportions reported are as follows:

	<u>Incidence</u>	<u>Informed</u>
	%	Police
		%
house broken into	3	3
car broken into	7	4
car stolen	2	1
other property stolen	5	4
property damaged or destroyed	4	2
physical assault	2	2
other	2	1

No demographic group stands out as being different from the average for either incidence of any crime, incidence of any type of crime, or whether a crime was reported to the police.

### 3.3 Awareness And Standard of Community Buildings

*Q. By community buildings we mean both Council owned facilities such as community centres, community houses and community halls, and also non-council community buildings such as school halls, churches and other buildings and halls for community use. Thinking about both Council and non-Council community buildings in terms of whether there are enough of them, and if they are of a good enough quality. Even if you don't currently need to hire one, how satisfied are you with what is provided in Waitakere City?*

63% of residents are very or reasonably satisfied with what is provided. This is an increase over last year:

	Total Sample	
	2003 %	2004 %
Very satisfied	41	19
Reasonably satisfied	15	44
Somewhat dissatisfied	6	6
Very dissatisfied	2	2
No opinion	36	29
	100	100

} **56%**      } **63%**  
 } **8%**        } **8%**

Satisfaction is higher for:

- Residents aged 50 and over (75% aggregate rating)<sup>4</sup>
- Those not in paid employment (73%)<sup>5</sup>

Satisfaction is lower for:

- Household with children under 5 years old (50%).

<sup>4</sup> Statistically significant:  $Z=2.9 > 1.96$  at 0.05 level of significance

<sup>5</sup> Statistically significant:  $Z=2.29 > 1.96$  at 0.05 level of significance

### 3.4 Paid Work, and Work Transport

- Q. Firstly, are you in paid employment – that is, your main income comes from paid work or running a business?*
- Q. Do you do most of your work from home, or from some other location?*
- Q. I'm going to read out some means of transport. Which one do you mainly use to get to and from work?*

70% of residents are in paid employment. 91% of residents in paid employment work in a location other than their home (includes tradespeople based at home but travel to their various jobs). 9% work at home.

Based on all in paid employment, including those working from home, main transport in getting to or from place of work are:

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
	%	%	%	%	%
Work at home	10	12	9	11	9
Walking	2	1	2	1	1
Cycling	1	1	1	0	1
Bus or train	3	///	///	///	///
Bus	nm	2	2	5	5
Train	nm	2	1	1	3
Passenger (car, van, etc)	4	6	2	4	3
Drive oneself	80	78	84	72	78
	100	100	100*	100*	100

\* decimal rounding

nm not measured

Excluding those working out of home, but not as a place of work (e.g. trades people), 22% do not drive themselves to work. 8% use public transport (bus or train). This proportion is slowly increasing.

## **Demographic differences**

Use of public transport is higher for:

- Residents employed outside Waitakere City (11%) vs. those working within (4%)<sup>6</sup>
- Those aged under 30 years (22%), vs. those aged 30 or over (6% combined).

No other differences are statistically significant.

---

<sup>6</sup> Statistically significant:  $Z=2.04 > 1.96$  at 0.05 level of significance

### 3.5 Safety of Pedestrian Crossings

*Q. Now lets turn to getting about on foot. How safe do you feel using pedestrian crossings on main roads in Waitakere City?*

Almost two-thirds of residents (67%) say that pedestrian crossings on main roads are “very” or “reasonably safe”. Ratings have been steady since 2001.

	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>
	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total
	<u>Sample</u>	<u>Sample</u>	<u>Sample</u>	<u>Sample</u>	<u>Sample</u>
	%	%	%	%	%
Very safe	9	14	20	10	11
Reasonably safe	46	55	46	54	56
Somewhat unsafe	26	20	22	20	21
Very unsafe	14	7	9	9	7
No opinion	5	4	4	7	5
	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100*</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
Very/ Reasonably safe	55	69	66	64	67
Somewhat/ Very unsafe	40	27	31	29	28

\* decimal rounding

Safety ratings of “very” or “reasonably safe” for pedestrian crossings are higher for:

- New Lynn residents (78% vs. 65% aggregate for the other Wards)<sup>7</sup>.

Overall, 28% rate pedestrian crossings as “somewhat” or “very unsafe”. Ratings of “somewhat” or “very unsafe” are higher for:

- Residents living in Massey Ward (36%)<sup>8</sup>
- Households with three or more (aggregate of 35%, vs. 17% aggregate for one- and two-person households)<sup>9</sup>.

