

# Hamilton City Council Residents Survey Report

## Executive Summary

### Satisfaction with Facilities and Services (Page 6)

For the period July 2010 – June 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 Choice<sup>1</sup> facilities and services there were 16 increases and 16 decreases and one factor remained unchanged. Among the No Customer Choice<sup>2</sup> facilities and services, there were 22 increases and 16 decreases and one factor remained unchanged.

*On a quarterly basis, there were 23 increases in CSI scores and 48 decreases for the June 2011 quarter versus the March 2011 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 July 2010 – June 2011 results compared to the July 2009 – June 2010 period.

The largest increases were:

- A 13.1 point increase in satisfaction for *the outcome of being involved in Council decision making (e.g. submissions etc)*, (CSI score 71.2).
- A 10.4 point increase for *the process Council used for involvement in Council decision making* (CSI score 73.3)
- A 7.3 point increase for *the way Council staff handled your noise complaint* (CSI score 81.4)
- A 6.8 point increase with the *Hamilton City Leisure Centre (YMCA)* (CSI

#### Decreases in satisfaction scores

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

The largest decreases were:

- A 7.3 point decrease for *Garden Place in Central Hamilton* (CSI score of 63.8)
- A 7.3 point decrease for *The Meteor* (CSI score of 67.6).
- A 6.9 point decrease for *Porritt Stadium* (CSI score 66.8)
- A 4.3 point decrease for the *Hamilton City bus service* (CSI score of 77.1)

### 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 89.5, ahead of the *Hamilton Gardens* with a CSI score of 88.2.

HIGHEST RANKING FACILITIES AND SERVICES – TOP FIVE	CSI score	
	Jul 09 – Jun 10	Jul 10 – Jun 11
Continuity of Water Supply	88.5	<b>89.5</b>
Hamilton Gardens	88.0	<b>88.2</b>
Household Refuse Collection	87.1	<b>86.5</b>
Water Pressure	85.3	<b>85.7</b>
Hamilton Zoo	84.0	<b>85.6</b>

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	Jul 10 – Jun 11
Getting around in peak traffic	55.7	<b>57.7</b>
Involvement in Council decision making	62.8	<b>59.9</b>
Garden Place in Central Hamilton	71.1	<b>63.8</b>
Central City car parking in general	58.8	<b>63.9</b>
Porritt Stadium	73.6	<b>66.8</b>

Customer Choice facilities and services.

- The *Hamilton Gardens, Hamilton Zoo, Visitor Information Centre* and the *Community 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 supply, the household refuse services and kerbside recyclable collection, the Wastewater System, Hamilton as a place to live, Hamilton Park Cemetery, the Dog Control Service, Council Staff, the way Council staff handled the noise complaint, getting around in non peak traffic, and the Council night patrol team to make the Central City safer in the evenings and weekends* are all rated as an exceptional performance.

<sup>1</sup> 'Customer Choice' 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.

<sup>2</sup> '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 July 2010 – June 2011, there were more increases (26) versus decreases (18) in usage of facilities although most changes are small. Generally, the level of usage is similar to those recorded in previous years.

Increases in usage of facilities and services

- a 14.4% increase for the *Hamilton City Council Website*
- a 6.6% increase for *Hamilton Park Cemetery*
- a 5.4% increase for *the cycling facilities in the city*
- a 5.2% increase for *ArtsPost*.

INCREASES IN USAGE OF FACILITIES AND SERVICES	Usage	
	Jul 09 – Jun 10	Jul 10 – Jun 11
Hamilton City Council Website	33.6	48.0
Hamilton Park Cemetery	35.7	42.3
Cycling facilities	26.1	31.5
ArtsPost	21.7	26.9

Decreases in usage of facilities and services

- a 9.8% decrease for the *Central Library*
- an 8.9% decrease for the *Community Library*
- an 8.7% decrease for the use of any library
- a 7.5% decrease for the *Multi-level car park in Knox Street*

