

Hamilton City Council Residents Survey Report

Executive Summary

Satisfaction with Facilities and Services (Page 6)

For the period April 2012 – March 2013 there were 51 increases and 18 decreases in CSI scores compared to the July 2011 – June 2012 period but most moves were small. Among Customer Choice¹ facilities and services there were 24 increases and 8 decreases. Among the No Customer Choice² facilities and services there were 27 increases and 10 decreases and two factors were unchanged.

On a quarterly basis, there were 51 increases in CSI scores and 18 decreases for the March 2013 quarter versus the December 2012 quarter.

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

Increases in satisfaction scores

The largest increases compared to the July 2011 – June 2012 period were:

- an 11.8 point increase in satisfaction for the way **Council staff handled the noise complaint**, (CSI score 82.1).
- a 10.6 point increase for **the outcome of the noise complaint**, (CSI score 80.4),
- a 4.7 point increase for **Porritt Stadium** (CSI score 73.7)
- a 4.1 point increase for **Gallagher Aquatic Centre** (CSI score 77.3).

Decreases in satisfaction scores

There were 18 decreases in the CSI score for April 2012 – March 2013 results compared to the July 2011 – June 2012 period.

The largest decreases were:

- A 5.0 point decrease for the Public Toilets (CSI score of 67.8).
- a 2.6 point decrease for City Beautification (includes planting of traffic islands, street trees and the tree-scape of the city in general) (CSI score of 74.3).
- A 2.3 point decrease for the Visitor Information Centre in Garden Place (CSI score of 84.3)
- A 2.0 point decrease for the Household Refuse Collection (CSI score 86.3).

Highest and lowest ranked facilities and services

Highest ranking facilities and services on a MAT basis:

The St Andrews Library is in the top position with a CSI score of 93.8, ahead of the **continuity of the water supply** (CSI score 89.9) and **Hamilton Gardens** (CSI score 88.1).

HIGHEST RANKING FACILITIES AND SERVICES – TOP FIVE	CSI score	
	Jul 11 – Jun 12	Apr 12 – Mar 13
St Andrews Library overall		93.8
Continuity of Water Supply	90.1	89.9
Hamilton Gardens	87.3	88.1
Hillcrest Library overall		87.6
Household Refuse Collection	88.3	86.3

Lowest ranking facilities and services on a MAT basis:

- **Getting around in peak traffic** is 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 11 – Jun 12	Apr 12 – Mar 13
Getting around in peak traffic	56.4	55.4
The opportunities Council provides for community involvement in decision making	61.1	61.6
The overall performance of the Elected Members of Council	61.4	62.0
Hamilton's CBD at night	65.0	63.3
Central City car parking in general	62.4	63.5

Customer Choice facilities and services.

- **St Andrews Library, Hamilton Gardens, Hillcrest Library, Garden Place (Central) Library, Hamilton Zoo**, and the **Visitor Information Centre**, are all rated as an exceptional performance.
- **Hamilton's Central Business District at night** is rated as needing significant improvement.

No Customer Choice facilities and services.

- The **continuity, clarity and pressure of the water supply, the household refuse services and kerbside recyclable collection, Hamilton Park Cemetery, Hamilton as a place to live, the Wastewater System, Council night patrol team to make the Central City safer in the evenings and weekends, Council's programme to clean up Graffiti, the Council Staff, the handling and outcome of noise complaints, getting around in non-peak traffic** and the **Parks and Gardens in the City** are all rated as an exceptional performance.
- **The ease of getting around the city in peak traffic times**, is rated with a CSI score that reflects the need for significant improvement.

Usage of Facilities and Services (Page 23)

For the period April 2012 – March 2013, there were almost as many increases (20) versus decreases (23) 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 9.0% increase for **Claudlands Events Centre**
- a 9.0% increase for **Hamilton City Council Website**
- a 5.0% increase for the **Garden Place (Central) Library**

INCREASES IN USAGE OF FACILITIES AND SERVICES	% Usage	
	Jul 11 – Jun 12	Apr 12 – Mar 13
Claudlands Events Centre	48.7	57.7
Hamilton City Council Website	40.3	49.3
Garden Place (Central) Library	45.0	50.0
Kerbside Recycling	91.9	95.9

Decreases in usage of facilities and services

- a 12.0% decrease for **Alexandra Street underground car park**
- a 9.2% decrease for **Any Library**
- a 4.8% decrease for **Any Community Library**
- a 4.8% decrease for the **bus passenger facilities at the Hamilton transport Centre**

DECREASES IN USAGE OF FACILITIES AND SERVICES	% Usage	
	Jul 11 – Jun 12	Apr 12 – Mar 13
Alexandra Street underground car park	37.0	25.0
Any Library	70.4	61.2
Community Library	55.5	50.7
Hamilton Transport Centre	43.3	38.5

Some services like the **kerbside recyclable collection, pedestrian facilities, Parks and Gardens, Hamilton Lake, and Hamilton Gardens** 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 **Hamilton City Leisure Centre (YMCA), Glenview Library, St Andrews Library, making a noise complaint, and The Meteor** were used by a small proportion of the population.