<sup>7</sup> Statistically significant:  $Z=1.98 > 1.96$  at 0.05 level of significance

<sup>8</sup> Statistically significant:  $Z=2.076 > 1.96$  at 0.05 level of significance

<sup>9</sup> Statistically significant:  $Z=3.54 > 1.96$  at 0.05 level of significance

### 3.6 Public transport in Waitakere City

*Q. Think about public transport in Waitakere City. Whether you are using these services or not, how satisfied are you with the following I'll read out.*

*Q. [If "don't know/ no opinion": suppose there was a situation where your usual transport was not available.*

#### **Public transport – taking you places where you want to go**

42% state they are “very” or “reasonably satisfied” that public transport takes you to places where they want to go. This is a significant increase over previous years. Trends in ratings are as follows:

<b>Public transport – Taking you to places where you want to go</b>	<b>2001</b> Total <u>Sample</u> %	<b>2002</b> Total <u>Sample</u> %	<b>2003</b> Total <u>Sample</u> %	<b>2004</b> Total <u>Sample</u> %
Very satisfied	7	8	8	8
Reasonably satisfied	20	19	21	35
Somewhat dissatisfied	21	18	22	30
Very dissatisfied	14	22	28	16
Don't know/ no opinion	38	34	21	12
	100	100*	100	100*
Very/ reasonably satisfied	<b>27</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>42</b>
Somewhat/ very dissatisfied	<b>35</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>46</b>

\* decimal rounding

Satisfaction ratings are highest for:

- Females (49% “very reasonably satisfied”) vs. males (35%)<sup>10</sup>
- Those not in paid employment (53%)<sup>11</sup>
- Those working within Waitakere City (46%, vs. 30% for those working outside the City)<sup>12</sup>
- Massey Ward residents (52%, vs. 39% for the other Wards combined)<sup>13</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Statistically significant:  $Z=2.606 > 1.96$  at 0.05 level of significance

<sup>11</sup> Statistically significant:  $Z=2.525 > 1.96$  at 0.05 level of significance

<sup>12</sup> Statistically significant:  $Z=2.418 > 1.96$  at 0.05 level of significance

<sup>13</sup> Statistically significant:  $Z=2.057 > 1.96$  at 0.05 level of significance

## Convenience of times

39% state they are “very” or “reasonably satisfied” with the times of public transport. This is an improvement over previous years. Trends in ratings are as follows:

<b>Public transport – Convenience of times</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>
	Total	Total	Total	Total
	<u>Sample</u>	<u>Sample</u>	<u>Sample</u>	<u>Sample</u>
	%	%	%	%
Very satisfied	9	6	7	6
Reasonably satisfied	21	17	23	33
Somewhat dissatisfied	18	17	22	26
Very dissatisfied	16	22	28	21
Don't know/ no opinion	35	37	21	14
	100*	100*	100*	100
Very/ reasonably satisfied	<b>30</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>39</b>
Somewhat/ very dissatisfied	<b>35</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>47</b>

\* decimal rounding

Satisfaction ratings are highest for:

- Those not in paid employment (50%), vs. those in paid employment (35%)<sup>14</sup>
- Those working within Waitakere City (42%), vs. those working outside (27%)<sup>15</sup>
- Residents in Henderson and Massey Wards (46% aggregate rating), vs. Waitakere and New Lynn Wards (30% aggregate rating)<sup>16</sup>

It does not follow that those with lower positive ratings have higher negative ratings. Negative ratings are higher for:

- Those in paid employment (51% “somewhat or very dissatisfied”)<sup>17</sup>
- (No other demographic differences are statistically significant).

<sup>14</sup> Statistically significant:  $Z=2.571 > 1.96$  at 0.05 level of significance

<sup>15</sup> Statistically significant:  $Z=2.249 > 1.96$  at 0.05 level of significance

<sup>16</sup> Statistically significant:  $Z=3.6 > 1.96$  at 0.05 level of significance

<sup>17</sup> Statistically significant:  $Z=2.245 > 1.96$  at 0.05 level of significance

## **Affordability**

52% of residents are “very” or “reasonably satisfied” with the affordability of public transport.

