

# STRATEGIC GROUP

## *Key Performance Indicators Council Services Survey*

*August 2004*



*Waitakere City Council*  
*Te Taiao o Waitakere*

## CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION .....	1
SUMMARY: ANNUAL PLAN INDICATORS .....	2
ROADING AND TRAFFIC .....	6
PUBLIC SPACES .....	7
ENVIRONMENT .....	8
COMMUNITY .....	9
WATER .....	10
WASTE AND REFUSE .....	11
RESPONSIBLE COUNCIL .....	12
GENERAL .....	13
INCIDENCE OF PERSONAL USE OF SERVICES .....	14
COMMENTS .....	16



## INTRODUCTION

This survey was conducted by mail during July 2004 using a random sample of people from the Electoral Roll, and is comparable with previous annual surveys (1993 through 2003) where questions are the same. Revisions in question wording are shown in an appendix to the report.

It reports for each service grouping:

- trends in summary rating ("*Very good/ good*")
- summary rating for each item broken down by Ward.

These findings are of sufficient reliability to enable Corporate Planning and Unit Managers to include in their annual reporting.

### Key Performance Indices

Findings are reported as in previous years in terms of a standard index formed by combining "Very Good"/"Good" ratings. For incidence of use, the measure is based on incidence of use at least once in the past 12 months. These form a basis of comparison between items and for each item over time. For further data analyses contact the author.

### Notes:

- As we now have 3 or more data points for most of the annual measures, trends can be reported with increased reliability. With new measures, trends will become apparent only after 3 surveys.
- Where there is an apparent decrease since last year, it is recommended that reasons for this be investigated.

## SUMMARY: ANNUAL PLAN INDICATORS

KPI measures for selected items for Report. Sample base is 685 residents selected at random from the electoral roll. Random sampling error is  $\pm 4\%$  (at 95% confidence level).

The measure for each item is based on those who gave a rating, i.e. non-response or “don’t know/ no opinion” are excluded. For incidence of use, the measure is based on all respondents (i.e. non-users included).

### Urban & Rural Villages

Measures	Target	Achievement
Residents are satisfied with public places (i.e. public facilities and open spaces) in town centres and neighbourhoods. (57% in 1998/ 99) (55% in 1999/ 00) (61% in 2000/ 01) (64% in 2001/ 02) (57% in 2002/ 03)	63% or more	Town centres: 54% Neighbourhoods: 51% Combined: 53%
Residents are satisfied with cleanliness and maintenance of public places (i.e. public facilities and open spaces) in town centres and neighbourhoods. (56% in 1999/00) (60% in 2000/ 01) (59% in 2001/ 02) (54% in 2002/ 03)	65% or more	Town centres: 55% Neighbourhoods: 51% Combined: 53%
Maintain or increase the percentage of residents satisfied with the attractiveness and variety of gardens and shrubberies in parks and civic open space. (70% in 1998/ 99) (71% in 1999/ 00) (69% in 2000/ 01) (73% in 2001/ 02) (66% in 2002/ 03)	73% or more	64%

### Transport & Communications

Measures	Target	Achievement
Residents are satisfied with provision for pedestrians. (54% in 1998/ 99) (53% in 1999/ 00) (55% in 2001/ 02) (51% in 2002/ 03)	56% or more	57%
Residents are satisfied with provision for cyclists. (31% in 1998/ 99) (32% in 1999/00) (30% in 2001/02) (21% in 2002/ 03)	35% or more	25%
Residents are satisfied with the standard of road maintenance. (56% in 1998/ 99) (56% in 1999/ 00) (58% in 2001/ 02) (54% in 2002/ 03)	58% or more	52%

