

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

Pathways and Policy

Approaches to Community Resource Access, Health and Wellbeing in Two New Zealand Cities

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of
the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Public Health

at Centre for Social and Health Outcomes Research and Evaluation,

Massey University, Albany,

New Zealand

Adrian Christopher Field

2004



CANDIDATE'S DECLARATION

This is to certify that the research carried out for my Doctoral thesis, entitled *Pathways and Policy: Approaches to Community Resource Access, Health and Wellbeing in Two New Zealand Cities*, in the Centre for Social and Health Outcomes Research and Evaluation (Research School of Public Health), Massey University, Auckland campus, New Zealand is my own work and that the thesis material has not been used in part or in whole for any other qualification.

Candidate's Name: Adrian Field

Signature:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Adrian Field", is written over the "Signature:" label.

Date:

A handwritten date "1/12/03" is written in black ink, positioned to the right of the "Date:" label.



SUPERVISOR'S DECLARATION

This is to certify that the research carried out for the Doctoral thesis entitled *Pathways and Policy: Approaches to Community Resource Access, Health and Wellbeing in Two New Zealand Cities*, was done by Adrian Field in the Centre for Social and Health Outcomes Research and Evaluation (Research School of Public Health) at Massey University Auckland campus, New Zealand. The thesis material has not been used in part or in whole for any other qualification, and I confirm that the candidate has pursued the course of study in accordance with the requirements of the Massey University regulations.

Supervisor's Name: Professor Sally Casswell

Signature:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Sally Casswell", written over a horizontal line.

Date:

A handwritten date in black ink, "8/12/03", written in a cursive style.



CERTIFICATE OF REGULATORY COMPLIANCE

This is to certify that the research carried out in the Doctoral Thesis entitled *Pathways and Policy: Approaches to Community Resource Access, Health and Wellbeing in Two New Zealand Cities*, in the Centre for Social and Health Outcomes Research and Evaluation (Research School of Public Health) at Massey University (Auckland campus), New Zealand:

- (a) is the original work of the candidate, except as indicated by appropriate attribution in the text and/or in the acknowledgements;
- (b) that the text, excluding appendices/annexes, does not exceed 100 000 words;
- (c) all the ethical requirements applicable to this study have been complied with as required by Massey University, other organisations and/or committees (University of Auckland Human Subjects Ethics Committee) which had a particular association with this study, and relevant legislation;

Ethical Authorisation code: University of Auckland Human Subjects Ethics Committee 2001/252 (PhD enrolment transferred to Massey University in December 2002).

Candidate's Name: Adrian Field

Supervisor's Name: Professor Sally Casswell

Signature:

Signature:

Date:

1/12/03

Date:

8/12/03

Abstract

This research examines access to community resources – services, facilities and amenities that are potentially health promoting – in two New Zealand territorial authorities, and the policy and planning frameworks of each regarding community resources.

International research evidence indicates that community resource access is potentially beneficial to health and wellbeing, through creating supportive environments for health, and providing venues to facilitate social connections.

Review of the urban design and planning literature indicates that community resource access is strongly influenced by the dominant urban design and planning models.

Geographic information systems were used to develop a Census meshblock-based indicator of community resource accessibility (the Community Resource Accessibility Index). Quantitative analysis examined associations of resource access with socio-economic and demographic population patterns. Qualitative analysis, using key informant interviews and document analysis, explored policies on community resource access, and the role of health and wellbeing as a policy goal for each territorial authority.

Quantitative analysis revealed the socio-economically wealthier city had higher overall levels of community resource access, but within each city, more deprived areas had higher levels of access. The location of community resources within poorer areas reduces the mobility costs of people within these areas to access such resources, and makes more available the general health benefits of community resources.

Qualitative analysis indicated community resources are important components of urban strategies. Historic patterns of community resource development, aggregated city wealth and local policies were important determinants of the level of community resource access.

In New Zealand, as will be the case internationally to varying degrees, there is considerable scope for territorial authorities to enhance local health and wellbeing, through direct delivery of community resources, and through collaboration with external agencies to develop community resources that are outside the direct responsibilities of territorial authorities. When these findings are considered in the context of the passage of local government legislation in late 2002, there is growing potential for territorial authorities to use a variety of levers to enhance community resource access, and by implication, health and wellbeing. Health promoters have opportunities to engage with local government and contribute to urban development strategies, for the purposes of enhancing population health and reducing health inequalities.

Acknowledgements

Funding for this research was made possible by a Health Research Council Training Fellowship, and a Health Research Council project grant for The Place of Caregiving, led by Karen Witten.

There are a great many people to whom I owe substantial thanks for their advice and assistance in this research. My supervisors, Professor Sally Casswell and Dr Paul Duignan, and research advisor, Karen Witten, (all at the Centre for Social and Health Outcomes Research and Evaluation, Massey University) commented on earlier drafts of this thesis, frequently asked difficult questions, and always gave advice that improved the quality of the research and analysis. Karen's leadership in The Place of Caregiving research project provided the basis for the development of the Community Resource Accessibility Index, and subsequent analysis. Dr Linda Hill co-supervised in early stages of the research.

I am indebted to Elizabeth Robinson, Dr Megan Pledger, Clare Salmond and Dr Jay Gao for statistical advice, and Dr Tim McCreanor for advice on qualitative analysis. Daniel Exeter provided invaluable training in geographical information systems, and undertook foundational work in the development of the accessibility index. I am also grateful to Professor Rod Jackson of the Division of Community Health, University of Auckland, for providing a base for undertaking this research, when I

was located at the Alcohol & Public Health Research Unit, and for his support when this research was transferred to Massey University.