	Total Sample	
<b>Public transport – Affordability</b>	<b>2003</b> %	<b>2004</b> %
Very satisfied	10	7
Reasonably satisfied	29	44
Somewhat dissatisfied	15	20
Very dissatisfied	12	9
Don't know/ no opinion	34	19
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	100	100*
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Very/ reasonably satisfied	39	52*
Somewhat/ very dissatisfied	27	29

\* decimal rounding

Those living in Massey and Henderson Wards (aggregate 34% “very or somewhat” dissatisfied) tend to give higher dissatisfaction ratings than residents from Waitakere or New Lynn (21% on aggregate)<sup>18</sup>. No other demographic difference is statistically significant.

---

<sup>18</sup> Statistically significant:  $Z=2.444 > 1.96$  at 0.05 level of significance

**Safety**

Just under three quarters (71%) state they are “very” or “reasonably satisfied” with safety. This outweighs an increase in dissatisfaction ratings to 17%. Trends in ratings are as follows:

<b>Public transport – Safety</b>	<b>2001</b> Total <u>Sample</u> %	<b>2002</b> Total <u>Sample</u> %	<b>2003</b> Total <u>Sample</u> %	<b>2004</b> Total <u>Sample</u> %
Very satisfied	13	18	20	14
Reasonably satisfied	39	30	42	57
Somewhat dissatisfied	10	9	5	13
Very dissatisfied	4	5	7	4
Don't know/ no opinion	35	38	26	12
	100*	100	100	100
Very/ reasonably satisfied	<b>52</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>71</b>
Somewhat/ very dissatisfied	<b>13</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>17</b>

\* Decimal rounding

The only demographic difference which reaches statistical significance is:  
Those aged 60 years and over more likely to be “very or reasonably” satisfied (82% vs. and aggregate of 68% for those aged under 60)<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> Statistically significant:  $Z=2.06 > 1.96$  at 0.05 level of significance

### **Used any public transport**

56% of residents state they have used either a bus or train in the last 6 months, i.e. some form of public transport.

The use of public transport is higher for:

- Females (64%)<sup>20</sup>
- Age under 30 years (76%)<sup>21</sup>
- Part time workers (71% vs. 48% for full time workers)<sup>22</sup>

As the household size increases so does public transport use.

---

<sup>20</sup> Statistically significant:  $Z=2.81 > 1.96$  at 0.05 level of significance

<sup>21</sup> Statistically significant:  $Z=2.658 > 1.96$  at 0.05 level of significance

<sup>22</sup> Statistically significant:  $Z=2.92 \geq 1.96$  at 0.05 level of significance

### 3.7 Train Usage, Safety and Accessibility

- Q. Have you used a train anywhere within Waitakere City in the last 6 months?*
- Q. How safe are the train stations in Waitakere city? Whether you have used them or not, do you feel they are **very safe, reasonably safe, somewhat unsafe, very unsafe**, or are you **unsure** or have **no opinion**?*
- Q. For what reasons do you say this?*
- Q. And how accessible are the train stations to the public in Waitakere City? Are they **very accessible, reasonably accessible, somewhat inaccessible, very inaccessible**, or are you **unsure** or have **no opinion**?*

40% of residents have used a train at least once in the last six months (22% in 2000 and 2002, 26% in 2003).

This incidence of usage is higher for those employed part-time (54%, vs. 34% for full-time workers)<sup>23</sup>

Henderson Ward residents tend to use the train less than residents from other Wards (24% vs. 49% incidence for the other Wards combined)<sup>24</sup>.

---

<sup>23</sup> Statistically significant:  $Z=2.64 > 1.96$  at 0.05 level of significance

<sup>24</sup> Statistically significant:  $Z=4.20 > 1.96$  at 0.05 level of significance

## Safety

Overall, 36% of residents rate Waitakere City train stations as “very” or “reasonably safe”. About one third are non-committal.

The ratings in full are:

<b>Safety of Waitakere City train stations 2004</b>	<u>Total</u> %		<u>Used Train</u> %		<u>Did not Use Train</u> %
Very safe	5	} 36%	6	} 45%	4
Reasonably safe	31		39		26
Unsure/ no opinion	29		7		43
Somewhat unsafe	29	} 35%	39	} 48%	21
Very unsafe	7		8		6
	100*		100		100

\* Decimal rounding

There is a marked difference between users and non-users of trains. Both are evenly polarised on safety ratings, but Non-Users tend to have a much higher neutral/ don't know rating. Ratings of unsafe are markedly higher for Users than in previous years. Trends in ratings are as follows:

