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Executive Summary

The strengths of any community include its meeting places; places where positive ongoing relationships can form. Schools are one of the most important such places. A central aim of this research had been to explore the possibility of a community hub based at Aorangi School with the intention to build on its strength as a naturally occurring meeting place and enhance the network of relationships around the school and its community.

While the closure of Aorangi School means it is no longer possible for a hub to be at this school, the overall principle of this research was to distinguish the existing strengths in the Bryndwr community, as well as the needs. Any community facility established therefore would build upon and support the community’s strengths as well as help meet and overcome the needs, and (in our minds) this still remains very relevant.

In this research, four sources of information were gathered from the Bryndwr residents. The first was a 102 resident survey forming the broadest coverage of the community (the street boundaries of this area are Memorial Avenue, Grahams Road, Condell Avenue, Blighs Road and Ilam Road). The second source of information was a survey of 33 Burnside Primary School parents. The third source was through interviews and focus groups with 36 residents predominantly living within the state housing area of Bryndwr and the vicinity of Aorangi School; and the fourth source of information was from interviews, discussions and surveys with Bryndwr youth both at the Jellie Park skate park and classes of Burnside High School students. We also called upon the professional opinions of 20 community agencies and organisations working within the Bryndwr community in support roles.

From our findings, the consistently viewed strengths of Bryndwr are its convenience including its amenities such as schools, work, and Jellie Park. The churches were also noted as real strengths. People enjoy the environment of Bryndwr, again Jellie Park, and other parks contribute to this and the area is viewed by its residents as ‘pretty’ and ‘quiet’. The diversity of the area is also something that residents enjoy, including its housing and its people. In fact the ‘people’ in Bryndwr are also noted as a strength of the community by many of those taking part in this research.

In contrast, the research identifies the broad areas of need in Bryndwr as being, ‘safety’, particularly in the Jellie Park area, as well as ‘general crime reduction’. The need to reduce financial strain was also identified, as was the need for reducing language and cultural barriers. Older children and youth activities were other established areas of need, as were creating greater social and community connectedness in that residents note the area has no central focus and lacks cohesion.

In line with the identified strengths of the Bryndwr community and the understanding that a strong community develops best when local people commit their energies and resources in the effort, the recommendations of this research focus on ways that support can be given to existing local groups and networks to expand their activities and services to address needs. More specifically, to gather together local groups including schools, churches, and resident groups, to explore ways to address the various needs, and to support these initiatives financially.
One particular area needing attention is Jellie Park. The park is viewed by residents as a valued community asset and the skate park is a natural meeting place for young people from all around Bryndwr. However there is also a concern by many residents and young people about the safety of the park.

We recommend that:

- the schools around Jellie Park and interested local community and resident groups meet together to look at how safety at the park can be improved through positive community initiatives,
- one such initiative be the establishment of regular, free or low-cost activities for youth based next to the skate park, and that this be publicised through the local schools and community, and organised together with youth that come from a cross-section of the community.

Also in regard to the safety issues raised by residents we recommend:

- to support and increase the number of neighbourhood support groups available in the area and foster supportive neighbourly relationships. While the 'focus' may not be entirely on safety to begin with but free street-by-street events to encourage social interaction and neighbourliness could be supported by the NZ Police and Neighbourhood Support.

Jellie Park and the local schools are seen by all of the groups of respondents as important community strengths and make valuable contributions to community life. These locations are also accessed by a wide range of people living within the Bryndwr area. We therefore recommend that:

- the establishment of a community hub be considered for either Jellie Park or one of the local schools. Our understanding is that many of the Aorangi School families are transferring to Burnside Primary and Cobham Intermediate. A community hub located at one of these schools or nearby may be of great support to the Aorangi families,
- cultural support also should be considered as a part of this. The bilingual unit (now located inside Burnside Primary School and Cobham Intermediate) offers great opportunities for Maori families, but extensions to support Afghani, Samoan and Korean families would also be beneficial. These supports could be in the form of a space for these people to meet as a cultural group, attend language classes as well as mix with other cultural groups,
- information about community activities and events could also stem from here through things like taking the lead in developing a local newsletter, noticeboard, website and having translators available.

The churches are noted as already providing many services and activities which help meet the needs of the community (eg: financial support through free doctors, vegetable cooperatives), particularly as they are located within the state housing area of Bryndwr. We recommend that:

- their services be supported and expanded upon in order to further meet needs. As an example St Aidan's vegetable cooperative proves very popular, though residents and organisations say there is a need for more access to Housing New Zealand, Work and Income and the police. These organisations could consider being available during the vegetable cooperative times. This is only one suggestion on how to expand and support the current services available. Through
the community network outlined above, other ideas and worthwhile initiatives will become apparent,

- the churches in the area may also like to take a lead role, alongside Bryndwr residents and the Christchurch City Council in the upkeep of the physical environment which has been outlined as an issue.

While research can never provide all of the answers to the questions raised about how a community can best be supported, it is our hope that this document can form some meaningful backdrop when questions continue to be asked and community initiatives sought as answers.
1 Introduction

1.1 Background

In 2008, the Christchurch City Council commissioned Presbyterian Support (Upper South Island) ‘Family Works’ to undertake a ‘strengths and needs’ analysis of the Bryndwr community, with consideration for the possibility of a community hub or community facility being made available at Aorangi School, Colwyn Street, Bryndwr.

While this document is intended for the Christchurch City Council, all of the organisations that have taken part in this research have expressed an interest in the conclusions drawn as a result of this research and requested a copy of the final document, which Family Works plans to provide. It is our hope that this work and research will be useful to all organisations working with the Bryndwr community in helping clarify what steps can be taken to contribute to a stronger community here.

1.2 Definitions

While many of the terms used within this document may not appear as unusual, they have sometimes been used out of ordinary contexts. In order to clarify this where possible, the following definitions have been applied:

- **Community hub**
  The ‘community hub’ definition and response given to any persons participating within this research has been:
  "(A community hub) is a place where people can go to access a range of activities and services. In other places community hubs have a cafe, parent groups, interest groups and community and health workers available to talk to. A community hub must meet the needs of its community. Your answers will help us to know what the community needs are."

- **Bryndwr community**
  The terms 'Bryndwr' and 'research area' are used interchangeably within this report. Figure 1 on page 9 provides a map of the research area.

- **Residents**
  The 'Residents' referred to in this document are defined as the people who have contributed to this report by completing a survey, attending a focus group or having been interviewed. Some of these people do not necessarily reside within the Bryndwr community area (as stipulated within this report), however they access services and facilities in the area (eg: schools), and are seen to be members of the community.

- **Organisations and agencies**
  These terms are both used to describe both Government and Community Support agencies and organisations. The reason they have not been separated is to ensure confidentiality of the representatives of each organisation who have participated in this report. Organisations and agencies are not companies or businesses. In order to see a list of the organisations and agencies that have taken part in this report (and are referred to as organisations and agencies), please see the list provided within the methodology section – 2.2.1.
1.3 Research aims

The outline of the project was to undertake a ‘strengths and needs’ analysis of the Bryndwr community (as outlined geographically Figure 1, section 1.4) in order to determine the possible implementation of a community hub or centre based at Aorangi School. The reason for the proposal being based at Aorangi School is that this general area was identified as a pocket within the Bryndwr community having high levels of deprivation and the school was seen as a natural resource for this community.

The specific objectives of this research are:

- to undertake a strengths and needs analysis of the gaps, resources and opportunities in the Bryndwr community,
- to network with other services/agencies in the area to identify what services and activity is currently available,
- to keep an eye open for particular community networks, members and groups who are natural community leaders, and may be interested in being involved in some of the outcomes of this research,
- to make recommendations which support and further encourage the community's strengths and help overcome the community's needs.

1.4 Geographic boundaries of the research area

The geographic boundaries of the Bryndwr community defined as a part of this report were initially agreed upon in conjunction with the Christchurch City Council and Aorangi School in order to capture the Aorangi School district and families community. Consideration was also taken over the New Zealand degrees of deprivation index, which indicate high levels of deprivation in this area.

Using Statistics New Zealand boundaries and data, the research area includes most of the Jellie Park census area unit, all of the Wairarapa census area unit and approximately half of the Aorangi census area unit.

A map of the actual research area is provided below broken into the three Statistics New Zealand census areas.

Figure 1: Map of the research area and Statistics New Zealand local census areas
The research area is bounded by the following streets:
- Memorial Avenue
- Grahams Road
- Condell Avenue
- Blighs Road and Ilam Road

1.5 Research approach and format of this report

A fundamental goal of the research was to incorporate as many voices of the Bryndwr community as possible. This meant actively encouraging people to participate and providing a number of different ways for people to be heard and have used surveys, focus groups and interviews as a means of collecting the information.

The voices of local organisations and service providers working within the Bryndwr community were also contacted for their perspectives. As well as already established community hub models within Christchurch and Nelson visited, interviews conducted with their respective coordinators and reported as a part of this document.

We thought it worthwhile explaining that the methods used to collect information for this report often also represented a different population base within the Bryndwr community. This is reported in this format within the findings (section 4) of this document. As a brief summary:

The resident survey is a blanket and broad approach to collecting information from the whole of the Bryndwr research area.

The Burnside Primary School parents represent a collective 'family' voice in many ways, as we know they are parents or caregivers living near or inside the Bryndwr community. We did not ask these parents specifically about a community hub concept, so this information is not available within section 4.3 of the findings. This was because we thought it may be too confusing for the students undertaking the interviewer role, but they have contributed to both 4.1 and 4.2 of this document with details of their thoughts on the strengths and needs of Bryndwr. We know too these voices are ethnically diverse.

The resident interviews and focus groups are from people who predominantly live in the State Housing area of the Bryndwr community and that which is noted as being of a high deprivation. They are also ethnically diverse, mostly representing people who were not born in New Zealand. The ethnicities represented are: Afghani, Samoan, Maori, Iranian and Korean. The Maori community included here are mostly parents at (the then) Aorangi School bilingual unit.

Youth perspectives represent only youth voices from Burnside High School students and young people utilising the Jellie Park skate park.

And the organisations and agencies working within Bryndwr are voices of people who work predominantly within the area recognised as being of high deprivation. They represent a good collective voice from the work they do and people they see, as well as are advocates for these people.
2 Methodology

2.1 Views of the people belonging to this community

Views of the residents were sought through:

- a Bryndwr community postal survey
- school surveys (of young people, and parent/caregivers of young people)
- focus groups
- individual interviews (conducted via telephone and face-to-face)

2.1.1 Resident Survey:

A random postal survey (Appendix A) was delivered within the stipulated Bryndwr community to every third letterbox. This was aimed at encouraging a broad cross-section of Bryndwr residents to have ‘their say’. Another aim of the survey was to generate findings that may be representative of the adults who live in the Bryndwr community as a whole. However the survey was only provided in English and this may have provided some limitations to generalising the results due to large number of ethnic minorities living within the research area. To compensate for this potential limitation, focus groups were held for people specifically from ethnic minorities, as outlined below.

The exact number of houses in the research is not accurately ascertainable from the Statistics New Zealand website data because the research area does not represent any ‘complete’ census data mesh blocks. From our own resident survey mail drop 897 surveys were delivered to every third house in the Bryndwr community. From the 897 survey delivered, 102 responses were received; this means a response rate of 11.4%.

The ethnicities of these people were noted as Asian (4%), British (3%), Dutch (1%), European (4%), New Zealand Maori (2%), Pacific Islander (1%), and New Zealander (70%). Sixteen percent of people who completed the survey did not complete the question in regard to their ethnicity (no response).

The ages identified by survey respondents fell approximately into the age brackets identified as a part of the following graph:
We also asked how long the respondents had lived in the Bryndwr community, the results were that 9% of resident survey respondents indicated they had lived in the area less than one year, 26% had lived in the area between 1 and 5 years, 20% had lived there between 6 and 10 years and 44% had lived there more than 10 years (no response (2%)).

No further demographic information was gathered in regard to resident survey respondents.

2.1.2 Burnside Primary School parent surveys

A survey was developed in order for Burnside Primary school year 6 students to gather feedback from their parent/caregivers (Appendix B).

The was done as a part of the students social science learning, whereby using the survey they interviewed an adult with whom they lived being parents or caregivers for their responses. This method also ensured the research contained much feedback from Bryndwr ‘families’.

Thirty-three surveys were completed from Burnside Primary School parents.

Within this research the Burnside Primary School students asked their parents/caregivers whereabouts they were born. The results from this were very diverse.
The parents/caregivers were also asked if they spoke any other language and it was noted that 45% of those parents/caregivers interviewed speak more than one language. Twenty-one percent spoke three or more languages.

We were also interested in the average amount of time the parents/caregivers being interviewed had lived in Bryndwr. 27% had lived there less than one year, 27% had also lived between 1 and 4 years, and those living in the areas between 5 and 9 years was 12%. People who had lived more than 10 years were again 27%.

No further demographic information was collected from Burnside Primary School parents.

2.1.3 Resident interviews and focus groups

A number of focus groups were held with adult residents in order to add to the data which the postal survey already provided, and to ensure participant voices incorporated an adequate ethnic diversity of within the population. Focus groups were conducted with 6 Maori Bryndwr residents, 9 Samoan residents, 2 Afghani residents and 3 Korean residents.

Within all of the focus groups (and interviews) the questions asked of each of the community groups were:

1. What are the strengths of this community?
2. What are the needs of this community?
3. How could a community hub help in this community?
To further extend the level of resident voices within the research, interviews were conducted with people who utilised the St Aidan’s vegetable cooperative; as well other people from the community were visited as recommended by other community residents. A total of 8 people were interviewed face to face, 6 took part in being interviewed via the telephone and 2 further people were interviewed via email.

The questions being asked were the same in all interview situations as those within the focus groups and these are used to report the findings within this report.

No further demographic information was collected from these people taking part in interviews.

### 2.1.4 Youth perspectives

Another school survey conducted was in order to obtain feedback from youth (Appendix C).

Twenty-four year 9 students (approximately 13 year olds), and twenty year 10 students (approximately 14 year olds) completed surveys as a part of the research as well as participated in a facilitated group discussion.

The ethnicity of the Burnside High School students is outlined in the following graph:

Figure 4: Burnside High School student ethnicities

![Figure 4: Burnside High School student ethnicities](image)

No further demographic information was sought from the Burnside High School students participating in the research.

A further 51 interviews were also conducted with youth at the Jellie Park Skate Park. The three questions asked here were the same as those used within the focus groups focussing on the strengths of the Bryndwr community, the needs of the community and whether a community hub would be useful and helpful to these participants.

No further demographic details were collected from these people.
2.2 Organisations and agencies working in Bryndwr

A wide range of organisations and groups that work in the Bryndwr area were consulted to broaden our knowledge and understanding of the strengths and needs of the Bryndwr community as well as the advantages that a community hub would offer to this community. It was believed that these organisations have a perspective and knowledge of the Bryndwr community which would be applicable to this research.

Three community focus groups were held with local organisations and agencies working in the area.

The aims of these organisation and agency focus groups were:

- to consult with service providers in the area and obtain information about the types of services they provide within the community; consider any service and/or facility gaps within the Bryndwr community as well as establish their views of the Bryndwr community,
- to give people from these organisations a chance to meet with each other, increase their knowledge about each other and to network. Also to consider their own individual organisation’s involvement in the establishment of a community hub if there is found to be a community need.

Organisations were contacted directly, as well as sent email follow-ups. At the focus group, each organisation was asked to complete a short survey of background information (see Appendix D), and then a discussion was facilitated around the three focus questions:

1. What are the strengths of this community?
2. What are the needs of this community?
3. How could a community hub help in this community?

Individual interviews were conducted with significant organisations that could not attend. Again, the interview questions mirrored the focus group questions.

There are 20 organisations represented within this research through either attending focus groups or by being interviewed. These organisations are:

- Plunket
- Christchurch District Truancy Services
- RTLB
- Aratupu Preschool
- Big Brothers, Big Sisters Mentoring
- St Stephens Church, Bryndwr
- St Aidans Church, Bryndwr
- Bryndwr Churches Combined Community Support Society
- Bryndwr Baptist Church
- Yamaha Music School
- Christchurch Resettlement Services
- Christchurch City Council
- Neighbourhood Support
- Presbyterian Support Upper South Island (Family Works)
- Housing New Zealand
Because some organisations had more than one participant, their survey responses have been integrated for the purpose of the analysis. This is in order to ensure that certain organisational viewpoints are not over-represented in the percentage calculations.

