

## Environment: Community facilities

Downloaded from <https://www.canterburywellbeing.org.nz/our-wellbeing/environment/community-facilities/> on 25/04/2024 9:36 PM

A number of questions included in the Canterbury Wellbeing Survey ask respondents about their satisfaction with various aspects of their everyday life. One of these questions asks survey respondents to rate their satisfaction with local community facilities.

This indicator presents the proportion of those 18 years and over satisfied or very satisfied with local community facilities, using Canterbury Wellbeing Survey data from 2018 to 2022.



The figure shows that in both 2019 and 2020, 75.2 percent of all respondents to the Canterbury Wellbeing Survey indicated that they were satisfied or very satisfied with local community facilities. This proportion then decreased to 70.5% in 2022. This decrease of nearly 1 percentage point is statistically significant.

Breakdown by Territorial Authority



The figure shows that the levels of satisfaction with local community facilities in Waimakariri District, Selwyn District, and Christchurch City were similar in 2019 and 2020 (77.4%, 77.2%, and 74.6% respectively, 2020). However, the 2022 results show decreased satisfaction levels for Christchurch City, with levels of satisfaction with community facilities now statistically significantly lower in Christchurch City compared with Selwyn District and lower than Waimakariri District (although not statistically significantly lower).

Breakdown by ethnicity



The figure shows differences by ethnicity in the proportion of respondents who indicated that they were satisfied or very satisfied with local community facilities in greater Christchurch. The proportion of European and Pacific/Asian/Indian respondents who indicated that they were satisfied or very satisfied with local community facilities increased significantly between 2018 and 2019 and remained stable in 2020. However, there was no significant change for Māori respondents during this time and the 2022 result suggests an overall pattern of decline in satisfaction with local community facilities for Māori. The level of satisfaction in 2022 for European respondents is statistically significantly higher than for Māori respondents (71.1% and 63.4% respectively) although similar to Pacific/Asian/Indian respondents (69.9%).

Breakdown by age



The figure shows some differences by age group in the proportion of respondents who indicated that they were satisfied or very satisfied with local community facilities in greater Christchurch between 2018 and 2022. Broadly, the figure indicates a positive age gradient, with increasing age being associated with higher levels of satisfaction. In 2022 a significantly lower proportion of young people (18 to 24 years, 58.1%) indicated that they were satisfied or very satisfied with local community facilities compared to all other age groups (such as 65-74 years, 79.6%), with the exception of 25 to 34-year-olds (65%).

Breakdown by gender



The figure shows that a statistically significantly higher proportion of female respondents in greater Christchurch indicated that they were satisfied or very satisfied with local community facilities, over the time series shown, compared with male respondents (74.6% and 67.2% respectively in 2022).

Breakdown by income



The figure shows that in 2020 and 2022, a significantly lower proportion of those in the lowest income group (<\$30,000, 62%, 2022) indicated that they were satisfied or very satisfied with local community facilities compared with those in the highest income group (\$100,000+, 74.4%, 2022). Broadly, the figure indicates a positive income gradient, with increasing income being associated with higher levels of satisfaction. Between 2018 and 2019, the proportion of respondents in greater Christchurch who indicated that they were satisfied or very satisfied with local community facilities increased significantly among those in the lowest and highest income groups. The proportion satisfied or very satisfied decreased most notably for the lowest income group, between 2019 and 2022 (from 77.1% in 2019 to 62% in 2022).

Breakdown by disability



The figure shows that the proportion of respondents aged under 65 years with a long-term health condition or disability in greater Christchurch who indicated that they were satisfied or very satisfied with local community facilities, was significantly lower in 2018, 2019, and 2020 than for those without a long-term health condition or disability and lower (but not statistically significantly lower) in 2022. Respondents aged 65 years and older with a long-term health condition or disability also had significantly lower satisfaction levels compared to those without a long-term health condition or disability in 2019, but not at any other timepoints.

Overall, there was no significant difference in satisfaction levels between those with a long-term health condition or disability who were aged under 65 years and those aged 65 years and over, at any timepoint. Note that the wide confidence intervals for both groups limit the interpretation of these comparisons.

Data Sources

**Source:** Te Whatu Ora Waitaha Canterbury - formerly the Canterbury District Health Board.  
**Survey/data set:** Canterbury Wellbeing Survey to 2022. Access publicly available data from Te Mana Ora | Community and Public Health website [www.cph.co.nz/your-health/wellbeing-survey/](http://www.cph.co.nz/your-health/wellbeing-survey/)  
**Source data frequency:** Annually.

Metadata for this indicator is available at <https://www.canterburywellbeing.org.nz/our-wellbeing/index-data>

## REFERENCES

---

This is the full reference list for **Environment**.

