

Hamilton City Council Residents Survey Report

Executive Summary

Satisfaction with Facilities and Services (Page 6)

For the period July 2011 – June 2012 there were 31 increases in CSI scores and 41 decreases compared to the July 2010 – June 2011 period but most moves were small. Among Customer Choice¹ facilities and services there were 16 increases and 17 decreases. Among the No Customer Choice² facilities and services there were 15 increases and 24 decreases.

On a quarterly basis, there were 23 increases in CSI scores and 49 decreases for the June 2012 quarter versus the March 2012 quarter.

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

Increases in satisfaction scores

There were 31 increases in the CSI score for July 2011 – June 2012 results compared to the July 2010 – June 2011 period.

The largest increases were:

- a 10.6 point increase in satisfaction for the *Claudelands Events Centre*, (CSI score 80.5)
- a 6.0 point increase for the *Hamilton City bus service* (CSI score 83.1)
- a 5.4 point increase for the *bus passenger facilities at the Hamilton transport Centre* (CSI score 80.9)
- a 3.4 point increase for *The Council night patrol team to make the Central City safer in the evenings and weekends* (CSI score 82.4)

Decreases in satisfaction scores

There were 41 decreases in the CSI score for July 2011 – June 2012 results compared to the July 2010 – June 2011 period.

The largest decreases were:

- an 11.0 points for *the way Council staff handled your noise complaint* (CSI score of 70.4).
- a 6.7 point decrease for *Council's Dog Control Service* (CSI score of 75.8).
- a 6.5 point decrease for *the overall performance of the Elected Members of Council in the past year* (CSI score of 61.4).
- a 4.1 point decrease for *the outcome of your noise complaint* (CSI score of 69.8)
- a 3.7 point decrease for *the process Council used for involvement in Council decision making* (CSI score of 69.6)
- a 3.6 point decrease for *the cycling facilities in the city i.e. cycle lanes* (CSI score 64.9)

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 90.1, ahead of the *Household Refuse Collection* (CSI score 88.3).

HIGHEST RANKING FACILITIES AND SERVICES – TOP FIVE	CSI score	
	Jul 10 – Jun 11	Jul 11 – Jun 12
Continuity of Water Supply	89.5	90.1
Household Refuse Collection	86.5	88.3
Hamilton Gardens	88.2	87.3
Visitor Information Centre	83.7	86.7
Kerbside Recyclable Collection	85.5	86.2

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 10 – Jun 11	Jul 11 – Jun 12
Getting around in peak traffic	57.7	56.4
Involvement in Council decision making	59.9	61.1
Elected Members	67.9	61.4
Central City car parking in general	63.9	62.4
Cycling facilities	68.5	64.9

Customer Choice facilities and services.

- The *Hamilton Gardens*, the *Visitor Information Centre*, the *Community Library* and the *Hamilton Zoo* are all rated as an exceptional performance.
- *Hamilton's Central Business District at night and Garden Place* are both rated as needing significant improvement.

No Customer Choice facilities and services.

- The *continuity, pressure and clarity 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*, the *Council Staff*, *getting around in non-peak traffic*, and *Council's programme to clean up Graffiti* are all rated as an exceptional performance.

The *opportunities Council provides for community involvement in decision making*, the *ease of getting around the city in peak traffic times* and the *overall performance of the Elected Members of Council* are all rated with CSI scores that reflect the need for significant improvement.

Usage of Facilities and Services (Page 21)

For the period July 2011 – June 2012, there were more decreases (31) versus increases (15) 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 5.1% increase for *the Community Library*
- a 5.0% increase for *Any Library*
- a 5.0% increase for the *Refuse Transfer Station in Lincoln Street*

INCREASES IN USAGE OF FACILITIES AND SERVICES	% Usage	
	Jul 10 – Jun 11	Jul 11 – Jun 12
Community Library	50.4	55.5
Any Library	65.4	70.4
Refuse Transfer Station	60.4	65.4
Alexandra Street underground car park	34.2	37.0

Decreases in usage of facilities and services

- a 12.7% decrease for *City News*
- an 8.6% decrease for the *cycling facilities*
- an 8.4% decrease for *Hamilton Park Cemetery*
- an 8.2% decrease for *City bus service*

DECREASES IN USAGE OF FACILITIES AND SERVICES	% Usage	
	Jul 10 – Jun 11	Jul 11 – Jun 12
City News	74.9	62.2
Cycling facilities	31.5	22.9
Hamilton Park Cemetery	42.3	33.9
City bus service	52.6	44.4
Hamilton City Council Website	48.0	40.3

Some services like the *pedestrian facilities (92.3%)*, *kerbside recycling collection (91.5%)*, *Parks and Gardens (86.5%)*, *Hamilton Lake (83.7%)*, and *Hamilton Gardens (83.4%)* were used by most respondents.

