Quality of Life

Overall, residents of St. John’s have a relatively positive view of the quality of life in the City.

- Almost one-half (47%) rated the quality of life in the city an 8 or higher (on a 10-point scale).
- There was also a significant group who gave a rating of 7 (31%) indicating this group is fairly happy but feel there are some areas for improvement.
- Looking at results by ward, perceptions were most positive in Ward 1 and Ward 3.
- The perceived quality of life also increased by age with those 55 plus being the most positive (63% giving ratings of 8 or higher).
- Home owners were more positive about the quality of life in St. John’s compared to renters. This was likely linked to age and income differences between the two groups.

When asked what the City should focus on outside of basic services to improve the quality of life for residents, almost one-quarter (23%) were unable to provide a response to this question. Most people were unable to think beyond the basic services with the top mentions including better road maintenance (25%) and improved snow clearing (12%).
Overall, residents are mostly satisfied with the programs and services provided by the City. More than four-in-ten (42%) gave a rating of 8 or higher.

- Looking at results by ward, residents of Ward 1 were the most satisfied and Ward 4 were the least satisfied (33% rated their satisfaction with services as 8 or higher).
- Similar to perceptions of quality of life, satisfaction with programs and services increased with age with those 55 plus being the most positive (53% rating 8 or higher).

Residents who rated their overall satisfaction with city programs and services as a 6 or less (28%; n=133) were asked to elaborate on why they gave a lower rating. In general, many comments focused around concerns with snow clearing and roads as well as the current level of taxation. Concerns were also mentioned with respect to a lack of programming across various age groups (youth and seniors in particular).

The youngest age group (18 to 34) are the least satisfied with public transportation in the City.

In terms of satisfaction with City services, garbage collection rated highest (8 or higher by 86% of respondents), followed by parks/open spaces/trails, curbside recycling, water and sewer repairs, and Access St. John’s/311.

Satisfaction was lowest for road maintenance (10% of respondents rated this service as an 8 or higher), sidewalk snow clearing, parking, land use planning and traffic planning.
Level of Importance

- When asked to rate 18 service areas in terms of importance to them, 97% of respondents gave road snow clearing and garbage collection an 8 or higher; 96% of respondents ranked residential water and sewer repairs as an 8 or higher; road maintenance, parks, recycling, traffic planning, public transportation and recreation also were ranked as 8 or higher by more than 80% of respondents.
- Females were more likely to rate the arts and cultural grants as more important and also tended to be more satisfied with Access St. John’s and the Curb it! and 311 apps.
- Recreation programs and facilities was most important to residents with children under 17
- Access St. John’s was perceived as more important by those with a high school diploma or less compared to the other education brackets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>Importance % rating 8 or higher</th>
<th>Satisfaction % rating 8 or higher</th>
<th>Difference (Percentage Points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road maintenance</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road snow clearing</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>-61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk snow clearing</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic planning</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use planning</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking services</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transportation services</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage preservation</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits and inspections process</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential water and sewer repairs</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts/cultural grants</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, open spaces, and trails</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation facilities/programs/activities</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curbside recycling</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garbage collection</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal care and adoption services</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community events</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311/Access St. John’s</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Primary Areas for Improvement:
- Road maintenance
- Road snow clearing
- Traffic planning
- Sidewalk snow clearing

Sustain and Reinforce:
- Garbage collection
- Residential water and sewer repairs
- Parks, open spaces and trails
- Recreation facilities/programs/activities
- Curbside recycling
- Public transportation services

Secondary Areas for Improvement:
- Permits and inspections
- Land use planning
- Heritage preservation
- Parking services
- Arts/cultural grants

Watch and Monitor:
- Animal care and adoption services
- 311/Access St. John’s
- Community events
In terms of the perceived value residents receive for their tax dollars, 56% gave a rating of 7 or higher out of ten. Less than one-third (29%) gave a rating of 8 or higher.

There was also a significant group who gave a rating of 7 (27%) indicating this group sees some value but feel there is room for improvement.

Looking at results by ward, the perceived value was highest among Ward 3 residents and lowest in Ward 1.

Those 35 to 54 (also the most likely to have children) were the most negative regarding the value they receive for their tax dollars.

In general, citizens were mostly against any form of tax increase.
86% of those who voted by mail rated their overall experience with that system 8 or higher out of ten.

Residents were provided with 5 scenarios for the next election and asked whether or not the change would make them more likely to vote, less likely, or have no impact.

**Impact of Changes**

- **No impact:**
  - The election date was moved to October or November: 87%
  - Additional polling stations: 65%
  - Mail-in voting system was eliminated - telephone voting only: 56%
  - Mail-in voting system was eliminated - in-person voting only: 60%
  - Everyone had to register in advance in order to receive a mail-in ballot: 55%

Q. For each of the following scenarios, please indicate whether you would be more likely to vote, less likely to vote, or if it would have no impact on whether you would vote in the next municipal election.

Additional polling stations was identified as the scenario that would have the biggest positive impact on resident’s likelihood to vote while eliminating the mail-in system or requiring residents to register were viewed as having the most negative impact. Changing the date of the election from September to October or November would have minimal impact on whether or not individuals vote in the next election.

Renters were more likely to indicate that more polling stations would positively impact their likelihood to vote. This is likely linked to the transient nature of this group (frequent change of address).
Approximately one-half (48%) of residents surveyed had direct contact with the City over the past 12 months.

- Those who have been in the City the shortest amount of time (10 years or less) had a more negative view of their interactions with the City. They were less likely to find staff courteous or to be able to find the information they are looking for. They also the least likely to say the City responds in a timely manner and makes customer service a priority.
- The lowest income group ($50,000) are the least engaged. They are the least likely to vote, least likely to use the website or apps, and the least likely to have interaction with the city in general.

Online Services:
- Overall, six-in-ten (59%) had used the city’s website while less than one-half (44%) had used the Curb it! or 311 apps and just 16% had used the RECONNECT online registration service.
- Residents with children under 17 was the most likely to use RECONNECT and were also the most satisfied with this online service.

Satisfaction with the City’s online services ranged from a low of 56% (rating of 8 or higher) for the city’s website to a high of 73% for the recycling and 311 apps.
Residents indicated that affordable housing was the top priority area for non-essential infrastructure although the definition of affordable housing may not have been consistently understood.

Those with children at home were also the most likely to name Affordable Housing as the top priority for non-essential infrastructure capital spending.

Significantly more residents felt the city should focus on upgrading (63%) existing non-essential infrastructure vs. building new (16%). 11% said both while 11% were unsure.