

Hamilton City Council Residents Survey Report

Executive Summary

Satisfaction with Facilities and Services (Page 6)

For the period January 2011 – December 2011 there were 22 increases in CSI scores and 49 decreases and one unchanged result compared to the July 2010 – June 2011 period but most moves were small. Among Customer Choice¹ facilities and services there were 10 increases and 22 decreases and one factor remained unchanged. Among the No Customer Choice² facilities and services, there were 12 increases and 27 decreases.

On a quarterly basis, there were 34 increases in CSI scores and 37 decreases for the December 2011 quarter versus the September 2011 quarter.

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

Increases in satisfaction scores

There were 22 increases in the CSI score for January 2011 – December 2011 results compared to the July 2010 – June 2011 period.

The largest increases were:

- a 7.1 point increase in satisfaction for the *Claudelands Events Centre*, (CSI score 77.0).
- a 3.6 point increase for the *Council night patrol team to make the Central City safer in the evenings and weekends* (CSI score 82.6),
- a 3.3 point increase for the *Hamilton City bus service* (CSI score 80.5)
- a 3.1 point increase for both *Porritt Stadium* (CSI score 69.9) and *the outcome of your noise complaint* (CSI score 77.0).

Decreases in satisfaction scores

There were 49 decreases in the CSI score for January 2011 – December 2011 results compared to the July 2010 – June 2011 period.

The largest decreases were:

- a 5.1 points for *Council's Dog Control Service* (CSI score of 77.4)
- a 3.7 point decrease for *the process Council used for involvement in Council decision making* (CSI score of 69.6)
- a 2.7 point decrease for *the Children's Playground equipment in the neighbourhood park*
- a 2.5 point decrease for *Central City Car parking in general* (CSI score 61.4)
- a 2.4 point decrease for *the multi-level car park in Knox Street* (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 89.9, 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	Jan 11 – Dec 11
Continuity of Water Supply	89.5	89.9
Hamilton Gardens	88.2	87.8
Household Refuse Collection	86.5	86.9
Kerbside Recyclable Collection	85.5	85.9
Water Pressure	85.7	85.7

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	Jan 11 – Dec 11
Getting around in peak traffic	57.7	57.3
Involvement in Council decision making	59.9	61.2
Central City car parking in general	63.9	61.4
Garden Place in Central Hamilton	63.8	62.4
Elected Members	67.9	65.6

Customer Choice facilities and services.

- The *Hamilton Gardens and Hamilton Zoo* are both rated as an exceptional performance.
- *Garden Place, Children's Playground equipment and Hamilton's Central Business District at night* are all rated as needing significant improvement.

No Customer Choice facilities and services.

- The *continuity, pressure, clarity of the water supply, the household refuse services and kerbside recyclable collection, Hamilton Park Cemetery, the Wastewater System, the way Council staff handled the noise complaint, Hamilton as a place to live, Council night patrol team to make the Central City safer in the evenings and weekends, getting around in non peak traffic* and the *Council Staff* are all rated as an exceptional performance.
- The *ease of getting around the city in peak traffic times, the opportunities Council provides for community involvement in decision making and the Central City car parking in general* are all 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 January 2011 – December 2011, there were more decreases (34) versus increases (13) 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 2.5% increase for *Any Library*
- a 2.4% increase for the *Public Toilets*
- a 1.9% increase for the *Community Library*

INCREASES IN USAGE OF FACILITIES AND SERVICES	Usage	
	Jul 10 – Jun 11	Jan 11 – Dec 11
Any Library	65.4	67.9
Public Toilets	61.3	63.7
Community Library	50.4	52.3
Porritt Stadium	20.5	22.2

Decreases in usage of facilities and services

- a 6.7% decrease for *Claudlands Events Centre*
- a 5.9% decrease for *Hamilton's Central Business District (down town) at night time*
- a 5.8% decrease for *Hamilton Park Cemetery at Newstead*
- a 5.6% decrease for *City News*
- a 5.4% decrease for *Seddon Park (the cricket ground)*

DECREASES IN USAGE OF FACILITIES AND SERVICES	Usage	
	Jul 10 – Jun 11	Jan 11 – Dec 11
Claudlands Events Centre	50.1	43.4
Hamilton's CBD at night	67.8	61.9
Hamilton Park Cemetery	42.3	36.5
City News	74.9	69.3
Seddon Park	21.6	16.2

Some services like the *pedestrian facilities (92.4%)*, *kerbside recycling collection (88.4)*, *Parks and Gardens (87.4)*, *Hamilton Lake (84.5%)*, and *Hamilton Gardens (84.4%)* 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 Meteor (12.0%)*, *the Hamilton City Leisure Centre (YMCA) (13.4%)* *Noise Control (14.1%)*, *the Dog Control Service (14.4%)*, and *Seddon Park (16.2%)* 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 (43% used but 37% used at least once per year)*,