DECREASES IN USAGE OF FACILITIES AND SERVICES	Usage	
	Jul 09 – Jun 10	Jul 10 – Jun 11
Central Library	52.9	43.1
Community Library	59.3	50.4
Any Library	74.1	65.4
Multi-level car park in Knox Street	40.3	32.8
Alexandra Street underground car park	38.6	34.2

Some services like the *pedestrian facilities (93.4%)*, *kerbside recycling collection (92.2)*, *Parks and Gardens (87.3)*, *Hamilton Lake (86.9%)*, and *Hamilton Gardens (85.3%)* 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 (14.0%)*, *the Dog Control Service (14.8%)*, *Noise Control (14.9%)*, and *the Hamilton City Leisure Centre (YMCA) (16.4%)* 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 (40.1%) 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*).
- Close to a quarter of the respondents (23.7%) 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 (17.7%)* was rated as the main individual issue while *Law and Order (13.7%)* was the second most commonly mentioned issue and *Parking (13.7%)* was third.
- *Rejuvenate City Centre (12.6%)*, *Rates (12.3%)*, *Safety (10.3%)*, *City Development / Planning (10.3%)*, *Traffic (9.7%)*, and *Public transport (9.4%)* were the next most commonly mentioned issues.
- Similar to the MAT basis, the main issues for the June 2011 quarter covered *transportation issues (36%)* *law and order / safety issues (22%)* followed by *rejuvenate the city centre (17%)*, *rates (14%)*, *expenditure (11%)* then *city development / planning (7%)* and *events / entertainment (7%)*.
- The largest differences this quarter were a 4.1% decrease in *any transportation issue (36% this quarter versus 40% on a MAT basis)* and a 4.0% decrease in mention of *roading (14% versus 18% on a MAT basis)*. The largest increase was 4.0% for *rejuvenate the city centre (17% versus 13% 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 74.2, down 2.2 points from the July 2009 – June 2010 period.

The respondents were asked why they rated the *Overall Performance of Council* the way they did. On a MAT basis (July 2010 – June 2011), the main positive comments focused around the fact there were no problems (13%) or the feeling that Council was doing a good job or working well for the city (12%) and positive comments about good service (10%). The main negative comment had to do with concerns with specific services (11%), financial concerns (9%) and concerns with the Elected Members (5%) or concerns with non performance (4%).

Similar to the MAT basis, the main positive comments for the June quarter focused around the fact there were no problems (10%) and the main negative comments for the quarter had to do with concerns with specific services (12%), financial concerns (7%) and concerns with the Elected Members (5%). There were more negative comments about the V8's this quarter (5%). The largest difference was a 5% increase in the proportion who mentioned feeling that Council was doing a good job or working well for the city

### Elected Members (Page 39)

Over half of the respondents (55%) were satisfied with the *Overall Performance of the Elected Members of Council* (scores of 7 – 10). A quarter of the sample (24%) were neutral (scores 4 – 6) while 24 respondents (3.9%) were actually dissatisfied.

The CSI score was 67.9, down 3.6 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 (70%) 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 who paid residential rates (n = 527) thought they received good value for their residential rates, (27%) (scores of 7 – 10) although only 5% rated the value for money with a score of 10. Only 5.1% 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 1.2 points from June 2010. The Index of 68.9 for July 2010 – June 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 9% who rated this with a score of 10 (greatly improved). Only five respondents (0.8%) felt the quality had deteriorated and only one respondent (0.1%) felt it had greatly deteriorated (score of 0). The Index is 72.2, a decrease of 2.2 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 seventh of the subgroup (14%) rated this with a score of 9 or 10 (exceeded expectations). The mode was a score of 8 (26%).

A number of respondents (8%) were dissatisfied with the Council providing this type of information (scores 0 – 3) while 24% rated this as neutral (scores 4 - 6). The CSI score is 68.0, down 0.6 points from the July 2009 – June 2010 result.

The analysis shows a downward trend over the past 4 years in the quarterly CSI scores. The June 2011 Index at 65.7 is down 2.4 points from the March result. The current Index is the second lowest recorded by this monitor and below the current downward trend line.

### Topical Questions (Page 75)

There were no topical questions included this quarter.