

# Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey

2011

## State-wide Research Results Summary

May 2011

A project sponsored by the  
Department of Planning and  
Community Development  
and local governments

Prepared by  
**Wallis**  
CONSULTING GROUP



Department of Planning  
and Community Development

### Summary Table of Year to Year Change (2010-2011)

a. Governance Indicators	Total		Inner Metro		Outer Metro		Regional Centres		Large Shires		Small Shires	
	10	11	10	11	10	11	10	11	10	11	10	11
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Overall Performance	79	<b>77</b>	85	85	80	<b>78</b>	79	<b>73</b>	73	72	79	<b>74</b>
Advocacy	78	77	79	<b>77</b>	76	76	80	<b>77</b>	73	74	80	79
Community Engagement	70	<b>67</b>	73	<b>71</b>	71	<b>69</b>	68	<b>63</b>	63	63	71	<b>69</b>
Customer Contact	80	<b>78</b>	82	<b>80</b>	81	<b>79</b>	80	79	78	77	81	<b>78</b>
<b>b. Specific Performance Areas</b>												
Local Roads and Footpaths	60	<b>54</b>	74	<b>70</b>	64	<b>58</b>	62	<b>55</b>	49	<b>42</b>	52	<b>46</b>
Health and Human Services	89	89	89	89	87	87	89	90	90	90	90	89
Recreational Facilities	81	81	89	88	83	82	84	<b>82</b>	74	<b>76</b>	80	80
Appearance of Public Areas	79	<b>76</b>	78	<b>76</b>	73	<b>68</b>	80	80	79	<b>77</b>	81	80
Traffic Management and Parking	65	65	64	63	62	62	53	52	64	64	77	77
Waste Management	82	81	87	86	84	<b>78</b>	80	79	78	79	82	82
Enforcement of Local Laws	76	77	77	78	71	<b>73</b>	78	78	74	75	77	<b>79</b>
Economic Development	71	<b>69</b>	81	82	75	75	70	<b>67</b>	66	65	67	<b>64</b>
Town Planning Policy and Approvals	64	<b>62</b>	63	<b>60</b>	69	68	63	<b>60</b>	57	56	67	<b>65</b>

Data are based on percentage of respondents rating satisfaction as excellent, good or adequate.

Data displayed in **blue** show an improvement of more than one percentage point since 2010.

Data displayed in **red** show a decline of more than one percentage point since 2010.

## **Notes on Survey Methodology**

Since its inception in 1998, the Community Satisfaction Survey has been conducted annually, using Computer Assisted telephone Interviewing (CATI).

Each year, all Victorian Councils are invited to participate in this survey, which provides an opportunity to obtain feedback from residents in a timely and cost-effective manner. In 2011, 77 of Victoria's 79 Councils took part in the study.

The 'standard' sample size for the project is 350 interviews per local government area, but a few Councils chose to boost their sample to 800 to permit smaller area analysis of their results. The total number of interviews completed across Victoria in 2011 was 28,337.

Interviewing began in the inner metropolitan areas on 2<sup>nd</sup> February and concluded with interviews in small rural shires on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2011.

## Overall Performance


Across Victoria, since the survey commenced in 1998, there has been an improvement in overall council performance of 8% (69% of respondents rated their council's performance as excellent, good or adequate in 1998 compared with 77% in 2011).

In the intervening years there have been fluctuations in the level of satisfaction across councils, which reached a high in 2007. In the years since then, there have been small downward movements in satisfaction with overall performance in both metropolitan and country areas. This change is more marked in the country areas in 2011 as the graph below indicates.

In **metropolitan councils** in 2010, 83% of respondents rated councils as excellent, good or adequate. In 2011, this returned to the 2009 level of 82%.

For **country councils**, which have rated below metropolitan councils on this measure historically, the percentage in 2010 was 77% and in 2011 it dropped to the point at which 73% of respondents gave an excellent, good or adequate rating.


### Overall Performance: 2005 – 2011



A breakdown of results for the five key groups is shown on page 4:

- **Inner and outer metropolitan councils:** Relatively high satisfaction ratings, with percentages of 85% and 78% respectively.
- **Regional centres** showed an excellent, good or adequate rating of 79% in 2010, but recorded a rating of 73% on the same measure in 2011.
- **Large shires** have continued the decline since 2008 when an excellent, good adequate rating was reported by 75%; scoring 74%, 73% and 72% in 2009, 2010 and 2011 respectively.
- **Small shires** had an excellent, good adequate rating of 79% in 2010, but have shown a fall of five percentage points to 74% in 2011.





# Overall Performance by Group



## Relative proportion of the impact that each service area has on resident satisfaction overall

In 2011, the five services having the most impact on resident satisfaction were (in order of priority) –

- Town planning, policy and approvals
- Economic development
- Local roads and footpaths
- Recreational facilities
- Appearance of public areas



## Advocacy


Levels of satisfaction with council advocacy – representing the community's interests - have shown little change since the scores reported in 2010.

Comparing this year's results to 2010, we can see

- **Across Victoria:** In 2010, 78% of respondents rated councils as excellent, good or adequate. There is just one percentage point difference in 2011 where 77% reported an excellent, good or average result.
- **Inner metropolitan councils** showed a satisfaction level of 79% in 2010, and this declined by two percentage points in 2011, with 77% providing an excellent, good or adequate rating.
- **Outer metropolitan councils:** In 2010, 76% of respondents rated councils as excellent, good or adequate, and this result has continued to 2011.
- **Regional centres:** In 2010, 80% rated councils as excellent, good or adequate; but there has been a decline to 77% in 2011.
- **Large shires:** The percentage excellent, good or adequate was 73% in 2010 but have improved to 74% this year.
- **Small shires:** Since 2005, the excellent, good and adequate ratings have generally remained steady at about 80%, with 79% reporting an excellent, good adequate rating in 2011.



# Advocacy: 2005 – 2011









## Community Engagement

Levels of satisfaction with community engagement across Victoria have shown small declines across most groups in 2011.