### 2.3 Other community hub models

The final way in which information was gathered was by visiting and interviewing the coordinators of six existing community hub models within Christchurch and Nelson.

We believed this would give some insight into what is working in other areas, as well as obtain first hand knowledge of the advantages and disadvantages of being a school based facility.

Two of these community hubs had formal relationships with schools similar to that posed at Aorangi School. One community hub had no real formal relationship with a school, however they supported school communities in that it was located very near a low-decile school, and the remaining three community hubs were simply located within low socio-economic communities.
3 Statistical Profile of Jellie Park Residents

3.1 Demographic characteristics

Explanatory Note:
As outlined above, the geographic outline of the research area has taken into consideration the high levels of deprivation occurring in the Bryndwr area. For this reason, as a representative of the Bryndwr community most in need we looked at the statistics of the Jellie Park region (much of which is located within the geographic region outlined as our ‘Bryndwr research area’). This data has been uplifted from Statistics New Zealand 2006 census results and compared against the Canterbury region as a whole. The following Jellie Park census area unit map identifies the Jellie Park 2006 census mesh block.

While the Jellie Park census area is not wholly representative of the Bryndwr community, we believe this information provides a good backdrop in that the Jellie Park mesh block stands out as being one of the most deprived areas within the North-West of Christchurch, which is otherwise regarded as an affluent area (Christchurch City Council, February 2008). It is also understood that any community hub facility would be adopted in order to support the Bryndwr residents who are affected by poverty.

3.2 Limitations to the statistical data

3.2.1 Comparing Jellie Park to the broader Bryndwr research area
We have presented the statistical profile for Jellie Park as a whole, rather than disaggregating the figures by individual mesh blocks.

When referring to the New Zealand Deprivation Index, Jellie Park is an area which is shown to be a 9th decile rating (Christchurch City Council, 2008; Ministry of Health, 2006). Please note that while school decile ratings rate a school’s community on a decile rating scale from 1 to 10 whereby 10 are the highest level socio-economic group and a decile 1 the lowest socio-economic group, the deprivation index is the opposite. Here the 10th decile rates the ‘poorest’ socio economic rating, while a decile 1 rates the highest socio-economic areas. The remaining Bryndwr community which we have defined geographically appear as part of the Aorangi and Wairarapa census areas which appear as 4th and 6th decile ratings respectively (Ministry of Health, 2006).

NB: The following statistics are all sourced from Statistics New Zealand 2006 Jellie Park census results (Statistics New Zealand, 2006). These areas are taken directly from the Statistics New Zealand census areas, as can be seen in figure 1 on page 9.

3.2.2 Population
At the time of the Statistics New Zealand 2006 Census, 2535 people resided in the Jellie Park area, an increase of 9.2% since the 2001 census results. Of the 2535 people, 1239 stated they were male and 1293 stated they were female. As percentages, these are similar to the results for the Canterbury region overall.
3.2.3 Age
Unfortunately Statistics New Zealand 'Quick Stats' data does not give much detail on the age groups of populations within its available statistics. However, as a comparison to the Canterbury region population; 8.4% of people in Jellie Park are aged 65 years and over, compared with 13.9% of the total Canterbury region population, therefore there are lower levels of older people residing in the specific area. It is interesting too that 23.9% of people are aged under 15 years in Jellie Park, compared with 19.6% for all of Canterbury region. These figures indicate that the Jellie Park community has a relatively young population.

3.2.4 Ethnicity

Figure 5: Ethnic groups in Jellie Park and the Canterbury Region

In the 2006 census, ‘ethnicity’ refers to the ethnic group or groups that people identify with or feel they belong to. Ethnicity is a measure of cultural affiliation, as opposed to race, ancestry, nationality or citizenship. Therefore ethnicity is self-perceived and people can belong to more than one ethnic group.

As can be seen in figure 4 people predominantly identify with European ethnicities, but to a much lesser degree than that of the Canterbury region. All the other listed ethnicities, except 'other ethnicity' have higher percentages than the Canterbury region.

Of note is the Asian ethnicity attributed to 19.8%, compared with 5.7% for the whole of the Canterbury region. Both 'Middle Eastern' and 'Pacific peoples' ethnicities within Jellie Park are more than twice the rates noted within the Canterbury region.
It is also interesting that 31% of people in Jellie Park were born overseas, compared with 17.9% for the Canterbury region as a whole. For people born overseas who are now living in Jellie Park, the most common birthplace was Asia, compared with the UK and Ireland for the entire Canterbury region.

### 3.2.5 Languages spoken

English is the most commonly spoken language in Jellie Park. However 3% of people in Jellie Park speak Māori, compared with 1.7% of people for all of Canterbury region. Also 37.3% of people in Jellie Park speak more than one language, compared with 23% of people for the entire Canterbury region. It is clear from this data that Jellie Park is an ethnically diverse community.

### 3.2.6 Households

Figure 6: Household Comparison, Jellie Park and Canterbury Region – 2006 Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>Jellie Park</th>
<th>Canterbury Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One family</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more families</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other multiperson</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One person</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics New Zealand, Jellie Park 2006 Census results

According to Statistics New Zealand definitions, a household is; ‘either one person who usually resides alone or two or more people who usually reside together and share facilities (such as eating facilities, cooking, facilities, bathroom and toilet facilities, a living area)’. In general all private dwellings contained households unless, at the time of the 2006 census they were unoccupied or occupied by visitors only (ie: no person staying at the house at the time of the census actually lived there).

The data shows that slightly more ‘one-family’ households live in the Jellie Park area than the Canterbury region as a whole, as well as slightly more ‘two or more families’ and ‘other multi-person’ household arrangements are apparent in this specific region. Jellie Park has the least amounts of ‘one person’ households however (18.6%) when compared with the Canterbury region as a whole (24.4%). The data also reveals that the average household size in Jellie Park is larger, 3 people, compared with an average of 2.5 people for the entire Canterbury region.
3.2.7 Families

Figure 7: Family Type Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family type</th>
<th>Jellie Park (%)</th>
<th>Canterbury Region (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Couple without child(ren)</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple with child(ren)</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One parent with child(ren)</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics New Zealand, Jellie Park 2006 Census results

According to Statistics New Zealand 2006 census definition a family is ‘a couple with or without children. The children do not have partners or children of their own living in the same household.’ It is worth noting when considering this data that people who are living alone, people in a multi-person household, and even adult brothers and sisters who share a residence are not counted as part of a family according to census definitions.

It is also important to note that family data gathered by the 2006 census does not include some statistics that would have been of interest in regard to services pertaining to a potential community hub facility. An example is that there is no information pertaining to the number of children living in step or blended families, and the number of children who live in shared custody situations.

The Jellie Park statistics are interesting when compared against the Canterbury region as a whole however. The ‘couples without children’ is a substantially lower figure than that for the whole region, while the ‘one parent with children’ figure is substantially higher than the Canterbury region as a whole.

3.3 Markers of need/wellbeing

3.3.1 Education, work and income Levels

The Jellie Park 2006 census results outline the qualifications and education levels of residents as 'post school', 'school' and 'no qualification'. For Jellie Park, these statistics appear very similar to that of the Canterbury region as a whole.
3.3.2 Unemployment

Figure 8: Unemployment comparison

The unemployment rate in Jellie Park at the time of the 2006 census was 10.3% for people aged 15 years and over, which is significantly higher than that of the Canterbury region which is noted as having a 4% unemployment rate. This indicates that the Jellie Park unemployment rate (at the time of the 2006 census) was more than double that of the Canterbury region as a whole.

3.3.3 Employment

Figure 9: Occupation comparison

Source: Statistics New Zealand, Jellie Park 2006 Census results
Of those employed, the occupation category of ‘professional’ is high in comparison to the Canterbury region as a whole. This makes an interesting result when considering the increased levels of unemployment, education and income levels. Perhaps this is due to the higher proportion of persons from Asian and Middle Eastern ethnicities being ‘professionals’, though not being able to work in New Zealand within these professions. It may also be that the categories were not able to specify the actual occupations for the residents here.

3.3.4 Income

Figure 10: Income comparison

Source: Statistics New Zealand, Jellie Park 2006 Census results

Income is fundamental to wellbeing as it influences people’s ability to purchase goods and services. Income also has the potential to enhance choice and facilitate participation in society. Access to adequate income is therefore a fundamental desire of people, and areas characterised by low income will also have greater and potentially different needs than other areas.

In the 2006 census, total personal income was defined as the before tax income of the respondents for the 12 months ended 31 March 2006. Income information is only collected from residents aged 15 years and over.

In the above graph (figure 10), the lower income ranges ($5,000 or less, $5,001-$10,000 and $10,001-$20,000) see Jellie Park having higher proportional levels than that of the Canterbury region as a whole. The mid to higher ($20,000-$30,000 onwards) income ranges see Jellie Park having lower levels proportionally than that of Canterbury as a whole.

For people aged 15 years and over, the median income (half earn more, and half less, than this amount) in Jellie Park is $16,500. This compares with a higher median of $23,500 for all of the Canterbury region and $24,000 for all New Zealand. 56.6% of people aged 15 years and over in Jellie Park have an annual income of $20,000 or less, compared with 44.2% of people for the Canterbury region as a whole.
Also in Jellie Park, 13.6% of people aged 15 years and over have an annual income of more than $50,000, compared with 15.8% of people in the Canterbury region.

Through these statistics, it is evident that income levels overall are lower for Jellie Park than they are for the Canterbury region.

3.3.5 Housing

Figure 11: Home ownership

![Graph showing ownership of dwellings by household in Jellie Park and Canterbury Region, 2006 Census.]

Source: Statistics New Zealand, Jellie Park 2006 Census results

The income levels may also contribute to the lower home ownership apparent within the Jellie Park region in comparison to the Canterbury region, as per the graph (figure 11). In Jellie Park, 37.3% of households in private occupied dwellings own the dwelling, with or without a mortgage. This is proportionally less than for the Canterbury region as a whole, where 59.8% of households in private-occupied dwellings own the dwelling, with or without a mortgage.

However, there are a number of Housing New Zealand houses situated in this area, therefore some are unable to be privately owned.

3.3.6 Potential changes since the 2006 census

As the information presented in this section is from the 2006 census figures, at the time of writing, this data is three years old. New Statistics New Zealand census data though will not be gathered again until 2011, and is usually not available until the following year.

In order to ascertain how 'different' the populations might look now compared with 2006, we asked residents surveyed if they had lived in the Bryndwr community for more, or less than five years. 63.7% of residents had lived in Bryndwr for more than 5 years, thus they would have lived in the research area at the time of the 2006 census. 34.3% of the residents had lived in Bryndwr for less than five years, thus the 2006 census information may not directly pertain to some of these people.
There may be some argument, however that the type of people who have moved into the areas will display similar characteristics to those who moved out of the area.

Another point which may contribute to significant change in the statistical profile of the residents is any new housing in the area. Visibly the amount of new housing developments appear relatively small, and unlikely to have a major impact on the overall statistics of the area, though this is only taken from our observations of the area. For the future though of the entire Bryndwr research area, it may be worth considering the new developments taking place between Ilam and Aorangi Roads, which appears to be the Elmwood Estate (retirement village) re-development. No further developments are apparent at the time of writing this document.

3.3.7 Jellie Park 2006 census and deprivation index results summary
Jellie Park as a Statistics New Zealand census defined area, rates as a level nine (out of ten - being the most deprived) in degrees of deprivation, however is set among the more affluent communities (Christchurch City Council, 2008).

From the 2006 census results it can be seen that Jellie Park has a younger age population when compared with the Canterbury region as a whole, as well as more families (made up of adults and children). This is particularly true for one-parent families.

It is evident that the Jellie Park region is ethnically diverse. When compared with the Canterbury region as a whole it has lower levels of European residents, and higher proportions of Asian, Pacific Island, Maori and Middle Eastern residents. This extends into the languages spoken whereby more people speak more than one language than do the Canterbury region as a whole. Within households, Jellie Park has lower numbers of one-person households than the Canterbury region, and slightly more ‘one’ families, ‘two or more’ families as well as ‘other multi-person’ household compositions. This is also demonstrated in that each household has an average of three people living in it, whereas this figure is 2.5 for the Canterbury region. Again when considering the ‘family’ statistics, Jellie Park has less ‘couples without children’, more ‘two couple families’, and decidedly more ‘single-parent with children’ families (27.8%, compared with 15.7% for the Canterbury region).

When considering the markers of wellbeing within the Jellie Park community through education, work and income, it can be seen that the education levels of residents are relatively similar to the Canterbury region as a whole; however the unemployment rate was more than double that of the Canterbury region. While income levels of Jellie Park are lower than the Canterbury region, strangely the occupation of ‘professional’ is the most popular in the Jellie Park region. Home ownership is also at a lower level in Jellie Park than in the Canterbury region.
4 Findings

The findings of this research have been broken into three parts being, Bryndwr community strengths (4.1), Bryndwr community needs (4.2) and a Bryndwr community hub (4.3) which explores whether the strengths of the community will be enhanced and upheld with the introduction of a community hub, as well as what needs a community hub based in Bryndwr would meet.

4.1 Bryndwr community ‘strengths’

4.1.1 Resident surveys (N=102)

4.1.1.a Overall views of the Bryndwr community

Question 12 of the resident survey asked respondents for their 'overall' perspectives of the Bryndwr community. It is apparent that most people living in Bryndwr view the area positively. The resident's comments in regard to this were categorised on the basis of their judgements. The results were as follows:

Figure 12: Overall resident views of the Bryndwr community

Thirty-three percent of respondents wrote positively about the Bryndwr community. Many of those persons commenting wrote just a single statement reflecting their positive feelings about Bryndwr such as 'fine', 'a comfortable area', 'a good place to live'. Others expanded on their responses and added comments such as: 'Very good, safe community. Plenty of options, activities and resources to suit most families and individuals.' Comments such as this were also interpreted as positive; 'A rich composite of suburban life with the whole range of socio-economic groups and ethnic backgrounds'.

Some examples of mixed comments making up 17% included both a positive and a negative statement about Bryndwr, examples include, 'Very good, though drugs could be a problem', 'Friendly, accessible, could need more policing (the old fashion style)...', 'Mostly a group of good people, the trouble makers mainly come from rental...'
accommodation' and 'OK, but some streets (eg Aorangi Road) can feel a bit of a 'no go' at times (hoodies, dogs, etc').

Negative comments make up 18% of the responses and include comments such as; 'A mixed socio-economic areas with problems with graffiti and unruly behaviour...', 'We believe the increase of 'rough' and 'untidy' families has brought the community down.'

4.1.1.b Specific things people like about Bryndwr

Question two of the resident survey asked people more specifically what they liked about living in Bryndwr. Some respondents mentioned more than one aspect of what they liked. The things residents like about living in Bryndwr fall under the following broad categories seen within the following graph:

Figure 13: Reasons for living in Bryndwr

Convenience
Seventy-three percent of the survey respondents stated the 'convenience' of living in Bryndwr is what they like about living there. Many mentioned they like that the location is within walking distance of the shops, it is close to the city, local malls, Canterbury University, airport, parks and pool. Jellie Park was mentioned directly by 14% of these respondents as a part of the convenience of living in the Bryndwr community.

Environment
Twenty-four percent mentioned environmental aspects as what they like about living in Bryndwr. This included that it was 'quiet' and 'pretty' or 'attractive'. There were also comments on the area having 'lots of trees' and considering it 'a garden suburb'.

People
Fourteen percent of respondents liked the people aspect of the community because it meant they were 'near family', it is 'friendly', they feel they have 'good neighbours' and one person added what they liked about living in Bryndwr was the 'well behaved children'.
Diversity
The ethnic diversity of the community also featured as something people like about living in Bryndwr - 5% of respondents mentioned this, including 'diversity of housing and people', 'multi-culture' and 'large Asian' population.

