

Hamilton City Council Residents Survey Report

Executive Summary

Satisfaction with Facilities and Services (Page 6)

For the period April 2010 – March 2011 there were 38 increases in CSI scores and 32 decreases and two unchanged results compared to the July 2009 – June 2010 period but most moves were small. Among Customer Choice¹ facilities and services there were 15 increases and 17 decreases and one factor remained unchanged. Among the No Customer Choice² facilities and services, there were 23 increases and 15 decreases and one factor remained unchanged.

In total, there were 41 increases in CSI scores and 31 decreases for the March 2011 quarter versus the December 2010 quarter.

Increases and decreases in satisfaction on a Moving Annual Total (MAT) basis with facilities and services

Increases in satisfaction scores

There were 38 increases in the CSI score for April 2010 – March 2011 results compared to the July 2009 – June 2010 period.

The largest increases were:

- A 12.4 point increase in satisfaction for *the outcome of being involved in Council decision making (e.g. submissions etc)*, (CSI score 70.5).
- A 9.0 point increase for *the process Council used for involvement in Council decision making* (CSI score 71.9),
- A 5.9 point increase with the *Hamilton City Leisure Centre (YMCA)* (CSI score 69.5)
- A 5.3 point increase for *the way Council staff handled your noise complaint* (CSI score 79.4).

Decreases in satisfaction scores

There were 32 decreases in the CSI score for April 2010 – March 2011 results compared to the July 2009 – June 2010 period.

The largest decreases were:

- A 7.3 point decrease for *Porritt Stadium* (CSI score 66.4)
- A 5.0 point decrease for *The Meteor* (CSI score of 69.9).
- A 4.8 point decrease for *Garden Place in Central Hamilton* (CSI score of 66.3)
- A 4.6 point decrease for the *bus passenger facilities at the Hamilton Transport Centre* (CSI score of 74.6)

Highest and lowest ranked facilities and services

Highest ranking facilities and services on a MAT basis:

- The *continuity of the water supply* is again in the top position with a CSI score of 89.4, ahead of the *Hamilton Gardens* with a CSI score of 87.9.

HIGHEST RANKING FACILITIES AND SERVICES – TOP FIVE	CSI score	
	Jul 09 – Jun 10	Apr 10 – Mar 11
Continuity of Water Supply	88.5	89.4
Hamilton Gardens	88.0	87.9
Household Refuse Collection	87.1	87.0
Hamilton Zoo	84.0	86.8
Kerbside Recyclable Collection	84.6	86.4

Lowest Ranking facilities and services on a MAT basis:

- *Getting around in peak traffic* is again rated the lowest followed by the *opportunities Council provides for community involvement in decision making*.

LOWEST RANKING FACILITIES AND SERVICES – TOP FIVE	CSI score	
	Jul 09 – Jun 10	Apr 10 – Mar 11
Getting around in peak traffic	55.7	58.2
Involvement in Council decision making	62.8	60.9
Central City car parking in general	58.8	62.0
Garden Place in Central Hamilton	71.1	66.3
Porritt Stadium	73.6	66.4

Customer Choice facilities and services.

- The *Hamilton Gardens, Hamilton Zoo, the Community Library, Visitor Information Centre, the Hamilton Organic Centre and the Central Library* are all rated as an exceptional performance.
- *Garden Place and Porritt Stadium* are both rated with CSI scores that reflect the need for significant improvement.

No Customer Choice facilities and services.

- The *continuity, pressure, clarity of the water, taste and odour of the water supplied, the household refuse services and kerbside recyclable collection, the Wastewater System, Hamilton as a place to live, Hamilton Park Cemetery, Council Staff, getting around in non peak traffic, the Dog Control Service, the way Council staff handled the noise complaint, the City's Stormwater Drainage System and the Council night patrol team to make the Central City safer in the evenings and weekends* are all rated as an exceptional performance.