- **Across Victoria:** In 2010, 70% of respondents rated councils as excellent, good or adequate; the figure reduced to 67% in 2011.
- **Inner metropolitan councils:** In 2009, 69% rated councils as excellent, good or adequate; this improved to 73% in 2010, but pegged back a little to 71% in 2011.
- **Outer metropolitan councils:** Satisfaction levels continued the decline shown last year moving from 71% shown at that time, to 69% giving an excellent, good adequate rating this year.
- **Regional centres** have shown the largest change in satisfaction on this measure, moving from 68% in 2010 to 63% in 2011. This is the same level as was reported in 2002.
- **Large shires:** The percentage excellent, good or adequate has been maintained in the last year at 63%.
- **Small shires** continued the decline in results from 2010, with satisfaction levels moving from 71% in 2010 to 69% in 2011.

# Community Engagement: 2005 – 2011



■ - Excellent / Good     
  - Adequate     
 ■ - Needs some / a lot of Improvement


## Customer Contact

As the chart on page 11 illustrates, levels of satisfaction with customer contact across Victoria continue to be quite high amongst residents, and at similar levels in all five groups.

However, comparing this year's results to 2010, results show some small declines in 2011, as outlined below.

- Across **Victoria**: In 2010, 80% of respondents rated councils as excellent, good or adequate. In 2011, this rating declined to 78%.
- **Inner metropolitan councils**: In 2010, 82% rated councils as excellent, good or adequate; this declined to 80% in 2011.
- **Outer metropolitan councils** also showed a decline in satisfaction levels amongst its residents. The percentage of respondents that reported councils' performance as excellent, good or adequate moved from 81% in 2010 to 79% in 2011, eroding the gains shown in 2009 and 2010.
- Results for **Regional centres** also show a slight fall from last year, with a rating of 79% excellent, good or adequate in 2011.
- **Large shires** have shown consistent results for a number of years, but with a small decline in satisfaction ratings in 2011 to 77%.
- **Small shires** have reversed the improvement in 2010 results with 78% reporting excellent, good or adequate performance in 2011.

# Customer Contact: 2005 – 2011



## Local Roads and Footpaths







As the chart (page 13) illustrates, levels of satisfaction with local roads and footpaths continue to be higher in metropolitan areas than in country areas.

All council groups have recorded falls in resident satisfaction.

Comparing last year's results to this year -

- Across **Victoria**: In 2010, 60% of respondents rated councils as excellent, good or adequate, but this result declined to 54% in 2011.
- **Inner metropolitan councils** showed the most moderate decline of the five groups with, with 70% of residents rating performance as excellent, good or adequate in 2011.
- **Outer metropolitan councils** showed a decline in results this year, with 58% recording a rating of adequate or better. This compares with 64% in 2010, and is a return to the 1999 rating.
- **Regional centres**: In 2010, there was a slight slippage of the significant gains shown in 2009. In 2011 there has been a significant decline in satisfaction levels with 55% reporting excellent, good adequate performance. This is comparable with the 1998 rating.
- **Large shires** have also shown a significant decline in the proportion of respondents rating councils as excellent, good or adequate. In 2011 this showed a drop in satisfaction levels to 42%, which is comparable to 1998 and 1999 results.
- **Small shires**: The percentage excellent, good or adequate was 52% in 2010. This result moved to 46% this year, which is the same as that recorded in 1999.

# Local Roads and Footpaths: 2005 – 2011



■ - Excellent / Good    
  - Adequate    
 ■ - Needs some / a lot of Improvement

## Health and Human Services


Levels of satisfaction with health and human services across Victoria are high amongst residents, and at similar levels in all five groups.

Comparing this year's results to 2010, we see that results are largely unchanged in 2011.

- **Across Victoria:** In 2011, 89% of respondents rated councils as excellent, good or adequate. This result is consistent with 2010.
- **Inner metropolitan councils:** In 2010, 89% rated councils as excellent, good or adequate; this was maintained in 2011.
- **Outer metropolitan councils** have also maintained the 2010 outcome in 2011, with 87% of respondents rating councils as excellent, good or adequate.
- **Regional centres:** 89% of respondents rated councils as excellent, good or adequate in 2010; this rose slightly to 90% in 2011.
- **Large shires** continued a stable percentage excellent, good or adequate rating of 90% this year.
- **Small shires:** 89% of residents rated councils as excellent, good or adequate in 2011, compared to 90% last year. This is a return to 2005 ratings.



# Health and Human Services: 2005 – 2011




## Recreational Facilities

Results indicate levels of satisfaction with recreational facilities are highest in inner metropolitan councils, with outer metropolitan areas and regional centres scoring a little higher than the shires.

Comparing this year's results to 2010, results show small changes in ratings, but with a slightly larger decline in satisfaction in regional centres.

- Across **Victoria**: Results continue unchanged this year, with 81% rating councils as excellent, good or adequate.
- **Inner metropolitan councils**: In 2010, 89% rated councils as excellent, good or adequate, and this moved to 88% this year.
- **Outer metropolitan councils**: In 2010, 83% of respondents gave an excellent, good or adequate rating; this result moved to 82% in 2011, losing some of the gains made in the previous year.
- **Regional centres**: In 2010, 84% rated councils as excellent, good or adequate; the figure declined to 82% in 2011.
- **Large shires**: There was further improvement in satisfaction levels In 2011, with 76% of residents rating councils as excellent, good or adequate.
- **Small shires**: The percentage excellent, good or adequate has been maintained in 2011, at 80%.

## Recreational Facilities: 2005 – 2011




## Appearance of Public Areas

As the chart on page 19 illustrates, resident satisfaction with the appearance of public areas shows some reversal of the gains shown in 2010, with outer metropolitan areas showing the largest decline.

Comparing this year's results to 2010, we note –

- **Across Victoria:** In 2011, 76% of respondents rated councils as excellent, good or adequate. This is a decline from the 79% reported in 2010.
- **Inner metropolitan councils:** In 2009, 76% rated councils as excellent, good or adequate. In 2010 it improved to 78%, but returned to the 2009 level this year.
- **Outer metropolitan councils** show a notable fall in results this year, with 68% giving a satisfaction rating compared to 73% reporting an excellent, good or adequate rating in 2010.
- **Regional centres:** In 2011 80% of residents reported an excellent, good or adequate rating. This is the same result as in 2010.
- **Large shires:** In 2011, results have declined by two percentage points from the previous year, with a 77% excellent, good or adequate rating.
- **Small shires:** 81% of residents rated councils as excellent, good or adequate in 2010 and 80% gave this rating this year.

