

Christchurch City Council
Point of Contact Service Satisfaction
Residents Survey Results

2024-2025

Monitoring and Research Team
Performance Management Unit
March 2024

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	3
RATIONALE FOR RESIDENTS SURVEY FRAMEWORK.....	3
SUMMARY OF LEVELS OF SERVICE RESULTS: POINT OF CONTACT SURVEYS 2024-2025.....	5
ADDITIONAL SERVICE SATISFACTION RESULTS	6
SURVEY RESULTS	8
ACTIVITY: CITIZENS AND CUSTOMER SERVICES.....	8
Walk In Customer Service	8
Telephone Customer Service	10
ACTIVITY: COMMUNICATIONS AND ENGAGEMENT	13
External Communications	13
ACTIVITY: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND FACILITIES	15
Community Development and Capacity Building Initiatives	15
ACTIVITY: LIBRARIES NGĀ KETE WĀNANGA O ŌTAUTAHĪ	17
Libraries	17
ACTIVITY: RECREATION, SPORTS, COMMUNITY ARTS AND EVENTS	19
Community Events	19
Event Support.....	20
Recreation and Sport Support.....	22
Recreation and Sport Facilities.....	24
ACTIVITY: PARKS AND FORESHORE	27
Community Parks	27
Botanic Gardens and Mona Vale	29
Regional Parks	31
Cemetery Administration Services	33
Cemeteries	34
Hagley Park.....	36
Marine Structures	38
Environmental, Conservation, Water and Civil Defence Education Programmes	41
ACTIVITY: BUILDING REGULATION	44
Case Management Service.....	44
ACTIVITY: RESOURCE CONSENTING.....	46
Resource Consenting Process.....	46
ACTIVITY: TRANSPORT	48
Perception of Vehicle and Personal Safety at Council Off-Street Parking Facilities	48
Public Transport Facilities	49
APPENDIX 1: SATISFACTION RESULTS FOR ADDITIONAL SERVICES	52
EMAIL CUSTOMER SERVICE.....	52
Quality of the Service Received for Email Services.....	52
COMMUNITY FACILITIES.....	54
Range and Quality of Council Operated Community Facilities	54
SPORTS PARKS	57
Presentation of Sports Parks.....	57
REGIONAL PARKS.....	60
Presentation of Regional Parks	60
MARINE STRUCTURES.....	61
Presentation of Marine Structures.....	61
GOVERNANCE AND DECISION MAKING: PEOPLE WHO ATTENDED HEARINGS OR MADE DEPUTATIONS	62
Understanding of Council Decisions.....	62
Public Influence on Council Decision Making	63
Opportunities to Participate in and Contribute to Council Decision Making	64
Decision Making Processes Easy to Use and Engage With	64
Making Decisions in Best Interests of City	65
PUBLIC TRANSPORT FACILITIES	66
Appearance, Safety and Ease of Use of Bus Interchange and Hubs.....	66

Introduction

Rationale for Residents Survey Framework

Christchurch City Council began surveying residents on a regular basis in 1991 with the introduction of a face to face Annual Survey of Residents. The Council's Residents Survey framework assesses a total of 37 Levels of Service Measures of Success under 15 different Activities. It also assesses some other services for ongoing organisation performance trend monitoring. The Residents Survey includes a two part framework:

1. **General Service Satisfaction Survey** – this measures resident perceptions of satisfaction with Council services that the general population of Christchurch is likely to have had experience using (such as the water supply and roads). Survey content is closely aligned with Levels of Service in Service Plans (and uses, where possible, a consistent style of satisfaction questioning across services). It also includes an overall Council service performance measure and an overall effort or ease of interaction with Council measure. The online survey is conducted in January each year with a representative sample of 770 residents aged 18 years and over (quotas are applied for age, gender and ward). The overall questionnaire length is approximately 15 minutes. The General Service Satisfaction Survey measures 16 Levels of Service Measures of Success under 9 Activities. In January each year a Life in Christchurch booster survey is undertaken to boost participation by Māori, Pacific Peoples, Asian and those aged 18-24 years. This survey includes some of the key General Service Satisfaction Survey questions such as overall service performance, ease of interaction with Council and core infrastructure satisfaction.
2. **Point of Contact Service Satisfaction Surveys** – this is a series of surveys conducted during the year at the point of contact with Council services. Surveys cover services identified as better suited to assessment by users at the time they use a service or where there is a very specific customer base (eg. library users and resource consent applicants). A range of survey methods is used including onsite and telephone sequential mixed method surveying (onsite and online survey completions); postal/mail drop surveys and email surveys to people on Council data bases. Point of contact surveys are used to measure 21 Levels of Service Measures of Success under 9 Activities.

Infield: January	Infield: Throughout Year
General Service Satisfaction Survey Resident satisfaction with Council services used by a wide range of the general population; 770 respondent sample aged 18+ years; +/- 3.5% on individual questions at 95% confidence level; mainly closed questions with response options + three open ended questions; representative online survey	Point of Contact Service Satisfaction Surveys Resident satisfaction with Council services used by direct service users at point of contact; sampling of a range of sites for each service with between approximately 5 and 3,400 respondents per service; short survey of closed questions with response options + two open ended questions; face to face surveying, online and postal
Services include: eg. governance and decision making, public information and participation, waterways and stormwater management, events and festivals, rubbish and recycling, active travel, roading, water supply, parking, disaster preparedness	Services include: eg. libraries, parks, public transport infrastructure, first point of contact customer services, events and festivals, resource consents, cemeteries, marine structures, community facilities, recreation and sport services, external communications, governance and decision making, parking, education programmes
Results: MAY	Results: MAY
Performance Framework Resident perceptions feed into performance monitoring and reporting of Council service delivery	

NB: A Life in Christchurch booster survey may also be undertaken to ensure better representation across the Residents Survey by various ethnic groups and by young people

Methodology

- Survey questions based on Levels of Service in Activity Plans and/or existing surveys
- Where applicable, questions use a five point satisfaction scale (very satisfied, satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, dissatisfied, very dissatisfied, don't know / not applicable)
- Point of Contact Service Satisfaction Surveys are conducted at service sites or users are contacted by either telephone, email, post or mail drop with either a random sample or the total population of service users
- Respondent sample sizes range from approximately 5 to 3,400 per service, depending on factors such as user numbers and scale of services provided at the site

- A range of sites are selected for each service, (random selection of small, medium and larger sites) (service size is determined by factors such as user numbers and scale of services provided at the location)
- A variety of survey methods are used to gather information, with surveys taking on average 2-3 minutes to complete: Most of the surveys are administered using a sequential mixed methodology of onsite, mail drop/postal and online surveying. Respondents are asked if they would give feedback at the site about the service and if they agree, they are interviewed or given a self-complete form. Those who do not want to complete the survey onsite are asked for their email address and are then sent an online feedback form. Some surveys are completed as email collectors (using lists supplied by business units), postal/mail drop or as telephone interviews¹.
- Overall 8,889 Point of Contact surveys were completed in 2024-2025: of those completed via the summer research programme, 30% were completed face to face; 3% were completed by mail drop or post and 67% were completed online. The overall completion rate for the summer point of contact surveys was 31%.












































Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Customer services research suggests that customers want, with minimal effort on their part, to be able to interact with organisations in the easiest possible way for them, with their needs met so that they can get on with their busy lives (Corporate Executive Board 2014 *Blinded by Delight: Why Service Fails and How to Fix It* CEB, Arlington). A measure of ease of interaction with Council services, based on customer services principles, has been added to all point of contact feedback forms. This question tests respondent perceptions of how easy it is for them to interact with or use a Council service, based on efficient and effective processes and/or receiving respectful, prompt and efficient service by staff who understand customer/citizen needs and who provide accurate advice and effective options to address needs and resolve issues.

¹ With the potential for disruption to onsite surveying in 2021-2022 due to COVID restrictions, permanent changes were made to simplify the wording of many questions across the Residents Survey programme to ensure surveys could be delivered in a contactless manner if required. While the changes did not impact the intent of the questions, some caution is needed when comparing results to previous years.

Summary of Levels of Service Results: Point of Contact Surveys 2024-2025

NOTES: In 2021-2022 minor question wording simplification occurred across many measures and while the changes did not impact the intent of the questions, some caution is needed when comparing results to earlier years. Some pre 2021-2022 and pre 2018-2019 results have been adjusted to align with current LOS performance standards (footnotes below indicate which results this affects). To view unadjusted results, see previous years' results tables

