

Planning, Finance & Community Committee Meeting

7 September 2017

Separate Attachment

(as indicated this is attached separately)

This attachment relates to Item 3
in your Agenda



Marlborough District Council

2017 Annual Residents Survey

Dr Virgil Troy

SIL Research

This research was undertaken to the highest possible standards and in accord with the principles detailed in the Research Association of New Zealand (formerly MRSNZ) Code of Practice, which is based on the ESOMAR Code of Conduct for Market Research. All methodologies and findings in this report are provided solely for use by the Marlborough District Council.

Disclaimer: This report was prepared by SIL Research for the Marlborough District Council. The views presented in the report do not necessarily represent the views of SIL Research or the Marlborough District Council. The information in this report is accurate to the best of the knowledge and belief of SIL Research. While SIL Research has exercised all reasonable skill and care in the preparation of information in this report, SIL Research 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.

Executive Summary

The objectives of this research were to:

1. Assess residents' needs and satisfaction with the Marlborough District Councils (MDC's) services
2. Provide insights into residents' preferred prioritisation of MDC's services and activities

The two existing MDC questionnaires were revised by SIL Research in consultation with the MDC, and then tested prior to deployment. Two concurrent surveys of n=400 residents were undertaken during June-August 2017. A total of n=800 residents aged 18 years and above across the MDC's territorial area were interviewed via a CATI (Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing), administered telephone survey, and Online survey (via Marlborough District Council Facebook page) during an eight-week period starting June 2017. In 2017 service priorities were also measured.

Using the Statistics New Zealand usually resident's population statistics, a sample size of n=400 across 34,041 18yr + residents allows for a 95% confidence level +/- 3.9% to 4.87%. Throughout this report a selection of common statistical analyses and tools were used to interpret the data and present findings in a meaningful manner. A summary of results are as follows:

1. Overall performance: In 2017, MDC's overall performance rating improved over the previous year (up to 7.6 from 7.2). The linear regression suggested a steady improvement trend for the Council. Combining individual and grouped aggregated totals, the top three ranked services in 2017 were Drinking water (8.3), Emergency management (8.3), and Sewerage (8.2). Drinking water, followed by Urban storm water drainage showed the biggest improvement in 2017. When individual services were ranked separately, Public libraries had the highest rating (8.6), followed by Rural fire fighting (8.5), which was similar to the previous year. The services with the lowest ratings in 2017 were Biosecurity (6.0) and Democratic process (6.4), the results were very similar to the previous survey year. Overall, 15 services increased their performance scores compared to 2016, 6 had lower scores, and 1 stayed the same. (Note: Sewerage service available in Blenheim, Picton, Renwick, Havelock, Seddon (not all Awatere), and Grovetown (in Blenheim vicinity) only)

2. Contact with council: 45% of residents indicated that they had been in contact with the Council in the past 12 months. Satisfaction with Council contact was high at 82.6%, with an average rating for contact at 8.0 on the 1-10 scale.

3. Long Term Plan: 60.2% of all residents indicated they would like to see the Council's involvement with a project or issue in the Long Term Plan for the next 10 years. The most common issue or project specified was '*Water supply/Quality*'.

4. Democratic process: The overall mean showed an improvement in resident ratings in 2017 when compared with 2016 for the Democratic process. Regarding Information about Council business, 62.6% (similar to 62.4% in 2016) of residents were satisfied. However, slightly less residents were satisfied with Information on Council meetings, 48.5% (compared with 51.4% in 2016). In the comments, there were more negative comments related to public awareness (*Need to let locals know what's going on*).

5. Culture and heritage: Across the district, 67.7% of residents indicated that they were satisfied with the Council's performance regarding Culture and heritage.

6. Community housing: Across most areas there were differences in resident satisfaction with the provision of Community housing. Overall, 65.8% of respondents were satisfied with Community housing across the area (compared to 66.2% in 2016).

7. Community safety: Overall, 81.8% (up from 74.7% in 2016) of residents were satisfied with the Council's performance regarding Community safety.

8. Community support: Satisfaction ratings varied across services and areas, although the lowest percentages were from areas with small sample sizes. Satisfaction for all services was 66.4% on average (Community support services was 68.7%, Blenheim bus service 60.5%, Total mobility scheme 63.6%, and Funding community events 72.8%).

9. Library services: Public libraries achieved the highest individual service rating in 2017 (8.6). Strong levels of positive comments about the Public libraries service indicates high resident satisfaction. 92.3% (similar to 2016) of residents across the district were satisfied with the Council's Public libraries service.

10. Emergency management: This year, Emergency management achieved the second highest group performance rating (8.3) and also scored second place among 2017 service priorities. In particular, Rural fire fighting achieved the second highest individual performance rating in 2017 (8.5). Overall performance satisfaction percentages were 87.6% (similar to 89.9% in 2016) for Civil defence and 92.0% (92.3% in 2016) for Rural fire fighting.

11. Community facilities: In 2017, Community facilities had high performance ratings across all areas. The six facilities all recorded positive satisfaction rating percentages with Parks and reserves (87.4%), Sports grounds (89.0%), Bike paths and Tracks (82.5%), Swimming Pools (89.2%), and Cemeteries (89.3%), and Public toilets in its traditional 6th place on this list (76.5%, went up from 61.2% in 2016). Across most community facility provisions, 2017 average performance ratings were maintained at previous levels.

12. Roads and footpaths: Regarding Roads and Footpaths, in most instances, the provision of Street lighting gained the highest satisfaction ratings across the district (79.1%, close to 2016 results). Footpaths, at 67.9%, was up a little from 62.2% in 2016. Unsealed roads, at 44.8%, was down from 50.0% in 2016, and received the lowest satisfaction ratings among all four services. Negative comments for the Unsealed roads included *Lack of maintenance* and *Potholes*.

13. Flood protection and control: Across most areas, there were differences in resident satisfaction with Flood protection and control, indicating a degree of variation in the provision and quality of these deliverables across the district. Overall, 77.1% of all residents (slightly up from 76.1% in 2016) indicated that they were satisfied to some degree. However, smaller communities outside Blenheim were mixed in their levels of performance satisfaction. From a trend perspective, 2017 levels were not dissimilar to the previous years, although the ratings have increased.

14. Sewerage: Sewerage achieved the third highest group performance rating in 2017 (8.2, up from 7.9 in 2016). There were 149 No problems/ functions well responses in other positive comments. 2017 Overall satisfaction was 86.9% (up from 85.0% in 2016).

15. Urban storm water drainage: Urban storm water drainage service satisfaction level has increased in 2017 up to 78.9% (65.5% in 2016). This service showed the second biggest improvement in satisfaction ratings in the past year. Across areas there were differences, however, these variations could correspond with small sample size in some areas and availability of the service provision.

16. Drinking water: Drinking water was rated as the highest priority in 2017. Although it received the highest satisfaction ratings in 2017, there was still a slight mismatch between performance and service prioritisation. At the same time, Water supply/quality was the issue highlighted for the Long Term Plan, which may need Council attention. Overall, 85.5% of residents were Satisfied to some degree with the service regarding this deliverable (up from 76.0% in 2016). (Note: drinking water provided to Blenheim, Picton, Renwick, Havelock, Awatere valley part of Awatere area, Wairau Valley township (in Western Wairau), and Riverlands (in Blenheim vicinity)).

17. Waste management: Across the district, 79.1% of residents indicated that they were satisfied with the performance of the Council regarding Waste management. Reasons for positive and negative ratings varied across services. There was a slight increase with the satisfaction levels for Regional Waste Transfer stations (82.5%) and Resource Recovery Centre (83.0%) during the 2017 survey compared to the previous year. Kerbside rubbish and recycling was slightly down (71.7%, against 78.8% in 2016). (Note: services provided to Blenheim and Picton for kerbside collections, resource recovery centre sites across the district, resource recovery and reuse centre is based in Blenheim)

18. Environmental policy and monitoring: Across most areas, performance rating levels were similar for both Policy development and Monitoring provisions. The RMA development satisfaction level was 58.4% (59.1% in 2016) and monitoring was 60.0% (61.9% in 2016)

19. Consents and compliance: Overall satisfaction levels went up slightly across all services. The major improvement was for Health and Foods Act satisfaction level (81.5%, up from 74.7% in 2016).

20. Biosecurity: Biosecurity has shown the largest increase in terms of prioritisation preferences in the last 3 years. Although this service received the biggest mismatch between performance rating and perceived priority, this mismatch was recorded for the 2014 results as well. Reasons for negative comments were *No visible council involvement* and *Have to control pests ourselves*. The satisfaction level with Animal pest control was 48.7%, and 48.4% for Plant pest control, both services showed a decrease.

21. Animal control: There were more positive comments related to this service in 2017. These included *Don't see dogs or livestock roaming around, Good service/ No problems*. Overall, 78.9% of residents were satisfied with the Council's performance in these areas. Both performance ratings increased in 2017.

22. Harbours: Across most areas, as well as over time, there has been a level of consistency in resident satisfaction with the Council's provision for Harbours. The 2017 year resulted in 81.0% (up from 80.0% in 2016) of residents being satisfied with the service relating to Harbours.

23. Regional development: Across all three services, there was a good increase in satisfaction levels for regional development. The biggest changes were shown for Irrigation of the Southern Valleys (64.2%, up from 42.8% in 2016). There were less negative comments in 2017, and more positive feedback referring to Do a good job, Good/plenty of parking available, and Good across *all three services*.

24. Tourism: Overall, 71.9% of residents were satisfied with Council's Tourism service (slightly down from 76.6% in 2016). The satisfaction ratings varied across different areas. The negative comments referring to Tourism included *More effort/ room to improve* and *Poorly managed*.

25. Marlborough research centre: The recent year showed an increase in overall satisfaction level for Marlborough Research Centre (73.7%, up from 61.4% in 2016). Reasons for higher ratings included *Provide a good service*.

Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
CONTENTS	5
METHODOLOGY	6
Purpose of research	6
Methodology	6
Terminology, tools, and approach to analysis	7
Environmental Factors	8
IMPORTANT INFORMATION	9
Research Association of New Zealand [RANZ] Code of Practice	9
MAIN FINDINGS	10
1. Overall performance	10
<i>Correlation analysis</i>	13
<i>Prioritisation preferences (2017)</i>	14
<i>Prioritisation preferences (2014 vs. 2017)</i>	15
<i>Perceptual mapping</i>	16
<i>Performance Heat maps</i>	18
2. Contact with council	19
3. Long Term Plan	22
5. Democratic process	24
7. Culture and heritage	26
8. Community housing	28
9. Community safety	30
10. Community support	32
11. Library services	34
12. Emergency management	36
13. Community facilities	38
14. Roads and footpaths	40
15. Flood protection and control	42
16. Sewerage	44
17. Urban storm water drainage	46
18. Drinking water	48
19. Waste management	50
20. Environmental policy and monitoring	52
21. Consents and compliance	54
22. Biosecurity	56
23. Animal control	58
24. Harbours	60
25. Regional development	62
26. Tourism	64
27. Marlborough Research Centre	66
APPENDIX 1	68
Questionnaire 1	68
Questionnaire 2	71
APPENDIX 2	74
Demographic data	74

Methodology

Purpose of research


The objectives of this research were to:

1. assess residents' needs and satisfaction with MDC's services
2. provide insights into residents' preferred prioritisation of MDC's services and activities

Methodology

The existing MDC questionnaires were revised by SIL Research in consultation with the MDC, and then tested prior to deployment. Two concurrent surveys of n=400 residents were undertaken during June-August 2017. A total of n=800 residents aged 18 years and above, across the MDC's territorial area, were interviewed via a CATI (Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing) administered telephone survey during an eight week period starting June 2017.

Figure 1 Revised 2014 Survey area boundaries



A new question was introduced in 2017 to consult

with Marlborough residents regarding the Long Term Plan for the next 10 years. In consultation with the MDC, in 2014 changes were made to the sub-regional geographical areas reported in this survey compared to the 2013 survey. This change was to divide the 'Wairau Valley' area from the 2013 survey into two new areas – 'Western Wairau' (the valley plains west of Renwick) and 'Blenheim vicinity' (the valley plains east of Renwick to the coast, excluding the separate areas of Renwick and Blenheim). These changes were made by grouping Statistics New Zealand 2013 Census area units as presented in Figure 1.

The reason for the change was to better reflect the difference in services available to residents in the more populous Blenheim vicinity to those available to residents in the more rural Western Wairau.

Residents from Havelock, Awatere, Western Wairau, Renwick, Marlborough Sounds, Picton, Blenheim vicinity, and Blenheim were randomly selected from

the MDC ratepayer database. Phone numbers were matched from publicly available databases.

To reduce non response error, all respondents not contactable, i.e. no answer or answerphone, were re-called up to four times. Data was analysed using SPSS.