## Appearance of Public Areas: 2005 – 2011




## Traffic Management and Parking

As the chart on page 21 indicates, levels of satisfaction with traffic management and parking facilities continue to be highest amongst the small shires.

Regional Centres continue to record the lowest levels of satisfaction, with a further decline in 2011.

- Across **Victoria** 65% of respondents rated councils as excellent, good or adequate. This result is the same as that recorded in 2010.
- **Inner metropolitan councils:** The gains shown in 2010 have slipped a little this year, with 63% of respondents giving a satisfaction rating, compared to 64% in the previous year.
- **Outer metropolitan councils:** The percentage excellent, good or adequate was 62% in 2010 and this has been maintained in 2011.
- **Regional centres:** The significant decline in satisfaction levels reported last year has been further eroded: The percentage that reported councils' performance as excellent, good or adequate declined from 53% in 2010 to 52% in 2011.
- **Large shires** have held steady the satisfaction levels recorded in 2010, with 64% of residents rating councils as excellent, good or adequate.
- **Small shires:** The percentage excellent, good or adequate was 77% in 2011, as it had been in 2010.

# Traffic Management and Parking: 2005 – 2011



## Waste Management


Levels of satisfaction with waste management across Victoria are relatively high amongst residents. Results are slightly better among inner metropolitan areas than among the other groups.

With the exception of outer metropolitan areas, results show only minor changes in 2011.

- **Across Victoria:** In 2010, 82% of respondents rated councils as excellent, good or adequate. This result moved to 81% in 2011, which is the same as the 2006 result.
- **Inner metropolitan councils:** In 2010, 87% rated councils as excellent, good or adequate; and has shown a small decline to 86% in 2011.
- **Outer metropolitan councils:** There has been a notable decline in satisfaction with 78% rating their council's performance as excellent, good or adequate; compared to 84% in 2010.
- **Regional centres:** In 2010, 80% of respondents rated councils as excellent, good or adequate; the result for 2011 shows a further small decline to 79%.
- **Large shires:** The percentage excellent, good or adequate has improved from 78% in both 2009 and 2010 to 79% this year.
- **Small shires:** No change this year, with 82% giving a satisfaction rating; maintaining the improvements shown in earlier years.



# Waste Management: 2005 – 2011




## Enforcement of Local Laws

There has been a general continuation of the gains in satisfaction levels with enforcement of local laws which were seen last year.

Comparing this year's results to 2010, we note -

- Across **Victoria**: In 2010, 76% of respondents rated councils as excellent, good or adequate. This result showed further improvement to 77% in 2011.
- **Inner metropolitan councils**: The percentage excellent, good or adequate has moved from 77% as reported in 2010, to 78% this year.
- **Outer metropolitan councils**: In 2010, 71% of respondents rated councils as excellent, good or adequate; with further improvement to 73% in 2011.
- In **Regional centres** results have remained stable with 78% reporting excellent, good or adequate for three years.
- **Large shires**: Ratings have shown a small reversal of the decline evident in previous years. In 2011 the result was 75% - up 1% on the 2010 rating.
- **Small shires** have improved ratings in 2011. This year, 79% rated councils' performance as excellent, good or adequate.

## Enforcement of Local Laws: 2005 – 2011




## Economic Development

As the chart on page 27 illustrates, levels of satisfaction with economic development are higher in metropolitan areas than in country areas, where some decline is evident in 2011.

Satisfaction levels declined in the regional centres and shires, and this is reflected in a fall in the overall satisfaction rate.

- Across **Victoria**: In 2010, 71% of respondents rated councils as excellent, good or adequate. The 2011 level fell to 69%.
- **Inner metropolitan areas** have continued the upward trend reported in 2010; rising by a further percentage point. In 2011, 82% reported excellent, good, adequate scores.
- **Outer metropolitan areas** have maintained the gain shown in 2010, 75% reporting excellent, good, adequate scores again this year.
- **Regional centres**: In 2010, 70% of respondents rated councils as excellent, good or adequate. This has declined to 67% in 2011.
- **Large shires**: The percentage of excellent, good or adequate was 66% in 2010 and moved to 65% in 2011.
- **Small shires** have also shown a decline in results this year. In 2010, 67% rated councils' performance as excellent, good or adequate, compared to 64% in 2011.

# Economic Development: 2005 – 2011




## Town Planning Policy and Approvals

As the chart on page 29 indicates, levels of satisfaction with Town Planning Policy and Approvals have shown a general reversal of the improvements shown in 2010.

Comparing this year's results to 2010, we note that results are comparable with those reported in 2009.

- **Across Victoria:** In 2011, 62% of respondents rated councils as excellent, good or adequate. This is a decline of two percentage points on the figure of 64% in 2010.
- **Inner metropolitan councils:** In 2010, 63% of respondents rated councils as excellent, good or adequate. In 2011, this declined by 3% to 60% - the lowest result for ten years.
- **Outer metropolitan councils:** The percentage excellent, good or adequate was 69% in 2010, and 68% this year.
- **Regional centres:** The general decline in satisfaction levels amongst residents, evident since 2005, and briefly arrested in 2010, has continued in 2011. The percentage of respondents that reported councils' performance as excellent, good or adequate fell from 63% in 2010 to 60% this year – a record low for this group.
- **Large shires:** Despite falls in satisfaction in other groups, this continues to be the group with the lowest level of satisfaction amongst its constituents. The gains in satisfaction shown in 2010 have been partially lost this year, when the percentage of excellent, good, adequate ratings fell from 57% in 2010 to 56% in 2011.
- **Small shires** have also shown a decline in satisfaction ratings this year. The excellent, good, adequate ratings are at 65% in 2011, compared with 67% the previous year. This is a return to the 1998 level.

