

Hamilton City Council Residents Survey Report

Executive Summary

Satisfaction with Facilities and Services (Page 6)

For the period October 2011 – September 2012 there were 37 increases and 32 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 17 increases and 15 decreases. Among the No Customer Choice² facilities and services there were 20 increases and 17 decreases.

On a quarterly basis, there were 33 increases in CSI scores and 37 decreases for the September 2012 quarter versus the June 2012 quarter.

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

Increases in satisfaction scores

There were 37 increases in CSI scores and 32 decreases for the October 2011 – September 2012 results compared to the July 2011 – June 2012 period. The largest increases were:

- a 2.0 point increase in satisfaction for **ArtsPost**, (CSI score 78.9).
- a 1.8 point increase for **Council's programme to clean up Graffiti** (CSI score 81.7)
- a 1.8 point increase for the **Hamilton City bus service** (CSI score 84.9).

Decreases in satisfaction scores

There were 32 decreases in the CSI score for October 2011 – September 2012 results compared to the July 2011 – June 2012 period.

The largest decreases were:

- a 3.2 points decrease for **Council's Dog Control Service** (CSI score of 72.6).
- a 3.0 point decrease for the **Public Toilets** (CSI score of 69.7). T
- a 2.3 points decrease for **the cycling facilities in the city i.e. cycle lanes** (CSI score of 62.6)
- a 2.2 point decrease for **Seddon Park** (CSI score 73.9).

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 89.4, ahead of the **Household Refuse Collection** (CSI score 87.5).

HIGHEST RANKING FACILITIES AND SERVICES – TOP FIVE	CSI score	
	Jul 11 – Jun 12	Oct 11 – Sep 12
Continuity of Water Supply	90.1	89.4
Household Refuse Collection	88.3	87.5
Hamilton Gardens	87.3	87.4
Visitor Information Centre	86.7	85.7
Kerbside Recyclable Collection	86.2	85.5

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	Oct 11 – Sep 12
Getting around in peak traffic	56.4	57.4
Involvement in Council decision making	61.1	60.1
Cycling facilities	64.9	62.6
Central City car parking in general	62.4	62.8
Hamilton's CBD at night	65.0	64.4

Customer Choice facilities and services.

- The **Hamilton Gardens, Visitor Information Centre, the Hamilton City bus service** and the **Garden Place (Central) Library** 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, 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's programme to clean up Graffiti, the Council Staff, Council night patrol team to make the Central City safer in the evenings and weekends, and getting around in non-peak traffic** 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 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 22)

For the period October 2011 – September 2012, there were more decreases (31) versus increases (12) 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 5.3% increase for **Hamilton City Council Website**
- a 3.4% increase for **Claudelands Events Centre**
- a 3.2% increase for the **multi-level car park in Knox Street**

INCREASES IN USAGE OF FACILITIES AND SERVICES	% Usage	
	Jul 11 – Jun 12	Oct 11 – Sep 12
Hamilton City Council Website	40.3	45.6
Claudelands Events Centre	48.7	52.1
Multi-level car park in Knox Street	35.1	38.3
Dog Control Service	12.8	15.3

Decreases in usage of facilities and services

- a 5.6% decrease for **Any Library**
- a 5.4% decrease for **any Community Library**
- a 3.6% decrease for **Hamilton Gardens**
- a 3.1% decrease for the **Public Toilets**

DECREASES IN USAGE OF FACILITIES AND SERVICES	% Usage	
	Jul 11 – Jun 12	Oct 11 – Sep 12
Any Library	70.4	64.8
Community Library	55.5	50.1
Hamilton Gardens	83.2	79.6
Public Toilets	58.2	55.1
Gallagher Aquatic Centre	20.7	17.9

Some services like the **kerbside recycling collection** (93.2%), **pedestrian facilities** (91.3%), **Parks and Gardens** (87.2%), **Hamilton Lake** (82.5%), and **Hamilton Gardens** (79.6%) 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** (10.2%), **the Hamilton City Leisure Centre (YMCA)** (10.5%), **The Meteor** (12.3%) **the Dog Control Service** (15.3%), and **Seddon Park** (16.9%) 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** (52% used but 49% used once per year),

Other facilities like **Councils Dog Control Service** were used by a small proportion of the population (15%) and also used on an infrequent basis e.g. 14% used once per year.

Most important Issues Council should be looking at (Page 28)

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 (30.6%) 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 (15.9%) 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* (18.0%) and *Rates* (17.0%) were rated as the main individual issues then *Roads* (14.4%) and *Debt* (11.2%) or *Councillor concerns* (11.2%).