To introduce a statistically robust sampling methodology, SIL Research determined sample sizes based on Statistics New Zealand usually resident population figures, from the 2013 Census as presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1 MDC Sampling Methodology

	2013 usually resident	Percentage	n=400 surveys	n=800 surveys
Marlborough Sounds	4023	9%	35	70
Havelock	531	1%	5	10
Picton	4752	10%	41	82
Western Wairau	1956	4%	17	34
Renwick	2127	5%	18	36
Blenheim vicinity	6417	14%	55	110
Blenheim	25014	54%	216	432
Awatere	1482	3%	13	26
Total	46302	100%	400	800

As presented in Table 1 above, the *2013 usually resident* column shows the number of residents in each grouped area. The *Percentage* column presents the percentage of residents by area (i.e. Blenheim accounts for 54% of all residents in the district). The *n=400 surveys* column shows the number of surveys completed for each area based on the percentages in the previous column (i.e. Blenheim at 54% equates to n=216 surveys from the total of 400 completed across the district). Finally the *n=800 surveys* column presents the combined number of surveys completed across all areas during this project (i.e. Blenheim at 54% equates to n=432 surveys from the total of 800 completed across the district)

Drawing from Census 2013 figures for the Marlborough district, residents' age and gender proportions were identified to ensure a representative spread of residents aged 18 years and over as presented in Table 2 below.

Table 2 Marlborough District 18yrs+ age and gender statistics

Age Targets	Population		Percentages		Surveys n=400	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
18-24	1518	1310	4%	4%	17	14
25-34	2330	2370	6%	7%	26	26
35-44	2400	2620	7%	7%	26	29
45-54	2960	3160	8%	9%	33	35
55-64	3360	3480	9%	10%	37	38
65+	5200	5600	14%	15%	57	62
Total	17768	18540	49%	51%	196	204
Grand total	36308					

Using Statistics New Zealand population projections for the MDC catchment area, minor adjustments to age and gender sampling were applied in this year's survey. Using the above residents' population statistics, a sample size of n=400 across 36,308 18yr + residents allows for a 95% confidence level +/- 4.87% where residents are split 50/50 on any given issues, and a 95% confidence level +/- 3.9% where residents are split 80/20.

For issues in which n=800 residents were questioned, such as *overall council performance*, results from across 34,041 18yr + residents allows for a 95% confidence level +/- 3.43% where residents are split 50/50 on any given issues, and a 95% confidence level +/- 2.74% where residents are split 80/20. Differences or variations in results area are discussed only when statistically significant at a .05 (95% probability) level and differences are meaningful.

Note: In some charts there may appear to be a mismatch of means and percentages, these numbers are in fact correct. The satisfaction percentages disregard neutral and negative responses, whereas mean scores use all ratings.

Income, home ownership status, and tenure in the district data are presented in Appendix 2, from page 74.

Terminology, tools, and approach to analysis

Throughout this report, a selection of common statistical analyses and tools were used to interpret the data and present findings in a meaningful manner. Each will now be briefly explained.

Mean: Most performance data in this research was collected via a 1-9 Likert scale; this is a standard research approach to collecting, measuring, and presenting ratings. The mean is the average rating score provided by residents in each area and across the MDC district. In most sections, 1-9 mean scores have been recalibrated to 1-10 ratings and are presented in charts along with the number of residents the mean score is based on.

Anova and Chi square measures of significance: Throughout this report the term "*statistically significant*" is used to highlight differences in mean ratings across areas. Only when differences between areas are significant at a 95% level is the term "*statistically significant*" used. This tool is used to support statistically any references to visual differences presented in charts and or tables.

R² linear regression (pronounced R squared): An R² linear regression is a simple test which provides a number to indicate whether what is being observed in the year by year scores is indicative of an actual trend. As presented in

this report, three patterns emerged as a result of applying this test to historical and current aggregated ratings. The patterns were: (1) increase in performance ratings, (2) decrease in performance ratings, (3) no visible increase or decrease and the appearance of a see-saw pattern (up and down over time). In summary the closer the R^2 number to “1” the more likely a trend towards an increase or decrease in performance ratings.

Correlation analysis: In this report, a correlation analysis was used to predict which “services” influence “MDC’s overall performance rating”. Council services measured by survey were ranked in order of influence based on their level of statistical significance. Only services with a significance level of .01 or lower are presented in the charts below. Generally, the lower the “Sig.” number for the deliverable, the greater the influence on MDC’s overall performance rating. This test was used to detect opportunities for MDC’s future actions to address any negative impact or positive traction in the services identified.

Proportional recalibration: To enable a longitudinal (time based) comparison against ratings presented in previous year’s reports, 1-9 Likert scale ratings needed to be proportionally recalibrated to a 1-10 scale. This was achieved by dividing the 1-9 rating by 9, then multiplying the number by 10. Therefore, a 6.8 rating from the original 1-9 rating scale becomes 7.5 on the 1-10 scale.

Perceptual mapping: To present performance and prioritisation data in a meaningful and visual format, a perceptual map was used to illustrate the interplay of these two datasets; proportionally recalibrated data is presented in these maps. Chart 7 on page 16 presents the data using the full 1-10 scale, and Chart 8 on page 17 presents the same data, however, the data is zoomed in for a 5-rating for both performance and priority. Note: In 2017, service priority ratings were updated.

Heat mapping: To visually present *overall satisfaction* data, latitude and longitude coordinates based on resident addresses have been used to present the data across the district. To maintain anonymity of respondents, the level of detail presented has been limited to a “birds-eye” view only.

NOTE: Perceptual mapping vs. regression analysis: Results presented in the perceptual maps on pages 16 and 17 show ratepayer performance ratings and associated priorities for each council service group. These findings show the performance of services being delivered in proportion to the level of priority placed on each.

Results from the regression analysis on page 13 identify which individual council services have the potential to influence overall performance ratings.

Therefore, the perceptual maps highlight service strengths and opportunities for improvements in each service group, and the regression analysis identifies which individual services have the potential to improve or decrease overall performance ratings.

Environmental Factors

When reading this report, it is important to note that factors such as the timing of unusual or one-off events often affect the ratings that residents give. The issues that may have influenced perception of MDC performance are as follows:

- 1) 7.8 magnitude earthquake on November 14 2016
 - a) damage to residential and industrial properties, civic amenities, and infrastructure, particularly in Ward and Seddon areas.
 - b) Significant damage to some wineries and vineyards in the Blenheim area.
 - c) Long term closure of State Highway 1 had a significant negative impact on tourism (particularly domestic tourism from the south) and deliveries.
 - d) Alternative State Highway route through Marlborough (State Highway 63) was under significant pressure due to the volume of traffic and roadworks, and delays ensued.
 - e) Council services affected: emergency management, roads and footpaths, water supply, sewerage, flood protection, community facilities, building control, resource consents, economic development, tourism, community support.
- 2) Local elections October 2016 – democratic services

- 3) Environmental policy and monitoring – notification of the Marlborough Environment Plan has had ongoing media coverage locally
- 4) Proposed pyrolysis plant (June-August 2017) – significant media coverage locally about a proposed pyrolysis plant in Blenheim. Council services affected: solid waste management, environmental policy and monitoring
- 5) National debate about lack of housing, and public sector role in housing. Council services affected: community housing, water supply, sewerage, storm water, community facilities, and roads and footpaths, environmental policy and monitoring.
- 6) Havelock North drinking water contamination (August 2016) – focus on the safety of municipal water supplies. Council services affected: water supply.
- 7) Flooding 14 November 2016 and Easter 2017 –localised roading, stopbank and floodway damage. The November event was on the same day as the major earthquake.
- 8) Local economy performed strongly in 2016/17 which has a positive effect on confidence locally amongst residents and businesses.

Important Information

Research Association of New Zealand [RANZ] Code of Practice

SIL Research is a member of the RANZ and therefore is obliged to comply with the RANZ Code of Practice. A copy of the Code is available from the Executive Secretary or the Complaints Officer of the Society.

1. Confidentiality
 - a. Reports and other records relevant to a Market Research project and provided by the Researcher shall normally be for use solely by the Client and the Client's consultants or advisers.
2. Research Information
 - a. Article 25 of the RANZ Code states:
 - i. The research technique and methods used in a Marketing Research project do not become the property of the Client, who has no exclusive right to their use.
 - ii. Marketing research proposals, discussion papers and quotations, unless these have been paid for by the Client, remain the property of the Researcher.
 - iii. They must not be disclosed by the Client to any third party, other than to a consultant working for a Client on that project. In particular, they must not be used by the Client to influence proposals or cost quotations from other researchers.
3. Publication of a Research Project
 - a. Article 31 of the RANZ Code states:
 - i. Where a Client publishes any of the findings of a research project the client has a responsibility to ensure these are not misleading. The Researcher must be consulted and agree in advance to the form and content for publication. Where this does not happen the Researcher is entitled to:
 1. Refuse permission for their name to be quoted in connection with the published findings
 2. Publish the appropriate details of the project
 3. Correct any misleading aspects of the published presentation of the findings
4. Electronic Copies
 - a. Electronic copies of reports, presentations, proposals and other documents must not be altered or amended if that document is still identified as a SIL Research document. The authorised original of all electronic copies and hard copies derived from these are held to be that retained by SIL Research.


Main findings

This initial section provides an overview to Council performance and a summarised aggregated rating summary for the main service areas.

1. Overall performance

Residents were asked: “On a scale of 1 to 9 where 1=not at all well, 5=neutral and 9=extremely well, how would you rate the overall performance of the Marlborough District Council over the last 12 months?”

Chart 1 Overall Council performance



(n=756 – N/A removed) Scale recalibrated from 1-9 to 1-10; N/A removed.

As presented in the charts and tables in this section: In 2017, MDC’s overall performance rating improved over the previous year (up to 7.6 from 7.2). The linear regression suggested a steady improvement trend for the Council. Combining individual and grouped aggregated totals, the top three ranked services in 2017 were *Drinking water* (8.3), *Emergency management* (8.3) and *Sewerage* (8.2). *Drinking water*, followed by *Urban storm water drainage* showed the biggest improvement in 2017. When individual services were ranked separately *Public libraries* had the highest rating (8.6), followed by *Rural fire fighting* (8.5), which was similar to the previous year. The services with the lowest ratings in 2017 were *Biosecurity* (6.0) and *Democratic process* (6.4), the results were very similar to the previous survey year. Overall, 15 services increased their performance scores compared to 2016, 6 had lower scores, and 1 stayed the same. (Note: Sewerage service available in Blenheim, Picton, Renwick, Havelock, Seddon (not all Awatere), and Grovetown (in Blenheim vicinity) only)

Chart 2 Overall rating of service sections (averaged proportionally recalibrated service headings)






Chart 3 Overall rating of service sections (individual services only, not grouped or aggregated)



Correlation analysis

The charts below present the results of a correlation analysis used to determine which services had stronger relationships with MDC's overall performance rating. Variables used as predictors of Overall Council performance showed the potential presence of multicollinearity (intercorrelation with each other), which might influence on the overall results. This year it was decided that a slightly different statistical test would be used – correlation analysis. This type of analysis can show the presence of relationships between services and overall performance rating, its polarity (negative or positive) and strength.

Chart 4 Survey 1 and 2 services exerting greatest influence on overall satisfaction




All services showed a positive correlation with overall Council performance ratings. The strongest relationship between scores was recorded for *Developing resource management policies under the RMA, Information about Council Business, Funding community events, and Economic Development*. The correlation was significant at the 0.01 level.

Prioritisation preferences (2017)


In 2017, residents were informed that “The council needs to ensure priorities are established to best meet the needs of the community. Using the scale where 1=not at all important, 5=neutral and 9=extremely important, please rate the level of importance the council should place in prioritising services with regard to the following services and facilities”. Residents were asked to rate the priority of the services they had previously provided performance ratings for. The rankings for each aggregated service deliverable are presented below. 1-9 Likert scale ratings were proportionally recalibrated to a 1-10 scale.

Chart 5 2017 MDC Resident prioritisation of services




Prioritisation preferences (2014 vs. 2017)

Chart 6 Prioritisation preferences 2014 vs. 2017 comparison




Perceptual mapping

Chart 7 Performance vs. priority perceptual map (full scale)



In 2017, all service deliverables measured were rated as well performing services. In 2017, residents were asked to rate the priority of services. All service priorities from 2017 showed a rating increase in the last 3 years.

Chart 8 Performance vs. priority perceptual map (zoomed 5-10 scale)



All services were rated as important by Marlborough residents, scoring 7.0 and above on a 1-10 rating scale. Almost all services received lower performance scores when compared with the priority levels. The largest gap between performance and prioritisation preferences was shown for *Biosecurity*, *Environmental policy and monitoring*, and *Roads and Footpaths*. The most important deliverable (*Drinking water*) received the highest satisfaction rating in 2017.

Performance Heat maps

The Performance Heat map presents the average of overall performance scores given. A Heat map can show geographical clusters of scores that may highlight locations of high (green colour) or lower satisfaction (red colour).