# Town Planning Policy and Approvals: 2005 – 2011



# APPENDIX 1

## Survey Questionnaire



---

**WALLIS CONSULTING GROUP**  
**Department for Planning & Community Development**  
**Community Satisfaction Survey 2011**

**WG3822**  
**January 2011**

---

**INTRODUCTION**

**IF IN COUNCIL AREA:**

Good morning/afternoon/evening. My name is .....from Wallis Consulting Group. We are conducting research on behalf of Victorian Local Government. The survey aims to find out how residents feel about the PERFORMANCE of local Government in your area. Can you confirm that you live in **(NAME OF COUNCIL)**?

**IF NON-RESIDENT RATE-PAYER:**

Good morning/afternoon/evening. My name is .....from Wallis Consulting Group. We are conducting research on behalf of Victorian Local Government. The survey aims to find out how residents feel about the PERFORMANCE of local Government in the **(NAME OF COUNCIL)**. Council records indicate that you are a rate-payer in that area.

- |   |                                    |                      |
|---|------------------------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | Yes                                | <b>GO TO S1</b>      |
| 2 | In different Council area          | <b>GO TO PRE S1</b>  |
| 3 | Not available/callback (make appt) | <b>RETURN TO SMS</b> |
| 4 | Household refusal                  | <b>RETURN TO SMS</b> |
| 5 | Selected resident refusal          | <b>RETURN TO SMS</b> |
| 6 | Language Difficulties              | <b>RETURN TO SMS</b> |

PRE S1

**LIST ALL COUNCILS IN SAME GROUP**

What Local Government Area do you live in?

- |   |                                    |                      |
|---|------------------------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | Correct Council can be selected    | <b>CONTINUE</b>      |
| 2 | Council not listed – cannot select | <b>RETURN TO SMS</b> |
| 3 | Don't know                         | <b>RETURN TO SMS</b> |

**SCREENING**

S1: Firstly, have you or anyone in your household worked in a market research organisation or local government anywhere in the last three years?

- |   |                        |                      |
|---|------------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | No (continue)          | <b>CONTINUE</b>      |
| 2 | Yes - Market Research  | <b>RETURN TO SMS</b> |
| 3 | Yes - Local Government | <b>RETURN TO SMS</b> |

S2: Also, we just wish to speak to residents, not businesses, of **(NAME OF COUNCIL)**. Are you a residential household (**IF GROUPS 3-5:** or a farming household)?

- |   |                             |                      |
|---|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | Yes - Residential Household |                      |
| 2 | Yes - Farming Household     |                      |
| 3 | No                          | <b>RETURN TO SMS</b> |

S3: Can I please speak to a head of your household (either male or female) that is 18 years or older?

- |   |                                    |                      |
|---|------------------------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | Yes – available Continue           |                      |
| 2 | Not available/callback (make appt) | <b>RETURN TO SMS</b> |
| 3 | Household refusal                  | <b>RETURN TO SMS</b> |
| 4 | Selected resident refusal          | <b>RETURN TO SMS</b> |
| 5 | Not in Council area                | <b>RETURN TO SMS</b> |
| 6 | Language Difficulties              | <b>RETURN TO SMS</b> |

ONCE HAVE CORRECT PERSON: Thank-you for your participation. The survey will only take about 8 or 9 minutes AND THE INFORMATION YOU PROVIDE WILL BE USED TO HELP COUNCILS IMPROVE THEIR SERVICES. No information that you provide will be linked to your name.

**IF A FARMING HOUSEHOLD:** Please note, we would like you to participate in the survey thinking of your needs as a resident, rather than specific farm management issues.

S5: My supervisor may be monitoring the interview for quality control purposes. If you do not wish this to occur, please let me know.

- |   |                        |
|---|------------------------|
| 1 | Monitoring allowed     |
| 2 | Monitoring NOT allowed |

## MAIN SURVEY

Q1 I'm going to read out a list of nine areas which are the responsibility of local Government. For each area of responsibility, I would like to establish your **ASSESSMENT OF THE PERFORMANCE** of **(NAME OF COUNCIL)** over the last twelve months. Please keep in mind that the focus is on local government only.

**NOW ASK (a) AND (b) WHERE NECESSARY FOR EACH RESPONSIBILITY AREA, BEFORE PROCEEDING TO NEXT SERVICE AREA. RANDOMISE.**

Q1ax) In the last twelve months, how has **(NAME OF COUNCIL)** performed on **(RESPONSIBILITY AREA)**? Was it ... ?

READ OUT 1-5 INCLUDING DEFINITIONS THE FIRST TIME AND THEREAFTER ONLY THE KEY WORDS.

- 5 Excellent - outstanding performance
- 4 Good - a high standard
- 3 Adequate - an acceptable standard
- 2 Needs some improvement
- 1 Needs a lot of improvement
- 0 Don't Know / Can't Say

**ASK Q1b IF CODES 4 OR 5 IN Q1a. OTHERWISE CONTINUE WITH THE NEXT RESPONSIBILITY AREA.**

Q1bx) Why do you say that? PROBE FULLY. DO NOT READ OUT.

**USE ATTACHED PRE-CODES FOR EACH RESPONSIBILITY AREA.**

**ASK Q1c FOR THE SECOND RESPONSIBILITY AREA ONLY.**

Q1c) Have you or any member of your household used any of the **HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES** provided by the **(NAME OF COUNCIL)** in the last 12 months?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

### RESPONSIBILITY AREAS:

1. LOCAL ROADS AND FOOTPATHS, excluding highways and main roads **(IF GROUPS 2-5: but INCLUDING roadside slashing / maintenance)**
2. HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES; this includes Meals on Wheels, home help, maternal and child health, immunisation, child care, and support for disadvantaged and minority groups, but EXCLUDES hospitals.
3. RECREATIONAL FACILITIES; this includes sporting facilities, swimming pools, sports fields and playgrounds, arts centres and festivals, and library services.
4. APPEARANCE OF PUBLIC AREAS; this includes local parks and gardens, street cleaning and litter collection, and street trees.
5. TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AND PARKING FACILITIES; this includes council provision of street and off street parking, and local road safety.
6. WASTE MANAGEMENT; this includes garbage and recyclable collection, and operation of tips / transfer stations.
7. ENFORCEMENT OF LOCAL LAWS; this includes food and health, noise, animal control, parking, and fire prevention.