Activity Group	Activity	Level of Service Measure of Success	Type of Measure	2024-25 Performance Target	2024-25 Target Met	Satisfaction Score Trend Since Last Year	Higher and Lower Satisfaction Services in 2024-25	Survey Result 2024-25	Effort / Ease of Interaction or Use 2024-25	Survey Result 2023-24	Effort / Ease of Interaction or Use 2023-24	Survey Result 2022-23	Effort / Ease of Interaction or Use 2022-23	Survey Result 2021-22	Effort / Ease of Interaction or Use 2021-22
Communities and Citizens	Citizens and Customer Services	2.6.7.1 Citizens and customer satisfaction with the quality of the service received for walk in services	Community	At least 85%				99%	98%	98%	97%	98%	95%	97%	92%
		2.6.7.3 Citizens and customer satisfaction with the quality of the service received for phone contacts	Community	At least 85%				86%	89%	88% ¹	85%	90% ¹	92%	90% ¹	88%
	Libraries	3.1.5 Maintain library user satisfaction with the library service	Community	At least 90%				96%	97%	95%	95%	96%	98%	94%	95%
	Community Development and Facilities	4.1.27.1 Customer satisfaction with the delivery of community support, resilience, development, and recreation initiatives	Community	80%				83%	78%	86%	76%	79%	66%	81%	71%
	Recreation, Sports, Community Arts and Events	2.8.5.2 Customer satisfaction with the content and delivery across delivered events	Community	At least 80%				78%	83%	88%	80%	89% ¹	75%	82% ¹	76%
		2.8.6.2 Customer satisfaction with the quality of Council event support	Community	At least 80%				95%	88%	86%	76%	83%	85%	90%	78%
		7.0.3.2 Customer satisfaction with the quality of Council recreation and sport support	Community	At least 80%				94%	88%	93%	85%	87%	76%	85%	75%
		7.0.7 Customer satisfaction with the range and quality of facilities	Community	At least 80%				91%	92%	92% ⁶	92%	91% ⁶	93%	94%	NA
Strategic Planning and Policy	Communications and Engagement	4.1.10.1 Resident satisfaction that our external communications, marketing and engagement activities are timely, accurate, relevant and clear	Community	73%				78%	79%	73%	64%	72%	67%	65%	59%
Parks, Heritage and Coastal Environment	Parks and Foreshore	6.0.3 Customer satisfaction with the presentation of the City's Community Parks	Community	≥ 60%				55%	73%	54%	69%	61%	80%	56%	69%
		6.2.2 Customer satisfaction with the presentation of the City's Garden Parks – Botanic Gardens and Mona Vale	Community	≥ 90%				99%	95%	99%	94%	99%	97%	99%	97%
		6.3.5 Customer satisfaction with the recreational opportunities and ecological experiences provided by the City's Regional Parks	Community	≥ 80%				89%	86%	88%	87%	84%	80%	90%	89%
		6.4.4 Customer satisfaction with the presentation of the City's Cemeteries	Community	≥ 85%				87%	87%	85%	98%	84%	90%	72%	80%
		6.4.5 Customer satisfaction with cemetery administration services	Community	≥ 95%				100%	100%	95% ⁴	93% ⁴	97% ⁴	93% ⁴	95% ⁴	95% ⁴
		6.8.4.1 Customer satisfaction with the presentation of Hagley Park	Community	≥ 90%				98%	87%	95%	96%	97%	95%	97%	91%
		10.8.1.1 Customer satisfaction with the availability of public marine structure facilities	Community	≥ 60%				71%	90%	75%	81%	65%	79%	67%	72%
		19.1.6 Teacher satisfaction with the delivery of Environmental, Conservation, Water, and Civil Defence education programmes	Community	≥ 95%				100%	99%	100%	99%	100%	99%	100%	97%

Regulatory and Compliance	Strategic Planning and Resource Consents	9.1.15.2 Customer satisfaction with quality Case Management Services	Management	80%				87%	82%	98% ⁷	97%	NA	NA	100%	NA
		9.2.7 Customer satisfaction with the resource consenting process	Community	70%				79%	69%	86%	79%	71%	69%	77%	67%
Transport	Transport	10.3.7 Maintain customer satisfaction with vehicle and personal security at Council off-street parking facilities	Community	≥ 50%				72%	85%	78% ⁵	90%	77% ⁵	79%	82% ⁵	84%
		10.4.4 Improve customer satisfaction with public transport facilities (quality of bus stops and bus priority measures)	Community	≥ 73%				79% ⁸	91%	69%	85%	76%	91%	72%	83%

1 Sample may include non-residents of Christchurch. Prior to 2023-2024, LOS 2.6.7.2 was measured using three questions: time taken to respond; email being clear, professional; and easy to understand and email efficient way to communicate. From 2023-2024 onward, the level of service was measured using two questions: email efficient way to communicate; and email ease of contact as these two questions better reflect what the business unit is aiming to measure. Therefore, pre 2023-2024 data is not directly comparable. However, using the pre-2023-2024 methodology the result in 2023-2024 was still 68% satisfied

2 This score has been adjusted to allow comparability with current LOS scoring (ie. the same aggregate measures have been used for each year)

3 Caution must be taken in interpreting this result due to small sample size

4 From 2021-2022 onward, sample includes resident customers of cemetery support services (eg. who purchased plots) as well as funeral directors and monumental masons. From 2022-2023 onward, the ease of use question is asked of all funeral directors but only resident customers who had someone buried or interred

5 From 2022-2023 onward, the LOS is measured via the point of contact survey. Prior to 2022-2023 the official LOS score came from the General Service Satisfaction Survey result (2022 GSS: 52% satisfied, 34% neither and 8% dissatisfied). Official pre-2022-2023 results are not comparable with results from 2022-2023 onward as the General Service Satisfaction Survey was carried out online, included non-users of parking buildings and was not restricted to assessment at two facilities. From 2022-2023 the survey was carried out onsite at two facilities only. In 2021-2022, a trial survey was carried out onsite at the Art Gallery and Lichfield parking buildings with the following results which are comparable to results from 2022-2023 onward: 82% satisfied, 12% neither and 5% dissatisfied. The 2020-2021 result was recalibrated to exclude non-users of Council parking facilities (non-users had a satisfaction score of 38%)

6 Prior to 2022-2023, LOS 7.0.7 was measured via the University of South Australia’s CERM Survey. Measurement of the LOS was moved to in-house point of contact surveying in 2022-2023. Pre 2022-2023 results show the overall satisfaction percentage rather than the CERM score









7 Surveyed via Residents Survey point of contact surveying from 2023-2024 onward. The case management service started in 2015-2016

8 Results cannot be compared to previous years due to question changes

	LOS target met		LOS target not met		Data still being collected or analysed by business units
	Baseline result or target to be set		Effort / Ease of Interaction or Use consistent with LOS result (within 5%)	NA	Deleted Level of Service or no information available
	Higher satisfaction services (85%+ satisfaction)		Moderate satisfaction services (between 50% to 84% satisfaction)		Lower satisfaction services (less than 50% satisfaction)
	Increase in satisfaction score by 4% or more since last year		Satisfaction score remained same or within 3% of last year		Decrease in satisfaction score by 4% or more since last year
	Key higher satisfaction services that other services could learn from (90%+ satisfaction) (exemplars)				

Additional Service Satisfaction Results

Service	Detail	Old LOS Target ⁴	Old LOS Target Met ⁴	Satisfaction Score Trend Since Last Year	Higher and Lower Satisfaction Services in 2024-25	Survey Result 2024-25	Effort / Ease of Interaction or Use 2024-25	Survey Result 2023-24	Effort / Ease of Interaction or Use 2023-24	Survey Result 2022-23	Effort / Ease of Interaction or Use 2022-23	Survey Result 2021-22	Effort / Ease of Interaction or Use 2021-22	Survey Result 2020-21	Effort / Ease of Interaction or Use 2020-21
Email Customer Services	Citizens and customer satisfaction with the quality of the service received for email services	75%				72% ^{1a}	74%	68% ^{1a}	71%	74% ^{1a}	72%	76% ^{1a}	73%	71% ^{1a}	59%
Community Facilities	Deliver a high level of customer satisfaction with the range and quality of Council operated community facilities	80%				87%	85%	84%	87%	81%	78%	80%	73%	84%	73%
Sports Parks	Deliver a high level of customer satisfaction with the range and quality of sports parks	90%				73%	85%	67% ¹	85%	67% ¹	87%	70% ¹	87%	80% ¹	89%
Regional Parks	Overall customer satisfaction with the presentation of the City’s Parks – Regional Parks	≥ 80%				83%	86%	86%	87%	81%	80%	88%	89%	85%	91%
Marine Structures	Customer satisfaction with marine structure facilities (presentation)	90%				67%	90%	71%	81%	62%	79%	61%	72%	80%	76%
Governance and Decision Making	Percentage of residents that understand how Council makes decisions (users of governance services)	NA	NA			51%	NA	46% ³	NA	45% ³	NA	42% ³	NA	36% ³	39%
	Percentage of residents that feel the public has some or a large influence on the decisions the Council makes (users of governance services)	NA	NA			33%	NA	35%	NA	34%	NA	33%	NA	24%	39%

	Percentage of residents that feel they can participate in and contribute to Council decision making (opportunities to have a say) (users of governance services)	NA	NA			55% ⁵	NA	48%	NA	49%	NA	46%	NA	NA	NA
	Percentage of residents that feel they can participate in and contribute to Council decision making (processes easy to engage with) (users of governance services)	NA	NA			42% ⁵	NA	48%	NA	40%	NA	43%	NA	NA	NA
	Percentage of residents that have confidence the Council makes decisions in the best interests of the city (users of governance services)	NA	NA			28%	NA	19%	NA	23%	NA	27%	NA	NA	NA
Transport	Ensure user satisfaction with appearance, safety and ease of use of transport interchange(s) and suburban hubs	≥ 90%				84%	97%	84%	96%	80%	97%	89%	96%	93%	98%

1a Sample may include non-residents of Christchurch. Prior to 2024-2025, this was a level of service in the LTP. Prior to 2023-2024, LOS 2.6.7.2 was measured using three questions: time taken to respond; email being clear, professional; and easy to understand and email efficient way to communicate. From 2023-2024 onward, the level of service was measured using two questions: email efficient way to communicate; and email ease of contact as these two questions better reflect what the business unit is aiming to measure. Therefore, pre 2023-2024 data is not directly comparable. However, using the pre-2023-2024 methodology the result in 2023-2024 was still 68% satisfied

1 This score is based on an average score comprised of range of sport support facilities, sports park condition and information provided for sports parks

2 This score has been adjusted to allow comparability with current scoring (ie. the same aggregate measures have been used for both years)

3 This score is based on an aggregate measure of ‘understanding of Council decision making’ (a. understanding of how Council makes decisions, b. accuracy of information about Council decisions, and c. prompt and timely information about decisions). This aligns with the calculation of LOS 4.1.18 ‘understanding of Council decision making’ measured through the General Service Satisfaction Survey (for residents generally)

4 The Old LOS Target is the last available target that had been set for these services (ie. included in the 2018-2028 or 2015-2025 LTPs). If that level of service target was applied to the current result, would the service have passed that target?

