


## Environment: Community facilities

Downloaded from <https://www.canterburywellbeing.org.nz/our-wellbeing/environment/community-facilities/> on 10/12/2023 3:15 AM


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.




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. The earlier increase between 2018 and 2019 (6.4 percentage points), is statistically significant.

## Breakdown by Territorial Authority




In 2018, there were statistically significantly higher levels of satisfaction with local community facilities in Waimakariri District and Selwyn District, compared with Christchurch City (77.4%, 74.8%, and 66.8% respectively). However, the 2019 and 2020 results show increased satisfaction levels for Christchurch City, with levels of satisfaction with community facilities now similar across the three Territorial Authorities.

## 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 statistically similar in 2020. However, there was no significant change for Māori respondents during this time. The level of satisfaction in 2020 for European respondents is statistically significantly higher than for Pacific/Asian/Indian and Māori respondents (76.8%, 69.0% and 66.7% respectively).

## 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 2020. In 2018 there were significantly lower levels of satisfaction among the two younger age groups (18 to 24 and 25 to 34 years) compared to the 35 to 49, 65 to 74, and 75+ years age groups. In 2019 convergence is apparent between the groups, with no statistically significant differences in satisfaction levels between any of the age groups. In 2020 a significantly lower proportion of young people (18 to 24 years) indicated that they were satisfied or very satisfied with local community facilities compared to all other age groups, with the exception of 25 to 34 year olds.

## 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 in 2018, 2019 and 2020 (73.0%, 77.6% and 78.7%, respectively) compared to males (64.5%, 72.7% and 71.7%, respectively). For both females and males there was a significant increase in satisfaction with local community facilities between 2018 and 2019, which was maintained in 2020.

## Breakdown by income



The figure shows no statistically significant differences in the proportion of respondents in greater Christchurch who indicated that they were satisfied or very satisfied with local community facilities, by income level in either 2018 or 2019. However, in 2020, a significantly lower proportion of those in the lowest income group (<\$30,000, 66.5%) indicated that they were satisfied or very satisfied with local community facilities than those in the next lowest income group (\$30,000-\$60,000, 76.5%) and the highest income group (\$100,000+, 79.4%). 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. This proportion decreased significantly for the lowest income group in 2020 (from 77.1% in 2019 to 66.5% in 2020).

## 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. 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 in 2018 or 2020. 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.

Between 2018 and 2019, the proportion of those without a long-term health condition or disability who are satisfied or very satisfied with community facilities increased significantly, and remained stable in 2020. For those with a long-term health condition or disability, either aged under 65 years or aged 65 years and over, there was no statistically significant change in level of satisfaction over time.

### Data Sources

**Source:** Te Whatu Ora Waitaha Canterbury - formerly the Canterbury District Health Board.

**Survey/data set:** Canterbury Wellbeing Survey to 2020. 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 Gamb 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.