## Strong Communities

Measures	Target	Achievement
Residents are satisfied with the variety and location of parks in Waitakere City. (82% in 1998/ 99) (78% in 1999/ 00) (80% in 2000/ 01) (82% in 2001/ 02) (76% in 2002/ 03)	82% or more	76%
Residents believe that Waitakere City is a great place to live. (32% in 1998/ 99: 82% very good/ good place to live) (30% in 1999/ 00: 83% very good/ good place to live) (35% in 2000/ 01: 85% very good/ good place to live) (34% in 2001/ 02: 86% very good/ good place to live) (36% in 2002/ 03: 86% very good/ good place to live)	37% or more "Very good"	Very good/ Good: 83%  Very Good: 34%
Residents who have used a City library in the last year. (70% in 1998/ 99) (73% in 1999/ 00) (70% in 2000/ 01) (74% in 2001/ 02) (74% in 2002/ 03)	73% or more	73%
Residents satisfied with environmental health services. (65% in 1998/ 99) (65% in 1999/ 00) (61% in 2000/ 01) (70% in 2001/ 02) (51% in 2002/ 03)	69% or more	58%

## Innovative Economy

Measures	Target	Achievement
Increase the proportion of the work force that is employed within Waitakere City. (42% in 1998/ 99) (48% in 1999/ 00) (47% in 2000/ 01) (43% in 2001/ 02) (48% in 2002/ 03)	50%	49%  NOTE: 49% aggregate over the three KPI phone surveys and this survey).  44% in 2001 census.

## Green Network

Measures	Target	Achievement
More residents using the Green Network in the last 12 months. (49% in 1998/ 99) (60% in 1999/00) (58% in 2000/ 01) (32% in 2001/ 02) (53% in 2002/ 03)	66% or more	57%

## Zero Waste

Measures	Target	Achievement
Residents are satisfied with the weekly domestic refuse collection service. (81% in 1998/ 99) (82% in 1999/ 00) (83% in 2000/ 01) (80% in 2001/ 02) (88% in 2002/ 03)	85% or more	86%
Residents are satisfied with Council's dealing with litter. (52% in 1998/ 99) (57% in 1999/ 00) (62% in 2000/ 01) (62% in 2001/ 02) (65% in 2002/ 03)	65% or more	59%

## Active Democracy

Measures	Target	Achievement
Residents believe that Council's services and assets are managed in a financially responsible manner. (44% in 1999/ 00) (44% in 2000/ 01) (51% in 2001/ 02) (33% in 2002/ 03)	48% or more	32%
Residents satisfied with Council services overall. (60% in 1998/ 99) (63% in 1999/ 00) (63% in 2000/ 01) (69% in 2001/ 02) (not measured in 2002/ 03)	65% or more	52%
Residents are satisfied with value for money from rates. (31% in 1998/ 99) (35% in 1999/ 00) (39% in 2000/ 01) (43% in 2001/ 02) (31% in 2002/ 03)	40% or more	28%

## ROADING AND TRAFFIC

	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>
<u>Rated "Good/ Very Good"</u>										
Maintenance of roads	58	58	54	56	53	56	56	58	54	52
Maintenance of footpaths	45	48	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Maintenance of footpaths outside your home <sup>1</sup>	..	..	49	45	47	54	52	60	46	52
Provision for bicycles	28	27	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Provision for cycling	..	..	29	26	31	31	32	30	21	25
Pedestrian safety	49	50	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Provision for pedestrians	..	..	47	51	55	54	53	55	51	57

.. *Not measured*

*No measures in 2001 due to data corruption*

\* When based on residents who have a footpath outside their home, the performance ratings rise to 56%. For those without footpaths (about 13% of the sample) it drops to 31%. Trend data for ratings by those with footpaths outside their homes are as follows:

	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>
<u>Rated "Good/ Very Good"</u>										
Maintenance of footpaths outside your home	..	..				60	57	68	nm	56

### Trends

Generally, ratings are either holding or recovering after slight decline, although the differences compared to last year are statistically significant only for *Maintenance of footpaths* and for *Provision for pedestrians* (both improved).

### Differences by Ward

Overall, Waitakere Ward is the least positive by far, as was the case last year.