Other facilities like *The Meteor* were used by a small proportion of the population (12%) and also used on an infrequent basis e.g. 11% 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, a third of the respondents (31.0%) 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 (19.5%) 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*).
- *Rates (15.4%)* and *Expenditure (15.4%)* were rated as the main individual issues while *Roads (13.2%)* was the third most commonly mentioned issue and *Law and Order (12.8%)* was fourth.
- *Concerns with the City Centre (12.0%)* was the fifth most commonly mentioned important issue this year. This was followed by *Safety (10.1%)*, *Parking (9.3%)*, then *City Development / Planning (9.0%)* and *Public Transport (7.0%)*.
- Similar to the MAT basis, the main issues for the December 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 results are quite different for the December 2011 quarter versus the MAT basis with the main issue being *expenditure (22%)*, then *transportation issues (20%)* and *rates (18%)*, followed by *law and order / safety issues (16%)* *Councillor concerns (12%)* and *concerns with the city centre (9%)*.
- The largest differences this quarter was an 11.0% decrease in any *transportation issue (20% this quarter versus 31% on a MAT basis)*. The largest increase was a 6.8% increase in mention of *expenditure (22% versus 15% on a MAT basis)* and a 5.8% increase in mention of *Councillor concerns (12% versus 6% on a MAT basis)*.

Overall Satisfaction with Council (Page 29)

Three quarters of the respondents (73%) rated their satisfaction with the *Overall Performance of Council* with scores that reflect satisfaction (scores of 7 – 10).

The CSI score was 72.5, down 1.7 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 (January 2011 – December 2011), the main positive comments focused around the feeling that Council was doing a good job or working well for the city (10%) or positive comments about specific services (8%) or about good service (8%). The main negative comment had to do with concerns with specific services (12%), financial concerns (11%) and concerns with the Elected Members (10%).

The main positive comments for the December quarter focused on good staff (9%), positive things about specific services (8%) or around the feeling that Council was doing a good job or working well for the city (7%). The main negative comments for the quarter had to do with concerns with the Elected Members (17% versus 10% on a MAT basis) and financial concerns (16% versus 11% on a MAT basis).

Elected Members (Page 39)

Just under half of the respondents (48%) were satisfied with the *Overall Performance of the Elected Members of Council in the past year* (scores of 7 – 10). Over a quarter of the sample (29%) were neutral (scores 4 – 6) while 42 respondents (6.1%) were actually dissatisfied.

The CSI score was 65.6, down 2.3 points from the July 2010 - June 2011 result. The CSI score now reflects a fair performance with the need for improvement.

Value from Rates (Page 46)

Over two thirds of the respondents (69%) said they paid residential rates, including 3% who paid both residential and commercial rates. Five respondents (0.8%) paid only commercial rates. The balance of the sample (31%) said they did not pay rates.

The majority of respondents who paid residential rates (n = 508) thought they received good value for their residential rates, (61%) (scores of 7 – 10) although only 4% rated the value for money with a score of 10. Only 4.7% of those who paid residential rates thought they received poor value (scores 0 – 3).

The Value Index has decreased 1.7 points from June 2011. The Index of 67.2 for January 2011 – December 2011 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, (68%) felt the quality of Council facilities and services had improved in the past year, including 11% who rated this with a score of 10 (greatly improved). Only nine respondents (1.3%) 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 (56%) 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).

A number of respondents (9%) were dissatisfied with the Council providing this type of information (scores 0 – 3) while 26% rated this as neutral (scores 4 - 6). The CSI score is 66.9, down 1.1 points from the July 2010 – June 2011 result. The current CSI score is on par with the declining trend line.

Topical Questions (Page 75)

The topical questions for the December 2011 quarter (n = 180) covered included City News.

Two thirds of the respondents (69%) had used City News in the past 12 months. The largest group of users (31%) had used this monthly while 20% used City News on a weekly basis and 17% used it at least once per year (Note: this does not come out weekly). A few (1%) said they used it daily.

Four fifths (80%) of those who had used City News in the past 12 months (n = 323) were satisfied. The mode is a score of 8 (30%) and a third (29%) rated their satisfaction with a score of 9 or 10 (exceeded expectation).

The CSI score for January – December 2011 is 76.9, virtually unchanged from the July 2010 – June 2011 result. This again rates as a good performance but with potential for improvement.

Only a minority (19%) made any suggestion for improvements to City News. The main theme related to more Council News or information in regard to City Planning (8% of the sample but 35% of those who offered a suggestion).

Respondents were asked 'Were you aware that since July Council's news publication, City News is now only printed in the local paper in Hamilton?' Just a fifth of the December quarter's sample (20%) were aware of this. Conversely, three quarters of the respondents (76%) said they were not aware of this.