- 
8. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT; this includes business and tourism, and jobs creation.
9. TOWN PLANNING POLICY AND APPROVALS, including heritage and environmental issues.
- 

Q2a In the last twelve months, have you had any contact with **(NAME OF COUNCIL)**? This may have been in person, by telephone, in writing, email or by fax.

- 1 Yes  
2 No

**SKIP TO Q3**

Q2b Thinking of the most recent contact, how well did **(NAME OF COUNCIL)** perform in the WAY you were treated - things like the ease of contact, helpfulness and ability of staff, speed of response, and their attitude towards you. We do NOT mean the ACTUAL OUTCOME. Was it ... READ OUT 1-5 ... ?

- 5 Excellent - outstanding performance  
4 Good - a high standard  
3 Adequate - an acceptable standard  
2 Needs some improvement  
1 Needs a lot of improvement  
0 Don't Know / Can't Say

**ASK Q2c IF OPTION 2 AND CODES 4 OR 5 IN Q2b. OTHERWISE SKIP TO Q3a**

Q2c Why do you say that? PROBE FULLY. DO NOT READ OUT.

**(USE ATTACHED PRE-CODES)**

**ASK ALL**

Q3a Over the last 12 months, how would you rate the performance of **(NAME OF COUNCIL)** on consulting with the community and leading discussion on key social, economic and environmental issues which could impact on the local area, and may require decisions by Council? Would you say it was... READ OUT PERFORMANCE SCALE 1-5... ?

- 5 Excellent - outstanding performance  
4 Good - a high standard  
3 Adequate - an acceptable standard  
2 Needs some improvement  
1 Needs a lot of improvement  
0 Don't Know / Can't Say

**ASK Q3b IF OPTION 2 AND CODES 4 OR 5 IN Q3a. OTHERWISE SKIP TO Q4a**

Q3b Why do you say that? PROBE FULLY. DO NOT READ OUT.

**(USE ATTACHED PRE-CODES)**

Q4a In the last twelve months, how well has **(NAME OF COUNCIL)** represented and lobbied on behalf of the community with other levels of government and private organisations, on key local issues? Was it ... READ OUT 1-5 ... ?

- 5 Excellent - outstanding performance
- 4 Good - a high standard
- 3 Adequate - an acceptable standard
- 2 Needs some improvement
- 1 Needs a lot of improvement
- 0 Don't Know / Can't Say

**ASK Q4b IF OPTION 2 AND CODES 4 OR 5 IN Q4a. OTHERWISE SKIP TO Q5**

Q4b Why do you say that? PROBE FULLY. DO NOT READ OUT.

**(USE ATTACHED PRE-CODES)**

Q5 ON BALANCE, for the last twelve months, how do you feel about the performance of **(NAME OF COUNCIL)**, not just on one or two issues, BUT OVERALL across all responsibility areas. Was it ... READ OUT PERFORMANCE SCALE 1-5 ... ?

- 5 Excellent - outstanding performance
- 4 Good - a high standard
- 3 Adequate - an acceptable standard
- 2 Needs some improvement
- 1 Needs a lot of improvement
- 0 Don't Know / Can't Say

**SKIP TO Q7**

Q6a In giving your answer to the previous question, has any particular issue STRONGLY influenced your view, either in a positive or negative way? IF YES: Was it a positive or negative influence? MULTICODE IF NECESSARY

- 1 Yes - Positive
- 2 Yes - Negative
- 3 No
- 4 Don't Know / No Response

**ASK Q6b IF OPTION 2 AND CODES 4 OR 5 IN Q5. OTHERWISE SKIP TO Q7**

Q6b Why do you say that on balance the council's overall performance is in need of improvement? PROBE FULLY. DO NOT READ OUT.

**(USE ATTACHED PRE-CODES)**

Q7 Over the last 12 months, what is your view of the direction of **(NAME OF COUNCIL)**'s overall performance? Has it IMPROVED, STAYED THE SAME or DETERIORATED?

- 1 Improved
- 2 Stayed the Same
- 3 Deteriorated
- 4 Don't Know / Can't Say

**DEMOGRAPHICS**

Q8a Now I have just three final questions ...To which one of the following age groups do you belong? (READ OUT 1-5)

- 1 18 - 24
- 2 25 - 34
- 3 35 - 49
- 4 50 - 64
- 5 65 +
- 6 Refused
- 7 Under 18

**GO TO Q8b**

**NOW GO TO Q9**

Q8b I originally asked to speak to someone who is 18 years or older. Can you please confirm that you are under 18 years old?

- 1 Yes, confirm
- 2 No

**GO BACK TO Q8a**

Q9 Thinking of the property you live in, do you OWN it or are you RENTING?

- 1 Own (includes purchasing)
- 2 Renting

**IF CALLING PROPERTY IN COUNCIL AREA ASK Q10a, IF CALLING PROPERTY OUTSIDE COUNCIL AREA ASK Q10b**

Q10a Is the property WE HAVE CALLED YOU AT your main permanent residence or a secondary residence such as a holiday home?

Q10b Is the property in the **(NAME OF COUNCIL)** area your main permanent residence or a secondary residence such as a holiday home?

- 1 Permanent residence
- 2 Secondary residence

Q11 Record gender:

- 1 Male
- 2 Female

Q12 Record language interview conducted in:

- 1 English
- 2 Other SPECIFY (including home translator)

**CLOSE:** Thank you for taking part in this research. It is being carried out in accordance with the Privacy Act and the information you provided will be used for research purposes only. Once the survey is complete, any information that could identify you will be removed from the computer records.

Just in case you missed it, my name is '+iname+' and I'm from the Wallis Group. If you would like more information about this survey please visit our website at [www.wallisgroup.com.au](http://www.wallisgroup.com.au) . If would like to check the bona fides of the Wallis Group you may contact the Australian Market and Social Research Society on 1300 364 830.