Safety
Five percent liked that Bryndwr was a 'relatively safe' place. Some of these respondents said that in Bryndwr they 'feel safe', or they liked the 'safeness', others added it was 'relatively safe' or 'appears to be a safe suburb'.

Churches
Four percent mentioned the churches within the local area as what they liked about living in Bryndwr. These included that they were near their local church or comments such as '...the churches in the area are really wonderful...'.

Affordability
One of the other prominent things people liked about living in Bryndwr (3%) was that it was an affordable place to buy a good house, or had 'cheaper rent'.

Other comments
These comments were simply one-off comments which were both negative and positive in view. Examples included 'it's home', and one another person stated that they 'don't like living here' and was unable to state anything they liked about living in the Bryndwr community.

4.1.1.c Existing services/facilities/agencies that people use

Question three of the resident survey asked residents about the types of services and facilities they used within Bryndwr. Overall, many residents used many of the available services and amenities.

Figure 14: Bryndwr community facilities used by residents
We had expected that interest groups would be a higher proportion of the services utilised within the Bryndwr community and asked respondents to elaborate on the ones that they used. They mentioned; local book discussion groups, girl guides, yoga at a local hall, churches. Two of the respondents mentioned interest groups which actually fell outside of the Bryndwr area (Merivale and Papanui).

Nineteen respondents answered ‘other’ to this question and then elaborated. Almost all of these however referred to facilities which were outside of the designated Bryndwr research area. The most common of these was the library.

4.1.1.d Other Bryndwr community strengths

Survey respondents were asked if they had attended any events within Bryndwr in the last year, and to name the events that they had attended. The results are shown in the following pie graph.

Figure 15: Attendance at community events

Thirty-seven percent of the residents had attended events in Bryndwr within the past year, though it is with hindsight that we realise this question may have been difficult to answer. It is not easy to remember in which year people have attended an event, and the term ‘event’ was not defined. However, the results are still of interest. Those residents who said they had attended events in Bryndwr and were able to name them (39 responses in all) did so according to the following graph.
4.1.1.e Community events attended inside Bryndwr

Figure 16: Range of community events attended within Bryndwr

The information provided here may also indicate the facilities and services which the community residents are utilising (local schools, churches, Neighbourhood Support, Aurora performance venue and Jellie Park). Of note is that the Jellie Park pool would have only been available for a part of the year referred to within the resident survey, so this may have impacted the result. The ‘other’ category was made up of ‘neighbour gatherings’ (one response) or ‘community BBQ’ (one response) which could be interpreted as ‘friendship gatherings’ rather than community events. An unspecified ‘car boot sale’ and ‘political events’ were also mentioned once each.

One person of the ‘community watch’ group stated they attended a neighbourhood watch group. Did we get any other?? We would have gone otherwise.’ This may indicate a desire for more community events in Bryndwr, as discussed later in the ‘Bryndwr community needs’ and ‘a Bryndwr community hub’ sections of this report.

4.1.1.f Accessibility to local services

Also as a part of the resident survey we asked residents if there were any barriers that stopped them being able to access or utilise services and facilities within the Bryndwr community. Though this question was initially designed in order to establish any needs that were not currently being met, and a community hub facility may be able to cater for, we found the results relatively positive, hence they are included with the strengths of the Bryndwr community as a part of this report. The results are as follows:
The majority of people (41%) said there were no barriers which may stop them accessing services and facilities. This provides a positive response for the people living in the community and completing the resident survey. Another point is that by adding the 'no barriers' response (41%) and the no response rate (26%) together, this accounts for 66% of all respondents. Therefore only 33% stated there were barriers.

Lack of information features as the most prominent barrier (19%) which may indicate the need for a community newsletter or such (we are unaware of any focal point for local information within the area). Fifteen percent of residents stated money was a barrier to them being able to access services and facilities, 12% said time was and 11% said family commitments presented a barrier.

People who elaborated on which waiting lists were a barrier said 'Jellie Park swimming lessons for young children', 'GP/Medical centre and cost (cheaper outside Bryndwr)' and 'school zones'.

4.1.2 Burnside Primary parent survey (N=33)

Those students interviewing their parents also asked questions about living in the area which has brought up positive responses and mention the community strengths. The first was 'Why do you live in this community?' and the second was 'What do you like about living in this area?' Much strength of the area and its community were apparent in both of these questions, though differences also occur.
The majority of respondents (39%) added comments about the convenience of Bryndwr including: 'Close to everything', 'more convenient for the family', and many also mentioned that the area was 'close to school'.

In fact 'schools' is the second most popular reason that these Burnside Primary School parents live in the Bryndwr community (36%). In some ways however it is not surprising that schools have been mentioned so regularly as community strength. The interviewers were the Year 6 students of Burnside Primary, and possibly this has played a part in 'priming' school-type responses. However, this also suggests these parents genuinely believe their children's school and education is of a high quality and standard.

Work is the third most popular reason that people live in Bryndwr - 18% of the Burnside Primary School parents stated this.
Once again the convenience of Bryndwr rates highly as what people like about living there. Sixty-one percent of respondents mentioned this as a reason they like living in Bryndwr. The responses were quite specific about where and what was convenient than have been in the previous questions.

- 'close to shops and airport.'
- 'living near Jellie Park and the schools'
- 'nice homes, convenient for shopping malls, parks and leisure facilities.'

The physical environment also rated highly (48%) as a reason that people like living in Bryndwr. Comments pertaining to the environment often include that it is quiet, clean and/or pretty, such as:

- 'flat and green environment.'
- 'lots of trees and parks.'

Respondents were also positive about the people living in Bryndwr. 36% made 'people' type responses. Our impressions were that respondents felt 'connected' to other people living in Bryndwr or had family near them. Comments included:

- 'friendly people, neighbourhood watch...'
- 'very quiet and good neighbours',
- '...good schools, shopping centres, library and family.'

### 4.1.3 Resident interviews and focus groups (N=36)

#### 4.1.3.a Community strengths

The most commonly identified strength about living in Bryndwr were the amenities available to people in the area. Other things residents liked about Bryndwr included, Aorangi School, that Bryndwr was 'close to everything', that the community has 'nice trees', the 'friendly people', and was a 'quiet area'.

**Aorangi School**

Over half of the residents participating in the research identified Aorangi School as being one of the good things about living in Bryndwr. They saw the exposure to different cultures as a positive aspect of attending the school. In addition, the parents who had children at bilingual unit located at Aorangi school (at the time) saw the bilingual unit as strength because it promoted connection between parents of students in the unit, most of whom are Maori. They said this enhanced a small but strong Maori community of family and friends within Bryndwr.

These people-networks were based on connections that had been established over time, which helped create a sense of belonging. This meant the parents felt their children were safe in the local community as the children had families living in the local area that they could turn to if needed.

It is worth noting that a number of factors could well have influenced responses of the interviews and focus groups. Firstly, the majority of these residents were parents of children attending the school. Secondly, these interviews were conducted soon after the government released news of the possibility of the closure of Aorangi School.
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These factors may have accounted for Aorangi School coming up often in our discussion.

The Samoan community focus group participants focussed on their individual and ethnic community’s needs, these are discussed in section 4.2.

4.1.4 Youth perspectives (N=95)

4.1.4.a Community strengths

Amenities
Some of the young people said the best thing about living in Bryndwr was the amenities in the area. As with the adults interviewed, this was the factor that appeared most commonly mentioned by young people. Amenities refer to Jellie Park and pool, the Skate Park, shops and malls, Burnside High School and sport and recreation facilities.

It is worth noting that when youth stated Jellie Park as a good thing about Bryndwr, they could have been referring to either or both the skate park and Jellie Park pool. It is also important to bear in mind that the majority of youth were interviewed at the skate park which may have influenced the information in favour of it.

When talking with youth about shops; dairies were most commonly named as the type of shop they used. Also, many of those who named Burnside High School referred to this as positive in terms of a place to meet up with their friends.

The other good things that young people identified was having ‘friends live here’, it was seen as being ‘close to everything’, that there are ‘friendly people’ and that these young people ‘live close to friends and family’.

Youth is a stage where peers play an increasingly important role as young people leave the realm of their parents and establish their own identity as emerging adults. Hence the importance of socialising, whether meeting friends or connecting with peers through recreation, sport, school, or other activities.

4.1.5 Agencies and organisations working in Bryndwr (N=20)

Twenty organisations took part in providing feedback and information as a part of this report. Of these, 19 representatives from 15 organisations completed surveys, and 22 representatives from 18 organisations attended focus groups and contributed to discussions regarding the strengths and needs of the Bryndwr community as well whether a community hub would be helpful and useful for the community. A further two organisations were interviewed in order that they also contribute to the research.

The surveys completed by representatives of organisations and agencies working within the Bryndwr community asked what they see as the strengths of the community. The equal highest theme provided in response to this (41%) indicated the people.
The comments provided in regard to this included ‘diversity in culture’ and ‘local people who get involved in assisting others or the community’.

Also mentioned 41% of the time from organisations as a strength of the community was the amenities. This included comments such as: ‘Resourced well with Jellie Park pool and external play area and skate park’, as well as easy access to the amenities such as ‘town, shops, doctors, library, schools, play and music groups’ and ‘good transport’.

Schools featured in 29% of the organisation respondent’s answers regarding the strengths, stating that they were ‘good schools’, an aspect of Bryndwr’s established facilities, or more specific comments such as: ‘Pro-activity of schools’.

Twenty-three percent mentioned the churches as being strengths in the community, for example ‘the churches in the community re providing activities/services for the community’. And 22% also mentioned the social services available, including comments such as ‘good pastoral care within schools’, and ‘networks of social services who work in this community’. It appears that the organisations/agencies who are working in this area appreciate the others who do also, and support each other in their work.

A further breakdown of results included 18% noting the convenience of Bryndwr, 12% did not respond to this question and 6% mentioned the Christchurch City Council.

Focus groups and interviews highlighted many of these same strengths. The names and recognition of many perceived community leaders were provided and this included persons working for local organisations, as well as community residents. Many of the local resources mentioned as the strengths of the community were services/groups which are provided at the churches (GPs at Baptist Church, vege co-op, combined Bryndwr churches initiatives, youth groups), and schools (OSCAR, classes at Burnside).

Again too ‘the people’ or residents of Bryndwr are mentioned as strengths. The comments about the people in the community extend to include that the facilities, services and resources in the community are ‘people driven’, for example much of the participation in any of the local resources relies heavily on word of mouth.

The organisations and agencies participating in this research predominantly work in the Housing NZ areas of Bryndwr therefore their comments will pertain to these areas and the people who live in these areas.

4.1.6 Summary of the strengths of the Bryndwr community


Some of the perceptions of 'good' localities to live and parent found within the research include:

- a conveniently located central cluster of amenities and services which could also serve as natural community meeting places eg shopping village, parks, primary schools,
- a 'good' school (generally one that had a good reputation),
- known and valued people and places that could be reasonably reached on foot,
• access to playgrounds and parks,
• safe open spaces and natural places, such as the beach or bush,
• meaningful and distinct locality boundaries.

It appears that using the local facilities often becomes part of people’s routine and enhanced their sense of familiarity and belonging to the area. These local amenities also often functioned as informal meeting places where social contact could be established and/or maintained. Parents also really valued having access to a variety of community meeting places, including a local cafe and parks (Witten et al, 2006).

It can be assumed that any investment in a community hub in the Bryndwr community would be in order to support families, and therefore this Families Commission research seems an appropriate summary of a family’s requirements within their community and it appears too that a community hub may be able to provide some of these features. It also appears that some of these features already exist within the Bryndwr community according to its residents, though they may be able to be further enhanced through the development of a community hub facility. Possibilities which build upon the current Bryndwr community strengths are discussed below.

It appears many of the community residents who have taken part in this research, do view their community and Bryndwr positively. From the resident survey, the most popular of the resident responses was positive about their overall views of the community. When asked what it is that they like about their community a good proportion said they liked the ‘convenience’ of living in Bryndwr in that it was close to the city, mall, shops, parks, pool, university and airport. The shops and parks prominent here represent facilities which denote some of the amenities and facilities ideally available in a community setting which supports families (as observed within the Families Commission research).

The resident survey respondents also liked the environment stating that it is pretty and quiet and they also liked the people, stating they are generally friendly, near family and felt they had good neighbours. The people aspect is one that is important in a community which supports families.

Schools also feature as a strength of the local community and are in line with the Families Commission research as being important in a supportive community. Burnside Primary School parents said the reason they lived in Bryndwr community was because of its convenience, schools and work. They also (like the resident survey respondents) stated the top three reasons they liked living in Bryndwr was because of the convenience, physical environment and people. We know too that these people are Bryndwr ‘families’ living and/or accessing the local facilities and amenities.

The remaining adult residents interviewed and attending focus groups appear to be in agreement with other residents’ views in that convenient amenities, a good school and parks are represented in their perceptions of key strengths of the Bryndwr community. For these people too (like the resident survey respondents and Burnside Primary School parents) Bryndwr’s convenience, physical environment and people are also positive attributes.

Interestingly the Bryndwr youth echoed these community strengths. They liked having Jellie Park, its pool and skate park facilities available to them, as well as the convenience of local malls and shops. They too thought Burnside High School was a strength of the local community and believed the people in Bryndwr were a community
strength including their friends and families who lived in the area, and that people in Bryndwr were friendly.

The organisations and agencies working within the Bryndwr community held similar views to the residents in that they believed the people in Bryndwr were strength, as were the amenities, local schools and churches.

In consideration of a community hub in Bryndwr, it appears that while the local facilities and amenities, shops and schools, people and physical environment often feature as community highlights, the establishment of a community hub would not detract from any of these, and in fact may assist in heightening central meeting and social places which are seen as important.

The organisations and agencies working in the community have some similar and sometimes different ideas about Bryndwr community strengths. They mention the people as being a strength and further add that successful groups and facilities are often 'people-driven' and rely too on marketing through word-of-mouth. It would be imperative therefore that any commitment to a community hub would need to include and involve local people.

Within the resident survey and organisation/agency feedback there is also mention of churches as being strengths of the Bryndwr community, it is also apparent the local churches are already displaying community hub type properties with the groups they facilitate and supports they offer. Therefore it is recommended that further consultation and advice be sought from these facilities in regard to the development of a community hub.

This approach would also ensure that any community hub type facility was working in alignment with current progress made in supporting families by other services and facilities already existing and not lend itself to competing for the same patrons fulfilling the same needs. In order to ensure there was no 'reinvention of the wheel' in this way we asked residents what services and facilities they currently used. This way we are can establish which community needs may already be being met and are popular options that residents know are available. The most popular responses were; shops and businesses, Jellie Park, playground/parks, medical centres and churches.

When considering the purposes for a community hub in any community, one of the concepts it promotes is that of a meeting place for social interaction and engagement. We wanted to consider the community events being held and attended in Bryndwr bearing in mind that community events may be a part of a community hub role in that it would provide these community social and celebration-type opportunities.

While only a fairly small proportion of people had attended any local community events in the past 12 months, the highest proportion of these were organised or hosted by local churches, schools and Neighbourhood Support also provided popular community events. Again however, while some respondents had attended a local community event in Bryndwr over the past year, this does leave some possibility for a community hub facility organising more events, and could do so in collaboration with local churches, schools and other community groups.

An unexpected strength was that only 33% of respondents of the resident survey noted there being barriers to them accessing services and facilities in Bryndwr. Lack of
information was the most common barrier noted, and also seen as a barrier was money, and family commitments.

There are some residents taking part in this research who found it difficult to identify any strengths of Bryndwr and some needs of the community are beginning to be hinted at. There are still however, many important strengths of this community - its convenience, amenities, schools, Jellie Park and the people have all been repeatedly identified. This indicates that while there are difficulties, there is also optimism and pride.
4.2 Bryndwr community ‘needs’

In order to identify what role a community hub might have within the community, we were particularly interested in whether a community hub in Bryndwr could help the people who live here overcome any problems or challenges they face.

4.2.1 Resident survey (N=102)

4.2.1.a Resident views of the needs of their community

We started from a broad perspective within the resident survey. From question twelve of the resident survey ‘overall how do you see the Bryndwr community?’ there were many positive responses as can be seen reported within the strengths section of this research. Interestingly however, when looking through the results as a whole 18% of comments are negative and mention a lack of cohesion or absence of a sense of community in Bryndwr. These are aspects which a community hub certainly may be able to help provide. The comments included:

- 'lacking a central focus',
- 'diverse, not particularly cohesive or involved with each other except for small pockets',
- 'typical with little community interaction outside the church groups'.