Figure 2 MDC Overall Satisfaction – District



2. Contact with council


Residents were asked: “Have you had any direct contact with the Council in the past 12 months?” Those that indicated that they did have contact were then asked “In what ways was that contact made” followed by “on a scale of 1 to 9 where 1= not at all well, 5 = neutral and 9 = extremely well, how would you rate your overall contact with the Council?” Area percentages are presented in Chart 9 and the mean performance ratings are presented in Chart 10 below.

Chart 9 Contact with Council



(n=767)

Chart 10 Contact with council mean satisfaction ratings by area



(n=344)

Scale recalibrated from 1-9 to 1-10; N/A removed. (Total 2017 filtered responses n=344) Note: small response sample sizes in some areas. Numbers at top of coloured bars represent the number of residents providing a rating for each deliverable in each area.

Table 3 Contact with council satisfaction percentages by area

		Marlborough Sounds	Havelock	Picton	Western Wairau	Renwick	Blenheim vicinity	Blenheim	Awatere	Total
Council service (%)	Dissatisfied	9.1%	16.7%	9.7%	16.7%	0.0%	5.9%	12.7%	6.3%	10.5%
	Neutral	12.1%	16.7%	9.7%	16.7%	6.3%	2.0%	5.2%	12.5%	7.0%
	Satisfied	78.8%	66.7%	80.6%	66.7%	93.8%	92.2%	82.1%	81.3%	82.6%
Council service (Counts)	Dissatisfied	3	1	3	3	0	3	22	1	36
	Neutral	4	1	3	3	1	1	9	2	24
	Satisfied	26	4	25	12	15	47	142	13	284


(n=344 – N/A removed)

As presented in the charts and tables in this section: 45% of residents indicated that they had been in contact with the Council in the past 12 months. Satisfaction with Council contact was high at 82.6%, with an average rating for contact at 8.0 on the 1-10 scale.

Table 4 Contact with council unprompted comments

	Positive	Count	Negative	Count
Council service	Friendly service	94	No officer to take responsibility	8
	Good service	86	Too many people to get through	6
	Informative	61	Other	30
	Quick response/ no delay	61		
	Very helpful	111		
	Other	50		

Chart 11 Trend analysis – Contact with council longitudinal proportionally recalibrated ratings



(n=344)


Using simple linear regression over the last 10 years the trend was for an improvement in overall satisfaction with Council services over time. The 2017 results showed a higher Council service rating than the previous year.

Table 5 Form of contact with Council

		Marlborough Sounds	Havelock	Picton	Western Wairau	Renwick	Blenheim vicinity	Blenheim	Awatere	Total
Contact source (%)	Telephone	45.5%	83.3%	54.8%	44.4%	53.3%	49.0%	44.3%	68.8%	48.3%
	Post	6.1%	16.7%	16.1%	22.2%	6.7%	2.0%	15.5%	6.3%	12.2%
	Website	6.1%	16.7%	12.9%	16.7%	33.3%	9.8%	17.8%	6.3%	15.1%
	At Council offices	27.3%	83.3%	45.2%	83.3%	26.7%	64.7%	60.9%	31.3%	55.5%
	Email	30.3%	33.3%	29.0%	33.3%	13.3%	21.6%	24.1%	25.0%	25.0%
	Other	24.2%	0.0%	9.7%	16.7%	20.0%	17.6%	9.8%	12.5%	13.1%
	Total	139.4%	233.3%	167.7%	216.7%	153.3%	164.7%	172.4%	150.0%	169.2%
Contact source (Counts)	Telephone	15	5	17	8	8	25	77	11	166
	Post	2	1	5	4	1	1	27	1	42
	Website	2	1	4	3	5	5	31	1	52
	At Council offices	9	5	14	15	4	33	106	5	191
	Email	10	2	9	6	2	11	42	4	86
	Other	8	0	3	3	3	9	17	2	45
	Total	33	6	31	18	15	51	174	16	344

Note: Residents were able to mention multiple forms of contact, therefore, in some instances totals exceed 100%

Chart 12 Contact source mean rating scores




(n=344)

3. Long Term Plan


Residents were asked: “The Council is planning its Long Term Plan for the next 10 years. Is there a project you think the Council should get involved with? Or is there an issue or problem you think we should address?” The open-ended responses were aggregated into categories.

Chart 13 Is there a project the Council should get involved in



As presented in the charts and tables in this section: 60.2% of all residents indicated they would like to see the Council’s involvement with a project or issue in the Long Term Plan for the next 10 years. The most common issue or project specified was ‘Water supply/Quality’.

Chart 14 Issue of project specified for the Long Term Plan




(n=459)

Note: Residents were able to mention multiple forms of media, therefore, in some instances total exceeds 100%

5. Democratic process

Residents were informed that “*The Council values community engagement in making decisions that affect the community*” Residents were then asked: “*On a scale of 1 to 9 where 1=not at all well, 5=neutral and 9=extremely well, how well do you think the Council performs in providing these two services?*” Mean scores for all deliverables were then aggregated and averaged within this section to provide an indication of overall performance satisfaction for this service.

Chart 15 Democratic process mean satisfaction ratings by area



Scale recalibrated from 1-9 to 1-10; N/A removed. (Total 2017 responses n=332-377) Note: small response sample sizes in some areas. Numbers at top of coloured bars represent the number of residents providing a rating for each deliverable in each area.

Table 6 Democratic process satisfaction percentages by area

Area	Information about Council Business	Information on Council meetings
Marlborough Sounds	58.8%	34.8%
Havelock	80.0%	40.0%
Picton	50.0%	31.3%
Western Wairau	60.0%	64.3%
Renwick	58.8%	40.0%
Blenheim vicinity	76.5%	58.7%
Blenheim	62.6%	50.5%
Awatere	54.5%	45.5%
Total	62.6%	48.5%


(n=332-377– N/A removed)

As presented in the charts and tables in this section: The overall mean showed an improvement in resident ratings in 2017, when compared with 2016 for the *Democratic process*. Regarding *Information about Council business*, 62.6% (similar to 62.4% in 2016) of residents were satisfied. However, slightly less residents were satisfied with *Information on Council meetings* (48.5%, compared with 51.4% in 2016). In the comments there were more negative comments related to public awareness (*Need to let locals know what's going on*).

Table 7 Democratic process unprompted comments

	Positive	Count	Negative	Count
Information about Council Business	Advertise well in paper/media/leaflets in mailbox	43	Need to let locals know what's going on	42
	Do a good job	8	Too much behind closed doors/ not enough information provided	46
	Good communication	22	Other	17
	Information always available	32		
	Provide a good service	6		
	Other	18		
Information on Council meetings	Advertise well	30	Need to let locals know what's going on	58
	People are made aware of	10	Public not aware of meetings	46
	Do a good job	6	Too many closed door meetings	38
	Good communication	19	Other	20
	Other	6		

Chart 16 Trend analysis – Democratic process longitudinal proportionally recalibrated ratings




(2017 n=332-377)

The 2017 results showed a slight rating increase, however there was an overall decreasing trend over the past ten years.

7. Culture and heritage

Residents were informed that “*The Council manages culture and heritage assets and resources, provides culture and heritage grants, and works with local groups to support and develop our arts, culture and heritage resources.*” Residents were then asked: “*On a scale of 1 to 9 where 1=not at all well, 5=neutral and 9=extremely well, how well do you think the Council performs in providing this service?*”

Chart 17 Culture and heritage mean satisfaction ratings by area



Scale recalibrated from 1-9 to 1-10; N/A removed. (Total 2017 responses n=322) Note: small response sample sizes in most areas. Numbers at top of coloured bars represent the number of residents providing a rating for each deliverable in each area.

Table 8 Culture and heritage satisfaction percentages by area

	Marlborough Sounds	Havelock	Picton	Western Wairau	Renwick	Blenheim vicinity	Blenheim	Awatere	Total
Culture and Heritage (%)									
Dissatisfied	30.0%	0.0%	18.8%	15.4%	0.0%	6.7%	10.8%	11.1%	11.8%
Neutral	10.0%	20.0%	12.5%	23.1%	25.0%	17.8%	22.6%	33.3%	20.5%
Satisfied	60.0%	80.0%	68.8%	61.5%	75.0%	75.6%	66.7%	55.6%	67.7%
Culture and Heritage (Counts)									
Dissatisfied	6	0	6	2	0	3	20	1	38
Neutral	2	1	4	3	3	8	42	3	66
Satisfied	12	4	22	8	9	34	124	5	218


(n=322 – N/A removed)

As presented in the charts and tables in this section: Across the district, 67.7% of residents indicated that they were satisfied with the Council’s performance regarding *Culture and heritage*. The decrease in positive percent ratings was due to an increase in neutral responses, which resulted in a same mean score compared to 2016 results. Positive comments indicated *Good support* and simply *Good*. There were no significant increases in negative comments.

Table 9 Culture and heritage unprompted comments

		Count
Positive	Excellent	13
	Good	20
	Good support	37
	Plenty of choice	10
	Provides good service	18
	Well covered/ large variety	16
	Other	18
Negative	Council has cut funding	4
	Council needs to improve support	8
	Don't think rates should be used for culture and heritage	7
	Only some groups get helped out	6
	Too much money spent on it	12
	Other	18

Chart 18 Trend analysis – Culture and heritage longitudinal proportionally recalibrated ratings




(2017 n=322)

Based on a simple linear regression, MDC's performance rating for *Culture and heritage* has not shown any significant changes in the past five years.

8. Community housing

Residents were informed that “The Council owns about 170 housing units that are available to older people, and rented at discounted rates.” Residents were then asked: “On a scale of 1 to 9 where 1=not at all well, 5=neutral and 9=extremely well, how well do you think the Council performs in providing this service?”

Chart 19 Community housing mean satisfaction ratings by area



Scale recalibrated from 1-9 to 1-10; N/A removed. (Total 2017 responses n=240) Note: small response sample sizes in most areas. Numbers at top of coloured bars represent the number of residents providing a rating for each deliverable in each area.

Table 10 Community housing satisfaction percentages by area

		Marlborough Sounds	Havelock	Picton	Western Wairau	Renwick	Blenheim vicinity	Blenheim	Awatere	Total
Community housing (%)	Dissatisfied	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	27.3%	0.0%	0.0%	10.4%	0.0%	8.8%
	Neutral	0.0%	0.0%	29.0%	27.3%	12.5%	26.5%	27.6%	22.2%	25.4%
	Satisfied	66.7%	100.0%	71.0%	45.5%	87.5%	73.5%	61.9%	77.8%	65.8%
Community housing (Counts)	Dissatisfied	4	0	0	3	0	0	14	0	21
	Neutral	0	0	9	3	1	9	37	2	61
	Satisfied	8	1	22	5	7	25	83	7	158


(n=240– N/A removed)

As presented in the charts and tables in this section: Across most areas there were differences in resident satisfaction with the provision of *Community housing*. Overall, 65.8% of respondents were satisfied with *Community housing* across the area (compared to 66.2% in 2016). A quarter of residents were neutral in their ratings.

Table 11 Community housing unprompted comments

		Count
Positive	Readily available to those that need them	15
	Well maintained/ good upkeep	27
	Other	14
Negative	Council need to improve maintenance	4
	Not enough council housing on	14
	Other	7

Chart 20 Trend analysis – Community housing longitudinal proportionally recalibrated ratings




(2017 n=240)

Based on a simple linear regression, MDC's average performance rating for *Community housing* is stable over time. The 2017 results are on a par with previous years.

9. Community safety

Residents were informed that “The Council works closely with agencies in the policing, education and health sectors to address some of the root causes of behaviours that affect community safety - security cameras in the Blenheim CBD, and restorative justice and crime prevention through environmental design.” Residents were then asked: “On a scale of 1 to 9 where 1=not at all well, 5=neutral and 9=extremely well, how well do you think the Council performs in providing this service?”

Chart 21 Community safety mean satisfaction ratings by area



Scale recalibrated from 1-9 to 1-10; N/A removed. (Total 2017 responses n=340) Note: small response sample sizes in most areas. Numbers at top of coloured bars represent the number of residents providing a rating for each deliverable in each area.

Table 12 Community safety satisfaction percentages by area

		Marlborough Sounds	Havelock	Picton	Western Wairau	Renwick	Blenheim vicinity	Blenheim	Awatere	Total
Community Safety (%)	Dissatisfied	5.9%	0.0%	2.9%	5.9%	7.7%	0.0%	4.6%	18.2%	4.4%
	Neutral	11.8%	25.0%	14.7%	17.6%	15.4%	18.8%	12.2%	9.1%	13.8%
	Satisfied	82.4%	75.0%	82.4%	76.5%	76.9%	81.3%	83.2%	72.7%	81.8%
Community Safety (Counts)	Dissatisfied	1	0	1	1	1	0	9	2	15
	Neutral	2	1	5	3	2	9	24	1	47
	Satisfied	14	3	28	13	10	39	163	8	278


(n=340– N/A removed)

As presented in the charts and tables in this section: Overall, 81.8% (up from 74.7% in 2016) of residents were satisfied with the Council’s performance regarding *Community safety*. Positive comments increased and referred to *Do a good job*.