5 Caution must be used when comparing these results to previous years as the measurement scale has changed from a satisfaction scale to an agreement scale and pre 2024-2025, the score combined both the opportunities to have a say and the process ease of use questions. The opportunities to have a say question now includes reference to adequacy of opportunities. Results from previous years have been recalibrated to separate opportunities to have a say and ease of use questions

Survey Results

Activity: Citizens and Customer Services

Walk In Customer Service

2.6.7.1 Recommended Level of Service Performance Target: At least 85%

2.6.7.1 Citizens and customer satisfaction with the quality of the service received for walk in services

Target: At least 85%

Methodology

LOS score calculated as an aggregate of the four survey questions stated below:

Walk In:


- 1. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with how FRIENDLY and RESPECTFUL the staff member you spoke to today was?
- 2. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you that they UNDERSTOOD WHAT YOU NEEDED?
- 3. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with HOW THEY RESPONDED to your enquiry? *This includes checking your needs were met and following up on any other issues*
- 4. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you that our walk-in service was PROFESSIONAL and EFFICIENT? *This includes fast service, helpful instructions or signs and the presentation of counter staff*

Time in field: Face to face surveying took place between November and December 2024

Completed Surveys: 150

Sites Surveyed: 5


Service Centres	Number
CIVIC OFFICES (HEREFORD STREET)	30
MATATIKI HORNBY SERVICE CENTRE	25
LINWOOD SERVICE CENTRE	25
PAPANUI SERVICE CENTRE	25
TE HAPUA HALSWELL	45
Total	150



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Walk in manner	n	139	10	0	0	0	1	150
	%	92.7%	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	100.0%
Walk in understanding of needs	n	138	11	1	0	0	0	150
	%	92.0%	7.3%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Walk in how we responded	n	136	10	1	0	0	0	147
	%	92.5%	6.8%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Walk in professional and efficient	n	138	12	0	0	0	0	150
	%	92.0%	8.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
LOS AVERAGE RATING	n	551	43	2	0	0	1	597
	%	92.3%	7.2%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	100.0%

Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Question: And how much do you agree or disagree that the Council makes it EASY for you TO INTERACT with our customer service counters?



Agreement Results	Number	Percent
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results		
Strongly Agree	122	81.9%
Agree	24	16.1%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	3	2.0%
Disagree	0	0.0%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
Don't Know	0	0.0%
Total	149	100.0%
Not applicable	0	

Telephone Customer Service

2.6.7.3 Recommended Level of Service Performance Target: At least 85%

2.6.7.3 Citizens and customer satisfaction with the quality of the service received for phone contacts

Target: At least 85%

Methodology


LOS score calculated as an aggregate of the four survey questions stated below:

Phone:

1. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with how FRIENDLY and RESPECTFUL the staff member you first spoke to was?
2. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you that they UNDERSTOOD WHAT YOU NEEDED?
3. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with HOW THEY RESPONDED to your enquiry? *This includes checking your needs were met and following up on any other issues*
4. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you that the Council's telephone customer service was PROFESSIONAL and EFFICIENT? *This includes waiting times, giving you fast service and providing helpful instructions*

Time in field: The telephone survey was infield in November and December 2024, with surveys conducted with residents who had called the CCC telephone customer services line in September and November 2024. 100% of surveys were completed by telephone


Completed Surveys: 151



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Phone manner	n	113	19	7	2	4	0	145
	%	77.9%	13.1%	4.8%	1.4%	2.8%	0.0%	100.0%
Phone understanding of needs	n	106	22	3	6	7	0	144
	%	73.6%	15.3%	2.1%	4.2%	4.9%	0.0%	100.0%
Phone how we responded	n	98	15	9	6	16	1	145
	%	67.6%	10.3%	6.2%	4.1%	11.0%	0.7%	100.0%
Phone professional and efficient	n	107	19	8	4	7	0	145
	%	73.8%	13.1%	5.5%	2.8%	4.8%	0.0%	100.0%
LOS AVERAGE RATING	n	424	75	27	18	34	1	579
	%	73.2%	13.0%	4.7%	3.1%	5.9%	0.2%	100.0%

Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Question: And how much do you agree or disagree that the Council makes it EASY for you TO INTERACT with us by telephone?



Agreement Results		
	Number	Percent
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results		
Strongly Agree	105	72.4%
Agree	24	16.6%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	7	4.8%
Disagree	6	4.1%
Strongly Disagree	3	2.1%
Don't Know	0	0.0%
Total	145	100.0%
Not applicable	6	

Activity: Communications and Engagement

External Communications

4.1.10.1 Recommended Level of Service Performance Target: 73%

4.1.10.1 Resident satisfaction that our external communications, marketing and engagement activities are timely, accurate, relevant and clear

Target: 73%


Methodology

LOS score calculated as an aggregate of the four survey questions stated below:

- 1. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you that Council communications are TIMELY? *This means information is available at the right time*
- 2. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you that Council communications are RELEVANT? *This means information covers what the Council is doing and what you want to know*
- 3. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you that Council communications are ACCURATE? *This means information is correct*
- 4. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you that Council communications are CLEAR and EASY TO UNDERSTAND?

Time in field: Face to face surveying took place at a range of public sites between November and December 2024


Completed Surveys: 300



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Timely communications (helpful)	n	44	167	38	26	4	9	288
	%	15.3%	58.0%	13.2%	9.0%	1.4%	3.1%	100.0%
Relevant communications	n	41	188	30	22	6	3	290
	%	14.1%	64.8%	10.3%	7.6%	2.1%	1.0%	100.0%
Accurate communications (effective)	n	62	165	29	22	9	10	297
	%	20.9%	55.6%	9.8%	7.4%	3.0%	3.4%	100.0%
Clean and easy to understand communications (helpful)	n	97	153	22	19	2	1	294
	%	33.0%	52.0%	7.5%	6.5%	0.7%	0.3%	100.0%
LOS AVERAGE RATING	n	244	673	119	89	21	23	1169
	%	20.9%	57.6%	10.2%	7.6%	1.8%	2.0%	100.0%

Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Question: How much do you agree or disagree that the Council makes it EASY for you TO USE Council communications?



Agreement Results		
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results		
	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	95	32.4%
Agree	137	46.8%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	24	8.2%
Disagree	23	7.8%
Strongly Disagree	7	2.4%
Don't Know	7	2.4%
Total	293	100.0%
Not applicable	6	

Activity: Community Development and Facilities

Community Development and Capacity Building Initiatives

4.1.27.1 Recommended Level of Service Performance Target: 80%

4.1.27.1 Customer satisfaction with the delivery of community support, resilience, development, and recreation initiatives
Target: 80%


Methodology

LOS score based on the survey question stated below:

1. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the SUPPORT GIVEN to your community group by Council community capacity building staff?
This includes community development, community support and community recreation staff being friendly, respectful and responsive. It also includes providing networking and collaboration opportunities, as well as providing information, resources and advice that is correct and helpful for developing resilience

Time in field: The online survey was infield in October and November 2024, with surveys emailed to 599 community groups that have had contact with community governance teams from January 2024. 100% of surveys were completed online


Completed Surveys: 208



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Support Given	n	104	67	24	5	3	4	207
LOS AVERAGE RATING	%	50.2%	32.4%	11.6%	2.4%	1.4%	1.9%	100.0%

Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Question: How much do you agree or disagree that the Council makes it EASY for you TO PARTICIPATE in our local community development and capacity building initiatives?



Agreement Results		
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	51	24.5%
Agree	111	53.4%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	23	11.1%
Disagree	15	7.2%
Strongly Disagree	6	2.9%
Don't Know	2	1.0%
Total	208	100.0%
Not applicable	0	

Activity: Libraries Ngā Kete Wānanga o Ōtautahi

Libraries

3.1.5 Recommended Level of Service Performance Target: At least 90%

3.1.5 Maintain library user satisfaction with the library service

Target: At least 90%

Methodology


LOS score calculated as an aggregate of the three survey questions stated below:

- 1. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you that library services are EFFICIENT, EASY TO UNDERSTAND and ACCESS? *This includes signs, self-service kiosks, computers, digital resources, free wifi, library catalogues and the library website*
- 2. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the RANGE of books and other items available? *This includes books, magazines, DVDs, reference material and digital resources like digital eBooks, eMagazines, PressReader, LinkedIn Learning, etc*
- 3. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with how FRIENDLY, KNOWLEDGEABLE and HELPFUL the library staff are?