Some said their support and social networks were outside Bryndwr altogether. A comment included ‘we do not identify with Bryndwr community as it has no natural focus’. It is also worth noting that the lack of cohesion or want for less segregation is also apparent within the comments made about how people see the Bryndwr community overall (as discussed in 4.1.1a).
4.2.1. Issues people living in Bryndwr face

As a part of the resident survey, we asked what the main issues facing the residents own households were. A tick box response was offered where respondents could tick as many of the options they felt were applicable to them. The responses are highlighted and graphed as below.

![Issues facing residents](image)

Thirty percent of respondents said money was a main issue facing their household closely followed by safety (28%) and health (28%).

We also asked in regard to this information, whether there was anything else the respondents would like to tell us about any of these things. The individual comments appear to provide further insight into the needs as seen by the respondents of this survey.

- "lost my job, find it hard getting out in community again, as don’t know what’s available and lack of money and don’t have children."
- "life is very busy for a single income family with toddler and a young baby. Paying our mortgage and bills and caring for our children takes priority over all other outside activities."
4.2.1.c Suggestions from Bryndwr residents about what things might help make living in Bryndwr better

As a follow-on from the issues households were facing, and as a potential lead in to the possibilities of a community hub, we asked 'Is there anything that would make living in Bryndwr better?’ It was decided to leave an open space within the survey after this question in order for respondents to write their own commentary and to encourage as much freedom in responses as possible.

The responses to these questions have been analysed and the main themes apparent are graphed below.

Figure 21: How to make living in Bryndwr better

Only 50% of residents answered this question possibly because no ‘tick-box’ options were provided. From the responses, crime reduction is one of the two most popular responses (30%) which would make living in Bryndwr better including 'stopping graffiti', 'safety' and requests for more Neighbourhood Support groups and action.

Some examples of the crime reduction responses included:

- ‘less graffiti, fewer burglaries (more security watch). A website that we can anonymously write tip or info about crime in the area.’
- ‘community meetings initiated by the local police to hear our concerns. Police patrol, better street lighting on both the left and right hand side, maybe a sign outside on streets to show this area/road should not be taken easy by potential burglars.’

The other most popular response to this question pertained to the physical environment (30%). This included noise pollution from traffic and the airport, general tidy-up comments about the area and the need for street lighting, which it can be presumed is also linked to safety.
Comments related to the physical environment included:

- 'as you have been commissioned by ChCh Council, I wonder, as far as street cleaning and tidiness of certain properties is concerned, some are doing nothing to stop any growth of their places and put rubbish on streets for weeks- ChCh used to be called the city that shines but not here.'
- 'more trees on Wairakei Road. Remove cars parked on grass.'

Some people responding to this question also mentioned wanting a better sense of community connectedness (13%). This included people stating:

- 'more community spirit, no real mixing between different socio-economic groups.'
- 'improved communication between various groups in the community'
- 'stronger community presence to help give youth new interests-flow on reduce graffiti- safer streets' (also links to crime reduction and teenagers/youth).
- 'more knowledge of where to find out about activities/groups in Bryndwr.'

Throughout some of the responses there were direct references to the state housing area, poorer area of Bryndwr or lower socio-economic people. We thought it would be interesting to see how many responses made reference to these - 11% which is the same percentage as references made to 'teenagers/youth', and 'no' responses in regard to 'is there anything that would make living in Bryndwr better?'. Some examples of the responses are:

- 'if the undesirable element weren't all being dumped in Bryndwr it would be better. Less easterlies.'
- 'some nice street plantings in the poorer parts of town- c'mon Fendalton share the love!!'
- 'raising the drinking age. We have some lower income and over-drinking households and youngsters here.'

Those responses categorised as 'other' make up another 11% of the responses and included one-off and random responses such as:

- ‘access to local high school.’
- ‘provision of daycare facilities for elderly perhaps for a 1/2 day per week when not able to be left alone.’
- ‘lower rates.’

**4.2.2 Burnside Primary School parents’ survey (N=33)**

We were more direct with the Burnside Primary School parents by asking what they don't like about living in the Bryndwr community. We chose to ask this question instead of asking about the challenges their household faces because we were mindful that children were interviewing their parents, and we did not want to put children in a situation where there was any concern for them as recipients of information. Please also bear in mind that this situation (children interviewing adults) also may have impacted on some of the responses overall.
Twenty-eight Burnside Primary School parents answered this question, the majority of which said there was nothing they didn’t like about living in the Bryndwr community (36%), which is a very positive response.

The physical environment (21%), crime (17%) and people (18%) also are the next most popular responses. Comments on the physical environment included comments such as:

- ‘...dogs mess on the footpath.’
- ‘...lots of rubbish.’

Comments pertaining to ‘crime’ included:
- ‘boy racers, theft and tagging.’
- ‘when people smash bottles on footpath, and break the bus timetable.’

And comments pertaining to ‘people’ included comments such as:
- ‘bullying, especially in Jellie Park.’
- ‘some people are snobby.’
- ‘not a strong link between each family in the community...’

The responses pertaining to ‘traffic’ generally referred to ‘boy racers’, speeding traffic and ‘physical location’ responses all referred to being too far away from family.

We also asked the parents of Burnside Primary School ‘what would be different if the Bryndwr community was a better place to live (if anything)?’ The responses gave some similar and some different results from the resident survey responses, as can be seen in the graph below and commentary.
The most popular response from Burnside Primary School parents was that more social or community connectedness (48%) would make Bryndwr a better place to live. Comments included:

- ‘neighbours would talk more and people would walk more’,
- ‘a cultural centre is needed in this community’,
- ‘maybe some activities that could gather the community together.’

This information and these comments certainly indicate a community hub or facility would be welcomed by these Bryndwr residents. It is worth noting too that the Burnside Primary School parents were the only participants within the research who were not fully ‘briefed’ by professional interviewers or specifically questioned on their feelings about a possible community hub being established in their community. This may suggest a true and real need for a community facility which will help Bryndwr residents connect more with others.

The other themes (as can be seen in the graph) and similarly to the resident survey responses included lower crime, attention to traffic issues or the physical environment.

### 4.2.3 Resident interviews and focus groups (N=36)

Please note that the persons who took part in the resident interviews and focus groups were primarily living in the area of Bryndwr depicted as having high levels of deprivation and specifically sought out for their perspectives. It was expected that the needs identified here may be different from those residents who completed surveys. Interestingly this is true for only one of the most identified needs; the other dominant categories remain the same as their neighbours living in the more affluent areas of the community.
Language and cultural barriers were the most commonly named difficulties identified by these residents. This is most likely a reflection of the fact that most of these residents were born in countries other than New Zealand.

As an example, one of the main needs identified by the Samoan focus group; was the need for advocacy in dealing with government departments and community services. Accessing these services and sources of support was hindered by language difficulties which affected the confidence these people had in seeking this help. For this reason English language classes were mentioned as a useful form of assistance to help overcome the barrier that currently exists.

In addition, cultural differences further hindered access to support for these Samoan residents. For example, one member of the group said that Samoan people tend to work within their existing networks rather than reach out to anyone new. Assistance and encouragement would be needed if Samoan people were to make stronger links with other people and resources in the community. This would then enhance their ability to access necessary resources.

Culture and language issues were also very relevant for the younger generations of Samoan people. We were told that, like their elders, young Samoan people need help to develop confidence in school settings so they could reach out and make their needs known. Young people growing up in traditional Samoan families were taught to defer to their elders and not to speak up, so that when they entered the palagi (pakeha) world, they were at a disadvantage.

Language difficulties were also identified by Korean residents. Not being fluent in English was seen as contributing to the difficulty of finding work. However, from our discussion, it also appeared that there were more support systems available to Korean residents. We were told that the government provides interpreters for Korean people when using government services, and there was a home office facility in Riccarton that provided assistance in dealing with government services. This greatly assisted their transition into the New Zealand culture. The internet and their ability to access information specific to Korean New Zealanders also greatly helped them in terms of support and networks. No other cultural group reported this being available to them.

The parents of another family who had arrived from overseas in the last couple of years, said language barriers are the biggest issue for them and that having language classes close by would be a big assistance for them as their children speak better English than they do.

The Maori residents said the Maori language and the bilingual unit at Aorangi school were essential for them. They stated that they need a place where “it feels comfortable being and speaking Maori”. Residents saw a need for Te Reo classes to be run in the area to support the strengthening of their culture and identity. One resident said her kids knew more Te Reo than her and that being able to learn the language locally meant she would be able to support her children better.
4.2.3.a Financial barriers

There were a number of ways financial difficulties affected these residents. For some, there was concern at the number of hours of work required in order to get a reasonable income. This they said had an adverse affect on the quality of family life.

It was also reported that Housing New Zealand homes were not warm enough and the cost associated with heating, was also raised as a concern. However, a couple of people also said that Housing New Zealand were faster at getting things fixed now, and that heat pumps and insulation were being put into Housing New Zealand houses now.

Another resident said money was the biggest issue for her family as they are on a benefit. She added that the local vegetable cooperative at St Aidans made vegetables really affordable. One of the administrators at St Aidans told us that the vegetable cooperative has seen a 50% increase in the amount of fruit and vegetables going out this year compared to last year, and according to one of the helpers at the cooperative, a third of those coming to the cooperative now are young mothers. This suggests that particular groups in Bryndwr, such as single parents, may be under increasing financial strain at present. However, the most commonly experienced financial problem for residents we interviewed was the inability of parents to provide recreation activities for their children and teenagers.

4.2.3.b Affordable activities for children and young people

For a lot of the parents, organised sports clubs or groups were seen as too expensive for their children and teenagers to attend. Jellie Park Pool was also identified by some parents as being too expensive for them to use. They said more free, or low cost organised activities for youth such as Affirm in Aranui, would be good. One parent said there were no local community activities that she could afford to bring her kids to. Even the YMCA was considered too expensive. She said that as a single parent, she could not afford to put her kids into programmes even though her kids were interested, such as dance classes at the YMCA. She said it was a financial issue for single parents.

The parents of another family who had arrived in New Zealand recently, said they would like their children to participate in more sporting activities such as swimming and gymnastics, but the cost of these activities was a barrier to this.

Some parents said youth in particular, need to have things to do after school, on week nights and weekends. The example of a touch rugby programme that had been organised at Aorangi School in after school hours was brought up to illustrate the kind of events that were positive and accessible.

Affordable before school care, after school care, and holiday programmes were also needed some parents said. They added that young people need a distraction, and having things to do would keep them safer as well.

There was an awareness amongst a few parents of the important mental health benefits that participation in social, recreation, and sporting groups had for young people. They said connecting up with other children increased their confidence to relate socially and develop a positive sense of place and belonging in the community.
One Afghani parent spoke about the benefits for young people in assisting them find their place in this new country. He said “youth need sport activities and facilities in order to help them adjust to the new culture. These keep youth out of trouble because they are dealing with a lot of pressures from being in a new country. If they did not have these activities, they could turn to drink, drugs, or gambling, as a way to escape the pressures.” This point illustrates that the provision of a range of affordable activities for young people is vital for the mental wellbeing of the young people in Bryndwr.

4.2.3.c Youth groups
Given that activities for children and youth play an important function in positive wellbeing, this suggests that the existing youth groups in Bryndwr would be one place where social and recreational activities could occur. However while some families were aware of these being available and made use of them, others did not.

One parent said there were two or three youth groups that her children could go to if they were interested such as one at Fendalton Library, St. Johns in Jeffreys Road, and St Aidans. Another parent though said she was not aware of any youth groups in the area, yet she lived in the same street where there was a youth group running at a local church.

This may reflect the need for more information on local groups and resources to be provided to families in Bryndwr. Or it may point to the need for a greater variety of groups to be available to young people to cater for the differences between people in the community. It may be that church based youth groups attract some who live in the community and not others.

As in any area of the city, there are communities within communities, people that unite with each other based on various criteria such as culture, age, interests eg: skateboarders, socio-economic differences, geographical, eg: neighbours, religious beliefs, professional or employment groupings, etc., -things they share with some but not others. This variety creates richness to a community. However, our belief is that it is also important to make it possible for all groups to be able to participate in its community, not only to enhance the wellbeing of the community, but also so that this variety and richness can be valued by all those that live there.

If it is deemed worthwhile to provide more activities for young people, then the activities provided need to reflect the range of groups that exist in the community. This also means they need to be financially accessible, so that all people have the opportunity to participate in their community.

4.2.3.d Safety
Evaluating the information around safety is not straight forward. While some residents not mentioning that safety was a concern, did refer to acts of theft and burglary. Therefore we have included feedback from residents on activities such as theft, burglary, intimidation, and some examples of vandalism, which by their nature, is likely to affect someone’s real or perceived sense of safety. Similarly, other factors can add to a sense of feeling safe for people, such as having positive relationships with neighbours or others in their street.

Some of the residents only made positive comments about Bryndwr as a safe place to live, while others spoke of areas of Bryndwr they felt were unsafe. However, some others only made negative comments about safety in Bryndwr.
A few residents said they found their neighbours really friendly with one adding she also felt it was a safe area for children. Another resident said she would rate the level of safety where she lives as normal, though she wouldn’t let her children roam the neighbourhood freely. “They are fairly close but not totally mothered” she said. She added that some of the people who move into Housing New Zealand homes can be quite transient and can be a threat to neighbours, but also said she felt connected to her neighbours. One of the residents who has lived in the area for over ten years said that people look out for one another, but that the neighbourhood is riddled with drugs. He went on to say that “this community is as safe as any other, except that it’s less safe if you are hassling people or not paying drug debts”.

One group of parents described Bryndwr as “safe for children” because of the existing network of relationships with other local families. This meant these families knew their children and could look out for them. Safety in this example had been created through the existence of a strong network of parents. This network was strong because it went back generations giving it a level of stability, and also because it was a network that had ongoing contact with Aorangi School which acted to nurture and enhance this network.

4.2.3.e Unsafe areas

It is interesting to note that these same parents identified certain areas around Bryndwr as less safe. The skate park at Jellie Park was one such area. One parent said it needs more patrolling. She said “I went there the other day and there were adults drinking during the day. It’s a good idea (to have the skate park), I don’t want to lose it, but it needs to be patrolled - needs to be safe”.

Other areas in Bryndwr were also considered unsafe by this group of parents with gangs being named as the cause of this. For example, Morley Park was not considered a safe place. One parent said she would never go and play there adding “Morley Park needs something done to it, it’s run down and dodgy, tagged, always police there”.

Certain streets or places being considered unsafe was a common theme amongst residents we interviewed. One resident said it can be frightening to walk around some streets. Even at 7am in the morning there are people drinking and swearing. She said she normally keeps away from these areas. Another resident said, “it is not the area you live in that is the issue, but the street you live in. You can have good streets and bad streets.”

This same resident said he could see no good things about Bryndwr as his experience had been very negative. He said his family’s shoes and clothes had been stolen regularly, beer bottles thrown at his house two or three times a month, sometimes breaking windows. He said it had been like this for the whole time he and his family had lived there. His car had been broken into and a camera stolen. They have reported these things to the police but the police have said they cannot do anything as they cannot park their car outside the home for twenty-four hours a day.

Another parent rated her feeling of safety as 8 or 9 out of 10 (10 being unsafe and 1 being safe). She went on to say that her house had been burgled eight or nine times this year, with clothes and medication being stolen.
One parent who had previously lived at another address in Bryndwr, said that their back neighbours used to have loud parties, were verbally abusive, regularly threw objects and bottles at their house and into their yard, and broke their fence. This resident felt too afraid to call the police because he was concerned it would make their neighbours more angry and intimidating. He now lives with his family in another house in a different area of Bryndwr. However, when they had just moved into their current house, it was broken into, and the children’s toys were stolen. He said the police did not come immediately, and they were told by police just to clean up the mess including possible evidence such as a large footprint probably belonging to the thief. He said that the children were now scared to walk through the house at night alone. It cost a lot of money to change the locks he said, but they have now put a security system into the house.