Table 13 Community safety unprompted comments

		Count
Positive	Community awareness	20
	Do a good job	51
	Doing good job with security and the cameras	32
	Excellent	3
	Feel safe	27
	Good Policing	15
	No problems	13
	Safe here	14
	Security system is good	3
	See plenty of Police around	8
	Other	20
Negative	Not safe to walk in Blenheim streets at night	4
	Youth roaming streets	3
	Needs more policing	4
	Need more cameras	5
	More of a Police issue	0
	Other	9

Chart 22 Trend analysis – Community safety longitudinal proportionally recalibrated ratings




(2017 n=340)

Using simple linear regression, over the last 10 years there has been an improvement trend in *Community safety* ratings.

10. Community support

Residents were informed that “The Council provides a range of diverse services and activities to support the community.” Residents were then asked: “On a scale of 1 to 9 where 1=not at all well, 5=neutral and 9=extremely well, how well do you think the Council performs in providing these four services?” Mean scores for all deliverables were then aggregated and averaged within this section to provide an indication of overall performance satisfaction for this service.

Chart 23 Community support mean satisfaction ratings by area



Scale recalibrated from 1-9 to 1-10; N/A removed. (Total 2017 responses n=162-275) Note: small response sample sizes in most areas. Numbers at top of coloured bars represent the number of residents providing a rating for each deliverable in each area.

Table 14 Community support satisfaction percentages by area

Area	Community support services for positive aging, youth, community grants	Blenheim bus service	Total mobility scheme	Funding community events
Marlborough Sounds	53.3%	66.7%	45.5%	62.5%
Havelock	75.0%	0.0%	33.3%	75.0%
Picton	65.2%	66.7%	75.0%	77.8%
Western Wairau	81.8%	83.3%	75.0%	75.0%
Renwick	53.8%	36.4%	44.4%	70.0%
Blenheim vicinity	75.6%	55.6%	61.9%	80.5%
Blenheim	69.1%	62.3%	65.3%	71.1%
Awatere	66.7%	40.0%	100.0%	71.4%
Total	68.7%	60.5%	63.6%	72.8%


(n=162-275– N/A removed)

As presented in the charts and tables in this section: Satisfaction ratings varied across services and areas, although the lowest percentages were from areas with small sample sizes. Satisfaction for all services was 66.4% on average (Community support services was 68.7%, Blenheim bus service 60.5%, Total mobility scheme 63.6%, and Funding community events 72.8%). (Note: bus service only provided in Blenheim)

Table 15 Community support unprompted comments

	Positive	Count	Negative	Count
Community support services	Doing a good job with young people	13	More attention needed for youth activities	16
	Good/ do the job well	37	Needs more funding	12
	Help always available	13	Need more elderly	9
	Lots of activities	11	Room for improvement in funding allocations	15
	Support people in trouble/ people to talk to if needed	14	Other	12
	Other	11		
Blenheim bus service	Reliable	23	Unreliable	1
	Clean	4	Dirty busses	0
	Frequent services	20	Insufficient services	33
	Good drivers	10	Poor timetable	24
	Other	18	Bad drivers	1
			Other	25
Total mobility scheme	Good that it's provided	24	Shouldn't be paid for by ratepayers	3
	Friendly drivers	2	Other	11
	Other	12		
Funding community events	Do a great job. events good	30	Cost is too high for outcome	8
	Good range of events	51	Currently ineffective	5
	Well advertised	20	Events should be advertised more	10
	Well promoted	22	More specific focus required, too general	7
	Other	14	Needs to reach all areas of district	5
			Other	7

Chart 24 Trend analysis – Community support longitudinal proportionally recalibrated ratings




(2017 n=162-275)

The average rating for Community support was similar to 2016 results, and the average performance rating for *Community support in total* has been stable over time

11. Library services

Residents were informed that “The Council operates two public libraries at Blenheim and Picton; and supports community libraries in Ward, Renwick, Havelock, and Waitaria Bay.” Residents were then asked: “On a scale of 1 to 9 where 1=not at all well, 5=neutral and 9=extremely well, how well do you think the Council performs in providing these two services?” Mean scores for all deliverables were then aggregated and averaged within this section to provide an indication of overall performance satisfaction for this service.

Chart 25 Library services mean satisfaction ratings by area



Scale recalibrated from 1-9 to 1-10; N/A removed. (Total 2017 responses n=57-338) Note: small response sample sizes in most areas. Numbers at top of coloured bars represent the number of residents providing a rating for each deliverable in each area.

Table 16 Library services satisfaction percentages by area

Area	Public libraries	Community libraries
Marlborough Sounds	87.5%	100.0%
Havelock	100.0%	66.7%
Picton	88.9%	50.0%
Western Wairau	93.3%	100.0%
Renwick	100.0%	57.1%
Blenheim vicinity	97.7%	57.1%
Blenheim	91.5%	62.5%
Awatere	90.0%	60.0%
Total	92.3%	66.7%


(n=57-338– N/A removed)

As presented in the charts and tables in this section: Public libraries achieved the highest individual service rating in 2017 (8.6). Strong levels of positive comments about the *Public libraries* service, indicates high resident satisfaction. 92.3% (similar to 2016) of residents across the district were satisfied with the Council’s *Public libraries* service. (Note: full library services only in Blenheim and Picton, remainder of district serviced by community libraries).

Table 17 Library services unprompted comments

	Positive	Count	Negative	Count
Public libraries	Accessible	84	Insufficient books	3
	Clean	59	Library needs and upgrade	2
	Good facilities/ PC's etc	112	Ratepayers shouldn't have to pay library charges	1
	Good range of books	113	Too much mouse/ "SKYPE" chats	5
	Good range of services	120	Other	5
	Good service/ staff helpful	141		
	Opening hours good	43		
	Other	50		
Community libraries	Accessible	2	Insufficient books	2
	Clean	0	Library needs and upgrade	2
	Good facilities/ PC's etc	4	Ratepayers shouldn't have to pay library charges	0
	Good range of books	4	Too much mouse/ "SKYPE" chats	0
	Good range of services	3	Other	3
	Good service/ staff helpful	5		
	Opening hours good	1		
	Other	6		

Chart 26 Trend analysis – Library services longitudinal proportionally recalibrated ratings




(2017 n=57-338)

The overall 10 years trend showed a slight decline in satisfaction ratings with Library service. However, satisfaction ratings over the past three years have shown some improvement.

12. Emergency management

Residents were informed that “The Council is a member of Marlborough-Kaikoura Rural Fire Authority. Council also maintains an emergency management centre and is responsible for managing and responding to natural disasters and emergency events including floods and earthquakes.” Residents were then asked: “On a scale of 1 to 9 where 1=not at all well, 5=neutral and 9=extremely well, how well do you think the Council performs in providing these two services?” Mean scores for all deliverables were then aggregated and averaged within this section to provide an indication of overall performance satisfaction for this service.

Chart 27 Emergency management mean satisfaction ratings by area



Scale recalibrated from 1-9 to 1-10; N/A removed. (Total 2017 responses n=347-348) Note: small response sample sizes in most areas. Numbers at top of coloured bars represent the number of residents providing a rating for each deliverable in each area.

Table 18 Emergency management satisfaction percentages by area

Area	Rural fire fighting	Civil Defence Emergency management
Marlborough Sounds	80.6%	60.7%
Havelock	100.0%	100.0%
Picton	90.6%	90.6%
Western Wairau	94.1%	88.2%
Renwick	100.0%	100.0%
Blenheim vicinity	94.0%	83.7%
Blenheim	92.9%	91.1%
Awatere	84.6%	83.3%
Total	92.0%	87.6%


(n=347-348– N/A removed)

As presented in the charts and tables in this section: This year, *Emergency management* achieved the second highest group performance rating (8.3), and also scored second place among 2017 service priorities. In particular, *Rural fire fighting* achieved the second highest individual performance rating in 2017 (8.5). Overall performance satisfaction percentages were 87.6% (similar to 89.9% in 2016) for *Civil defence*, and 92.0% (92.3% in 2016) for *Rural fire fighting*. (Note: services provided to all areas, but based in Blenheim)

Table 19 Emergency management unprompted comments

	Positive	Count	Negative	Count
Rural fire fighting	Really good service	47	All volunteers no Council funding	1
	Excellent	63	Council should provide more	2
	Good firemen/ well trained	67	Fire controls too stringent	0
	Good number of volunteers	45	Have to rely on own resources	1
	Good service	83	No civil defence in some areas	1
	On the ball	41	Other	4
	Quick response	71		
	Other	42		
Civil Defence Emergency management	Always people there when needed	36	All volunteers no Council funding	1
	Do a good job	107	Council should provide more	5
	Good planning for future situations	37	Floods not dealt with quickly enough	3
	Good service	40	Have to rely on own resources	5
	On the ball	36	No civil defence in some areas	5
	Very good service	26	Other	10
	Other	35		

Chart 28 Trend analysis – Emergency management longitudinal proportionally recalibrated ratings




(2017 n=347-348)

Based on a simple linear regression, results have been similar during the last 3 years, with an overall improvement trend.

13. Community facilities

Residents were informed that “*The Council manages and maintains a variety of community facilities.*” Residents were then asked: “*On a scale of 1 to 9 where 1=not at all well, 5=neutral and 9=extremely well, how well do you think the Council manages and maintains these facilities?*” Mean scores for all deliverables were then aggregated and averaged within this section to provide an indication of overall performance satisfaction for this service.

Chart 29 Community facilities mean satisfaction ratings by area



Scale recalibrated from 1-9 to 1-10; N/A removed. (Total 2017 responses n=268-388) Note: small response sample sizes in some areas. Numbers at top of coloured bars represent the number of residents providing a rating for each deliverable in each area.

Table 20 Community facilities satisfaction percentages by area

Area	Parks, reserves and open spaces	Sports grounds	Paths, walkways and tracks for walking and biking	Swimming Pools	Cemeteries and war memorials	Public toilets
Marlborough Sounds	54.8%	60.0%	59.1%	50.0%	69.6%	77.8%
Havelock	100.0%	100.0%	66.7%	100.0%	100.0%	80.0%
Picton	92.7%	91.9%	78.4%	66.7%	88.6%	82.9%
Western Wairau	82.4%	81.3%	75.0%	61.8%	100.0%	85.7%
Renwick	94.4%	94.1%	75.0%	84.6%	94.1%	94.1%
Blenheim vicinity	94.3%	85.1%	87.2%	90.9%	86.7%	70.7%
Blenheim	89.6%	91.3%	86.5%	93.8%	91.0%	72.4%
Awatere	75.0%	81.8%	70.0%	85.7%	90.0%	100.0%
Total	87.4%	89.0%	82.5%	89.2%	89.3%	76.5%


(n=268-388– N/A removed)

As presented in the charts and tables in this section: In 2017, *Community facilities* had high performance ratings across all areas. The six facilities all recorded positive satisfaction rating percentages with *Parks and reserves* (87.4%), *Sports grounds* (89.0%), *Bike paths and Tracks* (82.5%), *Swimming Pools* (89.2%), and *Cemeteries* (89.3%), and *Public toilets* in its traditional 6th place on this list (76.5%, went up from 61.2% in 2016). Across most community facility provisions, 2017 average performance ratings were maintained at previous levels.

Table 21 Community facilities unprompted comments

	Positive	Count	Negative	Count
Parks and reserves	Clean	55	Insufficient playgrounds	2
	Layout is good	36	Litter in parks and reserves	3
	Well maintained/ in good condition	185	More cycle/walkways required	1
	Other	47	Poorly maintained	13
Sports grounds			Other	11
	Clean	41	No rubbish bins/ took away rubbish bins	2
	Layout is good	24	Facilities poorly maintained	4
	Well maintained/ in good condition	155	Other	9
Bike Paths & Tracks	Other	27		
	Other	24	Other	6
	Good, quality	76	Poorly maintained	15
	Well maintained	58	More needed, not enough	3
Toilets	Lots, plenty, variety	14		
	Well maintained/ clean	73	Insufficient public toilets	8
	Other	19	Poor public toilet hygiene	18
			Maintenance issues	11
Swimming Pools			Other	9
	Clean	42	Issues: Need new/ upgraded pool	2
	Layout is good	22	Overcrowded	1
	Well maintained/ in good condition	122	Not well maintained	1
Cemeteries and war memorials	Other	42	Other	9
	Clean	46	Cemeteries poorly maintained	5
	Layout is good	19	Council uninvolved	0
	Well maintained/ in good condition	144	Other	7
	Other	28		

Chart 30 Trend analysis – Community facilities longitudinal proportionally recalibrated ratings



(2017 n=268-388)

Over the past 10 years, the *Community facilities* ratings have shown stable performance.