Time in field: Face to face surveying took place between November and December 2024

Completed Surveys: 300


Library Site	Number
TURANGA	60
FENDALTON	60
MATATIKI HORNBY CENTRE	60
PAPANUI	60
SHIRLEY	60
Total	300



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Efficient, easy to understand and access	n	224	65	5	2	0	2	298
	%	75.2%	21.8%	1.7%	0.7%	0.0%	0.7%	100.0%
Range of books and other items	n	189	87	10	2	1	7	296
	%	63.9%	29.4%	3.4%	0.7%	0.3%	2.4%	100.0%
Staff friendly, knowledgeable and helpful	n	258	31	2	0	0	5	296
	%	87.2%	10.5%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	100.0%
LOS AVERAGE RATING	n	671	183	17	4	1	14	890
	%	75.4%	20.6%	1.9%	0.4%	0.1%	1.6%	100.0%

Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Question: How much do you agree or disagree that the Council makes it EASY for you TO USE the library service?



Agreement Results		
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results		
	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	179	60.3%
Agree	108	36.4%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	5	1.7%
Disagree	2	0.7%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
Don't Know	3	1.0%
Total	297	100.0%
Not applicable	0	

Activity: Recreation, Sports, Community Arts and Events

Community Events

2.8.5.2 Recommended Level of Service Performance Target: At least 80%

2.8.5.2 Customer satisfaction with the content and delivery across delivered event

Target: At least 80%


Methodology

LOS score calculated as an aggregate of the two survey questions stated below:

1. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the CONTENT of the event? *This includes what the event included and it being interesting and enjoyable*
2. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the DELIVERY of the event? *This includes how it was run and presented*

Time in field: The online surveys were conducted with event attendees who attended a range of events at a range of dates in late 2024 and 2025


Completed Surveys: 795



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Event content	n	412	249	59	73	43	0	836
	%	49.3%	29.8%	7.1%	8.7%	5.1%	0.0%	100.0%
Event delivery	n	400	249	61	92	32	0	834
	%	48.0%	29.9%	7.3%	11.0%	3.8%	0.0%	100.0%
LOS AVERAGE RATING	n	812	498	120	165	75	0	1670
	%	48.6%	29.8%	7.2%	9.9%	4.5%	0.0%	100.0%

Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Question: How much do you agree or disagree that the Council made it EASY for you TO FIND INFORMATION about this event?



Agreement Results	Number	Percent
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results		
Strongly Agree	320	38.2%
Agree	373	44.6%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	94	11.2%
Disagree	41	4.9%
Strongly Disagree	9	1.1%
Don't Know	0	0.0%
Total	837	100.0%

Event Support

2.8.6.2 Recommended Level of Service Performance Target: At least 80%

2.8.6.2 Customer satisfaction with the quality of Council event support

Target: At least 80%

Methodology


LOS score calculated as an aggregate of the four survey questions stated below:

1. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with how FRIENDLY and RESPECTFUL the Council Events Partnerships and Development Team staff you dealt with were?
2. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the ACCURACY of INFORMATION and ADVICE PROVIDED to you by staff? *This includes information that is correct and available to you*
3. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the staff member's ABILITY TO RESPOND to your needs? *This includes helping you willingly and promptly, understanding your needs and offering information and options to meet your needs*
4. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the INFORMATION PROVIDED on the 'Running an event' support pages on the COUNCIL WEBSITE? *This includes the website being user-friendly and information that is correct and useful*

Time in field: The online survey was infield in October and November 2024, with surveys emailed to 160 respondents who had used the Events Partnerships and Development Team's services from October 2023 onward. 100% of surveys were completed online

Completed Surveys: 59


Satisfaction with Events Partnerships and Development Team Support Provided to Events Sector (LOS 2.8.6.2)



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Staff friendly and respectful	n	47	12	0	0	0	0	59
	%	79.7%	20.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Accuracy of information and advice	n	39	17	3	0	0	0	59
	%	66.1%	28.8%	5.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Ability to respond	n	35	21	2	1	0	0	59
	%	59.3%	35.6%	3.4%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Events support web pages	n	30	19	5	0	0	0	54
	%	55.6%	35.2%	9.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
LOS AVERAGE RATING	n	151	69	10	1	0	0	231
	%	65.4%	29.9%	4.3%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%

Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Question: How much do you agree or disagree that the Council makes it EASY for you TO USE our events support service?



Agreement Results	Number	Percent
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results		
Strongly Agree	25	43.9%
Agree	25	43.9%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	7	12.3%
Disagree	0	0.0%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
Don't Know	0	0.0%
Total	57	100.0%
Not applicable	1	

Recreation and Sport Support

7.0.3.2 Recommended Level of Service Performance Target: At least 80%

7.0.3.2 Customer satisfaction with the quality of Council recreation and sport support
Target: At least 80%

Methodology


LOS score calculated as an aggregate of the three survey questions stated below:

- 1. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with how FRIENDLY and RESPECTFUL the Council Recreation and Sport Services Team staff member/s you dealt with were?
- 2. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the ACCURACY of INFORMATION and ADVICE PROVIDED to you by staff? *This includes information that is correct and available to you*
- 3. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the staff member's ABILITY TO RESPOND to your needs? *This includes helping you willingly and promptly, understanding your needs and offering information and options to meet your needs*

Time in field: The online survey was infield in October and November 2024, with surveys emailed to 330 respondents who had used the Recreation Services Team's services from January 2024. 100% of surveys were completed online

Completed Surveys: 98


Satisfaction with Support Provided to Recreation and Sport Sectors (LOS 7.0.3.2)



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Staff friendly and respectful	n	59	36	3	0	0	0	98
	%	60.2%	36.7%	3.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Accuracy of information and advice	n	46	44	6	0	0	0	96
	%	47.9%	45.8%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Ability to respond	n	53	33	8	0	0	0	94
	%	56.4%	35.1%	8.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
LOS AVERAGE RATING	n	158	113	17	0	0	0	288
	%	54.9%	39.2%	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%

Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Question: How much do you agree or disagree that the Council makes it EASY for you TO USE our recreation and sport support service?



Agreement Results	Number	Percent
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results		
Strongly Agree	34	36.2%
Agree	49	52.1%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	7	7.4%
Disagree	4	4.3%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
Don't Know	0	0.0%
Total	94	100.0%
Not applicable	0	

Recreation and Sport Facilities

7.0.7 Recommended Level of Service Performance Target: At least 80%

7.0.7 Customer satisfaction with the range and quality of facilities

Target: At least 80%

Methodology²

LOS score based on the survey question stated below:

- 1. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you as a customer of this centre?

Time in field: Face to face surveying of casual users of seven facilities took place between November and December 2024. An online survey of facility members and concession card holders was carried out between August and December 2024. 100% of casual surveys were completed face to face and 100% of member and concession surveys were completed online.


Completed Surveys: 2,702

Sites Surveyed:

Recreation and Sport Centre Site	Number
Graham Condon Rec and Sport Centre	229
Jellie Park Rec and Sport Centre	593

² Prior to 2022-2023, LOS 7.0.7 was measured via the University of South Australia’s CERM Survey. Measurement of the LOS was moved to in-house point of contact surveying in 2022-2023.


Matatiki Hornby Centre	77
Pioneer Rec and Sport Centre	753
Taiora QEII Rec and Sport Centre	709
Te Pou Toetoe Linwood Pool	290
Te Hapua Halswell Pool (casual users only)	25
Waltham Pool (casual users only)	25
Site unknown	1
Total	2,702



Satisfaction Results	Number	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Overall Satisfaction with Centre	n	1308	1160	167	48	12	3	2698
LOS AVERAGE RATING	%	48.5%	43.0%	6.2%	1.8%	0.4%	0.1%	100.0%

Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Question: How much do you agree or disagree that the Council makes it EASY for you TO USE our recreation and sport centres?



Agreement Results		
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	1289	47.8%
Agree	1189	44.1%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	147	5.5%
Disagree	50	1.9%
Strongly Disagree	10	0.4%
Don't Know	10	0.4%
Total	2695	100.0%

Activity: Parks and Foreshore

Community Parks

6.0.3 Recommended Level of Service Performance Target: $\geq 60\%$

6.0.3 Customer satisfaction with the presentation of the City's Community Parks

Target: $\geq 60\%$

Methodology

LOS score calculated as an aggregate of the two survey questions stated below:

1. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the APPEARANCE of this park? *This includes layout, plants, trees and gardens*
2. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the CONDITION of this park? *This includes maintenance and how it is looked after*


Time in field: The mail drop postal and online survey was delivered to households in the vicinity of community parks from November to December 2024. Surveys were also completed using our Life in Christchurch online panel where respondents gave feedback on a range of local parks throughout the city

Completed Surveys: 226

Sites Surveyed:

Park Name	Number
AMELIA ROGERS RESERVE	4
BISHOPDALE MALL RESERVE	9
BUCHANANS RESERVE	6
CHAMPION RESERVE	8
CHARLESTON RESERVE	6
CORNELIUS O'CONNOR RESERVE	2
CROFTON RESERVE	11
CUNNINGHAM RESERVE	9
DERWENT RESERVE	13
DUNEDIN RESERVE	13
FERN RESERVE	10
FRANCIS RESERVE	10
GOULDING PLAYGROUND	7
HALIFAX RESERVE	10
HEREFORD PLAYGROUND	4
HOLLISS RESERVE	22
LIMES RESERVE	15
MABEL HOWARD RESERVE	11
MARA RESERVE	11
MCHAFFIES RESERVE	5
MOMORANGI RESERVE	6
NICHOLSON PARK	16
STANLEY PARK	11
WOODLANDS PLAYGROUND	7
TOTAL	226


Overall Satisfaction with Presentation of Community Parks (LOS 6.0.3)



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Park appearance	n	31	96	18	52	27	1	225
	%	13.8%	42.7%	8.0%	23.1%	12.0%	0.4%	100.0%
Park condition	n	28	92	27	55	20	0	222
	%	12.6%	41.4%	12.2%	24.8%	9.0%	0.0%	100.0%
LOS AVERAGE RATING	n	59	188	45	107	47	1	447
	%	13.2%	42.1%	10.1%	23.9%	10.5%	0.2%	100.0%

Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Question: How much do you agree or disagree that the Council makes it EASY for you TO USE this park?