	<u>Average</u>	<u>Most Positive</u>	<u>Least Positive</u>
Maintenance of roads	% 52	-	Waitakere (37%)
Maintenance of footpaths outside your home	52	Henderson (59%)	Waitakere (37%)
Provision for cycling	25	-	Waitakere (9%)
Provision for pedestrians	57	-	Waitakere (28%)

<sup>1</sup> includes residents who do not have a footpath outside their home

## PUBLIC SPACES

**1994 1995 1996 1997 1998 1999 2000 2001 2002 2003 2004**

Rated "Good/ Very Good"

Variety of parks	73	72	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Variety and location of parks	..	..	80	82	78	82	78	80	82	76	76
Maintenance of parks	76	76	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Upkeep and appearance of parks in your area	..	..	74	73	68	75	72	71	76	70	72
Attractiveness and variety of gardens & shrubberies in parks and public open spaces	..	..	..	..	..	..	71	69	73	66	64
Quality of public spaces in Town Centres	..	..	..	..	59	61	57	63	66	57	54
Quality of public spaces in your neighbourhood	..	..	..	..	..	53	52	60	62	56	51
Cleanliness and maintenance of public spaces in town centres	..	..	..	..	..	..	59	61	59	55	55
Cleanliness and maintenance of public spaces in your neighbourhood	..	..	..	..	..	..	53	60	58	52	51

.. Not measured

Ratings overall are similar to last year (no differences are statistically significant). Compared to previous years, the declines noted last year have not recovered.

### **Differences by Ward**

Overall, Massey is more positive than the other Wards, which rank about even. Most items are rated fairly evenly across Wards. Differences by Ward show for the following:

	<b><u>Average</u></b>	<b><u>Most Positive</u></b>	<b><u>Least Positive</u></b>
	%		
Variety and location of parks	76	Henderson (83%) Waitakere (81%)	New Lynn (69%)
Upkeep and appearance of parks in your area	72	Waitakere (80%)	New Lynn (64%)
Quality of public spaces in Town Centres	54	Waitakere (62%)	-
Quality of public spaces in your neighbourhood	51	Waitakere (60%)	-
Cleanliness and maintenance of public spaces in your neighbourhood	51	Waitakere (64%)	New Lynn (42%) Massey (45%)

## ENVIRONMENT

1994 1995 1996 1997 1998 1999 2000 2001 2002 2003 2004

Rated "Good/ Very Good"

Control of subdivisions in Waitakere foothills and ranges	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	54	52	57
Protection of native trees and vegetation in the Waitakere Ranges	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	70	72	71
Ensuring food hand hygiene regulations for food shops and restaurants, etc, are followed	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	54	64
Dog control	..	..	38*	44*	43*	..	..	..	..	44	45
Noise control	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	49	54
Control of industrial nuisances such as fumes and other pollution	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	51	55
<b>Environmental health services overall**</b>	54	56	52	63	62	65	65	61	70	51	58

\* worded as *Responsiveness to requests for service: dogs barking and wandering*

\*\* not directly comparable with measures from 1995 to 2002. There has been a major wording change to this question.

There is insufficient data to identify trends.

### Differences by Ward

Generally, Massey and Henderson are the most positive on these issues. New Lynn is the least positive, with Waitakere in between. Most items are rated fairly evenly across Wards. Differences by Ward show for the following:

	<u>Aver- age</u>	<u>Most Positive</u>	<u>Least Positive</u>
	%		
Control of subdivisions in Waitakere Foothills and Ranges	57	Massey (69%)	Waitakere (49%)
Protection of native trees and vegetation in the Waitakere Ranges	71	Massey (79%)	-
Dog control	45	Henderson (52%)	-
Noise control	54	-	Waitakere (73%)
Environmental health services overall	58	Massey and Henderson (62% each)	New Lynn and Waitakere (52% each)

## COMMUNITY

**1994 1995 1996 1997 1998 1999 2000 2001 2002 2003 2004**

Rated "Good/ Very Good"

Library services for a wide range of needs	86	87	87	86	84	86	84	85	83	84	83
Leisure and recreational activities in the city (e.g. programmes and events)	80	80	84	81	81	85	81	82	84	73	68
Community houses, halls and community centres for public use	81	83	80	81	75	79	78	77	82	78	75

NOTE: Question wording for 2003/04 differ from previous years. Comparisons should be made with caution.

There is an **apparent** decline for *Leisure and recreational activities*. Owing to question wording changes since 2003, this cannot be confirmed.

### Differences by Ward

Ratings are fairly even across Wards, with the following differences noted.

