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**BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES**

Welcome to the report of results and recommendations for the 2016 State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey.

Each year Local Government Victoria (LGV) coordinates and auspices this State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey throughout Victorian local government areas. This coordinated approach allows for far more cost effective surveying than would be possible if councils commissioned surveys individually.

Participation in the State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey is optional and participating councils have a range of choices as to the content of the questionnaire and the sample size to be surveyed, depending on their individual strategic, financial and other considerations.

The main objectives of the survey are to assess the performance of Victorian councils across a range of measures and to seek insight into ways to provide improved or more effective service delivery. The survey also provides councils with a means to fulfil some of their statutory reporting requirements as well as acting as a feedback mechanism to LGV.

**SURVEY METHODOLOGY AND SAMPLING**

This survey was conducted by Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) as a representative random probability survey of residents aged 18+ years in participating councils.

Survey sample matched to the demographic profile of councils as determined by the most recent ABS population estimates was purchased from an accredited supplier of publicly available phone records, including up to 10% mobile phone numbers to cater to the diversity of residents within councils, particularly younger people.

A total of n=28,108 completed interviews were achieved State-wide. Survey fieldwork was conducted between 1st February – 30th March, 2016.

The 2016 results are compared with previous years, as detailed below:

* 2015, n=28,316 completed interviews, conducted in the period of 1st February – 30th March.
* 2014, n=27,906 completed interviews, conducted in the period of 31st January – 11th March.
* 2013, n=29,501 completed interviews, conducted in the period of 1st February – 24th March.
* 2012, n=29,384 completed interviews, conducted in the period of 18th May – 30th June.

Minimum quotas of gender within age groups were applied during the fieldwork phase. Post-survey weighting was then conducted to ensure accurate representation of the age and gender profile of each council area.

Any variation of +/-1% between individual results and net scores in this report or the detailed survey tabulations is due to rounding. In reporting, ‘—’ denotes not mentioned and ‘0%’ denotes mentioned by less than 1% of respondents. ‘Net’ scores refer to two or more response categories being combined into one category for simplicity of reporting.

Within tables and index score charts throughout this report, statistically significant differences at the 95% confidence level are represented by upward directing blue and downward directing red arrows. Significance when noted indicates a significantly higher or lower result for the analysis group in comparison to the ‘Total’ result for the council for that survey question for that year. Therefore in the example below:

* The result among 50-64 year olds is significantly lower than for the overall result for the council.

Further, results shown in blue and red indicate significantly higher or lower results than in 2015. Therefore in the example below:

* The result among 35-49 year olds in the council is significantly higher than the result achieved among this group in 2015.

**FURTHER INFORMATION**

Further information about the report and explanations about the State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey can be found in Appendix A, including:

* Background and objectives
* Margins of error
* Analysis and reporting
* Glossary of terms

**CONTACTS**

For further queries about the conduct and reporting of the 2016 State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey, please contact JWS Research on (03) 8685 8555.