Agreement Results		
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	52	23.4%
Agree	110	49.5%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	22	9.9%
Disagree	28	12.6%
Strongly Disagree	6	2.7%
Don't Know	4	1.8%
Total	222	100.0%
N/A	4	

Botanic Gardens and Mona Vale

6.2.2 Recommended Level of Service Performance Target: $\geq 90\%$

6.2.2 Customer satisfaction with the presentation of the City's Garden Parks – Botanic Gardens and Mona Vale
Target: $\geq 90\%$

Methodology

LOS score calculated as an aggregate of the two survey questions stated below:

1. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the APPEARANCE of the Botanic Gardens? *This includes layout, plants, trees and gardens and layout and style of facilities such as the Visitor Centre, toilets, playgrounds, swimming pools and houses such as Cunningham House*
2. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the CONDITION of the Gardens? *This includes maintenance and how it is looked after*


OR

1. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the APPEARANCE of Mona Vale? *This includes layout, plants, trees and gardens and layout and style of facilities, such as the homestead and toilets*
2. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the CONDITION of Mona Vale? *This includes things such as maintenance and how it is looked after*

Time in field: Face to face surveying took place between November and December 2024


Completed Surveys: 195

Park Name	Number
BOTANIC GARDENS	150
MONA VALE	45
Total	195



Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Question: How much do you agree or disagree that the Council makes it EASY for you TO USE <the Botanic Gardens> or <Mona Vale>?



Agreement Results	Number	Percent
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results		
Strongly Agree	132	68.0%

Agree	52	26.8%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	5	2.6%
Disagree	3	1.5%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
Don't Know	2	1.0%
Total	194	100.0%
Not applicable	0	

Regional Parks

6.3.5 Recommended Level of Service Performance Target: ≥ 80%

6.3.5 Customer satisfaction with the recreational opportunities and ecological experiences provided by the City's Regional Parks
Target: ≥ 80%

Methodology

LOS score based on the survey question stated below:

1. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the RANGE of RECREATION OPPORTUNITIES and NATURE EXPERIENCES at this park? *This includes areas for sitting, relaxing and playing (eg. spaces, seats, picnic areas and drinking fountains); play spaces; walking and biking tracks; and opportunities to enjoy nature (eg. native plantings and bird life)*


Time in field: Face to face and mail drop postal surveying took place between November and December 2024

Completed Surveys: 247

Sites Surveyed:

Regional Park	Number
HORSESHOE LAKE RESERVE	12
NORTH BEACH	11
SOUTH NEW BRIGHTON BEACH	12
STYX MILL CONSERVATION RESERVE	20
SUMNER BEACH	5
TRAVIS WETLAND	7
BOTTLE LAKE BEACH PARK	30
HALSWELL QUARRY PARK	30
NEW BRIGHTON BEACH (developed)	30
RAPAKI TRACK	30
ROTO KOHATU	30
VICTORIA PARK	30
Total	247


Overall Satisfaction Recreation Opportunities and Nature Experiences at Regional Parks (LOS 6.3.5)



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Recreational opportunities and ecological experiences	n	119	100	9	14	2	1	245
LOS AVERAGE RATING	%	40.9%	42.7%	7.3%	7.0%	1.4%	0.7%	100.0%

Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Question: How much do you agree or disagree that the Council makes it EASY for you TO USE this park?



Agreement Results	Number	Percent
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results		
Strongly Agree	84	34.6%
Agree	125	51.4%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	22	9.1%
Disagree	8	3.3%
Strongly Disagree	3	1.2%
Don't Know	1	0.4%
Total	243	100.0%
Not applicable	3	

Cemetery Administration Services

6.4.5 Recommended Level of Service Performance Target: $\geq 95\%$

6.4.5 Customer satisfaction with cemetery administration services

Target: $\geq 95\%$


Methodology

LOS score calculated as an aggregate of the four survey questions stated below:

1. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the INFORMATION PROVIDED about plot location, ownership and availability? *This includes information that is correct and available to you*
2. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with how FRIENDLY and RESPECTFUL the Council Cemetery Support Officers are?
3. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you that the (interment) application process is EASY TO USE? *This includes clear instructions and processes, and checking your needs were met and following up on any issues*
4. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the (interment) application RESPONSE TIME? *This includes time taken to contact you and general timeliness of communication from us*

Time in field: The online survey was infield in October to November 2024, with surveys emailed to 50 funeral directors and monumental masons who had used the Cemetery administration services in the preceding 12 months. The survey was also emailed to 173 resident customers who had used the Cemetery administration services since January 2024 (this excluded those who had used the service in the eight weeks before the survey due to sensitivities). 100% of surveys were completed online

Completed Surveys: 76



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Provision of information	n	56	19	0	0	1	0	76
	%	73.7%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	100.0%
Staff friendly and respectful	n	61	10	0	0	0	0	71
	%	85.9%	14.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Ease of use of interment process	n	29	10	0	0	0	0	39
	%	74.4%	25.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Interment application response time	n	29	10	0	0	0	0	39
	%	74.4%	25.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
LOS AVERAGE RATING	n	175	49	0	0	1	0	225
	%	77.8%	21.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	100.0%

Cemeteries

6.4.4 Recommended Level of Service Performance Target: ≥85%

6.4.4 Customer satisfaction with the presentation of the City's Cemeteries

Target: ≥ 85%

Methodology

LOS score calculated as an aggregate of the two survey questions stated below:


1. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the APPEARANCE of this cemetery? *This includes layout, plants, trees and gardens (excluding headstones)*
2. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the CONDITION of this cemetery? *This includes maintenance and how it is looked after (excluding headstones)*

Time in field: Face to face and mail drop postal surveying took place between November and December 2024

Completed Surveys: 127

Sites Surveyed:


Cemeteries	Number
AVONHEAD CEMETERY	30
BELFAST CEMETERY	30
MEMORIAL PARK CEMETERY	30
RURU LAWN CEMETERY	30
AKAROA CATHOLIC CEMETERY	7
Total	127



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Cemeteries appearance	n	67	47	5	8	0	0	127
	%	52.8%	37.0%	3.9%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Cemeteries condition	n	58	48	7	13	1	0	127
	%	45.7%	37.8%	5.5%	10.2%	0.8%	0.0%	100.0%
LOS AVERAGE RATING	n	125	95	12	21	1	0	254
	%	49.2%	37.4%	4.7%	8.3%	0.4%	0.0%	100.0%

Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Question: How much do you agree or disagree that the Council makes it EASY for you TO USE this cemetery?



Agreement Results	Number	Percent
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results		
Strongly Agree	61	48.4%
Agree	48	38.1%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	11	8.7%
Disagree	5	4.0%
Strongly Disagree	1	0.8%
Don't Know	0	0.0%
Total	126	100.0%
Not applicable	0	

Hagley Park

6.8.4.1 Recommended Level of Service Performance Target: ≥ 90%

6.8.4.1 Customer satisfaction with the presentation of Hagley Park
Target: ≥ 90%

Methodology


LOS score calculated as an aggregate of the two survey questions stated below:

- 1. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the APPEARANCE of Hagley Park? *This includes layout, plants, trees and gardens*
- 2. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the CONDITION of Hagley Park? *This includes maintenance and how it is looked after*

Time in field: Face to face surveying took place between November and December 2024

Completed Surveys: 150


Overall Satisfaction with Presentation of Hagley Park (LOS 6.8.4.1)



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Park appearance	n	112	38	0	0	0	0	150
	%	74.7%	25.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Park condition	n	90	55	3	2	0	0	150
	%	60.0%	36.7%	2.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
LOS AVERAGE RATING	n	202	93	3	2	0	0	300
	%	67.3%	31.0%	1.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%

Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Question: And how much do you agree or disagree that the Council make it EASY for you TO USE this park?



Agreement Results	Number	Percent
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results		
Strongly Agree	69	46.0%
Agree	75	50.0%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	4	2.7%
Disagree	1	0.7%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
Don't Know	1	0.7%
Total	150	100.0%
Not applicable	0	

Marine Structures

10.8.1.1 Recommended Level of Service Performance Target: ≥ 60%

10.8.1.1 Customer satisfaction with the availability of public marine structure facilities

Target: ≥ 60%

Methodology

LOS score calculated as an aggregate of the five survey questions stated below:

Resident Users

1. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with being able to ACCESS marine structures for RECREATION? *This includes being in the right places and easy to get to and using them for things like launching boats, fishing and walking on them*
2. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you that there are ENOUGH marine structures of different types for RECREATION? *This includes wharves, jetties, ramps, rafts and moorings*
3. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with being able to ACCESS marine structures for TRANSPORT? *This includes structures being in the right places and easy to get to for ferries, etc*

Commercial Operators

4. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with being able to ACCESS marine structures for COMMERCIAL PURPOSES? *This includes structures being in the right places and easy to get to and using them for commercial activities such as launching boats, loading and unloading passengers and cargo, for refuelling and for tourism activities*

5. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you that there are ENOUGH marine structures of the different types outlined above for COMMERCIAL PURPOSES?