	<u>Aver- age</u>	<u>Most Positive</u>	<u>Least Positive</u>
	%		
Library services for a wide range of needs	83	-	New Lynn (76%)
Leisure and recreational activities in the city (e.g. programmes and events)	68	-	New Lynn (62%)
Community houses, halls and community centres for public use	74	Massey (81%)	-

## WATER

	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>
<u>Rated "Good/ Very Good"</u>											
Water supply (e.g. drinkable and with suitable pressure)	72	86	92	87	84	85	81	87	85	82	80
Dealing with interruptions to water supply	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	81	77
Dealing with flooding (when it occurs)	..	..	59	64	66	67	71	75	69	61	53
Sewage system (i.e. reduction of environmental pollution and risk to public health)	..	..	81	87	83	83	84	86	87	72	68

NOTE: Question wording for 2003 differs from previous years.

There is an **apparent** decline for *Dealing with flooding (when it occurs)* and *Sewage system*. Owing to question wording changes since previous measures, these declines may not be confirmed.

### Differences by Ward

Generally, Henderson and New Lynn are more positive on these issues, with Waitakere least positive. Massey is in between. Differences by Ward show for the following:

	<u>Aver- age</u>	<u>Most Positive</u>	<u>Least Positive</u>
Water supply	% 80		Massey (74%)
Dealing with interruptions to water supply	77		New Lynn (72%)
Dealing with flooding	53	Massey (63%)	New Lynn (47%) Waitakere (44%)
Sewage system	68	Henderson (80%)	New Lynn (60%) Waitakere (60%)

## WASTE AND REFUSE

	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>
<u>Rated "Good/ Very Good"</u>											
Weekly rubbish collection service*	94	90	..	..	87	81	82	83	80	88	86
Removal of domestic rubbish, including weekly collection and inorganic collection	..	..	89	85	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Recycling programme	91	89	89	88	78	82	81	81	81	87	82
Dealing with litter	46	45	..	..	..	52	57	62	62	65	59
Dealing with torn rubbish bags	38	38	..	..	..	40	..	..	..	..	..
Dealing with litter and torn rubbish bags	..	..	40	46	42	..	..	..	..	..	..
Dealing with graffiti	30	30	36	31	37	47	55	65	60	59	53
..	<i>Not measured</i>										

NOTE: For ease of reference, items of similar wording are grouped in rows of the same shading  
 \* The word "service" was added in 2000.

A declining trend is apparent for *Dealing with graffiti*. *Dealing with litter* is significantly lower than last year.

### Differences by Ward

Overall, ratings by Ward are fairly even. There are no statistically significant differences for each item by Ward.

	<u>Average</u>	<u>Most Positive</u>	<u>Least Positive</u>
Weekly rubbish collection service	% 86	Henderson (92%)	-
Recycling programme	82	-	New Lynn (77%)
Dealing with litter	59	Waitakere (69%)	New Lynn (51%)
Dealing with graffiti	53	Waitakere (61%)	-

## RESPONSIBLE COUNCIL

**1994 1995 1996 1997 1998 1999 2000 2001 2002 2003 2004**

Rated "Good/ Very Good"

Value for money from rates spending	36	42	34	33	30	31	35	39	43	31	28
Council's services and assets being managed in a financially responsible manner	..	..	..	..	..	..	44	44	51	33	32
Council staff being approachable, polite and helpful to people dealing with Council	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	60	64	61
Council creating a feeling of pride in Waitakere City	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	66	64	62
Council services overall	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	52

Declining trends are noted for *Value for money from rates spending* and *Council's services and assets being managed in a financially responsible manner*.

### Differences by Ward

Differences by Ward are apparent as follows.

	<u>Aver- age</u>	<u>Most Positive</u>	<u>Least Positive</u>
Value for money from rates spending	% 28	-	New Lynn (22%)
Council's services and assets being managed in a financially responsible manner	32	Henderson (40%) Waitakere (38%)	New Lynn (25%)
Council staff being approachable, polite and helpful to people dealing with Council	61	Henderson (71%)	Massey (49%)
Council services overall	52	Henderson (61%)	-

## GENERAL

	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>
<u>Rated "Good/ Very Good"</u>											
Waitakere City as a place to live	82	85	79	85	80	82	83	85	86	86	83
Waitakere City as a place to work	73	77	69	71	68	67	73	73	72	71	67
Waitakere City as a place for play and recreation	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	75	74

.. *Not measured*

Ratings are virtually unchanged from last year.

