Hamilton City Council Residents Survey Report

Executive Summary

Satisfaction with Facilities and Services (Page 6)

For the period October 2010 – September 2011 there were 27 increases in CSI scores and 42 decreases and three unchanged results compared to the July 2010 – June 2011 period but most moves were small. Among Customer Choice[1] facilities and services there were 13 increases and 19 decreases and one factor remained unchanged. Among the No Customer Choice[2] facilities and services, there were 14 increases and 23 decreases and two factors remained unchanged.

On a quarterly basis, there were 30 increases in CSI scores and 42 decreases for the September 2011 quarter versus the June 2011 quarter.

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

Increases in satisfaction scores

There were 27 increases in the CSI score for October 2010 – September 2011 results compared to the July 2010 – June 2011 period.

The largest increases were:

- a 4.1 point increase in satisfaction for the *Claudelands Events Centre*, (CSI score 74.0).
- a 2.6 point increase for *Council operated uncovered off street car parking on the fringe of the CBD* (CSI score 72.3),
- a 2.4 point increase for *the way Council staff handled your noise complaint* (CSI score 83.8)
- a 2.3 point increase with *the outcome of your noise complaint* (CSI score 76.2).

Decreases in satisfaction scores

There were 42 decreases in the CSI score for October 2010 – September 2011 results compared to the July 2010 – June 2011 period.

The largest decreases were:

- a 3.5 point decrease for *the process Council used for involvement in Council decision making* (CSI score of 69.8)
- a 2.3 point decrease for *the outcome of your being involved in Council decision making (e.g. submissions etc)* (CSI score of 69.0).
- a 2.2 point decrease for *Hamilton City Leisure Centre (YMCA)* (CSI score 68.2)

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 89.9, ahead of the *Hamilton Gardens* with a CSI score of 87.8.

Highest ranking facilities and services – top five	CSI score	
	Jul 10 – Jun 11	Oct 10 – Sep 11
Continuity of Water Supply	89.5	**89.9**
Hamilton Gardens	88.2	**87.8**
Household Refuse Collection	86.5	**87.3**
Kerbside Recyclable Collection	85.5	**86.2**
Hamilton Zoo	85.6	**85.1**

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 – Bottom five	CSI score	
	Jul 10 – Jun 11	Oct 10 – Sep 11
Getting around in peak traffic	57.7	**57.3**
Involvement in Council decision making	59.9	**61.4**
Garden Place in Central Hamilton	63.8	**62.3**
Central City car parking in general	63.9	**64.5**
The Meteor	67.6	**66.6**

Customer Choice facilities and services.

- The *Hamilton Gardens and Hamilton Zoo* are both rated as an exceptional performance.
- *Garden Place* is rated with a CSI score that reflects 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 way Council staff handled the noise complaint, the Wastewater System, Hamilton Park Cemetery, Hamilton as a place to live, getting around in non peak traffic, Council Staff, the Dog Control Service,* and the *Council night patrol team to make the Central City safer in the evenings and weekends* are all rated as an exceptional performance.
- 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.

[1] '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.

[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.

Usage of Facilities and Services (Page 17)

For the period October 2010 – September 2011, there were more decreases (35) versus increases (8) 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 3.0% increase for the *Public Toilets*
- *a* 1.7% increase for *Waikato Stadium*
- a 1.2% increase for *Council operated uncovered off street car parking on the fringe of the CBD*

Increases in Usage of Facilities and Services	Usage	
	Jul 10 – Jun 11	**Oct 10 – Sep 11**
Public Toilets	61.3	**64.3**
Waikato Stadium	41.7	**43.4**
Council off-street car parking	46.5	**47.7**
Hamilton Zoo	51.5	**52.3**

Decreases in usage of facilities and services

- a 3.1% decrease for *Founders Theatre*
- a 3.1% decrease for the *bus passenger facilities at the Hamilton Transport Centre*
- a 2.9% decrease for *Claudelands Events Centre*
- a 2.9% decrease for the *cycling facilities in the city i.e. cycle lanes*
- a 2.9% decrease for *Waikato Museum*

Decreases in Usage of Facilities and Services	Usage	
	Jul 10 – Jun 11	**Oct 10 – Sep 11**
Founders Theatre	48.5	**45.4**
Hamilton Transport Centre	43.7	**40.6**
Claudelands Events Centre	50.1	**47.2**
Cycling facilities	31.5	**28.6**
Waikato Museum	50.8	**47.9**

Some services like the *pedestrian facilities (92.8%), kerbside recycling collection (92.2), Parks and Gardens (85.9), Hamilton Lake (85.1%)*, and *Hamilton Gardens (84.5%)* were used by most respondents.