Time in field: An online survey was infield in October and November 2024, with surveys emailed to 12 commercial users who had used marine structures in the preceding 12 months. Five surveys were completed. 100% of surveys were completed online

Face to face surveying of residential marine structure users took place at marine structures between November and December 2024. In total 195 surveys were completed at 8 marine structures

Completed Surveys: 200 (including 5 commercial users)

Sites Surveyed (residential users):

Site	Number
Akaroa Boat Park and Recreation Ground Jetty and Slipway	15
Akaroa Wharf	30
Daly's Wharf	20
Diamond Harbour Wharf	33
Lyttleton Marina Public Ramp and Jetty	15
Moncks Bay Public Ramp	17
New Brighton Pier	50
Scarborough Beach Public Ramp	15
Total	195



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Accessibility for recreation	n	47	117	9	6	4	3	186
	%	25.3%	62.9%	4.8%	3.2%	2.2%	1.6%	100.0%
Enough for recreation	n	34	76	24	38	8	8	188
	%	18.1%	40.4%	12.8%	20.2%	4.3%	4.3%	100.0%
Accessibility for transportation	n	36	70	16	6	2	21	151
	%	23.8%	46.4%	10.6%	4.0%	1.3%	13.9%	100.0%
Accessibility for commercial purposes	n	0	1	2	0	2	0	5
	%	0.0%	20.0%	40.0%	0.0%	40.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Enough for commercial purposes	n	0	1	1	2	1	0	5
	%	0.0%	20.0%	20.0%	40.0%	20.0%	0.0%	100.0%
LOS AVERAGE RATING	n	117	265	52	52	17	32	535
	%	21.9%	49.5%	9.7%	9.7%	3.2%	6.0%	100.0%


Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Questions:

How much do you agree or disagree that the Council makes it EASY for you TO USE this marine structure?

or

How much do you agree or disagree that the Council makes it EASY for you TO USE marine structures for commercial purposes?



Agreement Results		Number	Percent
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results			
Strongly Agree		73	37.2%
Agree		103	52.6%
Neither Agree nor Disagree		7	3.6%
Disagree		9	4.6%
Strongly Disagree		4	2.0%
Don't Know		0	0.0%
Total		196	100.0%
Not applicable		2	

Environmental, Conservation, Water and Civil Defence Education Programmes

19.1.6 Recommended Level of Service Performance Target: ≥ 95%

19.1.6 Teacher satisfaction with the delivery of Environmental, Conservation, Water, and Civil Defence education programmes
Target: ≥ 95%

Methodology


LOS score based on the survey question stated below:

Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the education programmes? *This includes things such as the relevance of course content, its delivery, the accuracy of information and advice provided, the manner and attentiveness of the course tutor toward participants, and the programme's ability to help students learn about protecting and enhancing our natural environment*

Time in field: The online pulse survey was infield throughout the year, with surveys emailed to teachers after their students had participated in education programmes over the year. 100% of surveys were completed online

Completed Surveys: 362


Education Programme
A Waste of Time at various sites
All Flushed Out at the Christchurch Wastewater Treatment Plant
Casting Magic with Worms at the Curators House in the Botanic Gardens
Casting Magic with Worms at the EcoDrop Metro Place, Bromley
Coastal Management at North New Brighton beach
Creative and Native in the Botanic Gardens
Fertilising for the Future (EM Bokashi) at the EcoDrop Metro Place, Bromley
Fertilising for the Future at the Climate Action Campus
Forest Explorer at Spencer Park
Forest Explorer in Bottle Lake Forest
Freshwater Frolicking at the Groynes
Future Proof : Climate Change
Have Your Say
Junior Park Explorers at Halswell Quarry
Junior Park Explorers at the Climate Action Campus
Junior Park Explorers at the Groynes
Junior Park Explorers in the Botanic Gardens
Junior Park Explorers in Travis Wetland
Junior Park Explorers in Victoria Park
Junior Recycling programme in schools classroom
Kidsfest Making Mini Worm Farms
Native Nurturing in Victoria Park
On the Rocks at Sumner Beach
On The Rocks at Taylors Mistake Beach
Otautahi, Our City
Park Detectives at Halswell Quarry
Recycling Talk
Stan's Got a Plan for Earthquakes
Stan's Got a Plan for Floods
Stan's Got a Plan for Storms
Watch Your Waste at Metro Place, Bromley
Water for Life at Main Water Pumping Station
A Waste of Time at various sites
All Flushed Out at the Christchurch Wastewater Treatment Plant
Casting Magic with Worms at the Curators House in the Botanic Gardens
Casting Magic with Worms at the EcoDrop Metro Place, Bromley
Coastal Management at North New Brighton beach
Creative and Native in the Botanic Gardens
Fertilising for the Future (EM Bokashi) at the EcoDrop Metro Place, Bromley
Fertilising for the Future at the Climate Action Campus
Forest Explorer at Spencer Park



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Overall satisfaction	n	322	39	1	0	0	0	362
LOS RATING	%	89.0%	10.8%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%

Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Question: How much do you agree or disagree that the Council made it EASY for you to interact with us regarding the education programme? *This includes respectful, prompt and efficient service by knowledgeable Council staff who understood your needs, and who provided you with accurate information and service that met your needs*



Agreement Results	Number	Percent
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results		
Strongly Agree	297	82.0%
Agree	63	17.4%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	2	0.6%
Disagree	0	0.0%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
Don't Know	0	0.0%
Total	362	100.0%
Not Applicable	0	

Activity: Building Regulation

Case Management Service

9.1.15.2 Recommended Level of Service Performance Target: 80%

9.1.15.2 Customer satisfaction with quality Case Management Services
Target: 80%


Methodology

LOS score calculated as an aggregate of the three survey questions stated below:

- 1. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the ACCURACY of the INFORMATION and ADVICE provided to you by the case managers? *This includes it being correct and reliable*
- 2. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the case managers’ ABILITY TO RESPOND to your needs? *This includes helping you willingly and promptly, understanding your needs and offering information and options to meet your needs*
- 3. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with you with the MANNER of the case managers you dealt with? *This includes staff being approachable and supportive*

Time in field: The online survey was infield in October to November 2024, with surveys emailed to 131 case management service customers who used the service in the last 12 months. 100% of surveys were completed online


Completed Surveys: 49



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Accuracy of information and advice	n	22	20	3	1	2	0	48
	%	45.8%	41.7%	6.3%	2.1%	4.2%	0.0%	100.0%
Responsiveness of case managers	n	22	20	2	3	1	0	48
	%	45.8%	41.7%	4.2%	6.3%	2.1%	0.0%	100.0%
Manner of case managers	n	31	11	5	1	1	0	49
	%	63.3%	22.4%	10.2%	2.0%	2.0%	0.0%	100.0%
LOS AVERAGE RATING	n	75	51	10	5	4	0	145
	%	51.7%	35.2%	6.9%	3.4%	2.8%	0.0%	100.0%

Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Question: Acknowledging the statutory requirements councils and developers must meet, how much do you agree or disagree that the Council's case management service makes it EASY for you TO INTERACT with the Council for your development needs?



Agreement Results	Number	Percent
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results		
Strongly Agree	24	49.0%
Agree	16	32.7%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	6	12.2%
Disagree	2	4.1%
Strongly Disagree	1	2.0%
Don't Know	0	0.0%
Total	49	100.0%
Not applicable	0	

Activity: Resource Consenting

Resource Consenting Process

9.2.7 Recommended Level of Service Performance Target: 70%

9.2.7 % Customer satisfaction with the resource consenting process
Target: 70%


Methodology

LOS score calculated as an aggregate of the four survey questions stated below:

- 1. Thinking about this resource consent, how satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the ACCURACY of the INFORMATION and ADVICE PROVIDED to you by planner/s? *This includes information being correct and reliable*
- 2. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with you with the TIMELINESS of the INFORMATION and ADVICE provided to you? *This includes planners providing information and advice promptly*
- 3. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with you with the MANNER of the planner/s you dealt with? *This includes planners being friendly and respectful*
- 4. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with you with the TIME TAKEN to PROCESS your Consent application?

Time in field: The online survey was infield in October and November 2024, with surveys emailed to 345 resource consents applicants from January 2024. 100% of surveys were completed online


Completed Surveys: 75



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Accuracy of information and advice	n	18	41	7	4	2	0	72
	%	25.0%	56.9%	9.7%	5.6%	2.8%	0.0%	100.0%
Timeliness of information and advice	n	20	41	6	3	4	0	74
	%	27.0%	55.4%	8.1%	4.1%	5.4%	0.0%	100.0%
Staff manner	n	32	32	6	0	2	0	72
	%	44.4%	44.4%	8.3%	0.0%	2.8%	0.0%	100.0%
Time taken to process consents	n	16	29	19	4	4	0	72
	%	22.2%	40.3%	26.4%	5.6%	5.6%	0.0%	100.0%
LOS AVERAGE RATING	n	86	143	38	11	12	0	290
	%	29.7%	49.3%	13.1%	3.8%	4.1%	0.0%	100.0%

Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Question: Taking into account the legal requirements of the consent process, how much do you agree or disagree that the Council made it STRAIGHTFORWARD for you to have your resource consent processed?