<b>Train Station Safety – Train Users</b>	<b>2001</b> %	<b>2002</b> %	<b>2003</b> %	<b>2004</b> %
Very safe	10	10	6	6
Reasonably safe	58	53	45	39
Unsure/ no opinion	5	21	13	7
Somewhat unsafe	24	15	32	39
Very unsafe	3	1	4	8
	100	100	100	100
Very/ reasonably safe	<b>68</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>45</b>
Somewhat/ very unsafe	<b>27</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>48</b>

<b>Train Safety - Non Users</b>	<b>2001</b> %	<b>2002</b> %	<b>2003</b> %	<b>2004</b> %
Very safe	5	5	3	4
Reasonably safe	27	23	22	26
Unsure/ no opinion	44	44	40	43
Somewhat unsafe	22	21	29	21
Very unsafe	3	7	6	6
	100	100	100	100
Very/ reasonably safe	32	28	25	30
Somewhat/ very unsafe	24	28	35	27

Overall, safety ratings of “somewhat” or “very unsafe” are higher for:

- Users (48%) vs. Non-users (27%)<sup>25</sup>
- Massey Ward residents (47%, vs. 31% for the other Wards combined)<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> Statistically significant:  $Z=3.633 > 1.96$  at 0.05 level of significance

<sup>26</sup> Statistically significant:  $Z=2.7 > 1.96$  at 0.05 level of significance

## Accessibility

Overall, train stations are rated as “very” or “reasonably accessible” by 63% of residents.

<b>Accessibility of Waitakere City train stations - 2004</b>	<b>Total</b>		<b>Used Train</b>		<b>Did not Use Train</b>	
	<b>%</b>		<b>%</b>		<b>%</b>	
Very accessible	14	} 63%	16	} 72%	13	} 57%
Reasonably accessible	49		56		44	
Unsure/ no opinion	12		2		19	
Somewhat inaccessible	20	} 25%	22	} 26%	19	} 25%
Very inaccessible	5		3		6	
	<b>100*</b>		<b>100*</b>		<b>100*</b>	

\* Decimal rounding

As with safety ratings, accessibility ratings are highest for those who have used any train in the last six months (72% “very” or “reasonably accessible”) compared with non users (57%)<sup>27</sup>. Neither thinks the stations are inaccessible however. The pattern for “accessible” is steady over time, but ratings for “inaccessible” has climbed steadily for Users to a similar level as Non-users.

<b>Train Accessibility – Train Users</b>	<b>2001 %</b>	<b>2002 %</b>	<b>2003 %</b>	<b>2004 %</b>
Very accessible	28	35	25	16
Reasonably accessible	59	45	51	56
Unsure/ no opinion	4	8	1	2
Somewhat inaccessible	7	12	22	22
Very inaccessible	3	0	2	3
	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100*</b>
Very/ reasonably safe	86	79	76	72
Somewhat/ very unsafe	9	12	24	26

\* Decimal rounding

<sup>27</sup> Statistically significant:  $Z=2.716 > 1.96$  at 0.05 level of significance

<b>Train Accessibility - Non Users</b>	<b>2001</b> %	<b>2002</b> %	<b>2003</b> %	<b>2004</b> %
Very accessible	18	17	11	13
Reasonably accessible	39	27	42	44
Unsure/ no opinion	19	34	24	19
Somewhat inaccessible	17	17	18	19
Very inaccessible	7	5	6	6
	100	100	100*	100*
Very/ reasonably safe	57	44	53	57
Somewhat/ very unsafe	25*	22	24	25

\* Decimal rounding

Only one demographic difference stands out: Henderson residents are less satisfied with train station accessibility than other Wards (48% “very” or “reasonably accessible”).<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> Statistically significant:  $Z=3.90 > 1.96$  at 0.05 level of significance

### 3.8 Bus Usage, Bus Stop Safety and Accessibility

- Q. And have you used a bus anywhere within Waitakere City in the last 6 months?*
- Q. How safe are bus stops in Waitakere City? Whether you have used them or not, do you feel they are **very safe, reasonably safe, somewhat unsafe, very unsafe**, or are you **unsure** or have no **opinion**?*
- Q. For what reasons do you say this?*
- Q. We also want to find out how accessible bus stops are in Waitakere City. Taking into account how many bus stops are available and whether they are located in convenient places, are they **very accessible, reasonably accessible, somewhat inaccessible, very inaccessible**, or are you **unsure** or have **no opinion**?*

31% of residents have used a bus at least once in the last six months (23% in 2000, 25% in 2001, 21% in 2002, 30% in 2003). This incidence of usage is higher for:

- Females (36%)<sup>29</sup>
- Under 30's (55%) than over 40's (aggregate: 26%)<sup>30</sup>.