---

**RESPONSIBILITY AREA PRE-CODES****RA 1 – Local Roads and Footpaths Pre-codes****ON SCREEN:**

1. Improve/ Fix/ Repair uneven surface of footpaths
2. More frequent/ better re-surfacing of roads
3. More frequent / better slashing of roadside verges
4. Improve standard of unsealed roads (loose gravel, dust, corrugations)
5. Improve/More frequent grading etc of unsealed roads
6. Quicker response for repairs to roads, footpaths or gutters
7. Increase number of footpaths/ widen footpaths
8. Fix/ improve unsafe sections of roads
9. Improve the quality of maintenance on roads and footpaths
10. More frequent maintenance/ cleaning of roadside drains and culverts
11. Fix/ improve edges and shoulders of roads
12. More/ better roadside drains and culverts
13. Prune/trim trees/shrubs overhanging footpaths/roads
14. Other (SPECIFY)

**CODING:**

15. Widen roads/roads too narrow
16. More/better street/road signs (including position/visibility)
17. More/better street lighting
18. Need improved/more frequent weed control
19. Increase number of sealed roads - outside town limits
20. Increase number of sealed roads - inside town limits
21. Tree roots causing damage to footpaths/roads/drains
22. Council favours/focuses on certain areas over others
23. Traffic management issues

---

**RA 2 – Health and Human Services Pre-codes****ON SCREEN:**

1. More funds/resources to reduce waiting lists for services
2. More facilities/resources for Aged Care/better nursing homes
3. More/better support/services for minority/disadvantaged groups
4. Increase resources for/availability of home help /meals on wheels
5. More resources/longer hours for Maternal & Child Health Facilities
6. Improved/More childcare facilities/after school/holiday care
7. Improve quality of home help
8. More/better centres/facilities generally in more remote towns/areas
9. Services need to be improved in all areas/council needs to do more
10. Improve quality/variety of food in meals on wheels program
11. More/better publicity/information about available services
12. More/better premises for health or community facilities
13. Better transport to/from health or community centres/facilities
14. Other (SPECIFY)

**CODING:**

15. More/better activities/programs for young people
16. More information/resources to immunisation programs
17. Improve services for children with special needs/ disability services
18. More facilities/services for mental health
19. Improve/increased dental program/services
20. Better management of services/organisations



---

**RA 3 – Recreational Facilities Pre-codes****ON SCREEN:**

1. More/better Sporting Complexes (including pools)
2. Better maintenance of Sporting facilities (including pools)
3. More facilities/activities for young people/teenagers
4. More/better/safer Playgrounds and/or equipment/with sun shade
5. More/better sporting complexes and/or facilities in smaller towns
6. More/better recreational activities/programs
7. More/better library buildings/no library service/closing /moving library
8. More/better facilities and resources at libraries (incl funding)
9. More community consultation about recreational facilities etc
10. More/better arts/cultural facilities/events in smaller towns
11. More/better bike paths/ walking tracks/ skate board facilities
12. Longer opening hours for Sporting Complexes (including pools)
13. More support/funding needed for recreational/sporting facilities
14. Other (SPECIFY)

**CODING:**

15. More/better amenities in recreation areas (eg. seats, picnic tables, barbeques etc)
16. Less expensive recreational facilities and activities/more consistent fees
17. Better/More maintenance of Parks/Playgrounds-syringes/ lighting/ trees/ equipment etc
18. More support for local sporting clubs in smaller towns
19. Council favours certain areas over others in regard to recreational facilities
20. More publicity/information on facilities and activities/programs
21. More/better performing arts facilities
22. More/better events and festivals
23. Not enough money spent on cultural events and festivals
24. Not enough support for local community groups/clubs
25. Larger range/greater availability of books
26. Pool/baths closing/moving/closed/should be open more months a year
27. Need more parks/open space
28. Everything takes too long/upgrading of facilities/decision making i.e. facilities
29. Improved management of facilities/sports/recreation/library etc (incl food management)

---

**RA 4 – Appearance of Public Areas Pre-codes****ON SCREEN:**

1. Better maintenance of parks and gardens
2. More frequent/better street cleaning
3. More frequent/better pruning of street trees/plants
4. More frequent slashing/mowing of public areas/fire hazard
5. More frequent/better removal of litter in parks and gardens
6. Better care of street trees - watering, staking, removal etc
7. Better landscaping/design (eg. more colour, more shady trees)
8. More street trees
9. Better maintenance of beaches, lakes, rivers and surrounding areas
10. Some areas favoured over others/some areas are neglected
11. Better maintenance of amenities in parks (BBQ's, tables, toilets etc)
12. More frequent sweeping of leaves
13. More emphasis on smaller towns
14. Other (SPECIFY)

**CODING:**

15. More frequent spraying of weeds in open spaces/better weed management
16. Retain/More parks and gardens/open spaces
17. Better amenities within parks/gardens (eg. BBQ's, Picnic tables, toilets, play equipment etc.)
18. Better/different types/mix of trees/vegetation/more appropriate trees
19. Cleaning of public areas/generally untidy
20. More frequent clearing of public litter bins
21. More/better cleaning up of condoms, syringes etc. in parks, beaches, alleys
22. Clear drains regularly/stormwater drains often blocked/gutters
23. Improve streetscapes with landscape or architectural features
24. More public litter bins
25. Quicker/more frequent removal of graffiti/attention to vandalism
26. Cutting down too many trees
27. More maintenance of nature strips/median strips
28. Improve/better maintenance of entrances to town
29. Not responsive to maintenance requests/takes too long

---

**RA 5 – Traffic Management and Parking Facilities Pre-codes****ON SCREEN:**

1. More parking facilities adjacent to shopping and business centres
2. More parking facilities/capacity
3. Poor traffic/parking management
4. Improve traffic flow/congestion
5. Improve traffic management at intersections
6. More free parking/cheaper parking
7. Improve road signage – general (parking/speed/road works)
8. More parking specifically allocated for residents
9. Longer parking times/more long-term parking
10. More speed inhibitors (humps, barriers, traffic islands etc)
11. Improved parking management /more parking around schools
12. Less parking restrictions
13. Fewer parking meters
14. Other (SPECIFY)