Agreement Results		
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results		
	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	12	16.7%
Agree	38	52.8%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	11	15.3%
Disagree	7	9.7%
Strongly Disagree	4	5.6%
Don't Know	0	0.0%
Total	72	100.0%
Not applicable	1	

Activity: Transport

Perception of Vehicle and Personal Safety at Council Off-Street Parking Facilities

Methodology³

Score calculated as an aggregate of the three survey questions stated below:


- 1. How much do you agree or disagree that your MOTOR VEHICLE is SAFER in Council off-street parking compared to on-street parking? *This includes theft, damage from other cars or from posts, bollards or other things and damage from people (like vandalism)*
- 2. Thinking about your PERSONAL SAFETY, how much do you agree or disagree that you feel safe using Council off-street parking DURING THE DAY?
- 3. Thinking about your PERSONAL SAFETY, how much do you agree or disagree that you feel safe using Council off-street parking AFTER DARK?

Time in field: Face to face surveying took place between November and December 2024

Completed Surveys: 200

Sites Surveyed: 2

Parking Facilities	Number
ART GALLERY PARKING BUILDING	50
LICHFIELD PARKING BUILDING	150
Total	200




³ **NB:** The 2021-2022 LOS 10.3.7 results came from the General Service Satisfaction Survey and from 2022-2024 onward results came from point of contact surveys. Results across 2021-2022 and 2022-2024 are not comparable as the General Service Satisfaction Survey was carried out online, included non-users of Council parking buildings and was not restricted to assessment at two facilities. The 2022-2024 survey was carried out onsite at two facilities only and did not include non-users of parking buildings. In 2021-2022, a trial survey was carried out onsite at the Art Gallery and Lichfield parking buildings with the following results which are comparable to 2022-2024 results: 82% satisfied, 12% neither and 5% dissatisfied.

Agreement Results		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Vehicle safety in Council off-street parking	n	51	106	31	5	0	5	198
	%	25.8%	53.5%	15.7%	2.5%	0.0%	2.5%	100.0%
Personal safety during the day	n	62	117	10	6	0	2	197
	%	31.5%	59.4%	5.1%	3.0%	0.0%	1.0%	100.0%
Personal safety after dark	n	13	56	22	43	10	23	167
	%	7.8%	33.5%	13.2%	25.7%	6.0%	13.8%	100.0%
AVERAGE RATING	n	126	279	63	54	10	30	562
	%	22.4%	49.6%	11.2%	9.6%	1.8%	5.3%	100.0%

Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Question: How much do you agree or disagree that the Council makes it EASY for you TO USE Council parking?



Agreement Results	Number	Percent
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results		
Strongly Agree	59	29.8%
Agree	110	55.6%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	14	7.1%
Disagree	8	4.0%
Strongly Disagree	3	1.5%
Don't Know	4	2.0%
Total	198	100.0%
Not applicable	2	

Public Transport Facilities

10.4.4 Recommended Level of Service Performance Target: ≥ 73%

10.4.4 Improve customer satisfaction with public transport facilities (quality of bus stops and bus priority measures)

Target: ≥ 73%

Methodology

LOS score calculated as an aggregate of the four survey questions stated below⁴:

- 1. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with how EASY it is to USE bus stops in Christchurch? *This includes the seating, shelters, information provided, location of stops, protection against weather conditions, and the ease of boarding and getting on and off buses at bus stops*
- 2. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the CONDITION of bus stops in Christchurch? *This includes the maintenance and cleanliness of seats, signs, shelters, and real-time information displays and the presence of graffiti or vandalism*

Thinking now about the places you travel to by bus in Christchurch, how much do you agree or disagree that BUS PRIORITY lanes and traffic lights that let buses enter intersections before other vehicles...


- 3. REDUCE YOUR TRAVEL TIME by bus?
- 4. Help buses STAY ON TIME

Time in field: Face to face surveying took place between November and December 2024

Completed Surveys: 250

Sites Surveyed: 2

Bus Infrastructure	Number
BUS INTERCHANGE	200
RICCARTON BUS LOUNGE	50
Total	250



⁴ Results cannot be compared to 2023-2024 results due to changes in questions and measures.

Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Not Satisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results					2022-2024 LOS Target: ≥ 72%			
Bus stop ease of use	n	121	106	11	7	4	1	250
	%	48.4%	42.4%	4.4%	2.8%	1.6%	0.4%	100.0%
Bus stop condition	n	83	103	42	13	5	3	249
	%	33.3%	41.4%	16.9%	5.2%	2.0%	1.2%	100.0%
Bus priority measures reduce travel times	n	92	83	26	24	2	15	242
	%	38.0%	34.3%	10.7%	9.9%	0.8%	6.2%	100.0%
Bus priority measures help buses stay on time	n	90	104	21	14	1	13	243
	%	37.0%	42.8%	8.6%	5.8%	0.4%	5.3%	100.0%
LOS AVERAGE RATING	n	386	396	100	58	12	32	984
	%	39.2%	40.2%	10.2%	5.9%	1.2%	3.3%	100.0%

Appendix 1: Satisfaction Results for Additional Services

A range of services continue to be surveyed as part of the Residents Survey programme for organisation performance trend monitoring purposes

Email Customer Service

Quality of the Service Received for Email Services


Methodology

Score calculated as an aggregate of the eight survey questions stated below:

- 1. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you that our email customer service was **EFFICIENT** to use? *This includes saving you time and making it easy for information to be communicated between you and the Council*
- 2. How much do you agree or disagree that the Council makes it EASY for you TO MAKE CONTACT with us using email?

Time in field: The online survey was infield in October to December 2024, with surveys emailed to 1,400 residents who had emailed the CCC email customer services email address from June to September. In total, 135 surveys were completed. 100% of surveys were completed online

Completed Surveys: 135



Results		Very Satisfied / Strongly Agree	Satisfied / Agree	Neither	Dissatisfied / Disagree	Very Dissatisfied / Strongly Disagree	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Email efficient way to communicate	n	56	39	17	8	11	0	131
	%	42.7%	29.8%	13.0%	6.1%	8.4%	0.0%	100.0%
Email ease of contact	n	35	62	17	12	5	3	134
	%	26.1%	46.3%	12.7%	9.0%	3.7%	2.2%	100.0%
LOS AVERAGE RATING	n	91	101	34	20	16	3	265
	%	34.3%	38.1%	12.8%	7.5%	6.0%	1.1%	100.0%

Community Facilities

Range and Quality of Council Operated Community Facilities

Methodology

Score calculated as an aggregate of the eight survey questions stated below:


1. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the **CONDITION** of this facility? *This includes maintenance and how it is looked after*
2. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the **AVAILABILITY** of this facility? *This includes being able to book it when you want to use it*
3. How satisfied or dissatisfied are that people can **GET AROUND** and **ACCESS** this facility? *This includes the location of the facility, car parking and disability access*
4. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you that this facility is **FIT FOR PURPOSE** for your activities? *This includes layout, equipment, lighting, appliances and furnishings*
5. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you that this facility gives **VALUE FOR THE MONEY** you pay to use it?
6. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the **ACCURACY OF INFORMATION PROVIDED** about this facility? *This includes clear signs and instructions and information that is correct and available to people*
7. Thinking about Council community facilities **IN CHRISTCHURCH**, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the **RANGE** of facilities available for hire and use? *This includes options (like size and type) to meet your needs*
8. Thinking now about community facilities **IN YOUR LOCAL AREA**, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the **RANGE** of facilities available for hire and use?

Time in field: The online survey was infield in October and November 2024, with surveys emailed to 234 people who had hired Council Community Facilities from January 2024. 100% of surveys were completed online

Completed Surveys: 102

Community Facilities	Number
Abberley Park Hall	2
Aranui/Wainoni Community Centre	6
Avice Hill Community Centre	4
Fendalton Community Centre	6
Harvard Community Lounge	2
Hei Hei Community Centre	6
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Facility	1
Matuku Takotako Sumner Centre	1
North New Brighton Community Centre	4
Orauwata Bishopdale Library and Community Centre	8
Parklands Community Centre	4
Parkview Community Lounge	4
Rarakau Riccarton Centre	14
South New Brighton Community Centre	0
St Martins Community Centre	4
St Martins Community Centre	5
Te Hapua Halswell Centre	16
Templeton Community Centre	8
Waimairi Community Centre	7
Total	102

Satisfaction with Range and Quality of Council Operated Community Facilities




Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Condition	n	46	38	10	8	0	0	102
	%	45.1%	37.3%	9.8%	7.8%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Availability	n	46	47	7	2	0	0	102
	%	45.1%	46.1%	6.9%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Getting around and accessing	n	54	45	1	1	0	0	101
	%	53.5%	44.6%	1.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Fit for purpose	n	42	49	3	5	2	0	101
	%	41.6%	48.5%	3.0%	5.0%	2.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Value for money	n	53	40	5	1	1	0	100
	%	53.0%	40.0%	5.0%	1.0%	1.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Accuracy of information	n	39	55	5	2	0	0	101
	%	38.6%	54.5%	5.0%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Range of facilities in Christchurch	n	24	55	10	3	1	5	98
	%	24.5%	56.1%	10.2%	3.1%	1.0%	5.1%	100.0%
Range of facilities in local area	n	19	45	25	8	1	2	100
	%	19.0%	45.0%	25.0%	8.0%	1.0%	2.0%	100.0%
AVERAGE RATING	n	323	374	66	30	5	7	805
	%	40.1%	46.5%	8.2%	3.7%	0.6%	0.9%	100.0%

Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Question: How much do you agree or disagree that the Council makes it EASY for you TO USE Council-operated community facilities?