14. Roads and footpaths

Residents were informed that “The Council is responsible for all the roads in Marlborough except the state highways, this includes street lighting”. Residents were then asked: “In the district, EXCLUDING State Highways, on a scale of 1 to 9 where 1=not at all well, 5=neutral and 9=extremely well, how well do you think the Council performs providing these four services?” Mean scores for all deliverables were then aggregated and averaged within this section to provide an indication of overall performance satisfaction for this service.

Chart 31 Roads and footpaths mean satisfaction ratings by area



Scale recalibrated from 1-9 to 1-10; N/A removed. (Total 2017 responses n=252-392) Note: small response sample sizes in some areas. Numbers at top of coloured bars represent the number of residents providing a rating for each deliverable in each area.

Table 22 Roads and footpaths satisfaction percentages by area

Area	Sealed Roads	Unsealed roads	Footpaths	Street lighting
Marlborough Sounds	65.7%	33.3%	50.0%	72.2%
Havelock	60.0%	50.0%	80.0%	60.0%
Picton	78.9%	50.0%	68.4%	86.8%
Western Wairau	60.0%	15.4%	77.8%	77.8%
Renwick	66.7%	28.6%	66.7%	83.3%
Blenheim vicinity	71.7%	61.9%	84.4%	80.0%
Blenheim	68.8%	46.6%	65.7%	78.8%
Awatere	30.8%	22.2%	50.0%	62.5%
Total	68.1%	44.8%	67.9%	79.1%


(n=252-392– N/A removed)

As presented in the charts and tables in this section: Regarding *Roads and Footpaths*, in most instances, the provision of *Street lighting* gained the highest satisfaction ratings across the district (79.1%, close to 2016 results). *Footpaths*, at 67.9%, was up a little from 62.2% in 2016. *Unsealed roads*, at 44.8%, was down from 50.0% in 2016, and received the lowest satisfaction ratings among all four services. Negative comments for the *Unsealed roads* included *Lack of maintenance* and *Potholes*. (Note: does NOT apply to State Highways. Unsealed roads located mainly in Awatere, Marlborough Sounds, and some in Western Wairau)

Table 23 Roads and footpaths unprompted comments

	Positive	Count	Negative	Count
Sealed Roads	Good maintenance	41	Poor sealed roads	32
	Well maintained	66	Poor maintenance	28
	Well sealed	34	Lack of maintenance	29
	Well signposted	21	Potholes	34
	Other	31	Other	22
Unsealed Roads	No problems	5	Poor unsealed roads	24
	Well maintained	20	Poor maintenance	28
	Don't know	1	Lack of maintenance	33
	Other (please specify)	5	Potholes	33
			Other	16
Footpaths	Good condition	41	Poor footpath maintenance	36
	Well maintained	35	Lack of footpaths in the area	26
	No problems	25	Unsafe for the elderly/ mobility scooters	26
	Other	21	Other	16
Street Lighting	Adequate lighting	33	Street lighting inadequate	25
	Good lighting quality	57	Poor light quality	10
	Good/ well lit everywhere	60	Other	13
	Plenty of lighting	42		
	Other	12		

Chart 32 Trend analysis – Roads and footpaths longitudinal proportionally recalibrated ratings




(2017 n=252-392)

Based on a simple linear regression, there was an ongoing improvement in overall satisfaction with *Road and footpaths* over time. Satisfaction ratings for Unsealed and Sealed roads were down a little on the 2016 levels.

15. Flood protection and control

Residents were informed that “The Council provides and maintains a network of stop banks on rivers and drains on the main Wairau floodplain to protect against the risks of flooding and agricultural drainage. Lesser works are carried out in Picton and outside of the main Wairau floodplain at a lower rate charge. Note: Where rivers and drainage rates are not charged (e.g. Awatere), no river works are carried out.” Residents were then asked: “In your local area on a scale of 1 to 9 where 1=not at all well, 5=neutral and 9=extremely well, how well do you think the Council performs in providing this service?”

Chart 33 Flood protection and control mean satisfaction ratings by area



Scale recalibrated from 1-9 to 1-10; N/A removed. (Total 2017 responses n=336) Note: small response sample sizes in most areas. Numbers at top of coloured bars represent the number of residents providing a rating for each deliverable in each area.

Table 24 Flood protection and control satisfaction percentages by area


		Marlborough Sounds	Havelock	Picton	Western Wairau	Renwick	Blenheim vicinity	Blenheim	Awatere	Total
Flood protection and control (%)	Dissatisfied	15.8%	25.0%	15.2%	41.7%	0.0%	11.6%	8.6%	30.0%	11.6%
	Neutral	10.5%	25.0%	12.1%	16.7%	5.9%	4.7%	12.1%	20.0%	11.3%
	Satisfied	73.7%	50.0%	72.7%	41.7%	94.1%	83.7%	79.3%	50.0%	77.1%
Flood protection and control (Counts)	Dissatisfied	3	1	5	5	0	5	17	3	39
	Neutral	2	1	4	2	1	2	24	2	38
	Satisfied	14	2	24	5	16	36	157	5	259
(n=336 – N/A removed)										

As presented in the charts and tables in this section: Across most areas, there were differences in resident satisfaction with *Flood protection and control*, indicating a degree of variation in the provision and quality of these deliverables across the district. Overall 77.1% of all residents (slightly up from 76.1% in 2016) indicated that they were satisfied to some degree. However, smaller communities outside Blenheim were mixed in their levels of performance satisfaction. From a trend perspective, 2017 levels were not dissimilar to the previous years, although the ratings have increased.

Table 25 Flood protection and control unprompted comments

		Count
Positive	Do a good job	43
	Managed well	45
	Rarely floods	51
	Well maintained	37
	Other	22
Negative	Erosion	4
	Not enough maintenance	22
	Other	27

Chart 34 Trend analysis – Flood protection and control longitudinal proportionally recalibrated ratings




(2017 n=336)

The trend for the last 6 surveys showed that levels were similar from one year to the next. The 2017 average rating was up slightly.

16. Sewerage

Residents were informed that “The Council operates sewerage schemes in Blenheim, Renwick, Picton, Seddon, Havelock, Spring Creek, Grovetown, Riverlands and Cloudy Bay Business Park. These cater for both domestic and industrial waste”. Residents were then asked: “If you receive a Council supplied sewerage scheme, on a scale of 1 to 9 where 1=not at all well, 5=neutral and 9=extremely well, how well do you think the Council performs in providing these services?”

Chart 35 Sewerage mean satisfaction ratings by area



Scale recalibrated from 1-9 to 1-10; N/A removed. (Total 2017 responses n=283) Note: small response sample sizes in some areas. Numbers at top of coloured bars represent the number of residents providing a rating for each deliverable in each area.

Table 26 Sewerage satisfaction percentages by area

		Marlborough Sounds	Havelock	Picton	Western Wairau	Renwick	Blenheim vicinity	Blenheim	Awatere	Total
Sewerage (%)	Dissatisfied	0.0%	0.0%	12.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	3.2%
	Neutral	0.0%	25.0%	17.9%	33.3%	6.7%	11.8%	7.3%	25.0%	9.9%
	Satisfied	100.0%	75.0%	69.2%	66.7%	93.3%	88.2%	90.6%	75.0%	86.9%
Sewerage (Counts)	Dissatisfied	0	0	5	0	0	0	4	0	9
	Neutral	0	1	7	1	1	2	14	2	28
	Satisfied	5	3	27	2	14	15	174	6	246


(n=283 – N/A removed)

As presented in the charts and tables in this section: Sewerage achieved the third highest group performance rating in 2017 (8.2, up from 7.9 in 2016). There were 149 *No problems/functions well* responses in other positive comments. 2017 Overall satisfaction was 86.9% (up from 85.0% in 2016).

Table 27 Sewerage unprompted comments

		Count
Positive	No problems/ functions well	149
	No overflow/ leakage	46
	No pungent smells	49
	Other	10
Negative	Poorly designed	1
	Need better maintenance	5
	Need forward planning	2
	Need to prioritise	1
	Other	5

Chart 36 Trend analysis – Sewerage longitudinal proportionally recalibrated ratings




(2017 n=283)

Based on a simple linear regression which fits the data well, the overall satisfaction rating regarding *Sewerage* appears to have increased in the last two years. 2017 ratings were at the same level as the 2011 performance peak.

17. Urban storm water drainage

Residents were informed that “The Council provides a storm water drainage system to manage storm water runoff in urban catchments, predominantly in Blenheim and Picton, and smaller networks in Renwick, Havelock, Spring Creek, Riverlands and Cloudy Bay business park”. Residents were then asked: “on a scale of 1 to 9 where 1=not at all well, 5=neutral and 9=extremely well, how well do you think the Council performs in providing this service?”

Chart 37 Urban storm water drainage mean satisfaction ratings by area



Scale recalibrated from 1-9 to 1-10; N/A removed. (Total 2017 responses n=279) Note: small response sample sizes in some areas. Numbers at top of coloured bars represent the number of residents providing a rating for each deliverable in each area.

Table 28 Urban storm water drainage satisfaction percentages by area

		Marlborough Sounds	Havelock	Picton	Western Wairau	Renwick	Blenheim vicinity	Blenheim	Awatere	Total
Urban storm water drainage (%)	Dissatisfied	40.0%	0.0%	17.1%	0.0%	5.6%	5.6%	9.9%	25.0%	11.1%
	Neutral	20.0%	0.0%	12.2%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	9.3%	25.0%	10.0%
	Satisfied	40.0%	100.0%	70.7%	100.0%	77.8%	94.4%	80.8%	50.0%	78.9%
Urban storm water drainage (Counts)	Dissatisfied	2	0	7	0	1	1	18	2	31
	Neutral	1	0	5	0	3	0	17	2	28
	Satisfied	2	4	29	3	14	17	147	4	220


(n=279 – N/A removed)

As presented in the charts and tables in this section: Urban storm water drainage service satisfaction level has increased in 2017 up to 78.9% (65.5% in 2016). This service showed the second biggest improvement in satisfaction ratings in the past year. Across areas there were differences, however, these variations could correspond with small sample size in some areas and availability of the service provision. There were significantly less negative comments (*Flooding still occurring*), and more residents answered *No problems*. (Note: service available in Blenheim, Picton, Renwick, Havelock, Seddon (not all Awatere) only)

Table 29 Urban storm water drainage unprompted comments

		Count
Positive	No problems	72
	Not much flooding	32
	Very well controlled	21
	Other	7
Negative	Council doesn't follow up	4
	Drains blocked/ need clearing	15
	Flooding still occurring	19
	Irregular mulch/ mowing of banks	2
	Poor maintenance	8
	Rubbish in rivers	4
	Other	10

Chart 38 Trend analysis – Urban storm water drainage longitudinal proportionally recalibrated ratings




(2017 n=279)

The 2017 *Urban storm water drainage* satisfaction level was the highest in the past ten years, at 7.5. A simple linear regression indicates a trend towards improvement.

18. Drinking water

Residents were informed that “The Council operates fresh water supply schemes servicing Blenheim, Renwick, Picton, Awatere, Seddon, Wairau Valley, Havelock and Riverlands/Cloudy bay business parks”. Residents were then asked: “If you receive Council supplied drinking water; on a scale of 1 to 9 where 1=not at all well, 5=neutral and 9=extremely well, how well do you think the Council performs in providing this service?”

Chart 39 Drinking water mean satisfaction ratings by area



Scale recalibrated from 1-9 to 1-10; N/A removed. (Total 2017 responses n=276) Note: small response sample sizes in some areas. Numbers at top of coloured bars represent the number of residents providing a rating for each deliverable in each area.

Table 30 Drinking water satisfaction percentages by area

		Marlborough Sounds	Havelock	Picton	Western Wairau	Renwick	Blenheim vicinity	Blenheim	Awatere	Total
Drinking water (%)	Dissatisfied	0.0%	0.0%	14.6%	0.0%	17.6%	20.0%	1.1%	70.0%	7.6%
	Neutral	0.0%	0.0%	9.8%	66.7%	11.8%	13.3%	4.3%	10.0%	6.9%
	Satisfied	100.0%	100.0%	75.6%	33.3%	70.6%	66.7%	94.6%	20.0%	85.5%
Drinking water (Counts)	Dissatisfied	0	0	6	0	3	3	2	7	21
	Neutral	0	0	4	2	2	2	8	1	19
	Satisfied	2	4	31	1	12	10	174	2	236


(n=276 – N/A removed)

As presented in the charts and tables in this section: Drinking water was rated as the highest priority in 2017. Although it received the highest satisfaction ratings in 2017, there was still a slight mismatch between performance and service prioritisation. At the same time, *Water supply/quality* was the issue highlighted for the Long Term Plan, which may need Council attention. Overall, 85.5% of residents were *Satisfied* to some degree with the service regarding this deliverable (up from 76.0% in 2016). (Note: drinking water provided to Blenheim, Picton, Renwick, Havelock, Awatere valley part of Awatere area, Wairau Valley township (in Western Wairau), Riverlands (in Blenheim vicinity)).