---

<sup>29</sup> Statistically significant:  $Z=2.21 > 1.96$  at 0.05 level of significance

<sup>30</sup> Statistically significant:  $Z=3.46 > 1.96$  at 0.05 level of significance

## Safety

Overall, 60% of residents rate Waitakere City bus stops<sup>31</sup> as “very” or “reasonably safe”. 20% are non-committal. The ratings in full are:

Safety of Waitakere City Bus stops - 2004	Total		Used Bus		Did not Use Bus	
	%		%		%	
Very safe	8	} 60%	14	} 76%	6	} 53*%
Reasonably safe	52		62		47	
Unsure/ no opinion	20		7		25	
Somewhat unsafe	16	} 21* %	15	} 17%	17	} 22%
Very unsafe	4		2		5	
	100		100		100	

\* Decimal rounding

There is a marked difference between users and non-users of buses. 76% of those who have used a bus in the last six months rate bus stops as “very” or “reasonably safe”, whereas 53% of non-users rate them as “very” or “reasonably safe”<sup>32</sup>.

Trends comparing ratings of Bus Users vs. Non-Users follows:

Bus stop safety – Bus Users	2001 %	2002 %	2003 %	2004 %
Very safe	26	17	25	14
Reasonably safe	60	60	57	62
Unsure/ no opinion	7	6	7	7
Somewhat unsafe	6	17	11	15
Very unsafe	1	0	1	2
	100	100	100*	100
Very/ reasonably safe	87*	77	82	76
Somewhat/ very unsafe	7	17	12	17

\* Decimal rounding

<sup>31</sup> Note: change of measure from *bus shelter* to *bus stop*

<sup>32</sup> Statistically significant:  $Z=3.3.69 > 1.96$  at 0.05 level of significance

<b>Bus stop safety - Non Users</b>	<b>2001</b> %	<b>2002</b> %	<b>2003</b> %	<b>2004</b> %
Very safe	7	7	13	6
Reasonably safe	52	34	50	47
Unsure/ no opinion	25	48	25	25
Somewhat unsafe	12	9	11	17
Very unsafe	4	2	1	5
	<hr/> 100	<hr/> 100	<hr/> 100	<hr/> 100
Very/ reasonably safe	59	41	63	53
Somewhat/ very unsafe	16	11	11*	22

\* Decimal rounding

No demographic differences are statistically significant.

## Accessibility

Overall, bus stops are rated as “very” or “reasonably accessible” by 76% of residents (62% 2000, 57% in 2001, 55% in 2002, 83% in 2003).

<b>Accessibility of Waitakere City bus stops - 2004</b>	<b>Total</b>		<b>Used Bus</b>		<b>Did not Use Bus</b>	
	<b>%</b>		<b>%</b>		<b>%</b>	
Very accessible	26	} 76%	35	} 89%	21	} 70*%
Reasonably accessible	50		54		48	
Unsure/ no opinion	14		2		19	
Somewhat inaccessible	9	} 11%	7	} 9%	10	} 11* %
Very inaccessible	2		2		2	
	<b>100*</b>		<b>100</b>		<b>100</b>	

\* Decimal rounding

As with safety ratings, accessibility ratings are highest for those who have used any bus in the last six months (89% “very” or “reasonably accessible”) compared with non users (70%)<sup>33</sup>. Trends in ratings for Users and Non-users follow:

<b>Bus Accessibility – Users</b>	<b>2001</b> %	<b>2002</b> %	<b>2003</b> %	<b>2004</b> %
Very accessible	27	38	36	35
Reasonably accessible	48	36	59	54
Unsure/ no opinion	8	13	1	2
Somewhat inaccessible	13	10	3	7
Very inaccessible	5	3	1	2
	<b>100*</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
Very/ reasonably accessible	75	74	95	89
Somewhat/ very accessible	17*	13	4	9

\* Decimal rounding

<sup>33</sup> Statistically significant:  $Z=3.475 > 1.96$  at 0.05 level of significance

<b>Bus Accessibility - Non Users</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>
	%	%	%	%
Very accessible	18	17	32	21
Reasonably accessible	33	33	45	48
Unsure/ no opinion	28	41	14	19
Somewhat inaccessible	14	7	6	10
Very inaccessible	7	2	3	2
	100	100	100	100
Very/ reasonably accessible	51	50	78*	70
Somewhat/ very accessible	21	9	8*	11*

\* Decimal rounding

Bus stop accessibility ratings are higher for:

- Households with young adults (89%)

Accessibility ratings are lower for:

- Waitakere Ward residents (53%)<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> Statistically significant:  $Z=4.30 > 1.96$  at 0.05 level of significance

### 3.9 Attitude to Housing situation

*Q. Council is able to play a role in housing issues by planning rules and by discussing local needs with central government. How satisfied are you with the current housing situation in Waitakere City right now?*

47% of residents are “very” or “reasonably satisfied” with the housing situation.