¹ Customer Choice¹ facilities and services would normally expect to receive higher satisfaction scores, as dissatisfied customers can take their business elsewhere. Examples of 'Customer Choice' facilities and services include Hamilton Zoo, Waterworld, Hamilton Gardens and Waikato Museum.

² For 'No Customer Choice' facilities and service, the customer cannot change service provider, therefore dissatisfied customers remain users, which can result in a lower score. Examples of 'No Customer Choice' facilities and services include water supply, footpaths, animal control services and household refuse collection.

- The ease of getting around the city in peak traffic times and the opportunities Council provides for community involvement in decision making are both rated with CSI scores that reflect the need for significant improvement.

Usage of Facilities and Services (Page 17)

For the period April 2010 – March 2011, there were more increases (29) versus decreases (17) in usage of facilities, although most changes were small. Generally, the level of usage was similar to that recorded in previous years.

Increases in usage of facilities and services

- a 10.5% increase for the *Hamilton City Council Website*
- a 5.9% for increase for *Hamilton Park Cemetery*
- a 5.4% increase for *ArtsPost*
- a 5.4% increase for *the Children's Playground equipment in the neighbourhood park.*

INCREASES IN USAGE OF FACILITIES AND SERVICES	Usage	
	Jul 09 – Jun 10	Apr 10 – Mar 11
Hamilton City Council Website	33.6	44.1
Hamilton Park Cemetery	35.7	41.6
ArtsPost	21.7	27.1
Playground equipment	43.7	49.1

Decreases in usage of facilities and services

- a 9.0% decrease for the *Community Library*
- an 8.0% decrease for the *Central Library*
- a 7.9% decrease for the use of any library
- a 7.3% decrease for the *Multi-level car park in Knox Street*

DECREASES IN USAGE OF FACILITIES AND SERVICES	Usage	
	Jul 09 – Jun 10	Apr 10 – Mar 11
Community Library	59.3	50.3
Central Library	52.9	44.9
Any Library	74.1	66.2
Multi-level car park in Knox Street	40.3	33.0
Refuse Transfer Station	64.7	59.9

Some services like the *pedestrian facilities (92.7%), kerbside recycling collection (90.9), Parks and Gardens (87.8), Hamilton Lake (86.8%), and Hamilton Gardens (85.6%)* were used by the vast majority of respondents.

Many services were used by over 50% of the sample. Other facilities and services provided by the Council like *The Meteor (12.3%), the Hamilton City Leisure Centre (YMCA) (14.5%), Noise Control (15.5%), the Dog Control Service (15.7%), and Seddon Park (18.8%)* were used by small proportions of the sample.

Some facilities (like the *pedestrian facilities and kerbside recycling*) were used on a far more frequent basis (daily or weekly) than others which are used once per year e.g. the *Claudlands Events Centre (50% used but 46% used at least once per year)*, Other facilities like *The Meteor* were used by a small proportion of the population and also used on an infrequent basis e.g. at least once per year.

Most important Issues Council should be looking at (Page 23)

Respondents were asked 'What, in your opinion, are the three main issues that Council should be looking at?' This question was asked as an open question with the answers grouped together for analysis purposes.

- On a MAT basis two fifths of the respondents (41.2%) mentioned a transportation related issue as one of their three most important issues (i.e. anyone who mentioned either *roads, traffic, public transport, parking, or road safety*).
- Just over a quarter of the respondents (26.1%) mentioned a *Safety/Law and Order* related issue as one of the three most important issues (i.e. anyone who mentioned *Law and Order, crime, safety, or graffiti*).
- *Roads (19.4%)* was rated as the main individual issue while *Law and Order (15.5%)* was the second most commonly mentioned issue and *Parking (12.7%)* was third.
- *Traffic (11.7%), Safety (11.1%), Rejuvenate City Centre (11.3%), City Development / Planning (10.7%), Rates (10.3%)* and *Public transport (9.4%)* were the next most commonly mentioned issues.
- Similar to the MAT basis, the main issues for the March 2011 quarter covered *transportation issues (38%) law and order / safety issues (22%)* followed by *city development / planning (13%), rates (10%), expenditure (10%)* and *rejuvenate the city centre (8%)*.
- The largest differences were a 4.4% decrease in mention of *law and order or safety* this quarter (22% versus 26% on a MAT basis), and a 4.3% decrease in mention of *traffic issues* this quarter (7% versus 12% on a MAT basis). The largest increase was 2.3% for *roading (22% versus 19% on a MAT basis)*.