**KEY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

* Performance on **almost all core and individual service measures** **decreased slightly** over the past year. In most instances, results declined by only one or two index points; with measures only a few points from historical highs.
  + Performance on each of the **core measures** of **Community Consultation** (index score of 54), **Advocacy/Lobbying** (53) and **Overall Council Direction** (51) decreased by two index points in the past year. All other core measures decreased by one index point.
  + There were only three instances (out of 27) where **individual service areas** declined more than one or two points (these are detailed later in this summary).
  + There were three individual service areas that maintained their 2015 rating (Community and Cultural Activities, Business and Community Development and Tourism Development) and one service area (Slashing and Weed Control) that improved on its 2015 result by one point.
* Examining **core measures** specifically, declines occurred across most regional groups (Small Rural, Large Rural, and Regional Centres). That said, performance ratings for Metropolitan councils are those that are the most consistent with 2015 results compared to other regions, only declining slightly on a couple, but not all, core measures.
* Compared to other regions of the State, **Metropolitan followed by Interface councils perform best on core measures**. **Large Rural councils rate the lowest.** (Small Rural and Regional Centres councils fall between the three on ratings scales.)
* Interface councils tend to perform less well on individual service areas beyond the core measures, joining Large Rural councils near the lower end of the ratings scale.
* Generationally, the youngest cohort of residents – **18 to 34 year-olds – universally rate councils higher on core measures than their older counterparts. Residents aged 50 to 64 years tend to rate councils lower** (residents aged 35 to 49 years and 65+ years fall between the other two groups on all core measures).
* The State-wide **Overall Performance** index score of 59 represents a **one point decline** on the 2015 result; performance is two points from the State’s 2014 high score of 61. Almost all demographic and geographic groups rated Overall Performance within one or two points of 2015 ratings. The exception was Regional Centres, where residents rated their councils, on average, three index points lower than last year (58 to 55).
  + It is important to note that perceptions of performance are largely positive to neutral, with only a small percentage of the population rating councils negatively. A plurality (45%) of residents rate their council’s Overall Performance as ‘very good’ or ‘good’ and 36% as ‘average’ compared with only 16% who rate their council’s performance as ‘very poor’ or ‘poor’.
  + On average, **Large Rural councils** (54) **perform lower** on Overall Performance than other council groups, while **Metropolitan councils perform higher** (66; noting other scores were 61 among Interface councils, 57 among Small Rural councils and 55 among Regional Centres).
  + As with other core measures, on average residents aged 18 to 34 rate their respective councils higher for Overall Performance (62) than other age groups. Residents aged 50 to 64 years rate them lower (55; with an index score of 59 among residents aged 65+ years and an index score of 57 among residents aged 35 to 49 years).
* **Overall Council Direction declined two points** in 2016 (to an index score of 51). Although it is the core measure rated lowest across the State, most residents believe their council’s performance stayed the same over the past year (62%). Almost one in five (18%) believe that their council’s direction has improved in 2016 (down 2% from 2015); while 15% say their council’s direction has deteriorated (down 2% from 2015).
* Residents are largely positive in their **future outlook**. Sixty-eight percent (68%) of residents believe that their council is heading in the right direction, compared with the fewer than one in five (18%) who believe that their council’s direction has deteriorated in 2016.
* Regardless, nine in 10 residents believe their council has **room for improvement** (40% ‘a lot of room for improvement’ and 48% ‘a little room improvement’). Only 7% do not believe there is room for their council to improve its performance.
* Across the State, councils seem to be struggling to communicate advocacy efforts to residents. **Lobbying** (53) rates just above Council Direction and elicits **higher levels of ‘don’t know’** responses than other core measures (22%). Significant proportions of residents are therefore not hearing what councils are doing in this area, particularly the oldest cohort of residents (26% ‘don’t know’ response among residents aged 65+ years).
* Of the core measures, **councils perform best State-wide** when it comes to **Customer Service** (index score of 69, a one point decline since 2015). Customer Service in 2016 is three points from its 2014 high score of 72. Three in 10 residents (30%) rate Council’s Customer Service as ‘very good’, with a further 36% rating Customer Service as ‘good’ (17% ‘average’ and 14% ‘very poor’ or ‘poor’), just two percentage points behind the 2015 result.
* On the whole, councils improved in the quality of their **social media usage. Residents who contacted their council through social media** in the past year (3% of the population)rate the quality of their contact **eight points higher** than in 2015 (index score of 74 for Customer Service).
* Telephone (32%) and in-person enquiries (29%) remain the most popular methods for contacting councils. This was followed by contacting council by email (12%) and then in writing (12%). Virtually no-one uses text messaging (1%) to communicate with councils.
* Across the State, councils **perform well on a majority of individual service areas** tested. Of the 27 services evaluated in 2016, at a State-wide level councils received positive ratings (an index score of 60 or higher) on 14 of them. Only one measure scores negatively (a sub 50 score) – Unsealed Roads (43).
  + As mentioned previously, ratings for individual service areas all decreased by one or two points in the past year. Planning and Building Permits (50, down four points), Population Growth (51, down three points) and Law Enforcement (63, down three points) each declined by a slightly higher degree.
  + Community and Cultural Activities (69), Tourism Development (63), Business and Community Development (60) and Slashing and Weed Control (56) all remained constant between years.
* At a State-wide level, councils tend to **perform best** in the individual service areas of **Art Centres and Libraries** (72), **Appearance of Public Areas** (71), **Waste Management** (70), **Emergency and Disaster Management** (69), **Recreational Facilities** (69) and **Community and Cultural Activities** (69).
* Performance is **weakest** on **Unsealed Roads** (43), **Planning and Building Permits** (50), **Population Growth** (51) and **Town Planning Policy** (52). This is in addition to the core measures of **Lobbying** (53), **Community Decisions** (54), **Consultation** (54) and **Sealed Roads**.
* Consistent with 2015, Unsealed Roads (-36), Community Decisions (-26), Population Growth (-25) and Maintenance of Sealed Roads (-24) remain the **service areas with the highest disparity** between rated importance and performance.
* In general, the State and local councils should pay attention to service areas where residents stated **importance exceeds rated performance** by 10 points or more – this applies to 19 of 27 individual service areas measured. Areas where stated importance exceeds performance by 20 points or higher include:
  + **Maintenance of unsealed roads** (margin of 36 points)
  + **Making decisions in the interest of the community** (margin of 26 points)
  + **Planning for population growth** (margin of 25 points)
  + **Maintenance of sealed roads** (margin of 24 points)
  + **Consultation and engagement** (margin of 21 points)
  + **Town planning policy** (margin of 21 points)
  + **Planning permits** (margin of 21 points)
  + **Condition of local streets and footpaths** (margin of 20 points).
* **Councils looking to improve their performance could also look to improving the services deemed most important to residents. At a State-wide level, residents rate the following services as most important to their general satisfaction (individual councils may need to personalise this list depending on local, relevant results):**
  + **Emergency and disaster management (importance index score of 80)**
  + **Waste management (80, down one point from 2015)**
  + **Community decisions (80, consistent with 2015)**
  + **Unsealed roads (79, up one point from 2015)**
  + **Elderly support services (78, consistent with 2015)**
  + **Sealed local roads (78, up two points from 2015)**
  + **Local streets and footpaths (77, consistent with 2015).**
* Across the state, residents are most likely to cite **sealed road maintenance** (13%), **community consultation** (9%), **communication** (9%) and **financial management** (6%) as the **key areas for improvement** for their local council.
* Conversely, residents are most likely to believe **parks and gardens** (10%), **recreational/ sporting facilities** (8%), **city councillors** (7%) and **customer service** (6%) are the **best aspects** of their local council.
* Councils should also be **aware of what** **services individuals use most often** because a personal experience of a service can have an effect on ratings of performance. The most used services are **Waste Management, Parking Facilities, Public Areas, Recreational Facilities** and **Local Streets and Footpaths**.
* Residents of Victoria continue to want their local council to communicate with them **through** **council newsletters**. Print newsletters sent via mail (39%) are more popular than newsletters sent via email (24%). Residents both under and over the age of 50 prefer council newsletters be sent via mail (37% among residents under 50 and 41% among residents over 50) rather than email (27% and 21% respectively).
* In keeping with 2015 results, and as alluded to earlier, **residents aged 18 to 34 and residents of Metropolitan councils are generally the most satisfied resident groups**, rating councils highest on both core and individual service areas. By contrast, **residents of Large Rural and Interface councils tend to be the least satisfied** with services, as are residents aged 50 to 64 years.
* An approach we recommend is to further mine the survey data to better understand the profile of these over and under-performing demographic groups. This can be achieved via additional consultation and data interrogation, or self-mining the SPSS data provided or via the dashboard portal available.
* Please note that the category descriptions for the coded open ended responses are generic summaries only. We recommend further analysis of the detailed cross tabulations and the actual verbatim responses, with a view to the responses of the key gender and age groups, especially any target groups identified.

**Higher results in 2016**

* Slashing & Weed Control

**Maintained results in 2016**

* Community and Cultural Activities
* Tourism Development
* Business and Community Development

**Lower results in 2016**

* All core and most individual service areas

**Most favourably disposed towards Council**

* 18-34 year olds
* Metropolitan residents

**Least favourably disposed towards Council**

* 50-64 year olds
* Large Rural residents

**SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

**2016 Summary of Core Measures Index Score Results**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Performance Measures | Overall 2012 | Overall 2013 | Overall 2014 | Overall 2015 | Overall 2016 | |  | |  |
| **OVERALL PERFORMANCE** | 60 | 60 | 61 | 60 | **59** |  | |  |
| **COMMUNITY CONSULTATION**  (Community consultation and engagement) | 57 | 57 | 57 | 56 | **54** |  | |  |
| **ADVOCACY**  (Lobbying on behalf of the community) | 55 | 55 | 56 | 55 | **53** |  | |  |
| **MAKING COMMUNITY DECISIONS**  (Decisions made in the interest of the community) | n/a | n/a | 57 | 55 | **54** |  | |  |
| **SEALED LOCAL ROADS**  (Condition of sealed local roads) | n/a | n/a | 55 | 55 | **54** |  | |  |
| **CUSTOMER SERVICE** | 71 | 71 | 72 | 70 | **69** |  | |  |
| **OVERALL COUNCIL DIRECTION** | 52 | 53 | 53 | 53 | **51** |  | |  |

**2016 Summary of Core Measures - Detailed Analysis**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Performance Measures | Overall  2016 | vs. Overall  2015 | Highest score | Lowest score |
| **OVERALL PERFORMANCE** | **59** | 1 point lower | Metropolitan | Large Rural |
| **COMMUNITY CONSULTATION**  (Community consultation and engagement) | **54** | 2 points lower | Metropolitan | 50-64 year olds |
| **ADVOCACY**  (Lobbying on behalf of the community) | **53** | 2 point lowers | 18-34 year olds | Large Rural,  50-64 year olds |
| **MAKING COMMUNITY DECISIONS** (Decisions made in the interest of the community) | **54** | 1 point lower | Metropolitan | Large Rural,  50-64 year olds |
| **SEALED LOCAL ROADS** (Condition of sealed local roads) | **54** | 1 point lower | Metropolitan | Large Rural |
| **CUSTOMER SERVICE** | **69** | 1 point lower | Metropolitan | Large Rural, Men |
| **OVERALL COUNCIL DIRECTION** | **51** | 2 points lower | 18-34 year olds | Large Rural,  50-64 year olds |