**CODING:**

15. More parking enforcement/traffic officers
16. More disabled parking needed
17. Reduce speed limits in residential areas
18. More pedestrian crossings
19. Streets/roads too narrow/need widening/cars parked on sides
20. Improve blind spots, dangerous curves etc. on country roads (excluding highways)
21. More community consultation
22. Greater restriction of non-resident parking
23. More parking restrictions
24. More parking around specific areas, eg train stations, hospitals, etc
25. Fewer speed inhibitors (humps, barriers traffic islands etc)
26. Install more traffic lights at dangerous intersections
27. Less Roundabouts
28. Restrict/discourage traffic on residential roads
29. Restrict truck traffic in streets
30. Parking spaces too small/need to be widened
31. Greater enforcement of speed limits

---

**RA 6 – Waste Management Pre-codes****ON SCREEN:**

1. More consistent/ lower fees for tips etc (reintroduce vouchers)
2. Any/more frequent hard waste collection
3. More comprehensive recycling program/no recycling program
4. More consistent/convenient/Longer opening times/days for Tips etc.
5. No garbage collection
6. More reliable Collections
7. Bigger bins
8. Any/More frequent collection of green waste/vegetation
9. Better location of tip/transfer station/rubbish dump/no tip/closed tip
10. No collection of recyclable materials
11. Any/Better containers for collection of recyclable /green materials
12. More frequent collection of recyclable materials
13. Tip/transfer stations in poor condition/badly managed
14. Other (SPECIFY)

**CODING:**

15. Spilling garbage on footpath/ road during garbage collection/rubbish blows out of truck
16. Bins should be returned upright to curbside/in same place/with lids closed
17. More frequent rubbish collection
18. Cost of garbage/waste collection too much (including bins)
19. Extend areas covered by garbage collection in areas outside townships
20. Provide more info/keep residents informed about waste management procedures
21. More community consultation
22. Less damage to garbage bins
23. More education/promotion for recycling
24. Recyclable material goes into garbage truck/Doubt recycling occurs
25. Inconvenient time of day for pick-ups (too early/late/too noisy)
26. Collection of rubbish left on streets/footpaths/gutters/public areas
27. Quicker response to requests i.e., for new bins/bin lids

---

**RA 7 – Enforcement of Local Laws Pre-codes****ON SCREEN:**

1. Greater enforcement of animal Local Laws
2. Greater enforcement of noise Local Laws (domestic, industrial, traffic)
3. Greater enforcement of parking restrictions/more officers/rangers
4. Greater enforcement of Local Laws generally/more Local Laws officers
5. Greater enforcement of fire prevention Local Laws to clean up properties
6. Greater enforcement of fire prevention Local Laws
7. Greater enforcement of health/food handling Local Laws
8. Greater enforcement of littering Local Laws
9. Local Laws are too stringent
10. Less enforcement of parking restrictions
11. Quicker response to reports of Local Law infringements
12. Better attitude for Local Laws enforcement officers/rangers
13. Local Laws are too lenient
14. Other (SPECIFY)

**CODING:**

15. Greater enforcement of pollution Local Laws (domestic, industrial, traffic etc)
16. More publicity/information to residents
17. Local Laws purely revenue raising
18. Animal Local Laws are too stringent
19. Greater enforcement of traffic/road laws (including footpaths)
20. More consistent application of Local Laws/enforcement
21. Create access to/more free parking/unrestricted parking/dislike parking meters

**1.1**

---

**RA 8 – Economic Development Pre-codes****ON SCREEN:**

1. More/better job creation programs/employment opportunities
2. Encourage more tourism
3. Too little support for local businesses/ new business/many closing down
4. Greater emphasis on Economic Development in general
5. Encourage more companies/industries to re-locate to the area
6. Unaware of any economic development/improvement needed
7. Better financial planning/manage't of Council budget/ money wasted
8. Too much focus on major towns/need more focus on rural & regional areas
9. Not enough promotion of local businesses
10. Encourage more desirable industries to locate to the area
11. Need to publicise/inform the community of Council activities
12. More community consultation/consultation with business
13. Too much emphasis on tourism
14. Other (SPECIFY)

**CODING:**

15. Some areas of local govt are neglected
16. Stop rate increases/rates too high for businesses
17. Attract/encourage better/more diverse shops/businesses i.e. Target/ Spotlight/ newsagents
18. Takes too long to get things done/complete projects
19. Infrastructure in the area needs to be improved/keep up with new developments

---

**RA 9 – Town Planning Policy and Approvals Pre-codes****ON SCREEN:**

1. Better planning policies
2. More efficient/faster approval processes
3. More consultation with community
4. More consistent decisions
5. Too little regulation in heritage areas/knocking down old houses
6. Council should be stronger in representing community opinion
7. Take better account of environmental issues
8. Less high density dwellings
9. Too much residential sub-division
10. Ugly/inappropriate design/development/out of character with area
11. Greater enforcement of/adherence to planning policies
12. Take better account of impact on neighbouring properties
13. Too much regulation in heritage areas
14. Other (SPECIFY)

**CODING:**

15. Less development/too much overdevelopment
16. Greater clarity/information on guidelines and process for building application
17. Too much highrise development/high rise apartments
18. More helpful Town planning staff
19. Not enough infrastructure to support new developments i.e. lack of water/  
parking/ roads
20. Process is too bureaucratic/needs to be flexible/too many regulations/in  
exports
21. Council not very professional in this area/poor management
22. Could do better in this area/some areas favoured over others
23. Better planning for development of shopping areas
24. Decisions overridden by State Government/VCAT/the Tribunal