Table 31 Drinking water unprompted comments

		Count
Positive	Good quality	70
	Good supply	81
	Good taste	67
	No problems	93
	Some of the best water in New Zealand	22
	Very good	15
	Other	20
Negative	Water undrinkable	12
	Water of low standard	10
	Costs regarding water supply	1
	Have own supply	1
	Water out of town no good	1
	Other	13

Chart 40 Trend analysis – Drinking water longitudinal proportionally recalibrated ratings




(2017 n=276)

Based on a simple linear regression, there was a trend towards improvement in the average satisfaction ratings for the *Drinking water* deliverable over time, and the 2017 results were above this trend.

19. Waste management

Residents were informed that “The Council provide a range of waste management and minimisation services across the region.” Residents were then asked: “In your local area, on a scale of 1 to 9 where 1=not at all well, 5=neutral and 9=extremely well, how well do you think the Council performs in providing these three services?” Mean scores for all deliverables were then aggregated and averaged within this section to provide an indication of overall performance satisfaction for this service.

Chart 41 Waste management mean satisfaction ratings by area



Scale recalibrated from 1-9 to 1-10; N/A removed. (Total 2017 responses n=283-332) Note: small response sample sizes in some areas. Numbers at top of coloured bars represent the number of residents providing a rating for each deliverable in each area.

Table 32 Waste management satisfaction percentages by area

Area	Kerbside Rubbish & recycling	Regional Waste Transfer Stations, including Hazardous Waste	Resource Recovery Centre, Reuse Shop and green waste composting
Marlborough Sounds	57.1%	80.0%	76.9%
Havelock	0.0%	100.0%	66.7%
Picton	76.3%	71.0%	66.7%
Western Wairau	66.7%	86.7%	85.7%
Renwick	50.0%	66.7%	92.9%
Blenheim vicinity	77.3%	88.9%	86.4%
Blenheim	72.1%	84.0%	84.2%
Awatere	50.0%	81.8%	80.0%
Total	71.7%	82.5%	83.0%


(n=283-332– N/A removed)

As presented in the charts and tables in this section: Across the district, 79.1% of residents indicated that they were satisfied with the performance of the Council’s with *Waste management*. Reasons for positive and negative ratings varied across services. There was a slight increase with the satisfaction levels for *Regional Waste Transfer stations* (82.5%) and *Resource Recovery Centre* (83.0%) during the 2017 survey compared to the previous year. *Kerbside rubbish and recycling* was slightly down (71.7%, against 78.8% in 2016). (Note: services provided to Blenheim and Picton for kerbside collections, resource recovery centres sites across the district, resource recovery and reuse centre is based in Blenheim)

Table 33 Waste management unprompted comments

	Positive	Count	Negative	Count
Kerbside Rubbish & Recycling	Excellent	31	Expensive	3
	Great service/ pick up good	91	No kerb-side collection	12
	Reliable/ on time	45	Need to recycle	9
	Other	23	Recycling charged should be free	5
			Recycling bins needed	24
			Service is inadequate	18
			Other	31
Waste Transfer	Accessible - easy to get to	39	Expensive	17
	Convenient	32	Inconsistent with pricing and service	5
	Easy to access	34	Service is inadequate	7
	Efficient	18	Other	7
	Everything runs smoothly	22		
	Excellent service	23		
	Friendly staff	19		
	Good convenient service	20		
	Good facility	58		
	Good service/ it is good	35		
	Great service	15		
	Very good	14		
	Well managed	27		
	Other	35		
Resource Recovery	Accessible	51	Expensive	15
	Convenient	50	Recycling charges should be free	8
	Easy to use	57	Need to recycle	7
	Good parking	26	Service is inadequate	8
	Good service/ well managed	96	Fees too high	10
	Good to be able to easily recycle	41	Other	9
	Other	30		

Chart 42 Trend analysis – Waste management longitudinal proportionally recalibrated ratings




(2017 n=283-332)

Based on a simple linear regression, the average performance of this variable peaked around 2011 to 2012. The 2017 results were close to 2016.

20. Environmental policy and monitoring

Residents were informed that “The Council monitors and reports on the state of Marlborough’s environment, including air, land, water and coastal resources. Information collected is then used to inform the public on the condition of these natural resources and helps Council develop policies for the sustainable use and management of the district’s resources.” Residents were then asked: “On a scale of 1 to 9 where 1=not at all well, 5=neutral and 9=extremely well, how well do you think the Council performs in providing these two services?” Mean scores for all deliverables were then aggregated and averaged within this section to provide an indication of overall performance satisfaction for this service.

Chart 43 Environmental policy and monitoring mean satisfaction ratings by area



Scale recalibrated from 1-9 to 1-10; N/A removed. (Total 2017 responses n=274-285) Note: small response sample sizes in some areas. Numbers at top of coloured bars represent the number of residents providing a rating for each deliverable in each area.

Table 34 Environmental policy and monitoring satisfaction percentages by area

Area	Developing Resource Management policies under the Resource Management Act	Environmental monitoring and information provision
Marlborough Sounds	35.7%	33.3%
Havelock	75.0%	50.0%
Picton	56.5%	54.2%
Western Wairau	53.8%	70.0%
Renwick	46.2%	53.8%
Blenheim vicinity	66.7%	72.1%
Blenheim	62.0%	63.4%
Awatere	55.6%	45.5%
Total	58.4%	60.0%


(n=274-285– N/A removed)

As presented in the charts and tables in this section: Across most areas, performance rating levels were similar for both *Policy development* and *Monitoring provisions*. The *RMA development* satisfaction level was 58.4% (59.1% in 2016) and *monitoring* was 60.0% (61.9% in 2016); both were slightly down from 2016 results.

Table 35 Environmental policy and monitoring unprompted comments

	Positive	Count	Negative	Count
Developing Resource Management policies under the Resource Management Act	Do a good job	36	Issue: Pollution	17
	Other	12	Issue: Spray from vineyards	9
			Issue: Usage and monitoring of rivers	11
			Control not effective	13
			Council direction ineffective	15
			Lack of environmental monitoring	15
			Lack of information about environmental monitoring	12
			Other	27
Environmental monitoring and information provision	Do a good job	31	Issue: Pollution	13
	Good information flow	25	Issue: Spray from vineyards	10
	Other	6	Issue: Usage and monitoring of rivers	10
			Control not effective	14
			Council direction ineffective	11
			Lack of environmental monitoring	24
			Lack of information about environmental monitoring	16
			Other	20

Chart 44 Trend analysis – Environmental policy and monitoring longitudinal proportionally recalibrated ratings




(2017 n=274-285)

Based on a simple linear regression, *Environmental policy and monitoring* levels have remained consistent over time.

21. Consents and compliance

Residents were informed that “The Council administers a wide variety of regulatory functions, powers and duties. Many of these are legislated by government.” Residents were then asked: “In your local area, on a scale of 1 to 9 where 1=not at all well, 5=neutral and 9=extremely well, how well do you think the Council performs in providing these five services?” Mean scores for all deliverables were then aggregated and averaged within this section to provide an indication of overall performance satisfaction for this service.

Chart 45 Consents and compliance mean satisfaction ratings by area



Scale recalibrated from 1-9 to 1-10; N/A removed. (Total 2017 responses n=246-285) Note: small response sample sizes in some areas. Numbers at top of coloured bars represent the number of residents providing a rating for each deliverable in each area.

Table 36 Consents and compliance satisfaction percentages by area

Area	RMA - resource consents	RMA - monitoring compliance with consent conditions	Building Act - building consents	Sale and supply of alcohol Act	Health and Foods Act
Marlborough Sounds	54.2%	43.5%	61.9%	58.3%	76.5%
Havelock	50.0%	100.0%	50.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Picton	60.9%	59.1%	48.0%	73.3%	82.1%
Western Wairau	42.9%	30.8%	41.7%	90.0%	81.8%
Renwick	63.6%	63.6%	75.0%	85.7%	90.0%
Blenheim vicinity	51.2%	58.3%	77.4%	78.6%	81.8%
Blenheim	53.1%	55.7%	59.9%	77.6%	82.0%
Awatere	70.0%	62.5%	36.4%	50.0%	66.7%
Total	54.1%	54.9%	59.7%	76.5%	81.5%

(n=246-285– N/A removed)

As presented in the charts and tables in this section: Overall satisfaction levels went up slightly across all services. The major improvement was for *Health and Foods Act* satisfaction level (81.5%, up from 74.7% in 2016). The lowest satisfaction was for *RMA resource consents* at 54.1%, although it was still slightly up from 2016 results.

Table 37 Consents and compliance unprompted comments

	Positive	Count	Negative	Count
RMA - resource consents	Do a good job	19	Council costs too high	18
	Efficient	7	Council needs to communicate with landowners	16
	Provide a good service	14	No follow-up or enforcement	5
	Other	7	Slow/ takes too long	37
RMA - monitoring			Too much red tape	28
			Other	19
	Do a good job	22	Council needs to communicate with landowners	8
	Efficient	8	No follow-up or enforcement	13
Building Act	Provide a good service	10	Slow/ takes too long	17
	Other	9	Too much red tape	11
			Other	14
	Building inspectors helpful	7	Building consents take too long	25
Sale and supply of alcohol Act	Do the job well/ good job	22	Too much red tape	22
	No problems/ issues	11	Compliance costs too high	14
	Provide a good service	9	Council needs to communicate with landowners	8
	Other	10	Other	9
Health and Foods Act	Good	26	Better monitoring needed	9
	Monitoring underage drinking	28	Council doesn't listen to community	1
	No problems	17	No follow-up or enforcement	5
	Thorough ID checks made so working well	10	Safe liquor doesn't get policed	5
Health and Foods Act	Well managed/ well monitored/ regulated	38	Should increase drinking age	3
	Other	16	Should listen to the community	2
			Other	10
	Do a good job	29	Council doesn't listen to community	1
Health and Foods Act	Good health inspectors	12	No follow-up or enforcement	2
	Hood high standards and close monitoring	6	Restaurants should show ratings	2
	Good standards overall	20	Other	7
	No problems heard of	16		
Health and Foods Act	NZ standards/ restaurants standards are good	4		
	Other	18		

Chart 46 Trend analysis – Consents and compliance longitudinal proportionally recalibrated ratings




(2017 n=246-285)

Based on a simple linear regression, overall ratings for each of these services were on a par with previous years.

22. Biosecurity

Residents were informed that “Landowners are primarily responsible for controlling ‘declared’ regional animal and pest plants on their own properties. The Council is responsible for the monitoring of regional pests and works with landowners to ensure they are aware of their pest management responsibilities, providing information, and ensuring that landowners carry out the control of pests on their property to specified levels. Residents were then asked: “In your local area, on a scale of 1 to 9 where 1=not at all well, 5=neutral and 9=extremely well, how well do you think the Council performs in providing these two services?” Mean scores for all deliverables were then aggregated and averaged within this section to provide an indication of overall performance satisfaction for this service.

Chart 47 Biosecurity mean satisfaction ratings by area



Scale recalibrated from 1-9 to 1-10; N/A removed. (Total 2016 responses n=265-287) Note: small response sample sizes in some areas. Numbers at top of coloured bars represent the number of residents providing a rating for each deliverable in each area.

Table 38 Biosecurity satisfaction percentages by area

Area	Assisting landowners to manage animal pests	Assisting landowners to manage plant pests
Marlborough Sounds	20.8%	34.8%
Havelock	75.0%	50.0%
Picton	60.7%	24.2%
Western Wairau	14.3%	26.7%
Renwick	58.3%	50.0%
Blenheim vicinity	44.7%	48.7%
Blenheim	55.6%	58.5%
Awatere	33.3%	41.7%
Total	48.7%	48.4%


(n=265-287– N/A removed)

As presented in the charts and tables in this section: Biosecurity has shown the largest increase in terms of prioritisation preferences in the last 3 years. Although this service received the biggest mismatch between performance rating and perceived priority, this mismatch was recorded for the 2014 results as well. Reasons for negative comments were *No visible council involvement* and *Have to control pests ourselves*. The satisfaction level with *Animal pest control* was 48.7%, and 48.4% for *Plant pest control*, both services showed a decrease. (Note: these services are strategically targeted; pests are mostly present in Blenheim vicinity and to some extent in Western Wairau and Awatere)

Table 39 Biosecurity unprompted comments

	Positive	Count	Negative	Count
Animal	Council doing a good job	44	Don't like use of poisons	1
	Other	17	Issue: Opossums	6
			Issue: Rabbits	6
			Issue: Wild cats	7
			No visible council involvement/ Have to control pests ourselves	54
			Pest control national NOT local issue	1
			Other	17
Plant	Council doing a good job	39	Issue: Gorse	18
	No problems	8	Issue: Old Mans Beard	30
	Other	11	Have to control pests ourselves	36
			Lack of information about pests	13
			Council doesn't keep you informed	22
			Other	28

Chart 48 Trend analysis – Biosecurity longitudinal proportionally recalibrated ratings




(2017 n=265-287)

Based on a simple linear regression, across both biosecurity services there was the annual increase then decrease pattern that started in 2009. The 2017 results were very close to 2016 satisfaction ratings.