**2016 Summary of Key Community Satisfaction - Percentage Results**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| Overall Performance | 9 | 36 | 36 | 11 | 5 | 2 |
| Community Consultation | 8 | 29 | 32 | 15 | 7 | 10 |
| Advocacy | 5 | 23 | 31 | 13 | 5 | 22 |
| Making Community Decisions | 7 | 29 | 33 | 14 | 8 | 10 |
| Sealed Local Roads | 11 | 33 | 28 | 16 | 11 | 1 |
| Customer Service | 30 | 36 | 17 | 8 | 6 | 2 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Improved* | *Stayed the same* | *Deteriorated* | *Can't say* |
| Overall Council Direction | 18 | 62 | 15 | 5 |

**2016 Percentage Personal and Household Use and Experience of Council Services – Percentage Results**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Personal use | Total household use |
| Waste management | 83 | 86 |
| Parking facilities | 80 | 83 |
| The appearance of public areas | 78 | 79 |
| Recreational facilities | 65 | 70 |
| The condition of local streets and footpaths | 68 | 69 |
| Art centres and libraries | 57 | 65 |
| Condition of sealed local roads | 58 | 61 |
| Traffic management | 55 | 56 |
| Informing the community | 52 | 56 |
| Maintenance of unsealed roads in your area | 50 | 52 |
| Community & cultural activities | 44 | 48 |
| Environmental sustainability | 23 | 26 |
| Community consultation and engagement | 21 | 24 |
| Business & community development & tourism | 21 | 22 |
| Enforcement of local laws | 20 | 22 |
| Decisions made in the interest of the community | 18 | 20 |
| Council’s general town planning policy | 17 | 19 |
| Planning and building permits | 15 | 17 |
| Business & community development | 14 | 15 |
| Tourism development | 14 | 15 |
| Planning for population growth | 13 | 15 |
| Family support services | 11 | 15 |
| Elderly support services | 9 | 13 |
| Lobbying on behalf of the community | 10 | 12 |
| Emergency & disaster management | 9 | 10 |
| Disadvantaged support services | 4 | 6 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Individual Service Areas Summary Importance Vs Performance**

Service areas where importance exceeds performance by 10 points or more, suggesting further investigation is necessary:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Service** | **Importance** | **Performance** | **Net differential** |
| Parking facilities | 70 | 56 | -14 |
| Traffic management | 72 | 59 | -13 |
| Disadvantaged support services | 73 | 61 | -12 |
| Emergency & disaster management | 80 | 69 | -11 |
| Elderly support services | 78 | 68 | -10 |
| Waste management | 80 | 70 | -10 |
| Environmental sustainability | 73 | 63 | -10 |
| Business & community development | 70 | 60 | -10 |
| Maintenance of unsealed roads | 79 | 43 | -36 |
| Making decisions in the interest of the community | 80 | 54 | -26 |
| Planning for population growth | 76 | 51 | -25 |
| Maintenance of sealed roads | 78 | 54 | -24 |
| Consultation & engagement | 75 | 54 | -21 |
| Town planning policy | 73 | 52 | -21 |
| Planning and building permits | 71 | 50 | -21 |
| Condition of local streets & footpaths | 77 | 57 | -20 |
| Informing the community | 76 | 59 | -17 |
| Slashing & weed control | 73 | 56 | -17 |
| Lobbying on behalf of the community | 69 | 53 | -16 |
| Parking facilities | 70 | 56 | -14 |
| Traffic management | 72 | 59 | -13 |
| Disadvantaged support services | 73 | 61 | -12 |
| Emergency & disaster management | 80 | 69 | -11 |
| Elderly support services | 78 | 68 | -10 |
| Waste management | 80 | 70 | -10 |
| Environmental sustainability | 73 | 63 | -10 |
| Business & community development | 70 | 60 | -10 |

**2016 Importance Summary**

The following service areas have seen a decrease in rated importance in 2016 as compared to 2015:

* Elderly support services, down 1 point from 79 in 2015 to 78 in 2016
* Enforcement of local laws, down 1 point from 71 in 2015 to 70 in 2016
* Tourism development, down 2 points from 65 in 2015 to 63 in 2016

The following service areas have seen an increase in rated importance in 2016 as compared to 2015:

* Waste management, up 1 point from 79 in 2015 to 80 in 2016
* Unsealed roads, up 1 point from 78 in 2015 to 79 in 2016
* Sealed roads, up 2 points from 76 in 2015 to 78 in 2016
* Informing the community, up 1 point from 75 in 2015 to 76 in 2016
* Population growth, up 1 point from 75 in 2015 to 76 in 2016
* Consultation & engagement, up 1 point from 74 in 2015 to 75 in 2016
* Appearance of public areas, up 1 points from 73 in 2015 to 74 in 2016
* Town planning policy, up 1 point from 72 in 2015 to 73 in 2016
* Recreational facilities, up 1 point from 72 in 2015 to 73 in 2016
* Traffic management, up 1 point from 71 in 2015 to 72 in 2016
* Art centres & libraries, up 1 point from 65 in 2015 to 66 in 2016

**2016 Performance Summary**

There are no service areas that have seen an increase in rated performance in 2016 as compared to 2015.

The following service areas have seen a decrease in rated performance in 2016 as compared to 2015:

* Arts centres and libraries, down 1 point from 73 in 2015 to 72 in 2016
* Appearance of public areas, down 1 point from 72 in 2015 to 71 in 2016
* Waste management, down 2 points from 72 in 2015 to 70 in 2016
* Emergency and disaster management, down 1 point from 70 in 2015 to 69 in 2016
* Recreational facilities, down 1 point from 70 in 2015 to 69 in 2016
* Elderly support services, down 1 point from 69 in 2015 to 68 in 2016
* Family support services, down 1 point from 67 in 2015 to 66 in 2016
* Enforcement of local laws, down 3 points from 66 in 2015 to 63 in 2016
* Environmental sustainability, down 1 point from 64 in 2015 to 63 in 2016
* Disadvantaged support services, down 1 point from 62 in 2015 to 61 in 2016
* Business/community development/tourism, down 1 point from 61 in 2015 to 60 in 2016
* Informing the community, down 2 points from 61 in 2015 to 59 in 2016
* Traffic management, down 1 point from 60 in 2015 to 59 in 2016
* Local streets and footpaths, down 1 point from 58 in 2015 to 57 in 2016
* Parking facilities, down 1 point from 57 in 2015 to 56 in 2016
* Consultation and engagement, down 2 points from 56 in 2015 to 54 in 2016
* Sealed roads, down 1 point from 55 in 2015 to 54 in 2016
* Community decisions, down 1 point from 55 in 2015 to 54 in 2016
* Lobbying, down 2 points from 55 in 2015 to 53 in 2016
* Town planning policy, down 2 points from 54 in 2015 to 52 in 2016
* Population growth, down 3 points from 54 in 2015 to 51 in 2016
* Planning and building permits, down 4 points from 54 in 2015 to 50 in 2016
* Unsealed roads, down 2 points from 45 in 2015 to 43 in 2016