Many services were used by over 50% of the sample. Other facilities and services provided by the Council like *the Dog Control Service (12.2%), The Meteor (14.3%)*, *the Hamilton City Leisure Centre (YMCA) (14.3%) Noise Control (15.5%)*, and *Gallagher Aquatic Centre (17.6%)* 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 *Claudelands Events Centre (47% used but 41% used at least once per year),*

Other facilities like *The Meteor* were used by a small proportion of the population (14%) and also used on an infrequent basis e.g. 13% used 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, 0ver a third of the respondents (36.7%) 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*).
- A fifth of the respondents (22.3%) 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* (17.8%) was rated as the main individual issue while *Rates* (14.5%) was the second most commonly mentioned issue and *Law and Order* (13.9%) was third.
- *Concerns with the City Centre* (12.4%), Expenditure (12.0%), *City Development / Planning* (10.9%), *Safety* (10.4%), *Parking* (10.2%), *Traffic* (9.0%) and *Public Transport* (8.0%) were the next most commonly mentioned issues.
- Similar to the MAT basis, the main issues for the September 2011 quarter covered *transportation issues* (31%) *law and order / safety issues* (19%) followed by *rates* (19%), *expenditure* (18%), *concerns with the City Centre* (15%) and *city development / planning* (12%).
- The largest difference this quarter was a 6.2% decrease in any *transportation issue* (31% this quarter versus 37% on a MAT basis). The largest increase was a 5.9% increase in mention of *expenditure* (18% versus 12% on a MAT basis) and a 4.7% increase in mention of *rates* (19% versus 15% 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 73.9, down 0.3 points from the July 2010 – June 2011 period.

The respondents were asked why they rated the *Overall Performance of Council* the way they did. On a MAT basis (October 2010 – September 2011), the main positive comments focused around the feeling that Council was doing a good job or working well for the city (12%) or that there were no problems (11%). The main negative comment had to do with concerns with specific services (12%), financial concerns (9%) and concerns with the Elected Members (6%).

Similar to the MAT basis, the main positive comments for the September quarter focused around the feeling that Council was doing a good job or working well for the city (14%). The main negative comments for the quarter had to do with concerns with specific services (13%), concerns with the Elected Members (10%) and financial concerns (8%). The largest difference was a 6% decrease in mentioning no problems and a 4% increase in concerns with the Elected Members

Elected Members (Page 39)

Over half of the respondents (53%) were satisfied with the *Overall Performance of the Elected Members of Council in the past year (i.e. the Mayor and Councillors)* (scores of 7 – 10). A quarter of the sample (26%) were neutral (scores 4 – 6) while 26 respondents (3.9%) were actually dissatisfied.

The CSI score was 67.5, down 0.4 points from the July 2010 - June 2011 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 4% who paid both residential and commercial rates. Five respondents (0.7%) paid only commercial rates. The balance of the sample (28%) said they did not pay rates.

The majority of respondents who paid residential rates (n = 516) thought they received good value for their residential rates, (65%) (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)

The Value Index of 68.1 has decreased 0.7 points from June 2011 but is still at the higher end of the range but on par with the downward trend seen over the previous seven years.

Quality of Facilities and Services (Page 51)

Two thirds of the respondents, (69%) 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 six respondents (0.9%) felt the quality had deteriorated. The Index is 72.2, unchanged from the July 2010 – June 2011 result.

Council's provision of information (Page 62)

Over half of the respondents (57%) 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 (15%) rated this with a score of 9 or 10 (exceeded expectations). The mode was a score of 8 (26%).

A number of respondents (7%) were dissatisfied with the Council providing this type of information (scores 0 – 3). The CSI score is 68.1, virtually unchanged from the July 2010 – June 2011 result.

The analysis shows there has been a small increase of 0.1 points in the CSI score of 68.1 for the provision of Council information (relating to services, facilities, projects and plans) this reading. The current CSI score is on par with the declining trend line. However, the September 2011 quarterly Index at 70.2 is up 4.5 points from the June quarterly result.

Topical Questions (Page 75)

The topical questions for the September quarter (n = 151) covered respondents preparedness for survival after a natural disaster. Two thirds (63%) thought they would be able to survive on their own for three days without electricity, gas, phone, water and toilet facilities (scores of 7 – 10). A fifth of the sample (19%) thought they would be totally able to survive for 3 days on their own (rating themselves with a score of 10 out of 10). A tenth of the September sample (10%) said they would be unable to survive on their own for three days.

The average was 6.8, giving an Index of 68.0. The results are very similar to those obtained when this topical question was last asked in September 2007. In 2007 the index was 67.4

Their main suggestions as to what the respondent needs to make their household more able to survive on their own for three days without essential services after a natural disaster related to water (13% of the sample but 39% of those who rated at 6 or less), followed by 8% who mentioned an emergency kit and 7% mentioned food or a cooking facility / gas.

Just over half of the sample (54%) had a Household Emergency Plan that includes things such as survival items and important contact details for their family. Conversely, just under half of the respondents (46%) said they did not have a Household Emergency Plan.

Three quarters of the quarterly sample (73%) said they had enough water and food in their house to survive at least three days after a natural disaster. Conversely, a quarter of the respondents (26%) said they did not have enough water and food to survive at least three days after a natural disaster.