

**Community Forum Subcommittee –Work Programme 2016**

TOPIC	PURPOSE	MEETING DATE AND THEME
<b>Disability Action Plan</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Status report on delivery of actions</li> <li>Emerging issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Receive</li> </ul>	17 February 2016
<b>Ethnic Forum Report</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delivery of forum actions update</li> <li>Outcomes of discussions</li> <li>Actions to be completed</li> <li>Emerging Issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Receive</li> </ul>	17 February 2016
<b>Quality of Life Survey</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overview of the process</li> <li>Aligned indicators to support the Social Wellbeing Indicator Report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Receive and consider</li> </ul>	17 February 2016
<b>Social Wellbeing Indicator Report</b> Resolution of Council meeting of 15 December 2015: "...e) a Social Wellbeing Indicator Report is developed to present key features of the Quality of Life survey and presented at the Strategy and Policy Committee in May 2016." <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Receive and confirm feedback on draft indicators</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Receive and consider the Social Wellbeing Indicator Report</li> <li>Recommendation to S&amp;P May 2016</li> </ul>	17 February 2016
<b>Social Housing Plan</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide feedback on draft Plan</li> <li>Emerging issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Receive and consider report</li> <li>Recommendation to S&amp;P</li> </ul>	4 May 2016
<b>Social Wellbeing Report</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Emerging issues</li> <li>Delivery on outcomes</li> <li>Salvation Army/Poverty Action presentations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Receive and consider report</li> </ul>	4 May 2016
<b>Community Profiles</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Update for 2016 relevant information that may be of significance. i.e Housing prices.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Receive</li> </ul>	2 August 2016
<b>Migrant/Immigration Annual Report</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Emerging issues</li> <li>Delivery of Listening Form actions</li> <li>Outcomes of discussions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Receive</li> </ul>	2 August 2016
<b>Youth progress Report</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Status report on actions from the Youth Action Plan</li> <li>Emerging issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Receive</li> </ul>	2 August 2016
<b>Older Person's progress report</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Status report on actions from the Older Person's Action Plan</li> <li>Emerging issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Receive</li> </ul>	2 August 2016

Other: Annual HCC/WDHB forum

# Council Report

17/2/16

ITEM

10

## Strategy & Communications

---

To:	Chief Executive		
From:	Strategy		
Subject:	Quality of Life Survey (QOL)		
Author:	Julie Clausen		
Meeting Date:	16 February 2016	File:	D-2002037

---

### 1.0 Purpose of this Memo

- 1.1 As per the request at the 8 December 2015 Strategy and Policy Committee meeting, the purpose of this memo is to provide further information on the Quality of Life survey.

### 2.0 Executive Summary

- 2.1 The Quality of Life survey (QOL) is a biennial survey that will be undertaken by Colmar Brunton in 2016.
- 2.2 The survey measures the perceptions of residents living in urban areas to provide an understanding of the social, economic and environmental conditions which describe and quantify the quality of life of those living in New Zealand's major urban areas.
- 2.3 The Quality of Life survey is a perception survey of the 'liveability of the city', not of the Council services. Council service delivery is typically measured by a Residents Survey.
- 2.4 The Quality of Life survey will enable Hamilton City to compare itself to other key cities. This will enable Hamilton City Council to track whether Hamilton is perceived by its residents as improving as a city in which to live.
- 2.5 The Quality of Life survey data will provide data to measure a number of outcomes across our plans, policies and strategies.

### 3.0 Key Issues

#### 3.1 Background

- 3.1.1 Hamilton was, in the past, part of a 12 city Quality of Life (QOL) project which assessed a number of New Zealand cities and compared a wide range of resident perceptions of their respective cities.

- 3.1.2 The QOL survey provided a comprehensive assessment of quality of life in 12 New Zealand cities (Auckland, Manukau, North Shore, Waitakere, Wellington, Christchurch City, Rodney, Hamilton, Tauranga, Hutt City, Porirua, and Dunedin).
- 3.1.3 The report from the survey provided information that contributed to the understanding of social, economic and environmental conditions that could be used to describe and quantify the quality of life of those living in New Zealand's major urban areas.
- 3.1.4 The Quality of Life survey was first conducted in 2003, repeated in 2004 and has been undertaken every two years since then. Between 2010 and 2012 Hamilton and Tauranga withdrew from the project and eight local authorities were amalgamated in Auckland.
- 3.1.5 The reformed survey was undertaken in 2014 survey in partnership between the councils of Auckland, Wellington, Porirua, Hutt City, Christchurch and Dunedin.