Some facilities (like **kerbside recycling**) were used on a far more frequent basis (daily or weekly) than others which are used once per year e.g. **Founders Theatre (43% used but 42% used once per year)**.

Other facilities like **The Meteor** and **Councils Dog Control Service** were used by a small proportion of the population (14%) and also used on an infrequent basis e.g. 13% used once per year.

Most important Issues Council should be looking at (Page 29)

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, over a quarter of the sample (35.8%) 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 sixth of the respondents (17.4%) 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*).
- *Concerns with Roads* (18.0%) then *Rates* (15.1%) were rated as the main individual issues while *Expenditure* (14.6%) was the third most commonly mentioned issue and the *City Centre* (13.1%) was fourth. They were followed by *Law and Order* (12.8%), *Debt* (12.3%), *Safety* (10.1%), *Parking* (9.1%), and *Council concerns* (9.0%).
- Similar to the MAT basis, the main issues for the March 2013 quarter were transportation issues (31%), then law and order / safety issues (19%), followed by concerns with the city centre (19%), concerns with expenditure (17%), City Development / Planning (14%), and rates (13%).
- The largest difference this quarter was a 5.7% increase in mention of concerns with the city centre (19% versus 13% on a MAT basis) and a 5.7% decrease in mention of City Development / Planning (14% versus 8% on a MAT basis). The largest decrease was a 4.9% mention of any transportation issue (31% this quarter versus 36% on a MAT basis) and a 4.8% decrease in mention of debt (7% this quarter versus 12% on a MAT basis).

Overall Satisfaction with Council (Page 35)

Two thirds of the respondents (69%) rated their satisfaction with the **Overall Performance of Council** with scores that reflect satisfaction (scores of 7 – 10).

The CSI score was 72.2, up 0.7 points from the July 2011 – June 2012 period.

The latest quarter's CSI score of 73.8 is 0.9 points higher than last quarter. It appears that CSI scores have been steadily improving since December 2011.

The respondents were asked why they rated the **Overall Performance of Council** the way they did. On a MAT basis (April 2012 – March 2013), the main positive comments focused around the feeling that Council was doing a good job or working well for the city (10%) or on the staff (10%) or good service (10%). The main negative comment had to do with concerns with specific services (13%), financial concerns (12%), and concerns with the Elected Members (9%).

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 (12%), the fact there were no problems (9%), good staff (7%), and good service (6%). The main negative comments for the quarter had to do with concerns with specific services (13% versus 13% on a MAT basis), financial concerns (10% versus 12% on a MAT basis), and concerns with the Elected Members (7% versus 9% on a MAT basis). The largest difference between the March quarter and on a MAT basis was a 3.6% decrease in mention of good service. The largest increase was a 1.6% rise in mention of doing a good job or working well for the city.

Elected Members (Page 46)

Under half of the respondents (44%) 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) while an eighth of the respondents (12%) were actually dissatisfied.

The CSI score was 62.0, up 0.6 points from the July 2011 - June 2012 result. This is still the second lowest recorded since 2004 and is on par with the downward trend in CSI scores since 2005.

The latest quarter's CSI score of 64.8 is up 2.4 points from the previous quarterly result and 5.8 points above the low recorded in June 2012. There appears to be a rising trend in the CSI Scores for the past three quarters.

Value from Rates (Page 54)

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

The majority of respondents who paid residential rates (n = 535) thought they received good value for their residential rates, (60%) (scores of 7 – 10) although only 5% rated the value for money with a score of 10. Only 9.4% of those who paid residential rates thought they received poor value (scores 0 – 3).

The Value Index has decreased 1.4 points from June 2012. The Index of 65.1 for April 2012 – March 2013 is the lowest recorded since 2002. This is below the downward trend seen over the previous eight years.

Quality of Facilities and Services (Page 59)

Two thirds of the respondents, (65%) 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 14 respondents (1.9%) felt the quality had deteriorated and only four respondents (0.6%) felt it had greatly deteriorated (score of 0). The Index is 71.3, down 0.6 points from the July 2011 – June 2012 result.

Council's provision of information (Page 70)

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 fifth of the subgroup (19%) rated this with a score of 9 or 10 (exceeded expectations).

A number of respondents (7%) were dissatisfied with the Council providing this type of information (scores 0 – 3) while 28% rated this as neutral (scores 4 - 6). The CSI score is 68.0, up 1.6 points from the July 2011 – June 2012 result. The current CSI score is in the middle of the range and is above the declining trend line.

Topical Questions (Page 83)

For the March 2013 quarter (n = 175) the topical questions included respondents' attitudes as to whether Hamilton City Council should continue or stop adding fluoride to Hamilton's public water supply.

The results of the fluoride topical questions undertaken as part of this survey will be presented as part of the fluoridation submissions analysis report prior to the Tribunal commencing on 28 May 2013.