In contrast, another resident we interviewed said in the twenty-five years he had lived in Bryndwr, he had never been burgled.

The impact on the sense of safety people felt also appeared to be influenced by specific incidents that have occurred in Bryndwr. For example, one parent recalled reading about an incident in the local newspaper in July, of a car following a child home and the driver attempted to induce her to get into the car. This contributed to this parent feeling wary and worried. Other examples mentioned were a local drugs bust by the police a year ago, and a stabbing at local shops. Residents remembered events such as these when talking about safety, even if they had occurred some time ago perhaps due to the ‘dangerousness’ of the event. And they seem to have an impact on their sense of safety.

### 4.2.3.f Connection

While the focus to date has been primarily on practical issues, a few residents spoke about the importance of ‘connection’ at a social and spiritual level, as a need for people. One parent who suffered from a disability said social contact was an important way for her to help manage her disability. She said a local drop in centre where she could talk to someone if she was feeling low, or just to meet new people would be good. Another resident spoke about the need for her son who also has a disability, to have more opportunities to meet socially with others.

One resident, who had had repeated incidences of bottles being thrown at the house and things stolen, said he did not usually talk to his neighbours; however, he was now making contact with some neighbours he could trust in an effort to get support to deal with the stresses of his home and family being targeted.

Another resident who also works in the community said “the most important part of strengthening community is local people connecting with each other”. She said “two people came (to the vegetable cooperative) this morning and they wanted to talk”. She said that lots of lives are touched through the church activities.

### 4.2.3.g Interrelated problems

From the viewpoint of one service provider who has also lived in Bryndwr for many years, the issues mentioned such as financial barriers, safety, and cultural barriers, are often linked together with other issues and act to maintain and reinforce problems. Factors which can contribute to this are poverty, mental health issues, inadequate housing, and the lack of certain life skills such as delayed gratification. He said people could do with knowing about budgeting, making good choices, and perhaps drug...
counselling; however it is an uphill battle when people lead chaotic lives. He said many bright young people in the community lead the same lives (as their parents) because they have had access to and have taken drugs, alcohol, dropped out of school and had babies too young.

4.2.4 Youth perspectives (N=95)

4.2.4.a Safety

One of the biggest issues for the young people taking part in this research was that of safety and nearly half of young people mentioned this in their comments. Breaking these comments down, it was noted that Jellie Park needs to be safer, and the skate park was referred to as unsafe. There was often referral made to the "dodgy people" at the park or the park being a "dodgy place". The alley ways around the park and the gangs were also seen as unsafe. A few young people didn’t feel safe in certain areas and a couple of other young people said that Jellie Park was not safe at night.

The need for safe places or social groups where young people could hang out other than the park was reiterated, such as a mall or recreation centre to provide a better alternative to the park.

Two intermediate age girls we spoke to said their parents made a rule that they had to bike together through the park. They said that when there were lots of people about it felt safer because they could get help, but when they had to travel through streets where there were not many people, it felt less safe because there were not so many around to get help from. They also said sometimes there are fights in the park which makes them nervous. “When you don’t know what they’re gonna do, we don’t feel safe”.

Two Korean youth we interviewed at Jellie Park talked about their experience of what appears to be racially based abuse, theft, and intimidation at the park. They said that sometimes there are nice people at the park - that they have friends who they meet at the park and school, and on Saturday mornings they come and watch the soccer. Then they added, “There are nice people and bad people. Racists swear at us. Some people come here to annoy us, pick on people who don’t know English. There are more bad people than good people. There are lots of places they can gang up and steal from others. .. They have stolen my helmet, bag and lunchbox. The hardest thing to deal with is the racist people, and they gang up on us. I have no choice but to defend myself".
Another older teenager we interviewed at the park said “G’s (gangsters) like to rob people around the area. He said he had a scooter that was thrashed and crashed by the G’s. “They’re always around here, we know them, -they’ll never grow up, same age as us, there’s still a big group. If you’re smaller than them they’ll go for you...there needs to be a safe environment that kids are attracted to”. He also suggested that there had been some improvement regarding safety around Jellie Park in recent times.

Another group of intermediate boys at the park had a different perspective saying most of the people at the park were nice people, and a few aren’t.

Clearly, safety is a big concern for the young people taking part in this research. For many it meant being wary around the park. One young person said they were unable to walk around without looking behind their back, while another said “there was nowhere to bike, walk, or run safely”. Whether or not the park has become safer or not, it is still a concern for almost half the young people we interviewed and it appears to restrict their movements in the area. In response to this a few people commented on the need for increased surveillance, or security cameras around the park.

4.2.4.b More youth activities and recreation facilities

A need for more activities for youth, and more recreation facilities were commonly brought up by young people. While some just said that they needed more things to do, there was also a wide range of suggestions of activities for young people including, a confidence course, basketball court, better tennis courts, better gymnasium, rock climbing, kart track, dirt jump, under age music venue like ZBD’s, dancing and singing lessons, and drama groups . There were also suggestions about providing more activities at Jellie Park such as organised sport events, family days, and movie sessions (outdoor presumably).

Some young people said they wanted a safe place to ‘hang out’ that was free. A few made comments like “Places where you hang out costs money (we don’t have much!)” or “It (Bryndwr) needs something ‘free’ to hang out at, other than the park”. They also said they would like more shops or malls in the area. Again, some comments suggested that malls were good because they were safe and free places to meet with other young people. There also appeared to be an awareness that there were no malls in the local Bryndwr area, and that Riccarton mall was too far away. Food shops were mostly identified as the kind of shops young people were most interested in.

4.2.4.c Skate park improved

Improvements were also recommended as a need for some young people. This referred to having a bigger skate park with greater choices for skaters, more skate competitions, and greater safety at the park, (the absence of ‘dodgy people’ at the park).
4.2.5 Agencies and organisations working in Bryndwr (N=20)

Within the agency and organisation survey (appendix D), we asked ‘what do you see as the needs of this community being?’ This produced a wide range of responses, though common themes emerged.

Over half of the respondents (59%) noted ‘cultural support’ was a need of the Bryndwr community. Suggestions included; ‘integration of new immigrants to New Zealand’, ‘some way of breaking barriers of cultural diversity would be helpful’ and a ‘centre for Pacifica families to use for educational purposes/youth library’.

The next most popular identified need was ‘parent help and services for parents’ (41%). Comments included: ‘Groups for parents to learn cooking, budgeting etc’, ‘refugee support (parenting, English)’ and ‘parenting help ie: access/available to parenting programmes...’

Safety issues were mentioned by 35% of organisations participating. This included family violence, drug issues and the need for further safety requirements around the parks and possible community police patrolling.

Youth needs were identified by 35% of respondents. Comments varied about this, but included: ‘Youth, families, whanau needing skills support...’, ‘youth facilities and community workers working with the youths in the area’ and ‘activities for youth’.

‘Families’ and support/service availability to them was mentioned by 29% of respondents. Once again the comments varied, but included: ‘Social work in the area of family work’ and ‘affordable, available activities for low income families, especially teenage children from sole parent families’.

Each mentioned 24% of the time by organisations as needs within the community were; 'access to Government services', 'supports when there is poverty' and the need for 'a meeting place'.

Comments surrounding the need for Government services were: ‘easier access to housing corp. and WINZ in this area’ or another person has mentioned visiting services being provided by these organisations. The predominant requests were for Housing NZ and Work and Income to be more available.

One comment surrounding the need for help with families and people who are in poverty included: ‘a huge amount of poverty represented in our school – without food/shoes’.

A meeting place or comments which pertained to the possibility of a community hub included ‘a place for teenagers to hang out’, ‘a place to meet’ and ‘access to suitable facilities – halls’. Other comments indicating a community hub facility included:

- ‘...skills support etc in non-thinking environment, sharing the good things and celebrating these’.
- ‘supports based in the community’
- ‘a way to link people together more...’
It must be noted however that the organisation focus groups realised they were participating in research surrounding the possibility of a community hub-type facility in the Bryndwr community, so this may have in part accounted for these types of statements.

Twelve percent of the organisation respondents also mentioned the needs being around help with drug-usage, community-based supports being available for residents, and as well as the availability of budgeting advice.

Other one-off comments suggested more information made available to residents, and a comment noting that elderly isolation also existed within the community.

Focus group discussions outlined the following themes and needs:

**Youth needs**
Focus group discussions reiterated the need for support surrounding youth including a community place for a youth worker, possible employment opportunities – youth were mentioned here though the discussion was more general than this. One of the focus groups discussed the possibility of Aorangi School becoming a refugee and migrant centre including drop-in centre and community classes. ‘Safety’ was also a raised as a concern for this community.

**Support for parents of young children**
One focus group identified a need for groups and education for young parents. They saw that while there is an initial push to support these parents, this tails off. The organisations felt that while there were classes available to parents at Fendalton, many young parents did not attend due to financial constraints, racial barriers or a fear of being judged.

**Access to government agencies**
Housing issues was another problem for the community, particularly mentioned were those residents living in Housing New Zealand housing in that they were cold and damp. The flow-on effects of this were health issues, and access to health services was seen as difficult because of the costs involved.

Better access to Government agencies was identified as being important particularly Housing New Zealand and Work and Income, and while there was some discussion surrounding the buses being available to services such as those in Papanui, this too may be a barrier in that it costs money, and can be difficult to manage with young children.

It was apparent through interviews with local service providers that currently the Afghani community utilises existing church halls for weddings and events. Though this was welcomed, there were some restrictions because of the Afghan religion being Muslim as opposed to Christian based. Therefore a space for these types of Afghani Muslim community events was seen as a need. Also mentioned was young Afghani residents were finding the New Zealand way-of-life difficult in some regards. This was reiterated particularly around boys who, with New Zealand friends, find they have access to alcohol and sex, and this can lead to conflicts.
This community was also sometimes seen as being unsafe due to drugs, crime and violence. It was noted that while the community could sometimes support one another, the relationships could also be turbulent; “The (relationship) network is established through Housing New Zealand – they all know one another, all lived in the same neighbourhoods at one time or another....Relationships are okay, but they're fickle. Based on drugs...In many ways it makes the community a less safe neighbourhood.” Again, it was suggested that youth may be able to be supported in this.

4.2.6 Summary of the needs of the Bryndwr community

One of the common themes across many groups of the residents that have taken part in this research is that there was a lack of cohesion, and little community interaction in the Bryndwr community.

Other issues which were apparent with the resident survey responses were financial concerns, safety, health and stress. While Burnside primary school parents said they did not like the physical environment of Bryndwr because of such things as rubbish and dog mess, disliked the people because of bullying, snobbery and that there was no strong link between the community and families. They also stated what they did not like about living in Bryndwr was the crime.

In order to make living in Bryndwr better, the most popular resident survey responses included crime reduction, improvements to the physical environment and improved community connectedness. This is reiterated by the Burnside Primary school parents in that their responses to this question include; community/social connectedness, improvements to the physical environment and crime reduction.

The resident interviews and focus groups were held with people that mostly live within the state housing area of Bryndwr which may denote different needs from those residents who completed surveys. Firstly, language and cultural barriers was the most commonly named difficulty identified by these residents. Many (of these residents) were born in countries other than New Zealand and it was interesting hearing different ethnic groups speak of their needs for advocacy, youth work and support. The language and cultural difficulties also extended to finding employment. Each different ethnic needs in regard to language and cultural difficulties was unique in that what pertained to one group, did not necessarily pertain to another. As an example the need for advocacy was very relevant for the Samoan group, but not relevant for the Korean group, and while Maori wanted a place where they could feel comfortable speaking and learning Maori, other ethnic groups expressed no such need.

Like the resident survey respondents, focus group and interviewed residents said that financial issues concerned them. These included low working wages and the high cost of electricity to heat their homes. The vegetable co-operative run from St Aidan’s church provides fresh fruit and vegetables at affordable prices for local people and they have seen an increase in people using this service which also indicates financial difficulties for some residents.
Another common financial issue for families is the affordability of activities for children and teenagers. Recreation, sport, the Jellie Park pool facilities and YMCA were all identified as being too expensive for some families to use. While we know that sporting and recreational opportunities for young people are an important part of social interaction, role modelling and learning useful skills, they are not available for many of these families due to the associated cost.

Before and after school care and holiday programmes as well as activities for families were also unobtainable due to associated costs. These may also be important in providing parents with respite, as well as the children and young people with social, recreational and academic growth. The extension (based on different youth interests) and promotion of current youth groups or sporting activities may also be beneficial. Such activities could promote involvement and engagement into New Zealand life.

Safety was also a prevalent issue. While some of the resident focus groups and interviews said they felt okay about their own and their children’s personal safety in Bryndwr, they also reported certain areas of Bryndwr as unsafe. The Jellie Park skate park was seen as one such area, as was Morley Park because of an association with gangs living around there. Some aligned not specific ‘areas’ of Bryndwr as unsafe, but specific ‘streets’.

Theft and burglary were reported by some of the residents as having happened to them and their families, and some as a common occurrence. While the police are called, this in their experience has not led to any lessened levels of crime, or it was also reported that people felt they couldn’t call the police for fear of retribution. However, one resident said they had never had such problems, which again might be a part of the unsafe ‘street’, rather than unsafe ‘area’ possibility. It is also understood that drugs play a part in the crime levels as well as volatile neighbourly relationships reported because of such.

While these practical difficulties are a part of the challenges residents are facing, there was also a need established which was for social interaction and connection. The local churches and schools are the places mentioned as providing opportunities for this to occur for people.

For Bryndwr’s young people one of the biggest issues was that of safety, in fact nearly half of all youth who took part in this research considered it a problem for them. Most commonly people spoke of feeling unsafe around Jellie Park and skate park because of the types of people they saw there, that there was fighting, the alleyways could be scary, gangs were apparent in the area and at night it felt unsafe. There were also accounts of racially based abuse, theft and intimidation at Jellie Park.

It appears that while young people really enjoy Jellie Park (including the pool), it may not be being utilised to its full potential because of the safety issues for young people. Jellie Park may also be a perfect place for many of the recreational and social events, groups and interactions they would also like available, however while it is viewed as unsafe these possibilities may be restricted. Some of these ideas for activities and facilities could be incorporated into a possible youth facility.
The organisations and agencies working within the Bryndwr community often times voiced the same needs as the resident interviews and focus groups and advocate on their behalf. They state cultural support as being of high need in the community, in order that integration of new immigrants into New Zealand and this community is as successful as possible.

Greater parent help and support was also advocated, and agencies deem practical help (cooking, budgeting, parenting programmes) important. The residents themselves ask more for activities for their children. However, there may be a place for both. Examples could be programmes and activities that parents and young people could attend together - meal or school lunch preparation or could sport activities. School environments provide great settings for this 'whole family' approach, and this has proved popular in some of the school aligned community hubs discussed as part of section 4.3 of this document.

Safety issues were brought up as an issue by agencies as well, including family violence and drug issues. Other relevant issues noted in the Bryndwr community were the need for better access to Governmental and agency supports, Bryndwr youth needing support - but suggestions also extend to parenting/family groups or programmes to help support the transitions and problems that can arise for families during this time. In fact ‘family’ work or family support work was also seen as a community need.

Many of the needs expressed by residents and the agencies who work in Bryndwr do lend themselves to a community hub being established in the area. A community hub could (in order to actively respond to the community's needs) incorporate and establish a social place for residents as well as offer free or low-cost activities and facilities for young people. Support could also be made available to help with budgeting and provide better access to Government agencies, or more support may be offered where some of this is already being offered, eg through local churches and schools.

Groups, professionals and support running from a community hub facility may also provide health and stress advice, as well as cultural support in line with the community's needs. As well as this, the other two prominent needs identified; safety and up-keep of the physical environment, could also actively be responded to by resident groups in conjunction with the Christchurch City Council, NZ Police and existing supports such as Neighbourhood Support.

These are just some ideas, however it is realised that a community hub facility is not a fast and simple solution to overcome all the needs of the community. It is reassuring however, that the community needs as identified by the community itself, can actively be responded to by providing a community hub facility, as well as by supporting those groups already responding.
4.3  A Bryndwr community hub

Identifying the strengths and needs of the Bryndwr community has helped form ideas for the possibility of a community hub. We specifically asked participants whether a community hub was a good idea, where it could be located, and what sorts of facilities, activities and services it could provide.