## 3.2 Uses of the Quality of Life Survey

- 3.2.1 The Quality of Life survey results are provided to the participating councils in two forms:
- a summary report form which is published on the Quality of Life website <http://www.qualityoflifeproject.govt.nz/survey.htm> , and
  - a data set that Council can use to extract specific data.
- 3.2.2 As the survey is based on perceptions of the liveability of the city, it can be used to compare the perception of a city between council areas and over time.

## 3.3 Survey Method

- 3.3.1 A sequential mixed methodology was used in 2012 and 2014 to survey residents which allows respondents to complete the survey in their own time, at their own pace and either online or hard copy according to their preference.
- 3.3.2 Potential respondents are selected from the Electoral Roll, which allows for the inclusion of the majority of residents.
- 3.3.3 Each Council buys a targeted survey sample size of 500 residents. Some large Councils, such as Auckland, buy additional samples of 500 residents, increasing their total sample size.
- 3.3.4 A sample of 500 residents gives a statistically robust measure of residents and this is appropriate for the size of Hamilton City. The sample achieved is not always exactly 500 residents, with most Councils in the 2014 survey achieving higher numbers than targeted. For instance:

**Table 1: Summary of target sample, achieved sample and maximum margins of error for 2014**

Location	Sample Target	Sample Achieved	Maximum margin of error (95% level of confidence)
Auckland	2,000	2,441	± 1.9 %
Hutt City	500	569	± 4.1 %
Porirua	500	611	± 3.9 %
Wellington	500	647	± 3.9 %
Christchurch	500	488	± 4.4 %
Dunedin	500	539	± 4.2 %
<b>Total Six Councils</b>	<b>4,500</b>	<b>5,295</b>	<b>± 1.4 %</b>

### 3.4 Survey Questions

3.4.1 At the start of each survey round the questionnaire is reviewed by members of the project team for ongoing relevance and usefulness. As part of that review, some questions were not asked in 2014 that were previously asked, and some were added. The additional questions included a mix of brand new questions and several that had been asked prior to 2012. Once the questionnaire is finalised this is used in all Council territories to retain comparability. There is no opportunity for specific questions for individual Councils.

3.4.2 The topic areas may be generally compared across time but not at depth due to methodological changes and questionnaires changes. Topics covered included are:

- Quality of life
- Health and well-being
- Crime and safety
- Community, culture and social networks
- Council processes
- Built environment

### 3.5 Timeframes

3.5.1 The proposed timetable for the 2016 survey is outlined below:

**Table 2: Proposed timetable**

Time Period	Action
January 2016	Survey company is confirmed – Colmar Brunton
February 2016	QOL budget will be finalised
March – May 2016	Project team review questionnaire
June – July 2016	Survey field work
November 2016	Data and report available for Council

## **4.0 Research – Quality of Life and social connectedness**

- 4.1.1 Quality of life is a key driver for attracting and retaining residents<sup>1</sup>.
- 4.1.2 Recent research found that there is a significant connection between economic growth and people’s emotional attachment to the community they live in<sup>2</sup>. In a three year study of 26 cities in the US with almost 43,000 participants, it was found that those communities that experience the highest levels of attachment also showed the highest rates of GDP growth.
- 4.1.3 Residents that are strongly attached to their community are more likely to want to stay in their location. This finding is reiterated by other studies that see quality of life as an emerging key economic driver<sup>3</sup>.
- 4.1.4 Therefore measuring Quality of Life is useful to Hamilton as a tool for assessing our liveability and attractiveness, both for new residents and retention of current residents.

## **5.0 The benefits to Hamilton City of the Quality of Life survey**

- 5.1.1 The Quality of Life survey provides an independent robust evidence base that identifies the best cities to live in the country. It will enable Hamilton City to compare itself to other key cities to track whether Hamilton is perceived by its residents as improving as a city in which to live.
- 5.1.2 The information is given to us digitally which is far more accessible for staff to analyse the outputs. The previous QOL survey and report didn’t have this ability.
- 5.1.3 The QOL survey is a well-known high quality survey.
- 5.1.4 The QOL survey, along with other data sources, will help to identify areas of improvement for Hamilton.
- 5.1.5 The Quality of Life survey data will provide data to measure a number of outcomes across our plans, policies and strategies (Table 3).

---

<sup>1</sup> (Adelaja, et al. (2009). Chasing the past or investing in our future)

<sup>2</sup> (Knight Foundation, 2010, p. 2)

<sup>3</sup> (Project for Public Spaces, n.d.)