---

**VALUE-ADD QUESTIONS PRE-CODES**

**Customer Contact: Q2c Why do you say that?**

**ON SCREEN (ALL):**

1. Lack of follow up
2. Took too long to respond
3. Not interested in helping/didn't take an interest/responsibility
4. Poor customer service/ need better communication skills/personal service
5. Impolite/rude manner/tone
6. Issue not resolved in a satisfactory manner
7. Passed around departments/not clear who to speak to
8. Not knowledgeable
9. Did not achieve outcome I wanted
10. Too hard to get through to anyone/kept getting machine
11. Need longer opening hours/after hours contacts
12. Understaffed/spent too long waiting in queue/on phone
13. Not enough information/keep community informed
14. Other (SPECIFY)



---

**Advocacy: Q3b Why do you say that?**

**ON SCREEN:**

1. Don't represent the interests of the community
2. Not sure what the council does/ need to promote/ communicate effectively
3. Council does not make sufficient effort
4. Council represents some areas/services/interests but neglect others
5. Council more interested in politics/themselves than community interests
6. Don't consult to gauge community views
7. Not doing enough/ need to lobby harder on key local issues
8. Lobbying skills need improvement/ more professional/ effective lobbying
9. Didn't lobby effectively on freeway/toll issues etc
10. Division within council/infighting/need to be more cohesive
11. Need to assist/protect/encourage local business/industry
12. Town planning issues/ inappropriate development
13. Need more/improved public transport
14. Other (SPECIFY)

**CODING:**

15. Time taken for action to take place is too long
16. Could generally improve/do better
17. Rates are too high/unjustified increases
18. Councillors seem incompetent/naive/inexperienced
19. Waste money/spending money in the wrong areas

**Overall Performance:**

Q5b Why do you say that on balance the council's overall performance is in need of improvement?

**ON SCREEN:**

1. Favour certain areas in Shire/ local government area over others
2. Council too focused on internal politics/ don't achieve outcomes
3. Make decisions despite community consultation/ don't listen to community
4. Rates are not giving value for money
5. Local roads and footpaths
6. Town planning policy and approvals
7. Decline in standard of service generally provided by council
8. Waste/spend too much money/poor financial management/in debt
9. Communicating/leading discussion with community
10. Appearance of public areas including foreshore
11. Traffic management and parking facilities
12. Recreational facilities
13. Economic development
14. Other (SPECIFY)

**CODING:**

15. More resources/better handling of environmental issues
16. Service not as good as other councils
17. Health and human services
18. Waste management
19. Customer contact
20. Enforcement of Local laws
21. Too slow to act/respond/make decisions
22. Advocacy - representation to other levels of govt
23. Crime/drug related problems/violence
24. Wasted money on plastic cows/moving art/public sculpture

---

**Community Engagement: Q7b Why do you say that?**

**ON SCREEN:**

1. Need to keep community better informed/communicate more
2. Don't consult sufficiently/effectively/with entire community
3. Don't listen/ need to take more notice of community's wishes
4. More community consultation/ use consultants less/more public meetings
5. Need to publicise/promote consultation sessions and inform us of results
6. Only pay lip service to issues/need to follow through
7. Don't take a role in leading discussion/aren't proactive
8. Communicate more regularly via newsletter/ local paper etc
9. Only talk to the same people
10. Need to consult with all areas of the LGD
11. Inconsistent/ pick and choose which issues it leads discussion on
12. Too much council in-fighting/get politics out of it
13. Takes too long to get things done/ not enough action
14. Other (SPECIFY)

**CODING:**

15. Should explain/justify/consult more on rates and fees
16. Rates are too high
17. More knowledgeable people/senior management on council
18. People don't get opportunity to speak at council meetings
19. Too concerned with lobby groups/minority groups
20. Could generally improve
21. Inappropriate developments/poor town planning decisions
22. Need to focus more on environmental issues

## APPENDIX 2

### List of Participating Councils

# Annual Community Satisfaction Survey 2011

## Participating Councils

### 1. Inner Melbourne Metropolitan Councils

Banyule City Council  
Bayside City Council  
Boroondara City Council  
Darebin City Council  
Glen Eira City Council  
Hobsons Bay City Council  
Kingston City Council  
Maroondah City Council  
Melbourne City Council  
Monash City Council  
Moonee Valley City Council  
Moreland City Council  
Port Phillip City Council  
Stonnington City Council  
Whitehorse City Council  
Yarra City Council

### 2. Outer Melbourne Metropolitan Councils

Brimbank City Council  
Cardinia Shire Council  
Casey City Council  
Frankston City Council  
Greater Dandenong City Council  
Knox City Council  
Manningham City Council  
Melton Shire Council  
Mornington Peninsula Shire Council  
Nillumbik Shire Council  
Whittlesea City Council  
Wyndham City Council  
Yarra Ranges Shire Council

### 3. Rural Cities and Regional Centres

Ballarat City Council  
Greater Bendigo City Council  
Greater Geelong City Council  
Greater Shepparton City Council  
Horsham Rural City Council  
Latrobe City Council  
Mildura Rural City Council  
Swan Hill Rural City Council  
Wangaratta Rural City Council  
Warrnambool City Council  
Wodonga City Council

### 4. Large Rural Shires

Bass Coast Shire Council  
Baw Baw Shire Council  
Campaspe Shire Council  
Colac-Otway Shire Council  
Corangamite Shire Council  
East Gippsland Shire Council  
Glenelg Shire Council  
Macedon Ranges Shire Council  
Mitchell Shire Council  
Moirā Shire Council  
Moorabool Shire Council  
Moynē Shire Council  
South Gippsland Shire Council  
Southern Grampians Shire Council  
Surf Coast Shire Council  
Wellington Shire Council

### 5. Small Rural Shires

Alpine Shire Council  
Ararat Rural City Council  
Benalla Rural City Council  
Buloke Shire Council  
Central Goldfields Shire Council  
Gannawarra Shire Council  
Golden Plains Shire Council  
Hepburn Shire Council  
Hindmarsh Shire Council  
Indigo Shire Council  
Loddon Shire Council  
Mansfield Shire Council  
Mount Alexander Shire Council  
Murrindindi Shire Council  
Northern Grampians Shire Council  
Pyrenees Shire Council  
Borough of Queenscliffe  
Strathbogie Shire Council  
Towong Shire Council  
West Wimmera Shire Council  
Yarriambiack Shire Council