Overall Satisfaction with Council (Page 29)

Three quarters of the respondents (76%) rated their satisfaction with the *Overall Performance of Council* with scores that reflect satisfaction (scores of 7 – 10).

The CSI score was 75.2, down 1.2 points from the July 2009 - June 2010 result.

The respondents were asked why they rated the *Overall Performance of Council* the way they did. On a MAT basis (April 2010 – March 2011), the main positive comments focused around the feeling that Council was doing a good job or working well for the city (14%) or the fact there were no problems (13%) and positive comments about good service (10%). The main negative comment had to do with concerns with specific services (9%), financial concerns (9%) and concerns with Elected Members (5%) or concerns with non performance (3%).

Similar to the MAT basis, the main positive comments for the March quarter focused around the feeling that Council was doing a good job or working well for the city (13%) or the fact there were no problems (13%) and the main negative comments had to do with financial concerns (13%) concerns with specific services (11%), and concerns with the Elected Members (7%). The largest difference was a 4% increase in mention of financial concerns.

Elected Members (Page 39)

Over half of the respondents (54%) were satisfied with the *Overall Performance of the Elected Members of Council* (scores of 7 – 10). A tenth of the subgroup (10%) rated the *Overall Performance of the Elected Members* with a score of 9 or 10 (exceeded expectations). 24 respondents (3.5%) were actually dissatisfied.

The CSI score was 68.7, down 2.8 points from the July 2009 - June 2010 result. The CSI score still reflects a good performance, but with potential for improvement.

Value from Rates (Page 46)

Over two thirds of the respondents (71%) said they paid residential rates, including 3% who paid both residential and commercial rates. Five respondents (0.7%) paid only commercial rates. The balance of the sample (29%) said they did not pay rates.

The majority of respondents (68%) who paid residential rates thought they received good value for their residential rates (scores of 7 – 10) although only 5% rated the value for money with a score of 10. Only 5.3% of those who paid residential rates thought they received poor value (scores 0 – 3).

Historically there have been rises and falls in the Value Index for rates. The Value Index has increased 1.6 points from June 2010. The Index of 69.3 for April 2010 – March 2011 is again at the higher end of the range and above the downward trend seen over the previous five years.

Quality of Facilities and Services (Page 51)

Two thirds of the respondents, (67%) felt the *quality of Council facilities and services* had improved in the past year, including 10% who rated this with a score of 10 (greatly improved). Only five respondents (0.7%) felt the quality had deteriorated and no respondents (0%) felt it had greatly deteriorated (score of 0). The Index is 72.7, a decrease of 1.7 points from the July 2009 – June 2010 result.

Council's provision of information (Page 62)

Over half of the respondents (58%) were satisfied with the *Council providing adequate information to the community about its services, facilities, projects and plans* (scores 7 – 10). A sixth of the subgroup (15%) rated this with a score of 9 or 10 (exceeded expectations).

A number of respondents (6%) were dissatisfied with the Council providing this type of information (scores 0 – 3) while 25% rated this as neutral (scores 4 - 6). The CSI score is 68.3, down marginally from the July 2009 – June 2010 result.

The analysis shows a downward trend over the past 4 years in the quarterly CSI scores. The March 2011 CSI score of 68.1 is down 0.7 points from the December result and the current CSI score is on par with the downward trend line of the past 4 years.

Topical Questions (Page 75)

There were no topical questions included this quarter.