

Hamilton City Council Residents Survey Report

Executive Summary

Satisfaction with Facilities and Services (Page 6)

For the period April 2011 – March 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 14 increases and 19 decreases. Among the No Customer Choice² facilities and services there were 17 increases and 22 decreases.

On a quarterly basis, there were 50 increases in CSI scores and 22 decreases for the March 2012 quarter versus the December 2011 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 April 2011 – March 2012 results compared to the July 2010 – June 2011 period.

The largest increases were:

- 9.2 point increase in satisfaction for the *Claudelands Events Centre*, (CSI score 79.1)
- a 4.3 point increase for *the bus passenger facilities at the Hamilton transport Centre* (CSI score 79.8)
- a 3.8 point increase for *the Hamilton City bus service* (CSI score 81.0)
- a 2.7 point increase for *the Council night patrol team to make the Central City safer in the evenings and weekends* (CSI score 81.6)

Decreases in satisfaction scores

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

The largest decreases were:

- a 5.4 point decrease for *the way Council staff handled your noise complaint* (CSI score of 75.9).
- a 4.9 point decrease for *Council's Dog Control Service* (CSI score of 77.7).
- a 4.4 point decrease for *the overall performance of the Elected Members of Council in the past year* (CSI score of 63.6)
- a 4.4 point decrease for *the process Council used for involvement in Council decision making* (CSI score of 68.9)
- a 3.8 point decrease for *Gallagher Aquatic Centre* (CSI score 72.6)

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 89.4, ahead of the *Household Refuse Collection* with a CSI score of 88.1.

HIGHEST RANKING FACILITIES AND SERVICES – TOP FIVE	CSI score	
	Jul 10 – Jun 11	Apr 11 – Mar 12
Continuity of Water Supply	89.5	89.4
Household Refuse Collection	86.5	88.1
Hamilton Gardens	88.2	87.9
Kerbside Recyclable Collection	85.5	85.9
Water Pressure	85.7	85.3

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	Apr 11 – Mar 12
Getting around in peak traffic	57.7	57.2
Involvement in Council decision making	59.9	61.1
Central City car parking in general	63.9	63.0
Garden Place in Central Hamilton	63.8	63.3
Elected Members	67.9	63.6

Customer Choice facilities and services.

- *Hamilton Gardens* and the *Visitor Information Centre* are both rated as an exceptional performance.
- *Garden Place* is 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, the Wastewater System, Hamilton as a place to live, Hamilton Park Cemetery, getting around in non peak traffic, Council night patrol team to make the Central City safer in the evenings and weekends and the Council Staff* 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.

Usage of Facilities and Services (Page 21)

For the period April 2011 – March 2012, there were more decreases (36) versus increases (7) 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 4.8% increase for *the Community Library*
- a 3.8% increase for *Any Library*
- a 3.7% increase for the *Refuse Transfer Station in Lincoln Street*

INCREASES IN USAGE OF FACILITIES AND SERVICES	% Usage	
	Jul 10 – Jun 11	Apr 11 – Mar 12
Community Library	50.4	55.2
Any Library	65.4	69.2
Refuse Transfer Station	60.4	64.1
Garden Place	75.5	77.7

Decreases in usage of facilities and services

- an 11.0% decrease for *Hamilton's Central Business District (down town) at night time*
- a 9.7% decrease for *City News*
- a 7.3% decrease for *Waikato Museum*
- a 6.8% decrease for *City Walkways*
- a 6.8% decrease for *Founders Theatre*

DECREASES IN USAGE OF FACILITIES AND SERVICES	% Usage	
	Jul 10 – Jun 11	Apr 11 – Mar 12
Hamilton's CBD at night	67.8	56.8
City News	74.9	65.2
Waikato Museum	50.8	43.5
City Walkways	80.4	73.6
Founders Theatre	48.5	41.7