Satisfaction with Waitakere City housing situation	2000 (300) %	2001 (296) %	2002 (300) %	2003 (301) %	2004 (302) %
Very satisfied	4	10	8	9	7
Reasonably satisfied	49	27	31	37	40
Somewhat dissatisfied	18	24	23	18	22
Very dissatisfied	9	10	10	13	10
Have no opinion	20	29	29	24	21
	100	100	100*	100	100
Very/ reasonably satisfied	<b>53</b>	<b>38*</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>47</b>
Somewhat / very dissatisfied	27	34	33	31	32

\* Decimal rounding

Males tend to be more satisfied than females (53% “very/ reasonably satisfied” vs. 41%)<sup>35</sup>. No other demographic difference is statistically significant.

*Q. For what reasons do you say this?*

The most prominent reasons for dissatisfaction are:

- Disapprove of high density housing / infill housing (23% of those who have an opinion)
- Pressure on services / infrastructure (11%)

<sup>35</sup> Statistically significant:  $Z=2.02 > 1.96$  at 0.05 level of significance

### 3.10 Conservation and Environmental Protection

*Q. We want to find out what, if anything, residents are doing to improve the natural environment. This includes such things as protecting streams and native bush, trapping possums, planting, picking up rubbish from natural areas, and removing invasive weeds, but doesn't include things like tending flower beds and vegetable gardens, or mowing lawns. In the past year, have you taken any actions either on your own property or elsewhere, to improve the natural environment?*

47% of residents stated they have taken valid actions to improve the natural environment (61% in 2002, 40% in 2003). (Other respondents claim activities which are not directly associated with the natural environment. Claimed participation rate is 66%. Invalid mentions are not included in the count).

Variations from one demographic group to another are not statistically significant, with the exception that the following show lower participation rates:

- Henderson Ward residents (35%)<sup>36</sup>
- Those aged under 30 years (29%)<sup>37</sup>

*Q. What are these actions?*

The most commonly mentioned actions taken were:

- Clearing noxious weeds (29% of those who say take actions)
- Planting trees (20%)
- Picking up rubbish (15%)

---

<sup>36</sup> Statistically significant:  $Z=3.11 > 1.96$  at 0.05 level of significance

<sup>37</sup> Statistically significant:  $Z=2.52 > 1.96$  at 0.05 level of significance

### 3.11 Injury occurrence and concerns

- Q. In the last 12 months has anyone in your household, including yourself personally, suffered any injury requiring attention from a doctor or other trained medical professional?*
- Q. Just broadly speaking, what sort of injury was it, and how did the injury occur?*
- Q. We sincerely hope that incidents causing injury never happen, however what sorts of things, if any, that could cause injury would you most be concerned about?*

About a third of residents (36%) say they, or someone in their household, have had an injury requiring attention in the past year. This incidence is higher for:

- Larger households – 5 or more people (50%)
- Households with anyone aged under 20 years (children aged up to 15 years – 44%; young adults – 62%).

Incidence is lower for households with people aged 60 or over (23%).

Main types of injury specified are:

- Impact injury (28%)
- Falls (27%)
- Injury from lifting (13%)
- Cuts (10%)
- Burns (3%)

Base numbers are too low to identify statistically significant demographic differences for each type of injury. The following are *indications* only.

	<u>Higher for...</u>
Impact injury	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Households with children under 5</li><li>• Households with 3 or 4 people</li></ul>
Falls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Households with any aged 60 years and over</li><li>• Single-person households</li></ul>
Injury from lifting	(no difference evident)
Cuts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Households with 3 or more</li></ul>
Burns	(no difference evident)

Main concerns about injury cause are varied, but centre mainly on traffic-related issues, including relating to footpaths and pedestrian traffic, speeding, and road design. Other mentions are too low for patterns to emerge.