**Top Three Most Important Service Areas (Highest to Lowest, i.e. #1 – Most Important)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall | 1. Emergency & disaster mngt 2. Waste management 3. Community decisions |
| Metropolitan | 1. Waste management 2. Community decisions 3. Elderly support services |
| Interface | 1. Emergency & disaster mngt 2. Waste management 3. Local streets and footpaths |
| Regional Centres | 1. Community decisions 2. Emergency & disaster mngt 3. Waste management |
| Large Rural | 1. Emergency & disaster mngt 2. Unsealed roads 3. Elderly support services |
| Small Rural | 1. Emergency & disaster mngt 2. Community decisions 3. Sealed roads |

**Bottom Three Most Important Service Areas (Lowest to Highest, i.e. #1 – Least Important)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall | 1. Community & cultural 2. Tourism development 3. Art centres & libraries |
| Metropolitan | 1. Bus/community dev./tourism 2. Community & cultural 3. Slashing & weed control |
| Interface | 1. Tourism development 2. Community & cultural 3. Bus/community dev./tourism |
| Regional Centres | 1. Community & cultural 2. Art centres & libraries 3. Lobbying |
| Large Rural | 1. Community & cultural 2. Art centres & libraries 3. Tourism development |
| Small Rural | 1. Traffic management 2. Community & cultural 3. Art centres & libraries |

**Top Three Highest Performing Service Areas (Highest to Lowest, i.e. #1 – Highest Performing)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall | 1. Art centres & libraries 2. Appearance of public areas 3. Waste management |
| Metropolitan | 1. Waste management 2. Art centres & libraries 3. Recreational facilities |
| Interface | 1. Waste management 2. Emergency & disaster mngt 3. Art centres & libraries |
| Regional Centres | 1. Art centres & libraries 2. Appearance of public areas 3. Tourism development |
| Large Rural | 1. Art centres & libraries 2. Emergency & disaster mngt 3. Appearance of public areas |
| Small Rural | 1. Appearance of public areas 2. Art centres & libraries 3. Emergency & disaster mngt |

**Bottom Three Lowest Performing Service Areas (Lowest to Highest, i.e. #1 – Lowest Performing)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall | 1. Unsealed roads 2. Planning permits 3. Population growth |
| Metropolitan | 1. Planning permits 2. Population growth 3. Town planning policy |
| Interface | 1. Unsealed roads 2. Planning permits 3. Town planning policy |
| Regional Centres | 1. Community decisions 2. Lobbying 3. Consultation & engagement |
| Large Rural | 1. Unsealed roads 2. Sealed roads 3. Population growth |
| Small Rural | 1. Unsealed roads 2. Town planning policy 3. Planning permits |

**Importance and Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Service** | **Importance** | **Performance** |
| Consultation & engagement | 75 | 54 |
| Lobbying on behalf of the community | 69 | 53 |
| Making community decisions | 80 | 54 |
| Condition of sealed local roads | 78 | 54 |
| Informing the community | 76 | 59 |
| Condition of local streets & footpaths | 77 | 57 |
| Traffic management | 72 | 59 |
| Parking facilities | 70 | 56 |
| Enforcement of local laws | 70 | 63 |
| Family support services | 73 | 66 |
| Elderly support services | 78 | 68 |
| Disadvantaged support services | 73 | 61 |
| Recreational facilities | 73 | 69 |
| Appearance of public areas | 74 | 71 |
| Art centres & libraries | 66 | 72 |
| Community & cultural activities | 62 | 69 |
| Waste management | 80 | 70 |
| Business & community development & tourism | 67 | 60 |
| Town planning policy | 73 | 52 |
| Planning permits | 71 | 50 |
| Environmental sustainability | 73 | 63 |
| Emergency & disaster management | 80 | 69 |
| Planning for pop. growth | 76 | 51 |
| Slashing & weed control | 73 | 56 |
| Maintenance of unsealed roads | 79 | 43 |
| Business & community dev. | 70 | 60 |
| Tourism development | 63 | 63 |

**Positives and Areas for Improvement Summary**

Best things:

* Parks and gardens
* Recreational and sporting facilities
* Councillors
* Customer service

Areas for improvement:

* Sealed road maintenance
* Community consultation
* Communication
* Financial management

**Communications Summary**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Overall preferred forms of communication** | * Newsletter sent via mail (39) |
| **Preferred forms of communication among over 50s** | * Newsletter sent via mail (41) |
| **Preferred forms of communication among under 50s** | * Newsletter sent via mail (37) |

**DETAILED FINDINGS**

**KEY CORE MEASURE: OVERALL PERFORMANCE**

**Overall Performance Index Scores**

The overall score for overall performance is 59. This has decreased by a statistically significant 1 point since 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2016 average of 59:

* Metropolitan, score of 66
* 18-34, score of 62
* Interface, score of 61
* Women, score of 60

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2016 average of 59:

* Men, score of 58
* Small Rural, score of 57
* 35-49, score of 57
* Regional Centres, score of 55
* 50-64, score of 55
* Large Rural, score of 54

Performance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* 18-34, down 2 points from 64 in 2015 to 62 in 2016
* Women, down 1 point from 61 in 2015 to 60 in 2016
* 65+, down 2 points from 61 in 2015 to 59 in 2016
* Men, down 1 point from 59 in 2015 to 58 in 2016
* 35-49, down 2 points from 59 in 2015 to 57 in 2016
* 50-64, down 2 points from 57 in 2015 to 55 in 2016

**Overall Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very Good | Good | Average | Poor | Very Poor | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 9 | 36 | 36 | 11 | 5 | 2 |
| 2015 Overall | 10 | 39 | 35 | 10 | 4 | 1 |
| 2014 Overall | 11 | 40 | 35 | 9 | 4 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 10 | 40 | 35 | 10 | 4 | 1 |
| 2012 Overall | 9 | 40 | 36 | 9 | 4 | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 14 | 47 | 29 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| Interface | 10 | 39 | 36 | 9 | 4 | 2 |
| Regional Centres | 8 | 32 | 39 | 13 | 7 | 1 |
| Large Rural | 7 | 30 | 41 | 15 | 7 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 9 | 35 | 38 | 11 | 6 | 2 |
| Men | 9 | 36 | 36 | 12 | 6 | 1 |
| Women | 10 | 37 | 37 | 10 | 4 | 2 |
| 18-34 | 10 | 44 | 32 | 8 | 4 | 2 |
| 35-49 | 8 | 35 | 38 | 12 | 6 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 7 | 32 | 40 | 14 | 6 | 2 |
| 65+ | 11 | 34 | 37 | 10 | 5 | 2 |

**KEY CORE MEASURE: CUSTOMER SERVICE**

**Contact Last 12 Months Summary**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Overall contact with Council** | * 59%, down 2 points on 2015 |
| **Most contact with Council** | * Aged 35-49 years * Interface residents * Small Rural residents |
| **Least Contact with Council** | * Regional centres * Aged 18-34 years |
| **Customer Service rating** | * Index score of 69, down 1 point on 2015 |
| **Most satisfied with Customer Service** | * Metropolitan residents * Women * Aged 65+ years |
| **Least satisfied with Customer Service** | * Men * Large Rural residents |

**2016 Contact with Council Last 12 Months**

59% of Victorians have had contact with their council; this is 2 points down on 2015.