4.3.1  Resident survey (N=102)

4.3.1.a  Resident views on whether a community hub should be available in Bryndwr

When asking whether people thought a community hub in Bryndwr was a good idea, the results supported the concept and idea.

The majority of survey respondents believe a community hub is a good idea in Bryndwr. And, if the most negative situation arose and those that didn't answer this question (23%) all actually thought 'no', the majority of residents (68%) still support the idea. Therefore this is a very positive result in favour of a community hub in Bryndwr.
The reasons residents believe a community hub is a good idea are as follows:

**Figure 25: Why residents believe a community hub is a good idea**

Sixty-two percent of those responding felt a community hub may provide 'social connectedness' and said things such as:

- 'it could be a good meeting place for people',
- 'a place is needed where people can meet together regardless of culture etc.',
- 'builds community - helps people to get to know each other'.

Twenty-nine percent of respondents thought a community could provide access to 'social services'. These responses included:

- 'it will bring people together and provide assistance for those who need it' (also coded as social connectedness),
- 'for many, especially low-income families and the elderly, it is difficult for them to access the likes of WINZ, medical help etc without transport, language difficulties, literacy issues.'

Eleven percent of respondents who supported the community hub concept still had some concerns such as:

- 'but would it be utilised?'
- 'I do in a way, but there are already a few hubs of activity- Jellie Park, Ilam shops'
- 'I'm not sure a created hub would work'

The respondents who ticked 'no' as to whether they believed a community hub in Bryndwr was not a good idea, generally thought existing services were already well covered.
Survey respondents were asked if Aorangi School was a good location for the community hub. The news at this time had not hit the newspapers of the school’s proposed closure, though it was evident the school was struggling to secure permission to re-build the school, therefore this may have affected results.

The results of whether Aorangi school is a good location for a community hub are basically an even split, which may have made deciding on placement of a community hub there difficult. It is also worth noting that of the 52% of respondents answering yes, 11% of these also suggested somewhere else. The most common of these was Jellie Park. Also mentioned was Burnside High School, Wairakei School, 'somewhere more central' and within or as a part of 'an existing facility' in the community.

4.3.1. b Other locations suggested for a Bryndwr community hub

Twenty of the respondents who did not think Aorangi School was a suitable location suggested alternative locations:

Figure 26: Other locations for a community hub

The most popular comment was 'somewhere more central' (30%) and equal numbers (20% each) suggested Jellie Park or Wairakei School as the location, somewhere the bus services and foot traffic would help with access as well as 'other' ideas, though these mostly represented one-off suggestions.
4.3.1.3 Community facilities and services that a Bryndwr community hub could provide.

In order to be able to consider the possible need for a community hub in Bryndwr, as well as what facilities, activities and services it could provide, we asked questions about what services were being accessed from outside the Bryndwr community. This way the data provides insight into any considerations for services/facilities which may be beneficial if available within the Bryndwr community.

In hindsight however, this question did not directly lead us to the answer 'what facilities/services a possible community hub might provide'. It would after all be difficult to replicate shops/businesses which include 87% of responses. Medical centres have also received a number of responses (49%), though we have not asked why people are choosing medical centres outside of Bryndwr. Playgrounds and parks (42%) may be worth considering as an aspect of a community, though further research might be beneficial in distinguishing what these parks outside of Bryndwr offer that Jellie and Morley Parks do not. Perhaps a free indoor playground is an option for a community hub facility. It would have the benefit of potential usage all year round rather than an outdoor play ground and pool which are more weather dependent.

The interest groups category (29%) provided a space for respondents to list these. There are few 'double-up' responses and some responses, for example 'Canterbury University lectures' are unlikely to be available in the Bryndwr community. However there were night school or adult classes appearing which may provide some ideas for a possible community hub. These included:

- 'night school - Papanui High.' Another person said they attended 'Beginners Te Reo/Tikanga at CPIT', and one other person said they attended WEA lectures (which provide adult education),
- 'Just Breathe' (Postnatal Depression Coffee and Support Group), as well as another respondent adding 'Step Ahead (Stanmore Road and Riccarton)' which supports people who experience mental illness.

Other interest groups varied and ranged from an 'art group', 'choir and orchestra', 'floral art', 'genealogy', 'RSA', 'Lions', 'pottery', 'salsa dancing' as well as groups which appeared appropriate for older persons for example 'Probus', 'bridge clubs', 'sit and be fit' and 'Fendalton Seniors Friendship Group'.

We also asked survey respondents directly what things their household would like to see in a community hub we used a tick box selection which prompted the following results:
Access to a community constable (55%) and drop in space/cafe (53%) were most popular. In regard to 'education classes' the resident survey prompted 'which ones'. The results were as follows:

Figure 28: Education class suggestions
Thirty-three people added the types of education classes they would like to see in a community hub to their survey. Recent government funding cuts to the adult and continuing education however, may impact upon these types of options being available in a community hub facility.

4.3.1.d Community events

When considering Bryndwr community events within the 'strengths' and 'needs' sections of this report, we also asked respondents what events they had attended 'outside' of Bryndwr. Noted from the results earlier (section 1.1.1d), were those 63% of respondents had not attended events in the area, which seemed like a lot, but there are some further unknowns, for example, are there currently not many events held within the Bryndwr community? Or is there a lack of interest in community events inside Bryndwr? This may also relate to 'safety' issues which residents have noted are of concern to them.

Figure 29: Attendance of community events outside Bryndwr

Forty-eight people responded to the question 'have you attended community events outside Bryndwr?’. Fifty-three percent stated they had and 47% stated they had not. This might then be indicative of a community which aren’t overly interested in community events, it may be indicative of an older group of people answering the survey (approximately one third of respondents were aged 60 or above), it also again might be that the question was too obscure or difficult to answer or recall. It is evident within the answer where respondents have listed groups or activities they have attended; it appears that the lack of definition of a ‘community event' has in some instances led to confusion. In order to consider whether this community is not overly interested in community events, Bryndwr community event organisers may be able to comment on the levels of attendance they have experienced at their events for example local schools and Christchurch City Council.
Question eight of the resident survey provides a better reflection of facilities, services or events which a community hub could provide by asking 'Are there any other community services, facilities or events you would like available in Bryndwr?' This was left as an open question in order that residents could freely consider what facilities and events they would utilise.

Figure 30: Other community services, facilities or events Bryndwr residents want available

Those respondents who have indicated that they did not require any further events, services or facilities (24%) often expanded upon this with more information about the strengths of the community including:

- 'NO - because existing services are offered, based in existing church halls- coffee mornings, free doctors',
- 'NO - I think Bryndwr has a lot of facilities within the area already for its residents'.

Another popular response from residents was the need for more community events and connectedness (24%). Some examples of the responses here were:

- 'social groups, coffee groups'
- 'live music on a regular basis'
- 'market days'
- 'a cultural or neighbourhood event would be nice'.

Responses for business facilities (19%) included wanting a post shop, banks, and a good butcher.
Interestingly too is that support services are noted as something people would like available (11%), this included 'support for outsiders/immigrants', 'community police', 'food banks'.

Health services (11%) included a nurse clinic, a health centre, ante-natal groups and counselling services.

We also asked residents what other ideas they had for a community hub.

![Figure 31: Ideas for a community hub](image)

Twenty-two people added comments here from the 102 completed surveys. 27% of those responding used this question as a place to voice concerns, or to state their needs are already met. Twenty-three percent (of the 22) suggested community garden or food options including:

- 'community gardens - esp. vegetable, including tables and picnic area, pizza oven to be fired during weekends'
- 'practical healthy food-cooking-shopping for good nutrition budget menus and shopping lists'

Fourteen percent mentioned a gathering place or a place where social connections can occur including:

- 'at present Fendalton Village or Wairakei shops are the only place where people without children are able to meet their neighbours (in our area)'
- 'encouragement to have neighbourhood gatherings eg: meals'

Another 14% thought an idea for a community hub could be surrounding music and dance classes:

- 'live music space- outside for summer- inside for winter'
Those suggesting 'other' options said a local newsletter, library and 'any of the above if it helps people without transport etc, to access their needs'

4.3.2 Resident interview and focus groups (N=36)

Of the thirty-six adults interviewed, most were positive about having a community hub facility in Bryndwr, some were against the idea and others were undecided.

Figure 32: Is a community hub a good idea for Bryndwr?

4.3.2.a It is a good idea?

Supporters of a community hub in Bryndwr suggested a variety of ways that it could be of benefit to the community. These can be categorised as follows:

- a general meeting place for the community, a site for gatherings, a source of information,
- a place where teenagers and children could participate in affordable activities, meet and mix, including holiday programmes, after school programmes, youth groups, outings, social events,
- a social place for adults to meet, café facilities, family activities, social groups,
- a place where parents could get support with parenting,
- a place where social services could be provided,
- a place where government agencies such as Work and Income and Housing New Zealand could be accessed,
- a place where activity groups and classes could be offered,
- an additional facility for the school (based on it being at Aorangi School).

4.3.2.b General meeting place

Most commonly mentioned was that it could be a meeting place for local people, a place where people can be more involved with each other, building relationships and strengthening their connection with others in the community. One way this could occur was through the use of the centre as a site for gatherings from different cultures. One
Afghani parent said one of the biggest challenges for the Afghani community, was finding a big enough place to use for weddings, services, funerals, and meetings. A community centre might be able to be such a place and it appears there would have no problems sharing a centre with other groups in Bryndwr.

He went on to say that Afghani families, when they get together, are loud and noisy, and churches are reluctant to hire out venues because neighbours complain. There was agreement too from other residents understanding that while Muslims can celebrate certain events in a Christian facility, they couldn’t celebrate religious events themselves such as weddings (the wedding after function however is okay). Some residents also noted there was no gathering place for immigrant groups and some residents recommended that a community hub could be used for this purpose and that different cultures could come together at a community hub through sharing food. They said this is the best way to lessen discrimination.

This same group also said another way the hub could fulfil a community ‘connecting’ function was through it providing administration and communication resources such as computers, photocopying, and telephone. Linked to this was the hub being a source of information for local people on the services and activities going on in the area.

4.3.2.c A place for teenagers and children

This was the next most common point made by respondents. One parent said “teenage girls and boys are the group needing support. It is too expensive to do things with teenagers - we need things for them to do outside school times - on weekends and week nights”. Another idea was for outings and tours to be arranged for young people from the centre. Also mentioned was the provision of before and after school programmes, and holiday programmes from the centre. One parent said “a community centre would be good so all the kids can hang out and get to know each other. Kids could play games, sports, where parents could go as well and just meet, -just more things for kids unless you have to pay for it. Even if a charge is just a donation, people don’t mind paying some money. -thinking more of the kids’ health and fitness, -kids in this area don’t seem to have…I would like to see a place for local kids to meet and mix, and development confidence”. It was added that the YMCA which was generally affordable, had moved out of the area from Greers Rd to Bishopdale two or three years ago, reducing options for low-cost activities for youth. Youth activities were seen as a healthy way of young people channelling their energy in a positive direction.

4.3.2.d A place for parents

A few parents mentioned that a centre could be a good resource for mums and babies or toddlers, and could provide activity groups, toys available for pre-schoolers, get togethers, local speakers regarding childcare and children’s dental needs. Another parent said her teenage daughter was getting older and into a bit of trouble. She said she needed help about how to manage a teenage daughter. She also mentioned the value of health advice for parents.

A hub was also seen as a place where adults could come together to socialise. One respondent said she would like to be able to play pool or ping pong at the centre or drop in for a cup of coffee. Another parent said she would like her adult son to meet other people his age and join in with social events, while providing ‘Housie’ for a family night was also suggested.
4.3.2. e A place for support services

One respondent (who has been diagnosed with having a mental illness), said she would like to be able to drop in for a cup of coffee and chat if she was feeling low, - maybe talk with a social worker. She also thought it would be good for kids to be able to drop in to talk about their problems as she is aware youth suicide is a big problem in this city. It was also suggested a community worker could be based at the centre.

4.3.2. f A place for accessing government agencies

One parent we spoke to said the hub could be a place where local people may be able to get support from Housing New Zealand. He also said that confidentiality would be very important for it to work well. Another parent said they need easier access to Housing New Zealand. She said “it’s hard to get transport there. Getting an appointment can be difficult. It would be easier at the hub. It's embarrassing and impersonal in town”. Two residents also thought it would be good to have easier access to Work and Income noting that they had appreciated being able to meet with one of the Work and Income workers who currently visit people in the community.

Suggested classes included English as a Second Language (ESOL) classes and Te Reo classes. One parent said she would like to be able to learn Te Reo classes locally, evening classes where she could meet new people. This desire was echoed by other parents. Other suggestions for activities or classes included a community garden, affordable dance classes, yoga, and cooking. Another suggestion was providing classes for older people, such as exercise classes, craft activities, or day centre type activities. Holding such groups locally, made access easier for elderly people.

4.3.2. g A school based community hub

While the recent closing of Aorangi school could have meant this information having lessened relevance, it is still important to include because the school/community hub model continues to be relevant.

One group of parents, whose children attended the bilingual unit at Aorangi, said having a community hub at the school enhanced what the school could offer its students and families. For example, they spoke about the need for it to have a kitchen so that the year 7 and year 8 students in the bilingual unit could have access to facilities they needed as intermediate age students. They also said that having a hub would help them be more involved with the school, acting to strengthen relationships. They suggested that it could run along the lines of the community centre model in Aranui with Super Grans up the road.

4.3.2. h A community hub is not a good idea

One group of respondents who had immigrated to New Zealand said they felt a community centre was not really helpful for their community as their needs were being met in other ways. Similarly, a few other people said that adequate community centres or services already existed. One person said “people should make better use of the existing community assets” while another said “something about it doesn’t make sense when there are good groups already going”. She added that “there is the soccer club, karate, but it is expensive, the park is fantastic, park and pool,..., Northlands for movies, there are two or three youth groups [her teenager] could go to if interested, one down at Fendalton Library, Jeffreys Rd, and St Aidans”.

She also added that she was not religious but had nevertheless used facilities at St Aidans and St. Stephens such as the vegetable cooperative and craft group. She said
she also uses the health centre at the Baptist Church, and the Fendalton Library regularly.

Another concern raised by a couple of respondents was the danger of a hub drawing people away from existing community services and reducing connections. One person said if a new community centre is built, the migrant people may miss out on being able to link with the local people elsewhere.

At the same time there was also acknowledgement by a few people that a church based community centre could be a barrier for some people in accessing it. One respondent who was also a service provider in Bryndwr said he thought churches could be a barrier for some. He said churches can be viewed with deep suspicion, but that it is not particular to this community. Another person said a church should be a building used more than one day a week but not everyone wants to come inside a church.

4.3.2.i Undecided

One group of parents who had migrated to New Zealand were unsure if they would use a community hub as it was important for them to find a place for themselves. Having their own place meant that they could open up and build up their confidence and create the best for their children. They said they needed to build themselves up before they could reach out to others. Perhaps if a community hub facility was provided this group could secure access one day a week exclusively to meet this need.

Another respondent said it depended what was offered whether or not it was a good idea. He couldn’t think of anything that wasn’t already offered in the community.

4.3.3 Youth perspectives (N = 95)

4.3.3.a Connect the way a hub would meet the needs identified by youth

Mostly the youth we spoke with agreed that a community facility was a good idea and were quick to move on to what could be available there. Their suggestions can be classified in the following way:

- the availability of sport and recreation
- a social place to hang out
- a food and drink shop
- lessons and classes available
- access to computers
- a library and homework area
- social services eg youth workers
- a place that is safe

There were a wide variety of sport and recreation suggestions including, basketball, tennis, and squash, volleyball, rock climbing, confidence course, pool table, table tennis, and the need for a gymnasium. Social activities ranged from organised events, competitions, dances, picnics, games, to youth groups, to a free place to hang out and meet other young people. Once again cheap or low cost food and drink was also important. Lessons and classes included dance, art, drama, and music, and free internet was mentioned in relation to computers. There was concern amongst a few
young people that a community hub would be a place where ‘dodgy people’ would hang out making it unsafe. A police presence was suggested as a way to prevent this.