- 1 Handy SL, Boarnet MG, Ewing R, Killingsworth RE (2002) How the built environment affects physical activity. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 23: 64-73.
- 2 Perdue WC, Stone LA, Gostin LO (2003) The built environment and its relationship to the public's health: The legal framework. *American Journal of Public Health* 93: 1390-1394.
- 3 Sallis JF, Spoon C, Cavill N, Engelberg JK, Gebel K, et al. (2015) Co-benefits of designing communities for active living: An exploration of literature. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity* 12: 30.
- 4 Björk J, Albin M, Grahn P, Jacobsson H, Ardö J, et al. (2008) Recreational values of the natural environment in relation to neighbourhood satisfaction, physical activity, obesity and wellbeing. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 62: e2.
- 5 Blaschke P (2013) Health and wellbeing benefits of conservation in New Zealand. *Science for Conservation* 321.
- 6 de Dios Ortúzar J, Willumsen LG (2011) *Modelling Transport*. New York: Wiley.
- 7 Bennett H, Jones R, Keating G, Woodward A, Hales S, et al. (2014) Health and equity impacts of climate change in Aotearoa-New Zealand, and health gains from climate action. *New Zealand Medical Journal* 127.
- 8 Royal Society Te Apārangi (2017) *Human Health Impacts of Climate Change for New Zealand: Evidence Summary* Wellington.
- 9 Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (2012) *CERA Wellbeing Survey 2012 Report, prepared by AC Nielsen for the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority*. AC Nielsen and the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority.
- 10 Cameron MP, Cochrane W, McNeill K, Melbourne P, Morrison SL, et al. (2012) Alcohol outlet density is related to police events and motor vehicle accidents in Manukau City, New Zealand. *Aust N Z J Public Health* 36: 537-542.
- 11 Livingston M, Chikritzhs T, Room R (2007) Changing the density of alcohol outlets to reduce alcohol-related problems. *Drug and Alcohol Review* 26: 557-566.
- 12 Popova S, Giesbrecht N, Bekmuradov D, Patra J (2009) Hours and days of sale and density of alcohol outlets: Impacts on alcohol consumption and damage: A systematic review. *Alcohol and Alcoholism* 44: 500-516.
- 13 Cameron MP, Cochrane W, Gordon C, Livingston M (2013) *The locally-specific impacts of alcohol outlet density in the North Island of New Zealand, 2006-2011. Research report commissioned by the Health Promotion Agency*. Wellington: Health Promotion Agency.
- 14 Browne M, Bellringer M, Greer N, Kolandai-Matchett K, Langham E, et al. (2017) *Measuring the burden of gambling harm in New Zealand*: Central Queensland University and Auckland University of Technology.
- 15 Abbott M, Bellringer M, Garrett N (2018) *New Zealand National Gambling Study: Wave 4 (2015). Report number 6*. Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland University of Technology, Gambling & Addictions Research Centre.
- 16 Rook H, Rippon R, Pauls R, Doust E, Prince J (2018) *Gambling harm reduction needs assessment*. Wellington, New Zealand: Sapere Research Group.
- 17 Kristiansen S, Trabjerg Camilla M (2016) Legal gambling availability and youth gambling behaviour: A qualitative longitudinal study. *International Journal of Social Welfare* 26: 218-229.
- 18 Welte JW, Barnes GM, Tidwell M-CO, Hoffman JH (2009) Legal gambling availability and problem gambling among adolescents and young adults. *International Gambling Studies* 9: 89-99.
- 19 Pearce J, Mason K, Hiscock R, Day P (2008) A national study of neighbourhood access to gambling opportunities and individual gambling behaviour. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 62: 862-868.
- 20 Binde P (2013) Why people gamble: A model with five motivational dimensions. *International Gambling Studies* 13: 81-97.
- 21 Wardle H, Keily R, Astbury G, Reith G (2014) 'Risky places?': Mapping gambling machine density and socio-economic deprivation. *J Gambl Stud* 30: 201-212.
- 22 Beckert J, Lutter M (2009) The inequality of fair play: Lottery gambling and social stratification in Germany. *European Sociological Review* 25: 475-488.
- 23 Orford J, Wardle H, Griffiths M, Sproston K, Erens B (2010) The role of social factors in gambling: Evidence from the 2007 British Gambling Prevalence Survey. *Community, Work & Family* 13: 257-271.

- 24 Abbott M, Binde P, Hodgins D, Korn D, Pereira A, et al. (2013) *Conceptual Framework of Harmful Gambling: An International Collaboration*. Guelph, Ontario: Problem Gambling Research Centre (OPGRC).
- 25 Easton B (2002) Gambling in New Zealand: An economic overview. In: Curtis, B, editor. *Gambling in New Zealand*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press. pp. 45-58.
- 26 Department of Internal Affairs Gambling in Pubs and Clubs (Class 4). Wellington: The Department of Internal Affairs.
- 27 Canterbury DHB (2019) *Canterbury Wellbeing Survey, June 2019: Report prepared by Nielsen for the Canterbury District Health Board and partnering agencies*. Christchurch: Canterbury District Health Board.
- 28 Environment Canterbury Regional Council (2018) *Air Quality in the Canterbury Region- Winter 2018 Update: Environment Canterbury Environmental Snapshot Report*. Christchurch: Environment Canterbury Regional Council.
- 29 World Health Organization (2013) *Health effects of particulate matter*. Copenhagen: World Health Organization.
- 30 World Health Organization (2005) *WHO Air quality guidelines for particulate matter, ozone, nitrogen dioxide and sulfur dioxide: Global update 2005, Summary of risk assessment*.
- 31 McNamara KE, Buggy L (2017) Community-based climate change adaptation: a review of academic literature. *Local Environment* 22: 443-460.
- 32 Ebi KL, Semenza JC (2008) Community-based adaptation to the health impacts of climate change. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 35: 501-507.