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 the *Dog Control Service (12.8%), the Hamilton City Leisure Centre (YMCA) (13.0%) Noise Control (13.1%), The Meteor (13.5%) and Seddon Park (16.5%)* 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 (45% used but 37% 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 (29.0%) 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 sixth of the respondents (17.6%) 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 (17.5%)* and *Rates (16.2%)* were rated as the main individual issues while *concerns with the City Centre (13.2%)* was the third most commonly mentioned issue and *Law and Order (11.5%)* was fourth.
- *Roads (10.9%)* was the fifth most commonly mentioned important issue this year. This was followed by *Safety (9.4%), Parking (9.4%),* then *Councillor concerns (7.9%), City Development / Planning (7.2%)* and *Debt (7.0%)*.
- Similar to the MAT basis, the main issues for the March 2012 quarter covered *transportation issues (29%), expenditure (18%), law and order / safety issues (14%)* followed by *rates (13%), concerns with the City Centre (13%)* and *Councillor concerns (11%)*.
- 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 difference this quarter was a 6.0% decrease in law and order (6% this quarter versus 12% on a MAT basis) and a 3.0% decrease in mention of rates (13% versus 16% on a MAT basis). The largest increase was a 2.9% increase in mention of Councillor concerns (11% versus 8% on a MAT basis).

Overall Satisfaction with Council (Page 33)

Three quarters of the respondents (72%) rated their satisfaction with the *Overall Performance of Council* with scores that reflect satisfaction (scores of 7 – 10).

The CSI score was 72.0, down 2.2 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 Moving Annual Total basis (April 2011 – March 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 specific services (9%). The main negative comment had to do with concerns with specific services (12%), concerns with the Elected Members (11%) and financial concerns (10%).

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 (15%), or the fact there were no problems (10%). The main negative comments for the quarter had to do with concerns with specific services (14% versus 12% on a MAT basis), with concerns with the Elected Members (11% versus 11% on a MAT basis) and financial concerns (10% versus 10% on a MAT basis).

Elected Members (Page 43)

Just under half of the respondents (47%) 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 59 respondents (8.6%) were actually dissatisfied.

The CSI score was 63.6, down 4.3 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 50)

Over two thirds of the respondents (68%) said they paid residential rates, including 3% who paid both residential and commercial rates. Two respondents (0.2%) paid only commercial rates. The balance of the sample (32%) said they did not pay rates.

The majority of respondents who paid residential rates (n = 500) thought they received good value for their residential rates, (63%) (scores of 7 – 10) although only 5% 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 1.2 points from June 2011. The Index of 67.7 for April 2011 – March 2012 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 55)

Over two thirds of the sample, (70%) 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 11 respondents (1.6%) felt the quality had deteriorated. The Index is 72.6, up 0.4 points from the July 2010 – June 2011 result of 72.2.

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) while 27% rated this as neutral (scores 4 - 6). The CSI score is 66.8, down 1.2 points from the July 2010 – June 2011 result. The current CSI score is on par with the declining trend line.

Topical Questions (Page 79)

The topical questions for the March 2012 quarter (n = 175) covered people's attendance of arts events and their involvement in the arts.

Over half (60%) of the March quarter's sample (n = 175) had not attended an art event in Hamilton in the past 12 months. Conversely, over a third of the respondents (40%) had attended an art event in Hamilton in the past 12 months. A seventh of the sample (15%) had attended one event in the last 12 months while 12% had attended 2 – 3 art events. Slightly fewer (11%) had attended 4 – 9 art events while 4% had attended 10 or more art events in Hamilton in the past 12 months.

Women (49%), those working part time (62%), those from Hamilton East / Hillcrest (59%) and those of Maori descent (54%) were the most likely to have attended an arts event in the past 12 months.

The vast majority (90%) of the sample (n = 175) had not been involved in the arts in the past 12 months. Conversely, only 7% participated in the arts in the past 12 months.

Two thirds of the respondents (64%) were satisfied with knowing where to find information about the arts or arts events. A fifth of the respondents (18%) rated this as neutral (scores from 4 – 6) and nine respondents (5% of the sample) gave a score that reflected dissatisfaction (scores of 0 – 3).

The CSI score for knowing where to find information about the arts or arts events is 75.0. This rates as a good performance but with potential for improvement.