23. Animal control

Residents were informed that “The Council provides services in relation to the control of dogs and wandering livestock.” Residents were then asked: “On a scale of 1 to 9 where 1=not at all well, 5=neutral and 9=extremely well, how well do you think the Council performs in providing these two services?” Mean scores for all deliverables were then aggregated and averaged within this section to provide an indication of overall performance satisfaction for this service.

Chart 49 Animal control mean satisfaction ratings by area



Scale recalibrated from 1-9 to 1-10; N/A removed. (Total 2017 responses n=200-352): small response sample sizes in some areas. Numbers at top of coloured bars represent the number of residents providing a rating for each deliverable in each area.

Table 40 Animal control satisfaction percentages by area

Area	Dog control	Control of wandering Livestock
Marlborough Sounds	72.4%	73.9%
Havelock	66.7%	66.7%
Picton	80.0%	81.8%
Western Wairau	68.8%	53.3%
Renwick	78.6%	100.0%
Blenheim vicinity	79.6%	78.4%
Blenheim	78.9%	85.9%
Awatere	58.3%	75.0%
Total	77.3%	80.5%


(n=200-352– N/A removed)

As presented in the charts and tables in this section: There were more positive comments related to this service in 2017. These included *Don't see dogs or livestock roaming around*, and *Good service/No problems*. Overall, 78.9% of residents were satisfied with the Council's performance in these areas. Both performance ratings increased in 2017. (Note: dog issues are mainly in larger urban areas, wandering livestock – all areas)

Table 41 Animal control unprompted comments

	Positive	Count	Negative	Count
Dog control	Act quickly	25	Council does not do much to control animals	15
	Always very good/ sympathetic	16	Dog faeces in public places an issue	7
	Don't see dogs roaming around	49	Licensing too expensive	5
	Effective	17	Not getting any service from Dog Control	10
	Excellent	7	Poor levels of animal control	11
	Good	18	Other	14
	Good service	45		
	No problems	19		
	Prompt service	23		
	Respond quickly	16		
	Other	13		
Control of wandering Livestock	Don't see livestock roaming	31	Council does not do much to control animals	11
	Excellent	5	Poor levels of animal control	8
	Good	20	Other	4
	No issues	14		
	No problems	12		
	Other	8		

Chart 50 Trend analysis – Animal control longitudinal proportionally recalibrated ratings




(2017 n=200-352)

Based on a simple linear regression, the *Animal control* service average satisfaction ratings were similar over previous years.

24. Harbours

Residents were informed that “The Council is responsible for all matters of navigation and safety within Marlborough’s coastal waterways, including D’Urville Island, the Marlborough Sounds, Port Underwood, Clifford and Cloudy Bays including the maintenance of navigation aids.” Residents were then asked: “On a scale of 1 to 9 where 1=not at all well, 5=neutral and 9=extremely well, how well do you think the Council performs in providing this service?”

Chart 51 Harbours mean satisfaction ratings by area



Scale recalibrated from 1-9 to 1-10; N/A removed. (Total 2017 responses n=232) Note: small response sample sizes in some areas. Numbers at top of coloured bars represent the number of residents providing a rating for each deliverable in each area.

Table 42 Harbours satisfaction percentages by area

		Marlborough Sounds	Havelock	Picton	Western Wairau	Renwick	Blenheim vicinity	Blenheim	Awatere	Total
Harbours (%)	Dissatisfied	11.1%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	18.2%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	3.4%
	Neutral	18.5%	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	19.2%	12.5%	15.5%
	Satisfied	70.4%	75.0%	80.0%	100.0%	81.8%	90.0%	78.8%	87.5%	81.0%
Harbours (Counts)	Dissatisfied	3	1	0	0	2	0	2	0	8
	Neutral	5	0	6	0	0	4	20	1	36
	Satisfied	19	3	24	8	9	36	82	7	188


(n=232– N/A removed)

As presented in the charts and tables in this section: Across most areas, as well as over time, there has been a level of consistency in resident satisfaction with the Council’s provision for *Harbours*. The 2017 year resulted in 81.0% (up from 80.0% in 2016) of residents being satisfied with the service relating to *Harbours*. (Note: applies to Marlborough Sounds, Havelock, Picton, Blenheim vicinity and Awatere, however, boat owners live across the district)

Table 43 Harbours unprompted comments

		Count
Positive	Are strict and good	13
	Are very good at maintaining the equipment they use	33
	Good	17
	Good job	24
	Good monitoring	25
	Good services overall	21
	Nothing ever goes wrong	9
	Well managed	22
	Other	26
Negative	Boat speed limits need policing	4
	Council should impose additional costs	1
	Harbour needs better management	3
	Provide courses on navigation safety	1
	Over-regulated	0
	Other	5

Chart 52 Trend analysis – Harbours longitudinal proportionally recalibrated ratings




(2017 n=232)

Based on a simple linear regression, the average *Harbours* service satisfaction rating showed a slight improvement in the past three years.

25. Regional development

Residents were informed that “The Council has a number of services that support regional development. These include developing the region’s ‘smart and connected’ vision, encouraging the establishment of businesses and leading a number of projects to assist key industry sectors. Council also provides car parking, and irrigation of the Southern Valleys.” Residents were then asked: “On a scale of 1 to 9 where 1=not at all well, 5=neutral and 9=extremely well, how well do you think the Council performs in providing these three services?” Mean scores for all deliverables were then aggregated and averaged within this section to provide an indication of overall performance satisfaction for this service.

Chart 53 Regional development mean satisfaction ratings by area



Scale recalibrated from 1-9 to 1-10; N/A removed. (Total 2017 responses n=148-379) Note: small response sample sizes in some areas. Numbers at top of coloured bars represent the number of residents providing a rating for each deliverable in each area.

Table 44 Regional development satisfaction percentages by area

Area	Economic development	Car parking	Irrigation of the Southern Valleys
Marlborough Sounds	55.0%	62.1%	57.1%
Havelock	75.0%	80.0%	100.0%
Picton	73.5%	70.0%	42.9%
Western Wairau	66.7%	70.6%	58.3%
Renwick	53.8%	55.6%	71.4%
Blenheim vicinity	73.9%	67.3%	69.0%
Blenheim	65.9%	66.3%	65.3%
Awatere	53.8%	53.8%	60.0%
Total	66.4%	66.0%	64.2%


(n=148-379– N/A removed)

As presented in the charts and tables in this section: Across all three services there was a good increase in satisfaction levels for regional development. The biggest changes were shown for *Irrigation of the Southern Valleys* (64.2%, up from 42.8% in 2016). There were less negative comments in 2017, and more positive feedback referring to *Do a good job, Good/plenty of parking available, and Good across all three services*.

Table 45 Regional development unprompted comments

	Positive	Count	Negative	Count
Economic development	Do a good job	25	Actions impede business development	11
	Does well in supporting business	20	Communication issues	6
	Very good	7	Cost is too high	8
	Other	9	Council shouldn't be involved	5
			Ineffective	11
			Narrow focus - tourism & wine	14
			Need to allow new development	12
			Other	23
Car parking	Adequate parking	39	Insufficient parking	27
	Always available	34	Parking meters too expensive	33
	Good/ plenty of parking available	62	Other	42
	Other	20		
Irrigation of the Southern Valleys	Do well maintaining water supplies	3	Costs regarding water supply	1
	Good	14	Have own supply	1
	No problems	4	Restrictions on water use	1
	Other	8	Water out of town not good	0
			No supply	0
			Other	14

Chart 54 Trend analysis – Regional development longitudinal proportionally recalibrated ratings




(2017 n=148-379)

Based on a simple linear regression there were no major changes in *Regional development* satisfaction ratings over time. The 2017 survey results were slightly higher than 2016, but similar to 2015.

26. Tourism

Residents were informed that “The Council is the principal funder of Destination Marlborough, which is responsible for promoting Marlborough as a visitor destination to national and international tourists.” Residents were then asked: “On a scale of 1 to 9 where 1=not at all well, 5=neutral and 9=extremely well, how well do you think the Council performs in providing this service?”

Chart 55 Tourism mean satisfaction ratings by area



Scale recalibrated from 1-9 to 1-10; N/A removed. (Total 2017 responses n=352) Note: small response sample sizes in some areas. Numbers at top of coloured bars represent the number of residents providing a rating for each deliverable in each area.

Table 46 Tourism satisfaction percentages by area

		Marlborough Sounds	Havelock	Picton	Western Wairau	Renwick	Blenheim vicinity	Blenheim	Awatere	Total
Tourism (%)	Dissatisfied	13.3%	20.0%	12.1%	20.0%	42.9%	6.1%	16.6%	23.1%	15.9%
	Neutral	10.0%	0.0%	24.2%	6.7%	0.0%	10.2%	11.4%	30.8%	12.2%
	Satisfied	76.7%	80.0%	63.6%	73.3%	57.1%	83.7%	72.0%	46.2%	71.9%
Tourism (Counts)	Dissatisfied	4	1	4	3	6	3	32	3	56
	Neutral	3	0	8	1	0	5	22	4	43
	Satisfied	23	4	21	11	8	41	139	6	253


(n=352– N/A removed)

As presented in the charts and tables in this section: Overall, 71.9% of residents were satisfied with Council’s *Tourism* service (slightly down from 76.6% in 2016). The satisfaction ratings varied across different areas. The negative comments referring to *Tourism* included *More effort – room to improve* and *Poorly managed*.

Table 47 Tourism unprompted comments

		Count
Positive	Advertise well/ good advertising	14
	Council performs well and supporting tourism	27
	Doing a good job	38
	Good information/ brochures	13
	Lots of tourism in the area	10
	Promote the region well	29
	Tourism well promoted	15
	Other	18
Negative	Cost - is this appropriate for Council?	8
	Customer service & information centre poor	5
	More effort - room to improve	22
	More information required	7
	Poorly managed	20
	Other	27

Chart 56 Trend analysis – Tourism longitudinal proportionally recalibrated ratings




(2017 n=352)

A simple linear regression analysis shows no change over time for the *Tourism* service deliverable, although the 2017 average performance rating was slightly down.

27. Marlborough Research Centre

Residents were informed that “The Council is a part funder of the Marlborough research centre. This centre undertakes research into viticulture and other primary production sectors that help to ensure Marlborough's primary industries have access to world-class research and advisory services.” Residents were then asked: “On a scale of 1 to 9 where 1=not at all well, 5=neutral and 9=extremely well, how well do you think the Council performs in providing this service?”

Chart 57 Marlborough Research Centre mean satisfaction ratings by area



Scale recalibrated from 1-9 to 1-10; N/A removed. (Total 2017 responses n=217) Note: small response sample sizes in some areas. Numbers at top of coloured bars represent the number of residents providing a rating for each deliverable in each area.

Table 48 Marlborough Research Centre satisfaction percentages by area

		Marlborough Sounds	Havelock	Picton	Western Wairau	Renwick	Blenheim vicinity	Blenheim	Awatere	Total
Marlborough Research Centre (%)	Dissatisfied	15.4%	0.0%	10.0%	9.1%	0.0%	2.6%	5.3%	0.0%	5.5%
	Neutral	7.7%	0.0%	15.0%	36.4%	18.2%	18.4%	24.6%	0.0%	20.7%
	Satisfied	76.9%	100.0%	75.0%	54.5%	81.8%	78.9%	70.2%	100.0%	73.7%
Marlborough Research Centre (Counts)	Dissatisfied	2	0	2	1	0	1	6	0	12
	Neutral	1	0	3	4	2	7	28	0	45
	Satisfied	10	2	15	6	9	30	80	8	160


(n=217 – N/A removed)

As presented in the charts and tables in this section: The recent year showed an increase in overall satisfaction level for Marlborough Research Centre (73.7%, up from 61.4% in 2016). Reasons for higher ratings included *Provide a good service*.

Table 49 Marlborough research centre unprompted comments

		Count
Positive	Do a thorough job	28
	Provide a good service	31
	Other	31
Negative	Council shouldn't be involved/ private sector role	1
	Too much focus on grapes	8
	Don't see any results	1
	Other	6

Chart 58 Trend analysis – Marlborough Research Centre longitudinal proportionally recalibrated ratings



(2017 n=217)

Simple linear regression analysis revealed no significant trend over time for the *Marlborough Research Centre* service deliverable, however, 2017 results showed its highest performance score in the last ten years.