### 4.3.3 bIs Aorangi School a good location for a community centre?

Most of the young people taking part in this research did not think Aorangi School was a suitable location for a community hub. The reasons for this were because they did not know where the school was, some said it was too far away while others thought the area was too unsafe to visit.

### 4.3.4 Agencies and organisations working in Bryndwr (N=20)

A high proportion (82%) of the organisational representatives were positive about a community hub-type facility being available in the Bryndwr community. Comments included:

- ‘much needed. Would provide an identifiable focus for the community, rooms for group activities, service providers etc.’
- ‘a fabulous idea – a real opportunity for neighbours to get to know one another and for all residents to feel like real members of the community.’
- ‘it would be very useful to have ready access to a variety of social agencies and to have them cohabitating could result in a ‘cross-pollination’ and make sharing of info better’.

There were no completely negative responses, and 18% had mixed thoughts about the idea of a community hub being available locally. This included comments such as:

- ‘I think services are very accessible as they are located in Riccarton and Papanui. What this area really needs are groups and activities for all age groups.’
- ‘as long as the solutions to meet needs flow from the people who live here, that they define their own needs and not have these dictated to by others from outside the community.’

From the focus groups and interviews, the discussions again supported the idea of a community hub in Bryndwr. There was mention that if this did occur it would be the only community space available in Bryndwr that was not linked to a church. There too was comment that a community hub is a good idea, depending on how it is run and what facilities and services are in it. These types of comments are elaborated on later in this section of the report.

All of these people saw the value of a new community hub facility in Bryndwr because of the fact that it would not be a church based centre. A non church based centre may enable a segment of the population to gain access to a resource that they currently do not access. However, they also said that developing community resources and responding to needs was done through relationships they have with people in the community. "The community… is people driven… not facility driven. People are the greatest resources in this community". It was also stated however, that it is hard working with some of the issues in this community, -"we can provide a service for people, but those needing to access it can’t organise their lives to do that or attend".
The focus on relationships was also highlighted through the way a centre was established and run. Another of the respondents was concerned about how it would be run, and who would have a say about how it was to be used? "The community needs to own it, otherwise who is going to run it? The community needs to have input into the setting up of a centre and a facility alone is not a magic wand."

As a part of the organisation and agency survey we also asked which services and facilities they utilised as a part of their work within the Bryndwr community. Forty-six percent of the 13 responses received mentioned the local pre-schools and schools including Burnside Primary, Burnside High school, Christ the King school and Aorangi school. Twenty-three percent of respondents mentioned Child, Youth and Family Services, another 23% mentioned Big Brothers, Big Sisters mentoring services and 23% also mentioned that they utilise volunteers from the Bryndwr community. Fifteen percent of the participating organisations mentioned playgroups, Bryndwr Combined Community Support Society, Presbyterian Support, New Zealand Police and associated services and churches/church facilities. The remaining services and facilities mentioned 7% of the time were Strengthening Families, local dentist, RTLB (Resource Teacher Learning and Behaviour), local van, Jellie Park, Refugee Migrant Services and Social Worker in Schools.

Of the 17 responses to the organisation survey, 35% thought Aorangi School was a good location for a community hub in Bryndwr. The comments surrounding these positive responses included:

- ‘great idea. Sharing of resources.’
- ‘Aorangi has the space’

One of these comments however did consider it was a good location ‘in view of the proposed new development/buildings there’, which at the time was still occurring.

There were no respondents who were adamantly opposed to a community hub being located at Aorangi school, though 53% of the organisation representatives did have mixed views about this. These comments included:

- ‘a seven day a week facility would be easier – Jellie Park?’
- ‘great – although I do not see as appropriate having services like WINZ, HNZ etc at a primary school.’
- ‘...depends on what residents say.’

The other locations for a community hub mentioned by respondents were ‘Jellie Park’ and ‘Supermarket areas/Work and Income often their main visit points’.

The organisation focus groups’ discussion saw both the benefits and challenges associated with a community hub being based at Aorangi School. The benefits to it being located at Aorangi School included, that is was a great neutral place, there were already existing people accessing and utilising the school (both community groups and residents), it is non denominational and that it is not a ‘sterile’ environment.

The challenges were that it was not always seen as a neutral place, it may not feel ‘owned’ by the community, which was seen by participating organisations as vital to its success, and while it may be utilised by the Aorangi School community, there were some concerns that other residents who are not associated with the school, would not. It had been pointed out in one focus group that the community also had a number of
elderly residents, and people with mental health issues who have no involvement with the school, and would benefit from a doctor being available within a community hub.

While it appears that schools themselves are naturally forming communities, so are other facilities within the area, for example some of the parks such as Morley and Jellie park, and these may need to be considered as locations for a community hub.

Local churches were also mooted as a possibility for a community hub facility. The churches are, after all, providing many services for local residents, though again they may not provide a neutral place.

### 4.3.5 Other community hub models

**Community Hub Model 1**

Established approximately five years ago, this busy initiative serves a Christchurch community, as well as the wider district areas. The venue provides a wide range of both government and community organisation services. Examples include:

- Age Concern
- Budget Advice
- Career Services rapuara
- Child, Youth and Family - Youth Justice
- Community Law Canterbury
- Counselling
- CPIT
- Housing New Zealand Corporation
- Justice of the Peace (JP)
- Māori Community Development Worker
- Ministry of Justice
- Courts and Collections
- Smoke Free Clinics
- Te Kooti Whenua Māori - Māori Land Court
- Women’s Refuge
- Youth Justice

As well as this, this community hub provides referral services whereby agencies or community groups are called upon to provide face to face meetings and appointments utilising the hub’s office rooms to do so. This community hub model also provides an extensive network of referral services to government and community agencies as another extension of its onsite services.

Situated in a busy ‘business-type’ area the hub is just off a main road. Plenty of car parking is available for the site (as well as other local businesses), and this too is a main bus route, as well as being central to the local mall and other shopping facilities. Interestingly this community hub model is co-located with a governmental agency where they share a main entrance way and access is open between the two services. It appears these two service facilities support each other in providing a wrap-around
type response for persons using their services, and the relationship and arrangement reportedly work well.

The two areas are also separated by many social service, health and agency posters. The community hub coordinator says "they (the posters) can be therapy for people they say it's okay to ask for help." And the posters also act to de-formalise the space from being a government organisation or department.

The Chairperson of the management committee also offered feedback. Both the coordinator and chairperson are local people with a genuine interest and care of their community.

People appear to come in and willingly disclose whatever they were facing. One person had recently been released from prison and was looking for some hints for re-establishing him/herself.

The community hub reportedly received 700 face-to-face contacts per month in 2008. The local community is a low socio-economic population with a large Maori, Pacific Island and youth proportion. A prison is also located within the serviced area.

Both the coordinator and the chairperson of the management committee speak of a division in the local community. A new housing development has begun in one area which has seen the influx of a higher level socio-economic people and families, but there is concern that this creates a divide. This may be seen as similar to the Bryndwr community which backs onto the more affluent Fendalton community.

This community hub model is constantly evolving to accommodate local and current needs. Recently established is a family planning clinic being made available, and while the office spaces are glass, wall panels are added in order to ensure a discreet space for health professionals to work with clients. Health is apparently becoming a bigger area of need in this area. Mental health support is also needed, especially for youth. They are also currently looking for support services for men in particular, as they are seeing further need for this type of assistance. "(Community hubs) must develop around the community and by the community to make it theirs. People have got to feel like they own the place."

Community Hub Model 2
This community hub model is immersed within its local community shops and not co-located with any other organisation. It appears in the community as a stand alone 'one stop shop' type facility. However, it is conveniently situated reasonably close to other 'help' type facilities such as Super Grans, Housing New Zealand and Housing Information Centre as well as near a local Family Centre (which can offer group programmes and activities, though this was not thoroughly investigated as a part of this research).

There are some similarities between this model and community hub model 1. Once again those coordinating this community hub are local people, passionate about their community and the people. However, there were many differences too. The range of services include:

- Budget Service
- Workbridge
- Christchurch City Council Community Development Advisor
• Work and Income
• Community Drug and Alcohol Worker
• Unichem Chemist
• Nurse Maude - Wound clinic, Continence Advisory Service
• Career Services
• Community Education Services
• Community Nurse and range of Health Services
• NZ Police
• Community Law Canterbury
• Family Support Worker
• Foot Care Specialist
• Inland Revenue - Child Support
• Māori Land Court Advisory Service
• Otautahi Women's Refuge
• Pacific Trust Canterbury
• Solicitor
• CYF - Youth Justice Services

The main point of difference however, was this community hub being stand-alone (in that it was not physically attached to another business). This made it in some ways more appealing, appearing more community orientated. Another difference is that instead of the coordinators’ focus being on people coming into the community hub facility, more time is spent out in the community consulting with the people who live there, analysing and establishing their needs, and providing support and advocacy. They have played roles in consulting with the community over Housing New Zealand housing replacements, as well as working alongside Christchurch City Council on local issues.

The community hub coordinators and staff also take a lead role in organising the local festival for families, and some of the staff sit on a popular local sport board. These types of activities may demonstrate one of the ways the community hub coordinators and staff have engaged with the community, built relationships and immerse themselves as a part of the community.

Another part of the role they play is providing much research into local community needs. A recent project is investigating ‘hope’ within the community by asking if people wanted to help in the community. Though this sounds simple, it incorporates an empowering process in meeting community needs. One way this was explained was women were offered a pampering day, and as a part of this, the ‘it’s not okay campaign’ was discussed. The women were then asked if they wanted to get involved and they are now in the process of meeting to collaborate and share ideas to take this message out into the community in a way that works. This is an empowering and strengths-based approach and model.

Community Hub Model 3
Development of this community hub model began in 1990, when a not for profit social service provider began to focus on preventative work using the community development model. The process was planned, yet unplanned, when initially there was a Neighbourhood Worker employed with the task of building relationships with people in the community, and engaging with the community. A local person initiated the idea
of a labour pool (similar to the Otautahi Labour Pool which had already been established). This person then gathered some friends and called a meeting, funding was sought, then tools collected and a 'tool library' formed.

It then became evident that those who were managing the ‘tool library’ found it difficult to work because people came in to talk all the time. So social networks were established including a play group, and from this, parenting groups evolved. They also went door-knocking looking for ways to assist the community and began outings for older adults who wanted to get out of their houses. More people started to use the church lounge, dropping in, and it became apparent that more space was required.

While looking at options for a bigger space, they approached the local Community Board who was interested in the evidence of the community's need for this type of initiative. A hall usage survey in the area found that halls were really well used. They then called a public meeting of people who in turn formed a committee to establish a community hub. The Community Board gave a grant for rent, and the committee decided on a house version of a community space. A suitable house was available for rent and in August 1993 (three years later) this community hub model opened.

A volunteer system has been developed to welcome people into the community hubs – ‘welcomers’, and continue to develop other services in response to the community's needs. The play group has continued, as have the parent groups. A vegetable and fruit cooperative has been formed as well as a youth worker exploring the needs of parents. This in turn has seen the development of an after-school and holiday programme. The council has since offered a bare piece of land for community vegetable gardens which have become independent of the hub, and a raft of other changes have occurred as a part of a natural continuation of working with the community. "You need to be flexible enough to meet the needs at the time and then move on to other activities, like community lunches, women’s day, therapeutic massage."

The lead social service organisation involved with this community hub model now employs a team of six Community Development Workers in different parts of Christchurch. It appears they hold a philosophy that community development responds to whatever need is presented which may be different to what is actually expected and also may not necessarily be what funders and agencies want, but is what residents want. It was here that it was evident that community development facilitates a process, but the people from the community have to own it. It was also reiterated that it is good to have non-hierarchical power structures, highlighting there is power with, not over.

**Community Hub Model 4**

This community hub model is located opposite a small, low decile school. It began when two nuns from the Sisters of Mercy recognised a need to support women and children in the local area and a 24-hour service was provided. Over time, with changing community dynamics, the hub has moved into the more encompassing work of community development with a purpose of helping to develop community resilience and strength. The work is guided through community consultations where community: aspirations, dreams, desires, needs and ideas are sought and acted upon. Some initiatives include: a craft group, an adult literacy group, a women’s group, a men’s group (men’s shed) and a community garden and cooking classes. Many independent groups such as Tough Love also use the hub facilities weekly, along with government agencies and other organisations from time to time.
The community hub has its own Board of Trustees consisting of local people and it has three part-time employees. These include a Community Development Worker who has a social work background (20 hours per week), a community centre Coordinator involved with managing the community hub, its programmes, operational planning, strategy and funding (25 hours per week), and a finance and resources manager (10 hours per week). Around ten volunteers undertake a number of functions. Funding comes from many sources including the: City Council, the local Community Board, Canterbury Community Trust, Lottery Community, COGS, J.R,McKenzie Trust, Tertiary Education Commission and Eureka Trust. The Centre does not engage in Government contracts for funding. The Board of Trustees and centre staff are committed to community responsiveness.

If people require individual help, which is not within the expertise or responsibility of staff, referrals are made to appropriate other services. Consequently network links and relationships with social service providers are important. Around 7500 visits are made to the hub annually and courses and classes are well-attended. Rooms are also available for agencies and organisations to use – Strengthening Families is one example.

The staff also work alongside and attend regular community network meetings with local counsellors, teachers, youth workers and social worker in schools, and many others, and they liaise with other community centres in the city. Links with the City Council and the local Community Board are generally through the Community Boards’ Community Development Advisor. This allows the pooling of resources and also ensures the sharing of current community information. An example of one way they work together is preparing for and running the local community family event. It is a part of the Community Development Worker’s role to take an active interest in the local area. Another example is in the recent park upgrade proposals and ensuring community consultation through door knocking, evening meetings.

It must be noted that this community hub model is an independent Incorporated Society which has mutually supporting relationships with around 40 other organisations and agencies, the local school being one. Many school families also have connections with the community hub. The community hub is set up and managed as a local Community Centre with emphasis on how individuals and families can strengthen themselves towards reaching their full potential.

Community Hub Model 5
This community hub model is situated right next to a low-decile medium-sized primary school. It is a joint venture in some respects between the school and the local Council in that it was a purpose-built building developed by the Council, but on school land. This is not dissimilar to the proposals which have been discussed in regard to the possibility of a community centre being situated at Aorangi School.

The Community hub however is run by an independent trust which has its own Board of Trustees, one member is also on the Board of Trustees for the school. The centre caters for the needs of the wider community, by offering spaces for local groups as well as an onsite Partnership Health Worker. The community centre also provides much support for the school and its respective families providing after-school care, holiday-care and parent-support group.
This arrangement works very well in servicing the school community well, but also realises it is difficult to reach out to the wider community. This may be because though the community centre building itself has a separate entrance, the building itself and signage look like they belong as a part of the school and this may cause some confusion for those people who do not know about the community centre and its services and facilities.

Perhaps too its emphasis on place-based services might create its reputation as being a part of the school. Partnership Health services do bring in clients from outside the school community, though they tend not to access any further services.

An enthusiastic and friendly coordinator is employed to meet, greet and coordinate the space and facilities. This in many ways sets the relaxed and warm environment for its successful and active in drop-in type facilities including phone usage, tea/coffee, referrals to outside agencies and organisations, some food parcels, CV-writing guidance and chats.

Community Hub Model 6
This community hub model appears to be a model-in-action that works for its school and wider community. This is a joint venture between the community hub (a charitable trust) and the large low-decile primary school inside which the community hub is located.

The principal of the school has used a 40/20/40 model as a guide regarding the investment of school resources. Essentially, he refers to research indicating that a child’s health and wellbeing (growth and development) is 40% dependent on the family, and community around the family, 20% dependent on the school, and 40% dependent on the child itself. Therefore, the school has recognised that it only plays a part in enhancing the wellbeing of the child. Based on this, the school has decided to invest a portion of its resources in providing facilities that enable the local families and community to support themselves and each other.

It has done this by building a community facility around a new school hall which was being built at the time. The community hub has a separate entrance from that of the school’s main entrance and backs onto the school playground. The agreement in place is that the community hub leases the building from the school, and in turn other services that use the hub facilities such as Plunket, a community nurse, and low-cost doctor. The centre is run by a manager and a coordinator.