Table 3: Uses for the Quality of Life survey

Themes	QOL survey – topics 2014	Social Wellbeing indicator report	City Safety	Hamilton Plan	River Plan	Arts Agenda	Central City Transformation Plan	Economic Development Agenda	Access Hamilton	Open Spaces
Quality of life	Overall quality of life	✓		✓				✓		
	Quality of life compared to 12 months earlier	✓		✓						
Health and Wellbeing	Overall health	✓			✓					✓
	Frequency of doing physical activity									
	Emotional wellbeing	✓								
	Satisfaction with life in general	✓								
	Stress	✓								
Availability of support	✓									
Crime and safety	Perceptions of crime and other undesirable problems		✓							
	Sense of safety		✓							
Community, culture and social networks	Sense of community	✓								
	Social networks	✓								
	Contact with neighbourhood people	✓					✓			
	Feeling of isolation	✓								
	Trust	✓								
	Impact of greater cultural diversity	✓							✓	
	Culturally rich and diverse arts scene	✓							✓	
Council processes	Understanding the council decision making process									

Themes	QOL survey – topics 2014	Social indicator report	City Safety	Hamilton Plan	River Plan	Arts Agenda	CCPT	Economic Development Agenda	Access Hamilton	Open Spaces
<b>Built and natural environment</b>	Perception of city as a great place to live	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Pride in look and feel of city/local area		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓
	Ease of access to local park or other green space			✓	✓					✓
<b>Transport</b>	Perceptions of issues in their local area – graffiti, air pollution, water pollution, noise pollution	✓	✓							
	Frequency of use of public and private transport	✓					✓		✓	
<b>Economic wellbeing</b>	Perceptions of public transport – affordability, safety, accessibility, reliability, frequency, modes of transport, travel time	✓	✓				✓		✓	
	Employment status							✓		
	Balance between work and other aspects of life	✓						✓		
	Affordability and suitability – housing costs, suitability of type of dwelling, suitability of area that is lived in			✓				✓		
	Ability to cover costs of everyday needs of housing							✓		

## 6.0 QOL survey compared with the Resident's Survey

The Quality of Life survey is fundamentally different to the Resident's survey.

**Table 4: Comparison of QOL survey with Resident's survey**

Survey	Quality of Life	Resident's Survey
<b>Frequency</b>	Biennial	Annual
<b>Type</b>	Wider perceptions of quality of life	Satisfaction survey
<b>Question type</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality of life</li> <li>• Health and well-being</li> <li>• Crime and safety</li> <li>• Community, culture and social networks</li> <li>• Council processes</li> <li>• Built environment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The community's perception of council;</li> <li>• The level of satisfaction with services and facilities; and</li> <li>• The usage of services and facilities in the previous year.</li> </ul>
<b>Use</b>	Monitoring perception of Hamilton as a city compared to other cities	Monitoring perception of council services
<b>Comparability</b>	Directly comparable between cities	Not comparable between cities
<b>Choices</b>	Cannot choose survey questions – to do so would reduce comparability between cities	Can choose survey questions to target areas of interest specific to Council services

6.1.1 The content and the form of the Resident's survey are currently under review as part of a wider review of surveying within Council. This review is expected to be completed by May 2016.

## 7.0 Costs and Benefits

### 7.1 Risks

7.1.1 The risks of not being involved in the QOL survey is that we are not able to track changes in Hamilton City's outcomes and identify areas to improve and highlight areas that we are doing well in.

## 8.0 Financial Implications

8.1.1 The survey is jointly funded by the participating councils. The last survey in 2014 cost \$22,000 for a sample of 500 residents. The cost of the 2016 has been confirmed as \$20,088 plus GST. For this investment all cities will receive their data set and results in the main findings report comparing all the Councils involved. The data set is given to each Council for their own internal purposes.

8.1.2 In addition, staff time to extract reports to provide outcomes for specific plans would be required and would be resourced from the Strategy team bringing the total cost to \$26,800. The total cost of \$26,800 would be incurred every two years. The funding for the survey is within the budget allocation of the Strategy team and requires no additional funding.

8.1.3 The following budget shows the external costs of taking part in the survey as well as the internal staff costs for staff to work with the data and produce outcome reporting for the purposes of the Hamilton Plan and the Social Wellbeing Indicator Report.

Cost structure	Sample size	Total
<b>External costs</b>		
Undertaking survey	500	
Data		
Council comparison report		
External total		\$ 20,800
<b>Internal costs</b>		
	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Staff costs</b>
Internal report writing	40	\$ 100.00
Internal design and printing	20	\$ 100.00
<b>External &amp; internal total</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>\$ 26,800</b>

## 9.0 Residents Survey costs

9.1.1 For comparison - the total external cost of the 2015 Residents survey was \$18,600. The reported sample size was 500 residents. This was an annual survey. This is covered within existing budget.

Julie Clausen  
**Strategy Programme Manager**