41% of Victorians have not had contact with their council.

**2016 Contact with Council Last 12 Months Including Method of Contact**

32% of Victorians who had contact with Council in the last 12 months made contact via telephone; this is a significant decrease of 3% since 2015.

29% made contact in person, 12% by email, 12% in writing, 8% via Council websites, 3% by social media and 1% by text message.

**2016 Contact with Council Last 12 Months Including Method of Contact**

38% of Victorians who had contact with Council in the last 12 months report their most recent method of contact to be via telephone.

34% had their most recent contact in person, 11% by email, 9% in writing, 5% via Council websites, 3% by social media and 0% by text message.

**2016 Contact Customer Service Index Scores**

The overall score for customer service is 69. This has decreased by a statistically significant 1 point since 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2016 average of 69:

* Metropolitan, score of 73
* Women, score of 72
* 65+, score of 71

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2016 average of 69:

* Large Rural, score of 67
* Men, score of 67

Performance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* Men, down 1 point from 68 in 2015 to 67 in 2016

**2016 Contact Customer Service Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 30 | 36 | 17 | 8 | 6 | 2 |
| 2015 Overall | 31 | 37 | 17 | 8 | 6 | 2 |
| 2014 Overall | 32 | 38 | 16 | 7 | 5 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 31 | 38 | 17 | 7 | 5 | 2 |
| 2012 Overall | 31 | 37 | 17 | 8 | 5 | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 34 | 38 | 16 | 6 | 5 | 2 |
| Interface | 31 | 38 | 16 | 7 | 7 | 2 |
| Regional Centres | 31 | 36 | 17 | 8 | 6 | 2 |
| Large Rural | 27 | 36 | 19 | 9 | 7 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 30 | 35 | 18 | 9 | 6 | 2 |
| Men | 26 | 38 | 18 | 9 | 8 | 2 |
| Women | 34 | 35 | 17 | 7 | 5 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 26 | 39 | 18 | 8 | 6 | 3 |
| 35-49 | 30 | 37 | 17 | 8 | 7 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 30 | 36 | 18 | 9 | 6 | 1 |
| 65+ | 35 | 34 | 16 | 8 | 6 | 1 |

**2016 Contact Customer Service By Method of Last Contact Index Scores**

Performance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* By telephone, down 2 points from 73 in 2015 to 71 in 2016
* In person down 3 points from 77 in 2015 to 74 in 2016
* In writing, down 4 points from 66 in 2015 to 62 in 2016

Performance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* Via social media, up 8 points from 66 in 2015 to 74 in 2016

**2016 Contact Customer Service By Method of Last Contact Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| By telephone | 33 | 36 | 14 | 8 | 6 | 2 |
| In person | 39 | 34 | 14 | 6 | 6 | 1 |
| By email | 28 | 36 | 20 | 7 | 6 | 2 |
| In writing | 15 | 38 | 29 | 7 | 6 | 5 |
| Via website | 27 | 46 | 16 | 4 | - | 8 |
| By social media | 33 | 41 | 17 | 5 | 3 | 1 |
| By text message\* | 36 | 50 | 11 | - | 3 | - |

**KEY CORE MEASURE: COUNCIL DIRECTION INDICATORS**

**Council Direction Summary**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Council Direction** | * 62% stayed about the same, down 1 point on 2015 * 18% improved, down 2 points on 2015 * 15% deteriorated, up 2 points on 2015 |
| **Most satisfied with Council Direction** | * Aged 18-34 years * Metropolitan residents |
| **Least satisfied with Council Direction** | * Aged 50-64 years * Large Rural residents |
| **Room for improvement** | * 40% ‘a lot’ of room for improvement * 48% ‘a little’ room for improvement * 7% not much / no room for improvement |
| **Direction Councils are headed** | * 68% right direction (20% definitely and 48% probably) * 18% wrong direction (9% definitely and 9% probably) |
| **Rates vs Services Trade-Off** | * 31% prefer rate rise, down 2 points on 2015 * 50% prefer service cuts, up 2 points on 2015 |

**2016 Overall Direction Last 12 Months Index Scores**

The overall score for overall council direction is 51. This has decreased by a statistically significant 2 points since 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2015 average of 51:

* 18-34, score of 56
* Metropolitan, score of 55
* Interface, score of 54
* Women, score of 52

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2015 average of 51:

* Small Rural, score of 50
* 35-49, score of 49
* Large Rural, score of 48
* 50-64, score of 48

**2016 Overall Council Direction Last 12 Months Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Improved | Stayed the same | Deteriorated | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 18 | 62 | 15 | 5 |
| 2015 Overall | 20 | 63 | 13 | 5 |
| 2014 Overall | 20 | 63 | 13 | 5 |
| 2013 Overall | 19 | 63 | 13 | 5 |
| 2012 Overall | 18 | 64 | 15 | 4 |
| Metropolitan | 20 | 65 | 10 | 6 |
| Interface | 19 | 64 | 11 | 6 |
| Regional Centres | 21 | 55 | 20 | 4 |
| Large Rural | 15 | 61 | 19 | 5 |
| Small Rural | 17 | 62 | 16 | 6 |
| Men | 17 | 61 | 16 | 5 |
| Women | 18 | 62 | 14 | 6 |
| 18-34 | 21 | 63 | 10 | 5 |
| 35-49 | 15 | 64 | 16 | 5 |
| 50-64 | 15 | 60 | 19 | 5 |
| 65+ | 18 | 59 | 16 | 6 |

**2016 Room for Improvement Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | A lot | A little | Not much | Not at all | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 40 | 48 | 7 | 2 | 3 |
| 2015 Overall | 47 | 44 | 7 | 1 | 2 |
| 2014 Overall | 41 | 50 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| 2013 Overall | 46 | 46 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| 2012 Overall | 47 | 45 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| Metropolitan | 35 | 51 | 9 | 3 | 3 |
| Regional Centres | 56 | 36 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| Large Rural | 39 | 52 | 7 | 1 | 1 |
| Men | 40 | 47 | 8 | 2 | 3 |
| Women | 39 | 49 | 7 | 1 | 3 |
| 18-34 | 32 | 55 | 8 | 2 | 3 |
| 35-49 | 42 | 49 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| 50-64 | 45 | 45 | 7 | 1 | 2 |
| 65+ | 42 | 42 | 10 | 2 | 4 |

**2016 Right/Wrong Direction Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Definitely right direction | Probably right direction | Probably wrong direction | Definitely wrong direction | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 20 | 48 | 9 | 9 | 14 |
| 2015 Overall | 20 | 49 | 10 | 10 | 11 |
| 2014 Overall | 21 | 52 | 9 | 8 | 10 |
| 2013 Overall | 19 | 50 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| 2012 Overall | 18 | 49 | 11 | 12 | 10 |
| Metropolitan | 20 | 50 | 9 | 8 | 13 |
| Interface | 11 | 44 | 10 | 13 | 22 |
| Regional Centres | 24 | 48 | 9 | 9 | 10 |
| Large Rural | 27 | 52 | 6 | 5 | 10 |
| Small Rural | 21 | 44 | 10 | 10 | 14 |
| Men | 22 | 45 | 9 | 10 | 14 |
| Women | 19 | 51 | 8 | 8 | 13 |
| 18-34 | 20 | 55 | 7 | 6 | 13 |
| 35-49 | 19 | 47 | 10 | 10 | 14 |
| 50-64 | 19 | 44 | 11 | 13 | 13 |
| 65+ | 24 | 45 | 8 | 8 | 15 |