The impact of this combined school and community collaboration appears to be beneficial to the community. Both the centre manager and the school principal spoke of the large drop in transience of local families over the last few years – down from 60-70% to 10-15% now. There had also been no stand-downs at the school in the last eight years, where previously this was much more common, and whereas 70% of referrals to RTLB’s used to come from this particular school, this year there has only been one referral for behavioural issues.

There are approximately 75 sources of funding for the different programmes run from the centre, but the Department of Health Board funding makes up a large proportion of total funds. The centre has only been running for two years, and in this short time, a huge number of services, activities, and programmes have been established.
From the school's perspective, it is the family that is enrolled at the school, not the child. "We want the best for our parents and school. This is the 40% focus." There appears to be a very outward community focus in the way the school sees its relationship with its community. It is acknowledged that this is in contrast to what appears as schools seeing themselves as the experts, which often translates into the experience of a wall being put up between the school and its community.

It has been a long and challenging journey to get to this point and one that started in 1994. At the time it was seen as a tough school, with tough kids. Changing to a caring school culture, where even tough kids know there is a good part to them, and a commitment to these children and their families to see it through, has taken time. It has required the school to take barriers down such as any negative attitude of teachers and principals.

One of the activities the school did was to run a programme called ‘Eliminating Violence’. This included researching the experience of parents and children about the culture of the teaching staff at the school. It was realised that bullying was part of the way teachers related to students and so this needed to change. "If you want to make changes in a school you need to show 'warts and all'". This program is still available for other schools to use from the Ministry of Education. However, it appears this kind of self-reflective process is an important aspect of the way the school operates.

The principal sees the attitude of principals as the biggest barrier to developing this approach in other schools. "Schools appear to want to remain in control fearing it will become too big a burden on the school. Schools traditionally interpret their role too narrowly, when in reality there is the opportunity for schools to taking a broader view of supporting a child’s health and wellbeing. These ideas come from an old-fashioned view of education that is only about classrooms and teaching."

The principal states, "it is about creating the right environment, that parents feel this is their place as well, and feel welcomed and encouraged to be part of it." But, "schools can’t do it by themselves. Schools are too busy to do community work. We are here to help families to raise their children."

This kind of school/community partnership is 'normal' policy in many countries overseas such as Canada, USA, and the UK. They use the concept of 'Extended Schools', and its associated research to support this approach. “It is about changing a mindset of why schools are there. Principals often ignore the aspects of the policy about community engagement. But they don’t have to do it on their own. Schools perhaps fear change, fear the unknown".

Speaking with the community hub coordinator, she says "the single most important factor that is required for this kind of project to work is the relationship between herself and the principal, and the relationships between the two organisations". In addition to this, recognising opportunities for resources and supports that fit into the community hub and school's vision is important. This is captured in the centre's mission statement. Shared values also underpin this collaboration such as a fundamental respect for people -"everyone matters" is a motto of the school, being open-minded and open-hearted, daring to be creative, and understanding how schools, families, and communities function and what supports wellbeing.
As the coordinator, the role is to enable others to do their thing. She mentioned the root meaning of education as “to bring out that which is within”. This underpins her own philosophy in running the centre.

She also talks of transactional and transformational relationships and leadership. Transactional relationships are those where money is exchanged, ‘you give me that and I will give you this’. In contrast transformational relationships do not focus on what ‘I’ can get from this, but involves generosity and giving for its own sake, and contributing to a wider vision or purpose. She believes that the centre has enabled people to feel like they belong to something bigger than themselves, and that a sense of belonging and connectedness is sorely needed by people in this day and age.
A Bryndwr Community Hub - Summary

Most respondents were supportive of a community hub in Bryndwr. In every method we used to collect information as a part of this research, it appears the most popular response as to whether a community hub in Bryndwr is a good idea, is positive.

Respondents to the resident survey said that it would be beneficial because it could create a place to encourage social connectedness, a place for social services to operate and be available from, and it would be a good place for youth to be able to utilise.

Agreeing on any location by the residents and organisations working there is difficult. Somewhere central, Jellie Park, Wairakei School, Churches, Burnside High School and other locations have all been suggested. Aorangi School as a location (before its closure) was of focus and a popular location choice with parents of the school. However, it was not as popular from the perception of other groups (taking part in the research), in that it was seen as not being central enough and in an unsafe area.

According to the resident survey a wide range of services, activities and facilities could be run from a community hub facility. Access to a community constable, a drop-in space or cafe, the availability of legal advice, education classes, health nurse, budget advice, Plunket and parenting courses were the most common requests. Hosting or organising community events may also provide an opportunity and role within the community, especially in line with a need of the community needing more opportunities and places for social connectedness.

The resident interviews and focus groups' ideas for its possible uses and facilities were that it could provide a meeting/social/function place which could cater for different cultural groups, a youth facility, a family/parent social space where cafe facilities as well as parenting help being available. Social and government services and agencies could be provided and accessed within a community hub facility. Classes and groups being run there were also options, and it also was seen as a useful additional resource for a school (if based there).

Those residents who expressed concern over the development of a community hub, thought that adequate community centres and services were already being provided, for example at the churches in the community. However there was acknowledgement that a church-based facility can be a barrier for some people. Collaboration and financial support from Christchurch City Council and other organisations may both help support the work churches already do in the community, as well as provide further extensions of this.

It was also reiterated that any facilities such as churches, or community hubs are not 'place' driven, but people and relationship driven. Community ownership of such a project and facility was also seen as necessary.
In section two (‘Bryndwr community needs’), young people identified safety, more youth activities and recreational facilities and hang-out spaces that are safe and free; as their greatest needs. It appears a community hub could go a long way towards addressing these needs if it oriented its focus accordingly. While increasing safety at Jellie Park is not achieved by providing such a centre alone, it may help in providing alternative meeting places, supervised adequately to ensure safety and therefore enable young people to come together to socialise and participate in recreational activities.

The range of activities suggested by young people is wide. One important step to take would be to look at what is already provided in the area. Many of the sporting and recreational activities suggested appear similar to those provided by YMCA’s, community halls and perhaps schools. Could this be a matter of promotion? Or what other barriers are there which stop young people making more use of these existing facilities? For example cost, location (which make them difficult to get to) or safety issues.

Community groups and community centres already provide services for some youth; perhaps they can expand the services they currently offer to cater further to the needs identified by this community? Especially in light of the majority of young people we interviewed who did not think Aorangi School was the best place for a hub and distance was seen as the barrier.

Organisations and agencies also supported the idea of a community hub, and believed it could be utilised for organisation and Government agency support, children and youth activities, parenting support services and groups as well as community facilities, adult education and new migrant support.

A community hub facility could also, as a part of its community role, provide community events and functions or support other community groups that are already providing those types of services in the community (churches, Neighbourhood Support, schools).

Some people through the resident survey and community organisation and agencies believe that the support services and facilities are already being well-managed by the community's churches and in other ways.

In order to gain some other ideas for Bryndwr, we visited six existing community hub models in order to ascertain what worked well in these types of facilities.

The community hub model facilitator/coordinators reiterate that a community hub facility must be owned by the community. Continual research and investment in the local community seems a good idea, as does activity surrounding the local community - events was one such way.

Some of the models occurred as a natural introduction, building upon the needs of the community. They have taken much time to develop and immerse, however all of the community hub models have become well-supported and utilised facilities (both within the community, as well as in terms of funding and local service organisational commitment). While some of these community models appeared to service the whole community, we were particularly interested in the models associated with or built within school grounds. A good relationship between the facility coordinator, school principal and other community social support agencies is seen as a key element.
In many ways a close locality between schools and a community hub provides better access to people (ie: whole family approaches), as well as better access for families, in that they can use its facilities while also carrying out the school drop-off and pick-ups. Further extension could be considered, like one of the existing community models, in providing a place/space for preschool children as well.

One of the community hub facilities began with its focus around 'health', and still uses this as a means of meeting the needs of the local community (providing low or no cost doctors, health nurses, counselling), but also extends its services to the school and school families alongside community agencies eg: Super Nanny courses whereby parents and children attend a programme to help strengthen their relationship. As well as this the community hub and school facilities offer classes and lessons eg: English as a second language, and a playgroup.

The need for the school principals (in these types of facilities) was reiterated to see a wider picture beyond classroom and child learning. Transformational relationships focus on generosity and giving for its own sake, and contributing to a wider vision or purpose.
5 Conclusions and recommendations

Though the Jellie Park Statistics New Zealand census results do not provide information for all of the area of Bryndwr which this research pertains to, it does provide an interesting backdrop. After all, one of the reasons a community hub facility is being considered in Bryndwr is because of the high levels of deprivation apparent, particularly within the Jellie Park area census unit. The Jellie Park census information therefore allows us to see from a statistical standpoint, what this looks like.

Jellie Park, when compared to Christchurch, has an ethnically diverse and younger population. It has more ‘families’ comprised of adults and children, but significantly more one-parent families living within it.

If a community was to consider these things, it may want to consider elements which ensures that it caters for different cultures, young people and families with children.

The unemployment rate for Jellie Park is more than two-and-a-half times higher than the Canterbury region as a whole, and indicates there is less money available for people, and this may negatively impact upon families. In addition, home ownership is nearly 50% less in Jellie Park than it is for the Canterbury region as a whole.

This information reiterates the levels of poverty faced by the Jellie Park residents. A community hub therefore may be able to provide some services and education which may help with these types of issues, but importantly for any community hub facilities and services to be utilised by these residents it will need to be no, or low-cost.

Once we began interacting and asking residents directly from the whole of the Bryndwr community (as defined geographically within this research, see figure 1), we were interested in three things from them. ‘What they, as the residents of Bryndwr believed the strengths of their community are’, What they believe the needs of their community are’ and ‘Whether a community hub facility in the area would be useful and helpful’. We also wanted to ensure that a community hub facility encouraged and supported the community strengths, while helping to overcome the needs.

Two hundred and sixty-six Bryndwr residents took part in the research made up of 171 adult and 95 young people’s responses. We also asked for the perspectives of 20 community and Government agencies who work in the area.

There were many strengths of the Bryndwr community identified by the residents and agencies who work there. The most popular being that it is a convenient place to live in that it is close to many facilities and amenities, the environment - the people enjoy the parks especially Jellie Park and its facilities, and that Bryndwr is a ‘good area’. Another strength is the people in that they are ‘culturally diverse’ and ‘friendly’. These responses indicate not only a positive perspective, but while poverty and deprivation are apparent within the community, so is optimism and hope.

All of the local schools are seen as a strength of the community by adult residents, youth and the organisations that work in Bryndwr. The resident focus groups and interviews most regularly mentioned Aorangi School, though it must be noted it was under threat of closure at the time, so this may have impacted upon the results. However, these families will no doubt be feeling a sense of loss and dislocation from
the community with the recent news of its closure, and perhaps any community hub response could support these families. This was also one of the initial intentions of a community hub potentially being located at Aorangi School.

The local churches are also noted as a strength by residents who completed the survey, Burnside Primary School parents and the local organisations and agencies working in the area. They appear (alongside the schools and local Neighbourhood Support), as the organisations primarily responsible for organising or hosting community events within Bryndwr that people have attended. It is evident from this that the schools, churches and Neighbourhood Support groups are building on the 'people' strengths of the community by bringing them together and providing social occasions.

The schools, Jellie Park and churches may be good locations to consider for a community hub facility. They are already well-regarded within the community, utilised by social service organisations working in the area and natural meeting places for residents.

The needs identified by residents and organisations remain fairly consistent across all who have taken part in this research. A meeting, social, central hub or facility is considered a relevant and pressing need for these community members. This is also very much what a community hub facility could provide.

Safety is another issue this community is faced with. While some have been personally affected by burglaries, property loss or damage, racism and bullying, others relay that they do not feel safe. More Neighbourhood Support availability is requested and may help with crime being prevented on streets and in homes. While 'out and about' in Bryndwr however, particular emphasis of the need for more safety was placed upon Jellie Park by parents of the focus and interview groups and youth. These groups, as well as the organisations and agencies working in Bryndwr, also advocated for access to safe and free activities for young people.

While a community hub can only address some of the safety issues arising from this research, Neighbourhood Support and the police could also begin a process to reduce crime in the area. One idea might be for street barbeques to be arranged (free food and a bouncy castle provided). In many ways this can begin to create the social interaction and events that residents crave. This may also foster good relationships both between neighbours as well as residents with the police and Neighbourhood Support.

Jellie Park is much appreciated by young people in Bryndwr, but it is also considered an unsafe place to be by some of the youth and parents. If youth facilities and activities were considered at Jellie Park, this would mean supervision for young people, more people around, which in turn impacts on an area being safer.

Residents also faced problems such as 'health', 'stress' and 'financial difficulties'. And while these might be a more prevalent feature within the more deprived areas of Bryndwr, other residents have stated the same or similar. 'Time' and 'work' are also mentioned as being difficulties which residents and their families face, and while no further information was collected on this, statements such as; "Lost my job, find it hard getting out in community again, as don’t know what’s available and lack of money ..." may be one indication.
These issues are currently supported by Government and social service providers, as well as through churches. Perhaps the current church run supports could be expanded upon to help, for example the vegetable cooperative at St Aidans Church is popular, but also in many ways appears safe for people to attend, and non-judgmental. As just one idea, this could be an opportunity for Work and Income, Housing New Zealand and budget advisory services to also be available for people.

For the those people attending the resident focus groups and who were interviewed, as well as advocated for by the organisations and agencies working in Bryndwr, cultural support is seen as one of the greatest needs. While some of these people were parents at Aorangi School they spoke of the bilingual unit being one of the only places in the community where Maori language and culture was able to be learnt, shared and encouraged. For another cultural community advocacy was needed in order that they could better understand New Zealand systems and ways.

While the bilingual unit is to be moved across to Burnside Primary School and Cobham Intermediate, some facility attached to this to accommodate parents and families may be worthwhile. This may also assist in encouraging parental engagement with the school, provide better access to services, as well as the fundamental need to be able to express their own culture.

And again a community centre may be a good place for people to be able to learn about other cultures, interact socially and feel safe sharing their own cultures as well as being able to access 'help' services, such as advocacy.

In light of our research, it appears that a community hub facility in Bryndwr may go some way towards encouraging its strengths and helping to overcome its needs. It is with this in mind, we recommend that:

- the schools around Jellie Park and interested local community and resident groups meet together to look at how safety at the park can be improved through positive community initiatives,
- one such initiative be the establishment of regular, free or low-cost activities for youth based next to the skate park, and that this be publicised through the local schools and community, and organised together with youth that come from a cross-section of the community.

Also in regard to the safety issues raised by residents we recommend:

- to support and increase the number of neighbourhood support groups available in the area and foster supportive neighbourly relationships. While the 'focus' may not be entirely on safety to begin with but free street-by-street events to encourage social interaction and neighbourliness could be supported by the NZ Police and Neighbourhood Support.

Jellie Park and the local schools are seen by all of the groups of respondents as important community strengths and make valuable contributions to community life. These locations are also accessed by a wide range of people living within the Bryndwr area. We therefore recommend that:

- the establishment of a community hub be considered for either Jellie Park or one of the local schools. Our understanding is that many of the Aorangi School families are transferring to Burnside Primary and Cobham Intermediate. A
community hub located at one of these schools or nearby may be of great support to the Aorangi families,

- cultural support also should be considered as a part of this. The bilingual unit (now located inside Burnside Primary School and Cobham Intermediate) offers great opportunities for Maori families, but extensions to support Afghani, Samoan and Korean families would also be beneficial. These supports could be in the form of a space for these people to meet as a cultural group, attend language classes as well as mix with other cultural groups,

- information about community activities and events could also stem from here through things like taking the lead in developing a local newsletter, noticeboard, website and having translators available.

The churches are noted as already providing many services and activities which help meet the needs of the community (eg: financial support through free doctors, vegetable cooperatives), particularly as they are located within the more deprived area of Bryndwr. We recommend that:

- their services be supported and expanded upon in order to further meet needs. One example of this is provided on page 83.

- the churches in the area may also like to take a lead role, alongside Bryndwr residents and the Christchurch City Council in the upkeep of the physical environment which has been outlined as an issue.
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