Appendix 1

Questionnaire 1

1. Firstly, we need to ensure that we speak with a cross section of the community. Which of the following age groups do you fit into?
2. Is the home where you live owned by someone who lives in the household, or is it rented?
3. The Council is responsible for all the roads in Marlborough except the state highways, this includes street lighting. In the district, EXCLUDING State Highways, on a scale of 1-9 where 1=not at all well, 5=neutral and 9=extremely well, how well do you think the Council performs providing:
 - a. Sealed roads: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask “why did you give it that rating?”
 - b. Unsealed roads: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask “why did you give it that rating?”
 - c. Footpaths: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask “why did you give it that rating?”
 - d. Street lighting: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask “why did you give it that rating?”
4. The Council operates sewerage schemes in Blenheim, Renwick, Picton, Seddon, Havelock, Spring Creek, Grovetown, Riverlands, and Cloudy Bay Business Park. These cater for both domestic and industrial waste. If you receive a Council supplied sewerage scheme, on a scale of 1-9 where 1=not at all well, 5=neutral and 9=extremely well, how well do you think the Council performs providing...
 - a. Sewerage services in general: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask “why did you give it that rating?”
5. The Council provides and maintains a network of stop banks on rivers and drains on the main Wairau floodplain to protect against the risks of flooding and agricultural drainage. Lesser works are carried out in Picton and outside of the main Wairau floodplain at a lower rate charge. Note: Where rivers and drainage rates are not charged (e.g. Awatere), no river works are carried out. In your local area, using the same scale, how well do you think the Council performs providing...
 - a. Flood protection and control works: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask “why did you give it that rating?”
6. The Council provide a range of waste management and minimisation services across the region. In your local area, on a scale of 1-9 where 1=not at all well, 5=neutral and 9=extremely well, how well do you think the Council performs in providing...
 - a. Kerbside Rubbish and Recycling Collection in Blenheim and Picton: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask “why did you give it that rating?”
 - b. Regional Waste Transfer Stations, including Hazardous Waste: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask “why did you give it that rating?”
 - c. Resource Recovery Centre, Reuse Shop, and green waste composting: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask “why did you give it that rating?”
7. The Council manages culture and heritage assets and resources, provides culture and heritage grants, and works with local groups to support and develop our arts, culture, and heritage resources. Using the same scale, how well do you think the Council performs in supporting...
 - a. Culture and heritage in the district: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask “why did you give it that rating?”

8. The Council values community engagement in making decisions that affect the community. On a scale of 1-9 where 1=not at all well, 5=neutral and 9=extremely well, how well do you think the Council assists residents in providing...
 - a. Information about Council Business: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask "why did you give it that rating?"
 - b. Information on Council meetings: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask "why did you give it that rating?"
9. The Council operates two public libraries, at Blenheim and Picton, and supports community libraries in Ward, Renwick, Havelock, and Waitaria Bay. Using the same scale, how well do you think the Council performs in providing...
 - a. a. Public libraries in Blenheim and Picton: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask "why did you give it that rating?"
 - b. b. Community libraries in Ward, Renwick, Havelock, and Waitaria Bay: if rating under 4 or over 8 ask "why did you give it that rating?"
10. The Council is responsible for all matters of navigation and safety within Marlborough's coastal waterways, including D'Urville Island, the Marlborough Sounds, Port Underwood, Clifford, and Cloudy Bays including the maintenance of navigation aids. On a scale of 1-9 where 1=not at all well, 5=neutral and 9=extremely well, how well do you think the Council performs in providing...
 - a. Harbour Control: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask "why did you give it that rating?"
11. The Council provides a range of diverse, services and activities to support the community. Using the same scale, how well do you think the Council performs in providing ...
 - a. Community support services-for positive aging, youth, community grants: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask "why did you give it that rating?"
 - b. Blenheim bus service: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask "why did you give it that rating?"
 - c. Total mobility scheme for the disabled: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask "why did you give it that rating?"
 - d. Funding for community events: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask "why did you give it that rating?"
12. The Council monitors and reports on the state of Marlborough's environment, including air, land, water, and coastal resources. Information collected is then used to inform the public on the condition of these natural resources and helps Council develop policies for the sustainable use and management of the district's resources. On a scale of 1-9 where 1=not at all well, 5=neutral and 9=extremely well, how well do you think the Council completes these functions...
 - a. Developing Resource management policies under the Resource Management Act: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask "why did you give it that rating?"
 - b. Environmental monitoring and information provision: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask "why did you give it that rating?"
13. The Council is the principal funder of Destination Marlborough, which is responsible for promoting Marlborough as a visitor destination to national and international tourists. Using the same scale, how well do you think the Council supports...
 - a. Tourism: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask "why did you give it that rating?"

14. The council needs to ensure priorities are established to best meet the needs of the community. Using the scale where 1=not at all important, 5=neutral and 9=extremely important, please rate the level of importance the council should place in prioritising service's with regards to the 10 following services and facilities: *Community support, Culture and heritage, Democratic process, Environmental policy and monitoring, Flood protection and control works, Harbours, Library services, Roads and footpaths, Sewerage, Solid waste management, and Tourism.*
15. The Council is planning its Long Term Plan for the next 10 years. Is there a project you think the Council should get involved with? Or is there an issue or problem you think we should address?
16. Have you had any direct contact with the Council in the past 12 months?
17. In what ways was that contact made?
18. On a scale of 1-9; where 1=not at all well, 5=neutral and 9=extremely well, how would you rate your overall contact with the Council?
19. On a scale of 1-9; where 1=not at all well, 5=neutral and 9=extremely well, how would you rate the overall performance of the Marlborough District Council over the last 12 months?
20. How long have you lived in Marlborough?
21. Which of the following best describes your household's annual income before tax?

Questionnaire 2

1. Firstly, we need to ensure that we speak with a cross section of the community. Which of the following age groups do you fit into?
2. Is the home where you live owned by someone who lives in the household, or is it rented?
3. Now I'm going to ask you about the various water services provided by the Council. The Council operates fresh water supply schemes servicing Blenheim, Renwick, Picton, Awatere, Seddon, Wairau Valley, Havelock, and Riverlands/Cloudy bay business parks. If you receive Council supplied drinking water; on a scale of 1-9 where 1=not at all well, 5=neutral and 9=extremely well, how well do you think the Council performs in providing...
 - a. Drinking Water Supply: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask "why did you give it that rating?"
4. The Council provides a storm water drainage system to manage storm water runoff in urban catchments, predominantly in Blenheim and Picton, and smaller networks in Renwick, Havelock, Spring Creek, Riverlands, and Cloudy Bay business park. On a scale of 1-9 where 1=not at all well, 5=neutral and 9=extremely well, how well do you think the Council performs in providing...
 - a. Urban storm water drainage: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask "why did you give it that rating?"
5. Landowners are primarily responsible for controlling 'declared' regional animal and pest plants on their own properties. The Council is responsible for the monitoring of regional pests and works with landowners to ensure that they are aware of their pest management responsibilities, providing information, and ensuring that landowners carry out the control of pests on their property to specified levels. In your local area, using the same 1-9 scale, how well do you think the Council performs in...
 - a. Monitoring of pest animals and working with landowners to ensure they manage their pests (such as rabbits): If rating under 4 or over 8 ask "why did you give it that rating?"
 - b. Monitoring of pest plants and working with landowners to ensure they manage their pest plants (such as Nassella Tussock and Chilean Needle Grass): If rating under 4 or over 8 ask "why did you give it that rating?"
6. The Council manages and maintains a variety of community facilities. On a scale of 1-9 where 1=not at all well, 5=neutral and 9=extremely well, how well do you think the Council manages and maintains these facilities...
 - a. Parks, reserves, and open spaces: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask "why did you give it that rating?"
 - b. Sports grounds: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask "why did you give it that rating?"
 - c. Paths, walkways, and tracks for walking and biking: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask "why did you give it that rating?"
 - d. Swimming Pools: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask "why did you give it that rating?"
 - e. Cemeteries and war memorials: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask "why did you give it that rating?"
 - f. Public Toilets: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask "why did you give it that rating?"
7. The Council administers a wide variety of regulatory functions, powers and duties. Many of these are legislated by government. In your local area, using the same scale, how well do you think the Council performs in administering services related to the ...

- a. Resource Management Act resource consents: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask “why did you give it that rating?”
 - b. Resource Management Act, monitoring compliance with consent conditions: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask “why did you give it that rating?”
 - c. Building Act building consents: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask “why did you give it that rating?”
 - d. Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask “why did you give it that rating?”
 - e. Health and Foods Act: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask “why did you give it that rating?”
8. The Council owns about 170 housing units that are available to older people, and rented at discounted rates. On a scale of 1-9 where 1=not at all well, 5=neutral and 9=extremely well, how well do you think the Council performs in providing this service
 - a. Community housing: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask “why did you give it that rating?”
9. The Council provides services in relation to the control of dogs and wandering livestock. Using the same scale, how well do you think the Council performs in providing...
 - a. Dog control: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask “why did you give it that rating?”
 - b. Control of wandering Livestock: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask “why did you give it that rating?”
10. The Council works closely with agencies in the policing, education, and health sectors to address some of the root causes of behaviours that affect community safety. This includes security cameras in the Blenheim CBD, and restorative justice and crime prevention through environmental design. On a scale of 1-9 where 1=not at all well, 5=neutral and 9=extremely well, how well do you think the Council performs in supporting...
 - a. Community Safety: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask “why did you give it that rating?”
11. The Council is a member of Marlborough Kaikoura Rural Fire Authority. Council also maintains an emergency management centre and is responsible for managing and responding to natural disasters and emergency events including floods and earthquakes. Using the same scale, how well do you think the Council performs in providing...
 - a. Rural fire fighting: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask “why did you give it that rating?”
 - b. Civil Defence Emergency management: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask “why did you give it that rating?”
12. The Council has a number of services that support regional development. These include developing the region's 'smart and connected' vision, encouraging the establishment of businesses, and leading a number of projects to assist key industry sectors. Council also provides car parking and irrigation of the Southern Valleys. On a scale of 1-9 where 1=not at all well, 5=neutral and 9=extremely well, how well do you think the Council performs in providing...
 - a. Economic development: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask “why did you give it that rating?”
 - b. Car parking: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask “why did you give it that rating?”
 - c. Irrigation of the Southern Valleys: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask “why did you give it that rating?”
13. The Council is a part funder of the Marlborough Research Centre. This centre undertakes research into viticulture and other primary production sectors that help to ensure Marlborough's primary industries have

access to world-class research and advisory services. Using the same scale, how well do you think the Council performs in supporting...

a. Crop research: If rating under 4 or over 8 ask “why did you give it that rating?”

14. The council needs to ensure priorities are established to best meet the needs of the community. Using the scale where 1=not at all important, 5=neutral and 9=extremely important, please rate the level of importance the Council should place on prioritising service's with regards to the 10 following services and facilities: *Animal control, Biosecurity, Community facilities, Community housing, Community safety, Consents and compliance, Drinking water supply, Emergency management, Marlborough Research centre, Regional development, and Urban storm water drainage.*
15. The Council is planning its Long Term Plan for the next 10 years. Is there a project you think the Council should get involved with? Or is there an issue or problem you think we should address?
16. Have you had any direct contact with the Council in the past 12 months?
17. In what ways was that contact made?
18. On a scale of 1-9; where 1=not at all well, 5=neutral and 9=extremely well, how would you rate your overall contact with the Council?
19. On a scale of 1-9; where 1=not at all well, 5=neutral and 9=extremely well, how would you rate the overall performance of the Marlborough District Council over the last 12 months?
20. How long have you lived in Marlborough?
21. Which of the following best describes your household's annual income before tax?

Appendix 2

Demographic data

Table 50 Resident home ownership status

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Own	709	88.6	88.6	88.6
Rented	60	7.5	7.5	96.1
Private trust	21	2.6	2.6	98.8
Other (please specify)	9	1.1	1.1	99.9
Refused	1	0.1	0.1	100.0
Total	800	100.0	100.0	

Table 51 Resident income status

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Under \$10,000	1	0.1	0.1	0.1
\$10-\$25,000	69	8.6	9.0	9.1
\$25-\$40,000	119	14.9	15.5	24.6
\$40-\$55,000	74	9.3	9.6	34.3
\$55-\$70,000	88	11.0	11.5	45.8
\$70-\$85,000	66	8.3	8.6	54.4
\$85-\$100,000	49	6.1	6.4	60.8
Over \$100,000	134	16.8	17.5	78.2
Declined	167	20.9	21.8	100.0
Total	767	95.9	100.0	
Did not answer	33	4.1		

Table 52 Resident tenure in the district status

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Other	12	1.5	1.6	1.6
Less than 2 years	26	3.3	3.4	5.0
2-5 years	35	4.4	4.6	9.5
5-10 years	90	11.3	11.7	21.3
10+ years	604	75.5	78.7	100.0
Total	767	95.9	100.0	
Did not answer	33	4.1		