Agreement Results	Number	Percent
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results		
Strongly Agree	26	25.7%
Agree	60	59.4%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	6	5.9%
Disagree	6	5.9%
Strongly Disagree	1	1.0%
Don't Know	2	2.0%
Total	101	100.0%
Not applicable	0	



Sports Parks

Presentation of Sports Parks

Methodology

Score calculated as an aggregate of the three survey questions stated below:


1. How satisfied or dissatisfied are with the RANGE OF SPORTS SUPPORT FACILITIES available at this park? *This includes toilets, changing rooms and drinking fountains*
2. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the CONDITION of this park? *This includes maintenance and how it is looked after*
3. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with INFORMATION PROVIDED for this park? *This includes clear signs and information that is available to people*

Time in field: Face to face and mail drop postal surveying took place between November and December 2024

Completed Surveys: 219

Sites Surveyed:


Park Name	Number
FENDALTON PARK	18
HALSWELL DOMAIN	9
JELLIE PARK	5
PAPANUI DOMAIN	10
SHELDON PARK	12
TEMPLETON DOMAIN	9
TULETT PARK	15
WARREN PARK	11
BURNSIDE PARK	40
HAGLEY PARK SOUTH	30
LANCASTER PARK	30
NGA PUNA WAI	30
TOTAL	219



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Sport support facilities	n	40	102	25	30	5	6	208
	%	19.2%	49.0%	12.0%	14.4%	2.4%	2.9%	100.0%
Park condition	n	86	85	11	24	8	0	214
	%	40.2%	39.7%	5.1%	11.2%	3.7%	0.0%	100.0%
Park information provided	n	37	108	21	15	5	20	206
	%	18.0%	52.4%	10.2%	7.3%	2.4%	9.7%	100.0%
Getting around park	n	85	105	9	11	5	2	217
	%	39.2%	48.4%	4.1%	5.1%	2.3%	0.9%	100.0%

Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Question: How much do you agree or disagree that the Council make it EASY for you TO USE this park?



Agreement Results		
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results		
	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	79	36.4%
Agree	106	48.8%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	18	8.3%
Disagree	9	4.1%
Strongly Disagree	2	0.9%
Don't Know	3	1.4%
Total	217	100.0%
Not applicable	0	

Regional Parks

Presentation of Regional Parks

Methodology


Score calculated as an aggregate of the two survey questions stated below:

- 1. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the APPEARANCE of this park? *This includes layout, plants, trees and gardens*
- 2. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the CONDITION of this park? *This includes maintenance and how it is looked after*

Time in field: Face to face and mail drop postal surveying took place between November and December 2024

Completed Surveys: 246

Sites Surveyed: see list in Regional Parks section above



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Park appearance	n	107	102	14	18	3	0	244
	%	43.9%	41.8%	5.7%	7.4%	1.2%	0.0%	100.0%
Park condition	n	85	113	17	22	7	0	244
	%	34.8%	46.3%	7.0%	9.0%	2.9%	0.0%	100.0%
AVERAGE RATING	n	192	215	31	40	10	0	488
	%	39.3%	44.1%	6.4%	8.2%	2.0%	0.0%	100.0%

Marine Structures

Presentation of Marine Structures

Methodology


Score calculated as an aggregate of the two survey questions stated below:

- 1. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the APPEARANCE of this marine structure? *This includes layout, type and style of facilities*
- 2. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the CONDITION of this marine structure? *This includes maintenance and how it is looked after*

Time in field: Face to face surveying took place between November and December 2024

Completed Surveys: 195

Sites Surveyed: see list in Marine Structures section above



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Marine structure appearance	n	36	106	20	23	9	1	195
	%	18.5%	54.4%	10.3%	11.8%	4.6%	0.5%	100.0%
Marine structure condition	n	32	87	23	38	11	3	194
	%	16.5%	44.8%	11.9%	19.6%	5.7%	1.5%	100.0%
AVERAGE RATING	n	68	193	43	61	20	4	389
	%	17.5%	49.6%	11.1%	15.7%	5.1%	1.0%	100.0%

Governance and Decision Making: People Who Attended Hearings or Made Deputations

Methodology

Time in field: The online survey was infield in October 2024, with surveys emailed to 614 people who had attended a hearing or made a deputation to the Council or to a Council committee or community board from January 2024. 100% of surveys were completed online


Completed Surveys: 228

Understanding of Council Decisions

Questions

Score calculated as an aggregate of the three survey questions stated below:

1. How much do you agree or disagree that you UNDERSTAND how the Council makes decisions?
2. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the ACCURACY of information provided to you about Council decisions? *This includes being able to rely on what you are told and information being clear, correct and available to people*
3. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you that the public receives information about decision making in a PROMPT and TIMELY manner?




Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied / Strongly Agree	Satisfied / Agree	Neither	Dissatisfied / Disagree	Very Dissatisfied / Strongly Disagree	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Understanding of decision making	n	43	111	33	27	9	5	228
	%	18.9%	48.7%	14.5%	11.8%	3.9%	2.2%	100.0%
Accuracy of information about decisions	n	12	82	55	44	31	3	227
	%	5.3%	36.1%	24.2%	19.4%	13.7%	1.3%	100.0%
Prompt and timely information about decisions	n	10	86	59	42	23	5	225
	%	4.4%	38.2%	26.2%	18.7%	10.2%	2.2%	100.0%
AVERAGE RATING	n	60	227	109	125	98	7	626
	%	9.6%	36.3%	17.4%	20.0%	15.7%	1.1%	100.0%

Public Influence on Council Decision Making

Question

Score based on the survey question stated below:

1. How much INFLUENCE do you feel the public has on the decisions the Council makes?




Satisfaction Results		Large Influence	Some Influence	Small Influence	No Influence	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results							
Influence on decision making	n	7	67	108	43	1	226
AVERAGE RATING	%	3.1%	29.6%	47.8%	19.0%	0.4%	100.0%

Opportunities to Participate in and Contribute to Council Decision Making

Question

1. How much do you agree or disagree that you have adequate OPPORTUNITIES TO HAVE A SAY in what the Council does?




Agreement Results		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Opportunities to have a say	n	21	103	43	37	18	2	224
AVERAGE RATING ⁵	%	9.4%	46.0%	19.2%	16.5%	8.0%	0.9%	100.0%

Decision Making Processes Easy to Use and Engage With

Question

1. How much do you agree or disagree that the Council makes it EASY for you TO USE and ENGAGE with our decision making processes? *This includes clear instructions about processes and timelines, having options for engaging with us and being able to talk to staff and elected members about decisions*




5 Caution must be used when comparing these results to previous years as the measurement scale has changed from a satisfaction scale to an agreement scale and pre 2024-2025, the score combined both the opportunities to have a say and the process ease of use questions. The opportunities to have a say question now includes reference to adequacy of opportunities.

Agreement Results		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Decision making processes being easy to use and engage with	n	12	82	57	40	27	5	223
AVERAGE RATING	%	5.4%	36.8%	25.6%	17.9%	12.1%	2.2%	100.0%

Making Decisions in Best Interests of City

Questions

- How satisfied or dissatisfied are you that the Council MAKES DECISIONS that are in the BEST INTERESTS of the city?



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Decisions made in best interests of city	n	4	59	69	47	41	4	224
AVERAGE RATING	%	1.8%	26.3%	30.8%	21.0%	18.3%	1.8%	100.0%

Appearance, Safety and Ease of Use of Bus Interchange and Hubs

Methodology


Score calculated as an aggregate of the four survey questions stated below:

- 1. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the APPEARANCE of the Bus Interchange OR Hub/Lounge? *This includes layout, type and design*
- 2. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the CONDITION of the Bus Interchange OR Hub/Lounge? *This includes maintenance and how it is looked after (like cleanliness and no graffiti and vandalism)*
- 3. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your PERSONAL SAFETY at the Interchange OR Hub/Lounge DURING THE DAY? *This includes safety from crime, amount of lighting, and road safety (like separating people from buses and other road users)*
- 4. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your PERSONAL SAFETY at the Interchange OR Hub/Lounge AFTER DARK?

Time in field: Face to face surveying took place between November and December 2024

Completed Surveys: 250

Sites Surveyed: Bus Interchange, Riccarton Bus Lounge



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Interchange appearance	n	101	88	6	1	2	0	198
	%	51.0%	44.4%	3.0%	0.5%	1.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Interchange condition	n	97	91	7	2	1	1	199
	%	48.7%	45.7%	3.5%	1.0%	0.5%	0.5%	100.0%
Interchange safety during day	n	94	75	21	6	2	1	199
	%	47.2%	37.7%	10.6%	3.0%	1.0%	0.5%	100.0%
Interchange safety at night	n	37	36	12	20	11	20	136
	%	27.2%	26.5%	8.8%	14.7%	8.1%	14.7%	100.0%
Suburban hub appearance	n	20	29	0	0	0	0	49
	%	40.8%	59.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Suburban hub condition	n	22	26	1	1	0	0	50
	%	44.0%	52.0%	2.0%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Suburban hub safety during day	n	20	25	1	2	2	0	50
	%	40.0%	50.0%	2.0%	4.0%	4.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Suburban hub safety at night	n	5	8	4	8	8	5	38
	%	13.2%	21.1%	10.5%	21.1%	21.1%	13.2%	100.0%
AVERAGE RATING	n	396	378	52	40	26	27	919
	%	43.1%	41.1%	5.7%	4.4%	2.8%	2.9%	100.0%

Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Question: How much do you agree or disagree that the Council makes it EASY for you TO USE the Interchange (or suburban hub/lounge)?

Agreement Results	Number	Percent
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results		
Strongly Agree	155	70.5%
Agree	58	26.4%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	3	1.4%
Disagree	3	1.4%
Strongly Disagree	1	0.5%
Don't Know	0	0.0%
Total	220	100.0%
Not applicable	2	