**2016 Rates/Service Trade Off Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Definitely prefer rate rise | Probably prefer rate rise | Probably prefer service cuts | Definitely prefer service cuts | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 10 | 21 | 22 | 28 | 19 |
| 2015 Overall | 10 | 23 | 22 | 26 | 18 |
| 2014 Overall | 11 | 25 | 24 | 23 | 17 |
| 2013 Overall | 11 | 25 | 22 | 24 | 18 |
| 2012 Overall | 11 | 29 | 22 | 22 | 16 |
| Metropolitan | 12 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 18 |
| Interface | 8 | 21 | 18 | 32 | 21 |
| Regional Centres | 9 | 21 | 19 | 31 | 20 |
| Large Rural | 8 | 18 | 22 | 33 | 20 |
| Small Rural | 10 | 21 | 22 | 26 | 21 |
| Men | 12 | 19 | 21 | 29 | 19 |
| Women | 9 | 22 | 22 | 27 | 20 |
| 18-34 | 12 | 24 | 24 | 23 | 17 |
| 35-49 | 9 | 22 | 22 | 28 | 19 |
| 50-64 | 9 | 20 | 20 | 30 | 20 |
| 65+ | 10 | 17 | 21 | 31 | 21 |

**POSITIVES AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

**2016 Best Things about Council Detailed Percentages (Top Issues or Services)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Parks and Gardens | 10 |
| Recreational/Sporting Facilities | 8 |
| Councillors | 7 |
| Customer Service | 6 |
| Public Areas | 5 |
| Road/Street Maintenance | 5 |
| Waste Management | 5 |
| Community Facilities | 4 |
| Community Support Services | 4 |
| Generally Good - Overall/No Complaints | 4 |
| Community/Public Events/Activities | 4 |

**2016 Council Needs to Improve Detailed Percentages (Top Issues or Services)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Sealed Road Maintenance | 13 |
| Community Consultation | 9 |
| Communication | 9 |
| Financial Management | 6 |
| Development - Inappropriate | 5 |
| Rates - Too Expensive | 5 |
| Waste Management | 5 |
| Parking Availability | 4 |
| Traffic Management | 4 |
| Footpaths/Walking Tracks | 4 |
| Nothing | 9 |

**COMMUNICATIONS**

**2016 Best Forms of Communication Percentages**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| A council newsletter sent via mail | 39 |
| A council newsletter sent via email | 24 |
| Advertising in a local newspaper | 14 |
| A council newsletter as an insert in a local newspaper | 13 |
| A text message | 4 |
| The council website | 2 |
| Other | 3 |
| Can't say | 1 |

**2016 Best Forms of Communication – Under 50s Percentages**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| A council newsletter sent via mail | 37 |
| A council newsletter sent via email | 27 |
| Advertising in a local newspaper | 12 |
| A council newsletter as an insert in a local newspaper | 10 |
| A text message | 5 |
| The council website | 3 |
| Other | 4 |
| Can't say | 1 |

**2016 Best Forms of Communication – Over 50s Percentages**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| A council newsletter sent via mail | 41 |
| A council newsletter sent via email | 21 |
| Advertising in a local newspaper | 16 |
| A council newsletter as an insert in a local newspaper | 15 |
| A text message | 2 |
| The council website | 2 |
| Other | 3 |
| Can't say | 1 |

**INDIVIDUAL SERVICE AREAS**

**2016 Community Consultation and Engagement Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for community consultation and engagement is 75. This has increased by a statistically significant 1 point since 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2016 average of 75:

* 50-64, score of 78
* Small Rural, score of 77
* Women, score of 77
* Large Rural, score of 76
* 35-49, score of 76
* 65+, score of 76

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2016 average of 75:

* Metropolitan, score of 73
* Men, score of 73
* 18-34, score of 72

Importance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* Women, up 1 point from 76 in 2015 to 77 in 2016
* Men, up 1 point from 72 in 2015 to 73 in 2016
* 18-34, up 4 points from 68 in 2015 to 72 in 2016

**2016 Community Consultation and Engagement Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 32 | 41 | 22 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| 2015 Overall | 29 | 42 | 24 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 2014 Overall | 28 | 41 | 25 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 27 | 43 | 25 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 2012 Overall | 27 | 43 | 25 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 27 | 43 | 25 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Interface | 31 | 40 | 24 | 3 | \* | 2 |
| Regional Centres | 31 | 42 | 22 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Large Rural | 34 | 40 | 20 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| Small Rural | 34 | 42 | 18 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Men | 28 | 42 | 24 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Women | 35 | 41 | 20 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 26 | 38 | 30 | 4 | \* | 1 |
| 35-49 | 34 | 40 | 22 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 38 | 41 | 16 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 65+ | 30 | 45 | 18 | 3 | 1 | 3 |

**2016 Community Consultation and Engagement Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for community consultation and engagement is 54. This has statistically significantly decreased by 2 points since 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2016 average of 54:

* Metropolitan, score of 58
* 18-34, score of 57
* Women, score of 56
* Small Rural, score of 55
* 65+, score of 55

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2016 average of 54:

* Men, score of 53
* Regional Centres, score of 52
* Large Rural, score of 52
* 50-64, score of 51

Performance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* 18-34, down 2 points from 59 in 2015 to 57 in 2016
* Women, down 1 point from 57 in 2015 to 56 in 2016
* 65+, down 1 point from 56 in 2015 to 55 in 2016
* Men, down 1 point from 54 in 2015 to 53 in 2016
* 50-64, down two points from 53 in 2015 to 51 in 2016

**2016 Community Consultation and Engagement Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 8 | 29 | 32 | 15 | 7 | 10 |
| 2015 Overall | 7 | 31 | 32 | 14 | 6 | 9 |
| 2014 Overall | 8 | 32 | 32 | 13 | 5 | 9 |
| 2013 Overall | 8 | 32 | 34 | 13 | 5 | 9 |
| 2012 Overall | 8 | 33 | 33 | 13 | 5 | 8 |
| Metropolitan | 9 | 31 | 31 | 12 | 4 | 12 |
| Interface | 7 | 29 | 32 | 14 | 5 | 13 |
| Regional Centres | 7 | 28 | 32 | 16 | 8 | 9 |
| Large Rural | 7 | 26 | 34 | 17 | 9 | 8 |
| Small Rural | 8 | 30 | 30 | 15 | 7 | 9 |
| Men | 7 | 28 | 32 | 16 | 8 | 9 |
| Women | 8 | 29 | 32 | 14 | 6 | 11 |
| 18-34 | 7 | 33 | 33 | 12 | 4 | 10 |
| 35-49 | 8 | 29 | 32 | 16 | 7 | 9 |
| 50-64 | 7 | 26 | 33 | 17 | 9 | 8 |
| 65+ | 9 | 27 | 29 | 15 | 7 | 12 |