Many services were used by over 50% of the sample. Other facilities and services provided by the Council like *Noise Control (10.4%)*, *the Hamilton City Leisure Centre (YMCA) (12.6%)*, *the Dog Control Service (12.8%)*, *The Meteor (13.6%)* and *Seddon Park (16.7%)* 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 (49% used but 40% used at least once per year)*,

Other facilities like *Councils Dog Control Service* were used by a small proportion of the population (13%) 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 27)

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 (28.9%) 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 seventh of the respondents (16.2%) 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*).
- *Expenditure (18.8%)* and *Rates (17.8%)* were rated as the main individual issues then *Roads (13.2%)* and *concerns with the City Centre (11.0%)*
- *Law and Order (10.7%)* was the fifth most commonly mentioned important issue followed by *Debt (9.8%)*, *Councillor concerns (9.8%)*, *Safety (9.5%)*, *Parking (7.5%)*, *City Development / Planning (6.6%)* and *Traffic concerns (6.5%)*.
- Similar to the MAT basis, the main issues for the June 2012 quarter being *transportation issues (37%)*, then *rates (21%)*, *expenditure (17%)* and *law and order / safety issues (16%)*, followed by concerns with *debt (15%)* and *Councillor concerns (13%)*
- The largest difference this quarter was a 9.6% increase in *roading issues (23% this quarter versus 13% on a MAT basis)* and a 5.6% increase in mention of *debt (15% versus 10% on a MAT basis)*. The largest decrease was a 3.0% decrease in mention of concerns with the *City Centre (8% versus 11% on a MAT basis)*.

Overall Satisfaction with Council (Page 33)

Two thirds of the respondents (70%) rated their satisfaction with the *Overall Performance of Council* with scores that reflect satisfaction (scores of 7 – 10).

The CSI score was 71.5, down 2.7 points from the July 2010 – June 2011 period. The latest quarter's CSI score of 70.6 is 1.6 points lower than last quarter and this is the second lowest recorded to date.

The respondents were asked why they rated the *Overall Performance of Council* the way they did. On a Moving Annual Total basis (July 2011 – June 2012), the main positive comments focused around the feeling that Council was doing a good job or working well for the city (11%) or positive comments about the staff (9%) or specific services (8%). The main negative comment had to do with concerns with specific services (13%), concerns with the Elected Members (13%) and financial concerns (13%).

The main positive comments for the June quarter focused around good staff (13%), good service (13%), and 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 financial concerns (15%) concerns with specific services (15%), and concerns with the Elected Members (13%). The largest difference between the June quarter and MAT basis was a 6.2% increase in mention of non-performance. The largest decrease was a 4.0% reduction in mention of working well for the city.

Elected Members (Page 43)

Under half of the respondents (43%) were satisfied with the Overall Performance of the Elected Members of Council (scores of 7 – 10) while a ninth of the respondents (11%) were actually dissatisfied.

The CSI score was 61.4, down 6.5 points from the July 2010 - June 2011 result. The current CSI score is the lowest recorded since 2004 and reflects a need for significant improvement. The latest quarter's CSI score of 59.0 is the lowest recorded by the quarterly monitor.

Value from Rates (Page 50)

Two thirds of the respondents (68%) said they paid residential rates, including 3% who paid both residential and commercial rates. The balance of the sample (32%) said they did not pay rates.

The majority of respondents who paid residential rates (n = 509) thought they received good value for their residential rates, (62%) (scores of 7 – 10) although only 3% rated the value for money with a score of 10. A further 5% rated this at 9 and the mode was a score of 7 (28%). Only 5.2% of those who paid residential rates thought they received poor value (scores 0 – 3).

The Value Index has decreased 2.4 points from June 2011. The Index of 66.5 for July 2011 – June 2012 is the lowest recorded since 2003 but is on par with the downward trend seen over the previous seven years.

Quality of Facilities and Services (Page 55)

Over two thirds of the respondents, (69%) 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 13 respondents (1.9%) felt the quality had deteriorated and only three respondents (0.4%) felt it had greatly deteriorated (score of 0). The Index is 71.9, down marginally from the July 2010 – June 2011 result.

Council's provision of information (Page 66)

Over half of the respondents (55%) 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).

A number of respondents (8%) were dissatisfied with the Council providing this type of information (scores 0 – 3). The CSI score is 66.4, down 1.6 points from the July 2010 – June 2011 result. The current CSI score is the lowest recorded since 2002 but this is on par with the declining trend line.

Topical Questions (Page 79)

For the June 2012 quarter (n = 175) the topical questions covered the way Hamilton residents should be represented on their Council for the 2013 election.

Almost a third (30%) of the June quarter's sample (n = 175) preferred to vote for Councillors using a Ward system i.e. they can only vote for candidates in the Ward they live in. Conversely, the largest group of respondents (41%) prefer to vote for Councillors using a citywide system - no Wards, meaning they can vote for Councillors across the whole city. A fifth of the sample (21%) preferred to vote for Councillors using a mixed Ward / citywide system.

Respondents were then asked '*How many Councillors do you think Hamilton City Council should have?*' The responses ranged from 6 to 29 Councillors. The mode (most common answer) was 11 Councillors (38%) and the average was 12.3 Councillors.

Respondents were asked '*Would you like to see Community Boards introduced as part of Hamilton City Council for the October 2013 Council elections?*' Almost half (48%) of the June quarter's sample said they should have community boards as part of Hamilton City Council for the October 2013 Council elections. Conversely, almost a third of the respondents (30%) said they should not have community boards. A few respondents (5%) had no preference while a further sixth of the sample (17%) did not know or did not answer this question.