Gayl Humphrey shared an office and put up with my stress and mood-swings, Lisa Morice delivered me countless references, and Jan Sheeran and Taisia Huckle provided light relief in the office at crucial moments. I would also like to thank my brother, Mark, for willingly agreeing to proof-read this thesis, without knowing what he was letting himself in for.

Professor Pip Forer of the Spatial Analysis Facility at the School of Geography and Environmental Science, at the University of Auckland willingly assisted in the provision of spatial data, as part of a wider research collaboration. Thanks must also be extended to the many participants in the qualitative phase of the research, who willingly gave of their time and shared with me their experiences across many facets of community resource access.

I owe many thanks to all my friends and family for their genuine interest whenever I discussed my research, and for changing the subject to remind me of life outside the thesis. Particular thanks are extended to the Grey Lynn frisbee group, and to the Auckland Yoga Academy. I am also grateful to my parents, Rose and Bill, who have constantly supported me through all my endeavours in life.

Lastly I want to thank my wife, Kate Goodfellow, for her ongoing support throughout the course of this research, for her knowledge, and for her love and companionship through these always interesting and occasionally difficult times.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	2
Acknowledgements.....	4
List of Tables.....	11
List of Figures	12
Introduction	13
Context.....	13
Key research questions.....	26
Chapter 1: The role of community resource access in health and wellbeing.....	32
Introduction.....	32
Deprivation, health and community resources.....	34
Community resources and health: Exploring the links	38
Community resources and health: the role of public policy.....	54
Summary.....	61
Chapter 2: Traditions in urban design and planning, and the role of community resource access.....	64
Introduction.....	64
Traditions in urban design.....	69
Traditions in urban planning	83

Implementation in the New Zealand context.....	95
Summary.....	109
Chapter 3: Methodology.....	111
Introduction.....	111
Literature reviews.....	113
Measuring and analysing accessibility	115
Exploring policy determinants of community resource access.....	138
Drawing conclusions.....	151
Chapter 4: Community resource access and the socio-economic landscape	153
Introduction.....	153
City Profiles.....	154
Choice of variables.....	160
Distribution of community resource access	171
Discussion.....	192
Summary.....	200
Chapter 5: Community resource planning priorities.....	203
Introduction.....	203
Community resource responsibilities.....	205
North Shore City.....	207
Waitakere City	253
Chapter 6: Council considerations of health and wellbeing.....	304

Introduction.....	304
New Zealand territorial authorities' role in health	305
North Shore City	310
Waitakere City	321
Summary.....	338
Chapter 7: The potential of CRAI.....	340
Introduction.....	340
The international context of indicator use.....	341
Indicator use in New Zealand and the role of community resource access	345
Monitoring activities at North Shore and Waitakere	351
Utility of CRAI for Councils	365
Summary.....	375
Chapter 8: Commonalities and contrasts	378
Introduction.....	378
Commonalities with international models of urban design and planning	379
Contrasts in urban design, planning and community resource priorities	386
Approaches to health and wellbeing.....	395
A paradox in community resource access.....	399
Summary.....	401
Chapter 9: Conclusions.....	403
Introduction.....	403
Overview of research findings.....	404

Implications of research findings	416
Future research directions.....	439
Conclusions	442
Appendices.....	446
Appendix 1: Sample interview schedule.....	446
Appendix 2: Sample participant information sheet.....	449
Appendix 3: Local government documents and publications	451
Appendix 4: Suburb map of study area	454
Glossary.....	455
References.....	456

List of Tables

Table 1: Major traditions in urban design and planning.....	68
Table 2: Matrix of research methods and central research questions.....	113
Table 3: Domain and Subdomain data.....	120
Table 4: Ethnicity, 2001 Census ¹¹	155
Table 5: Socio-economic data, 2001 Census.....	157
Table 6: Mean community resource accessibility scores	179
Table 7: Summary meshblock data (weighted for meshblock population)	181
Table 8: Multiple regression analyses of demographic variables and CRAI	184
Table 9: NSCC revenue and community resource expenditure 2000/01	211
Table 10: WCC revenue and community resource expenditure 2000/01	257
Table 11: Commonalities and contrasts between North Shore City and Waitakere City	402

List of Figures

Figure 1: Network analysis, based from meshblock centroid within Devonport...	126
Figure 2: NZDep 2001 – Waitakere Urban Area	159
Figure 3: NZDep2001 – North Shore City	159
Figure 4: Community Resource Accessibility – North Shore City.....	173
Figure 5: Community Resource Accessibility – Waitakere Urban Area	174
Figure 6: Domain 1 – Sport and Recreation.....	175
Figure 7: Domain 2 – Public Transport and Communication	175
Figure 8: Domain 3 – Shopping.....	176
Figure 9: Domain 4 – Education	176
Figure 10: Domain 5 – Health Services.....	177
Figure 11: Domain 6 – Social and Cultural.....	177
Figure 12: Distribution of CRAI scores	178
Figure 13: Adjusted mean CRAI Scores by NZDep2001 (after adjusting for other variables and weighting by meshblock population)	185
Figure 14: Pockets of inequity – Waitakere Urban Area.....	187
Figure 15: Pockets of inequity – North Shore City	187