### Differences by Ward

Overall, ratings for these items are highest for Waitakere, followed by Massey and New Lynn (at very similar levels), then Henderson. Differences by Ward show for the following:

	<u>Aver- age</u>	<u>Most Positive</u>	<u>Least Positive</u>
	%		
Waitakere City as a place to live	83	Waitakere (97%)	Massey (74%)
Waitakere City as a place to work	67	Waitakere (74%) Henderson (74%)	Massey (60%)
Waitakere City as a place for play and recreation	74	Waitakere (81%) Henderson (80%)	-

## INCIDENCE OF PERSONAL USE OF SERVICES

	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>
<b><u>Used at least once a year</u></b>											
Your local neighbourhood park	75	77	81	75	76	75	79	80	78	75	78
A major park	56	58	66	66	57	52	59	62	61	56	62
Any park at all	..	..	..	82	81	80	82	84	82	79	82
Any of the Green Network Connections	..	..	..	..	..	49	60	58	52	53	57
The library nearest your home	68	71	74	71	73	69	71	69	72	72	71
Any other library in Waitakere City	40	39	44	42	44	40	40	35	41	42	39
Any library at all	..	..	..	75	75	70	73	70	74	74	73

The above may be interpreted as "Used at all in the last year"

There are no statistically significant differences compared to last year.

*Waitakere City Council*

	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>
<b><u>Used at Least Once A Month</u></b>											
Your local neighbourhood park	42	42	48	44	44	45	45	48	50	41	47
A major park	24	24	26	25	23	25	23	28	24	21	25
Any park at all	..	..	..	..	..	50	49	53	53	45	51
Any of the Green Network	..	..	..	..	..	15	20	20	18	17	18
The library nearest your home	41	39	46	42	44	35	39	35	43	40	39
Any other library in Waitakere City	13	13	14	11	14	13	11	10	14	14	12
Any library at all	..	..	..	..	..	38	41	36	44	42	41

The above may be interpreted as "Used at all in the last month".

Declines noted last year have been reversed. Taken over the last 5 years, levels are fairly even.

	<u>Average</u>	<u>Higher than average incidence</u>	<u>Lower than average incidence</u>
<b><u>Used at least once a year</u></b>	%		
The library nearest your home	71	Henderson (77%)	-
Any other library in Waitakere City	39	Waitakere (55%)	-
Any library at all	73	-	-
Your local neighbourhood park	78	-	Massey (73%)
A major park	62	-	-
Any park at all	82	-	-
Any of the Green Network Connections	57	Henderson (65%)	-



	<u>Average</u>	<u>Higher than average incidence</u>	<u>Lower than average incidence</u>
<b><u>Used at least once a month</u></b>	%		
The library nearest your home	39	-	-
Any other library in Waitakere City	12	Waitakere (20%)	-
Any library at all	41	-	-
Your local neighbourhood park	47	-	-
A major park	25	Waitakere (36%)	-
Any park at all	51	-	-
Any of the Green Network Connections	18	-	-

## COMMENTS

Approximately half of respondents (47%) made a comment (same as last year's level). Free comments (in order of approximate frequency of mention) centre mainly on:

	2002	2003	2004
	%	%	%
Planning, stewardship and governance issues	10	17	15
Requests for service or suggestions	11	11	15
Roading and traffic issues	18	14	13
Pollution and the control of nuisances	10	9	10
Service shortcomings	11	11	10
General positive comment	12	11	10
Waste management complaints	10	8	8
Water issues	7	4	3
Miscellaneous negative comment	6	3	2

Most issues receive a similar order of mention to last year. Notable exceptions are a rise in mentions concerning criticisms relating to planning, stewardship and governance, and a fall in mentions concerning roading and traffic.

Waitakere City Council