Concerns with the City Centre (10.8%) was the sixth most commonly mentioned important issue followed by *Law and Order* (9.9%), *Safety* (9.0%), and *Parking* (8.6%).

- Similar to the MAT basis, the main issues for the September 2012 quarter were *transportation* issues (37%), then *law and order / safety issues* (18%), *rates* (16%), and *expenditure* (15%) followed by concerns with debt (13%) *Councillor concerns* (9%) and concerns with *Council services* (9%).
- The largest difference this quarter was a 6.3% increase in *any transportation issues* (37% this quarter versus 31% on a MAT basis) and a 4.0% increase in mention of *communication* (7% versus 3% on a MAT basis). The largest decrease was a 3.3% decrease in the mention of *events / entertainment* (1% versus 4% on a MAT basis)

Overall Satisfaction with Council (Page 34)

Two thirds of the respondents (68%) rated their satisfaction with the **Overall Performance of Council** with scores that reflect satisfaction (scores of 7 – 10).

The CSI score was 71.1, down 0.4 points from the July 2011 – June 2012 period.

The latest quarter's CSI score of 71.6 is 1.0 points higher than last quarter. This is the third lowest recorded to date although this is on par with the trend line, which continues to show a steady decline.

The respondents were asked why they rated the **Overall Performance of Council** the way they did. On a MAT basis (October 2011 – September 2012), the main positive comments focused on the staff (10%) or the feeling that Council was doing a good job or working well for the city (9%) or good service (9%). The main negative comment had to do with financial concerns (14%), with concerns specific services (12%), and concerns with the Elected Members (12%).

The main positive comments for the September quarter focused around good service (13%), the fact there were no problems (9%), good staff (9%) and the feeling that Council was doing a good job or working well for the city (6%). The main negative comments for the quarter had to do with financial concerns (17% versus 14% on a MAT basis) and concerns with specific services (9% versus 12% on a MAT basis). The largest difference between the September quarter and on a MAT basis was a 7.5% decrease in mention of concerns with the Elected Members. The largest increase was a 4.4% rise in mention of good service.

Elected Members (Page 44)

Under half of the respondents (42%) 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 (13%) were actually dissatisfied.

The CSI score was 60.4, down 1.0 points from the July 2011 - June 2012 result. The current CSI score is the lowest recorded since 2004. The latest quarter's CSI score of 61.9 is up 2.9 points from the previous result.

Value from Rates (Page 50)

Two thirds of the respondents (67%) said they paid residential rates, including 3% who paid both residential and commercial rates. The balance of the sample (33%) said they did not pay rates.

The majority of respondents who paid residential rates (n = 524) thought they received good value for their residential rates, (61%) (scores of 7 – 10) although only 3% rated the value for money with a score of 10. Only 7.9% 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 October 2011 – September 2012 is the lowest recorded since 2003. This is on par with the downward trend seen over the previous eight years.

Quality of Facilities and Services (Page 56)

Two thirds of the respondents, (67%) 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 17 respondents (2.4%) felt the quality had deteriorated and only five respondents (0.6%) felt it had greatly deteriorated (score of 0). The Index is 71.0, down 0.9 points from the July 2011 – June 2012 result.

Council's provision of information (Page 67)

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 tenth of respondents (8%) were dissatisfied with the Council providing this type of information (scores 0 – 3). The CSI score is 66.0, down 0.4 points from the July 2011 – June 2012 result. The current CSI score is the lowest recorded since 2002 but this is on par with the declining trend line.

Topical Questions (Page 80)

For the September 2012 quarter (n = 176) the topical questions included respondents preparedness for survival after a natural disaster. This is a repeat of questions asked in September 2011.

Two thirds (69%) of the September 2012 quarter sample (n = 176) 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 quarter of the sample (28%) thought they would be totally able to survive for 3 days on their own (Score of 10). A tenth of the September 2012 sample (11%) said they would be unable to survive on their own for three days without electricity, gas, phone, water and toilet facilities (scores 0 – 3).

The average was 7.3 giving an Index of 72.8. The results are up 4.8 points from those obtained when this topical question was last asked in September 2011 (Index 68.0). In 2007 the index was 67.4.

Just over half of the sample (58%) said they had a Household Emergency Plan that includes things such as survival items and important contact details for their family. There are slightly more respondents who said they did have an Household Emergency Plan this year (58% versus 54% in 2011).

Three quarters of the quarterly sample (72%) said they had enough water and food in their house to survive at least three days after a natural disaster. The results are similar to 2011.