**2016 Lobbying on Behalf of the Community Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for lobbying on behalf of the community is 69. This is equal to 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2016 average of 69:

* Women, score of 73
* Small Rural, score of 71
* 35-49, score of 71
* 50-64, score of 71

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2016 average of 69:

* Men, score of 66

Importance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2014:

* Women, up 1 point from 72 in 2015 to 73 in 2016

**2016 Lobbying on Behalf of the Community Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 24 | 38 | 27 | 6 | 2 | 3 |
| 2015 Overall | 23 | 39 | 28 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| 2014 Overall | 23 | 40 | 27 | 6 | 1 | 2 |
| 2013 Overall | 23 | 40 | 27 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| 2012 Overall | 23 | 41 | 27 | 6 | 1 | 2 |
| Metropolitan | 22 | 38 | 29 | 7 | 2 | 2 |
| Interface | 25 | 38 | 26 | 6 | 2 | 3 |
| Regional Centres | 23 | 38 | 28 | 8 | 1 | 2 |
| Large Rural | 25 | 37 | 26 | 7 | 2 | 3 |
| Small Rural | 27 | 38 | 24 | 4 | 3 | 4 |
| Men | 20 | 37 | 29 | 8 | 3 | 3 |
| Women | 28 | 38 | 25 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| 18-34 | 22 | 38 | 31 | 6 | 1 | 2 |
| 35-49 | 28 | 36 | 26 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| 50-64 | 28 | 36 | 24 | 7 | 3 | 2 |
| 65+ | 20 | 40 | 24 | 7 | 3 | 5 |

**2016 Lobbying on Behalf of the Community Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for lobbying on behalf of the community is 53. This is a significant decrease of 2 points from 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2016 average of 53:

* 18-34, score of 57
* Metropolitan, score of 56
* Interface, score of 55
* Small Rural, score of 54
* Women, score of 54
* 65+, score of 54

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2015 average of 55:

* Regional Centres, score of 52
* 35-49, score of 51
* Large Rural, score of 50
* 50-64, score of 50

Performance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* 18-34, down 1 point from 58 in 2015 to 57 in 2016
* Women, down 2 points from 56 in 2015 to 54 in 2016
* 65+, down 3 points from 57 in 2015 to 54 in 2016
* Men, down 2 points from 55 in 2015 to 53 in 2016
* 35-49, down 2 points from 53 in 2015 to 51 in 2016
* 50-64, down 3 points from 53 in 2015 to 50 in 2016

**2016 Lobbying on Behalf of the Community Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 5 | 23 | 31 | 13 | 5 | 22 |
| 2015 Overall | 6 | 26 | 32 | 12 | 4 | 20 |
| 2014 Overall | 6 | 27 | 32 | 11 | 4 | 19 |
| 2013 Overall | 6 | 26 | 33 | 12 | 4 | 18 |
| 2012 Overall | 6 | 27 | 33 | 12 | 4 | 17 |
| Metropolitan | 5 | 24 | 29 | 10 | 3 | 28 |
| Interface | 6 | 23 | 32 | 10 | 4 | 25 |
| Regional Centres | 5 | 24 | 35 | 15 | 6 | 15 |
| Large Rural | 5 | 21 | 33 | 15 | 7 | 20 |
| Small Rural | 6 | 26 | 29 | 12 | 6 | 20 |
| Men | 5 | 24 | 31 | 13 | 6 | 21 |
| Women | 5 | 23 | 32 | 12 | 5 | 23 |
| 18-34 | 6 | 27 | 34 | 9 | 4 | 20 |
| 35-49 | 4 | 23 | 32 | 14 | 6 | 20 |
| 50-64 | 4 | 21 | 32 | 15 | 7 | 21 |
| 65+ | 6 | 22 | 28 | 12 | 5 | 26 |

**2016 Decisions Made in the Interest of the Community Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for decisions made in the interest of the community is 80. This is equal to 2015.

The following group awards a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2016 average of 80:

* Women, score of 82

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2016 average of 80:

* Metropolitan, score of 79
* Men, score of 77

Importance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* Women, up 1 point from 81 in 2015 to 82 in 2016

**2016 Decisions Made in the Interest of the Community Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 39 | 42 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 2015 Overall | 38 | 42 | 15 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 2014 Overall | 37 | 43 | 16 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Metropolitan | 37 | 44 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Interface | 38 | 42 | 15 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Regional Centres | 45 | 40 | 12 | 3 | \* | \* |
| Large Rural | 42 | 38 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Men | 35 | 43 | 16 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| Women | 43 | 41 | 13 | 1 | \* | 2 |
| 18-34 | 40 | 41 | 15 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 40 | 41 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 50-64 | 41 | 40 | 13 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 65+ | 36 | 45 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 3 |

**2016 Decisions Made in the Interest of the Community Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for decisions made in the interest of the community is 54. This is a significant decrease of 1 point from 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2016 average of 54:

* Metropolitan, score of 59
* 18-34, score of 58
* Interface, score of 56
* Women, score of 55

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2016 average of 54:

* Small Rural, score of 53
* Men, score of 53
* 35-49, score of 52
* Regional centres, score of 51
* Large Rural, score of 50
* 50-64, score of 50

Performance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* 18-34, down 1 point from 59 in 2015 to 58 in 2016
* Women, down 1 point from 56 in 2015 to 55 in 2016
* 65+, down 1 point from 55 in 2015 to 54 in 2016
* Men, down 1 point from 54 in 2015 to 53 in 2016
* 35-49, down 1 point from 53 in 2015 to 52 in 2016
* 50-64, down 2 points from 52 in 2015 to 50 in 2016

**2016 Decisions Made in the Interest of the Community Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 7 | 29 | 33 | 14 | 8 | 10 |
| 2015 Overall | 7 | 31 | 33 | 14 | 6 | 9 |
| 2014 Overall | 7 | 33 | 34 | 12 | 5 | 10 |
| Metropolitan | 8 | 34 | 30 | 10 | 4 | 14 |
| Interface | 7 | 31 | 33 | 12 | 6 | 12 |
| Regional Centres | 6 | 27 | 33 | 18 | 10 | 7 |
| Large Rural | 5 | 24 | 35 | 17 | 10 | 8 |
| Small Rural | 7 | 29 | 32 | 14 | 8 | 9 |
| Men | 7 | 28 | 32 | 15 | 9 | 10 |
| Women | 7 | 29 | 33 | 14 | 7 | 11 |
| 18-34 | 8 | 34 | 31 | 11 | 6 | 10 |
| 35-49 | 5 | 28 | 32 | 15 | 9 | 10 |
| 50-64 | 5 | 25 | 35 | 17 | 9 | 9 |
| 65+ | 8 | 27 | 33 | 14 | 7 | 11 |

**2016 Condition of Sealed Local Roads Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for the condition of sealed local roads is 78. This is a significant increase of 2 points from 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2016 average of 78:

* Large Rural, score of 80
* Women, score of 79

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2016 average of 78:

* Metropolitan, score of 76
* Men, score of 76
* 18-34, score of 76

**2016 Condition of Sealed Local Roads Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 34 | 46 | 16 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 2015 Overall | 32 | 44 | 20 | 2 | \* | 1 |
| 2014 Overall | 33 | 45 | 18 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 29 | 49 | 18 | 3 | \* | 1 |
| Interface | 38 | 43 | 15 | 2 | 1 | \* |
| Regional Centres | 30 | 46 | 20 | 3 | - | 1 |
| Large Rural | 41 | 41 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Men | 30 | 47 | 18 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Women | 38 | 44 | 15 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 31 | 46 | 19 | 4 | \* | 1 |
| 35-49 | 36 | 44 | 16 | 3 | 1 | \* |
| 50-64 | 37 | 43 | 16 | 2 | 1 | \* |
| 65+ | 34 | 49 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 1 |

**2016 Condition of Sealed Local Roads Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for the condition of sealed local roads is 54. This is a significant decrease of 1 point from 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2016 average of 54:

* Metropolitan, score of 67
* Interface, score of 60
* 18-34, score of 58
* 65+, score of 56

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2016 average of 54:

* Small Rural, score of 52
* 35-49, score of 52
* 50-64, score of 51
* Large Rural, score of 44

Performance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* 18-34, up 1 point from 57 in 2015 to 58 in 2016

Performance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* 65+, down 1 point from 57 in 2015 to 56 in 2016
* Men, down 1 point from 55 in 2015 to 54 in 2016
* Women, down 1 point from 55 in 2015 to 54 in 2016
* 35-49, down 1 point from 53 in 2015 to 52 in 2016

**2016 Condition of Sealed Local Roads Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 11 | 33 | 28 | 16 | 11 | 1 |
| 2015 Overall | 11 | 33 | 29 | 16 | 10 | 1 |
| 2014 Overall | 12 | 33 | 27 | 17 | 10 | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 19 | 45 | 24 | 7 | 3 | 1 |
| Interface | 13 | 39 | 28 | 13 | 7 | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 10 | 33 | 29 | 17 | 10 | 1 |
| Large Rural | 6 | 23 | 29 | 23 | 19 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 8 | 31 | 30 | 17 | 12 | 1 |
| Men | 11 | 34 | 27 | 16 | 11 | 1 |
| Women | 11 | 32 | 29 | 16 | 11 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 14 | 36 | 25 | 14 | 10 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 10 | 31 | 27 | 17 | 13 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 8 | 30 | 30 | 18 | 13 | 1 |
| 65+ | 11 | 34 | 29 | 14 | 9 | 2 |

**2016 Informing the Community Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for informing the community is 76. This is a significant increase of 1 point from 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2016 average of 75:

* Women, score of 79
* Small Rural, score of 78
* Large Rural, score of 77

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2016 average of 75:

* 18-34, score of 75
* 35-49, score of 75
* Metropolitan, score of 74
* Men, score of 72

Importance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* Women, up 1 point from 78 in 2015 to 79 in 2016
* 18-34, up 2 points from 73 in 2015 to 75 in 2016

**2016 Informing the Community Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 33 | 42 | 20 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 2015 Overall | 30 | 44 | 22 | 3 | 1 | \* |
| 2014 Overall | 30 | 43 | 22 | 3 | 1 | \* |
| 2013 Overall | 30 | 44 | 22 | 3 | 1 | \* |
| 2012 Overall | 31 | 44 | 21 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 29 | 43 | 22 | 4 | 1 | \* |
| Interface | 35 | 40 | 20 | 3 | \* | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 36 | 39 | 20 | 4 | 1 | \* |
| Large Rural | 34 | 42 | 19 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 35 | 43 | 17 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Men | 27 | 42 | 24 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Women | 39 | 42 | 16 | 2 | 1 | \* |
| 18-34 | 32 | 41 | 22 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 33 | 41 | 21 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 37 | 40 | 19 | 3 | 1 | \* |
| 65+ | 32 | 46 | 18 | 3 | 1 | 1 |

**2016 Informing the Community Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for informing the community is 59. This is a significant decrease of 2 points from 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2016 average of 59:

* Metropolitan, score of 63
* 18-34, score of 61
* Women, score of 60

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2016 average of 59:

* Men, score of 58
* Large Rural, score of 56
* 50-64, score of 56
* Interface, score of 55

Performance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* Women, down 2 points from 62 in 2015 to 60 in 2016
* 35-49, down 2 points from 61 in 2015 to 59 in 2016
* 65+, down 2 points from 61 in 2015 to 59 in 2016
* Men, down 2 points from 60 in 2015 to 58 in 2016
* 50-64, down 2 points from 58 in 2015 to 56 in 2016

**2016 Informing the Community Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 12 | 35 | 31 | 13 | 5 | 4 |
| 2015 Overall | 12 | 38 | 31 | 12 | 4 | 2 |
| 2014 Overall | 13 | 40 | 30 | 11 | 4 | 3 |
| 2013 Overall | 12 | 38 | 32 | 11 | 3 | 3 |
| 2012 Overall | 12 | 38 | 31 | 13 | 4 | 2 |
| Metropolitan | 13 | 40 | 30 | 11 | 3 | 4 |
| Interface | 9 | 30 | 35 | 16 | 6 | 4 |
| Regional Centres | 13 | 32 | 33 | 13 | 5 | 3 |
| Large Rural | 11 | 32 | 31 | 16 | 7 | 4 |
| Small Rural | 11 | 35 | 29 | 13 | 7 | 4 |
| Men | 11 | 35 | 30 | 14 | 6 | 4 |
| Women | 13 | 36 | 31 | 12 | 5 | 4 |
| 18-34 | 12 | 38 | 30 | 12 | 3 | 5 |
| 35-49 | 11 | 36 | 30 | 14 | 5 | 4 |
| 50-64 | 10 | 32 | 33 | 15 | 7 | 3 |
| 65+ | 13 | 34 | 30 | 13 | 6 | 4 |

**2016 Local Streets and Footpaths Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for the condition of local streets and footpaths is 77. This is equal to 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2016 average of 77:

* Women, score of 80
* Interface, score of 79
* Metropolitan, score of 78
* 35-49, score of 78
* 50-64, score of 78

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2016 average of 77:

* 18-34, score of 76
* Small Rural, score of 75
* Men, score of 74

Importance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* Women, up 1 point from 79 in 2015 to 80 in 2016

Importance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* 65+, down 1 point from 78 in 2015 to 77 in 2016
* Men, down 1 point from 75 in 2015 to 74 in 2016

**2016 Local Streets and Footpaths Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 34 | 43 | 18 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 2015 Overall | 34 | 43 | 19 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 2014 Overall | 33 | 44 | 18 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 35 | 44 | 18 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 2012 Overall | 32 | 46 | 18 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 34 | 46 | 18 | 2 | 1 | \* |
| Interface | 39 | 43 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 33 | 44 | 19 | 3 | \* | 1 |
| Large Rural | 35 | 41 | 18 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Small Rural | 32 | 41 | 19 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| Men | 30 | 43 | 21 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| Women | 39 | 42 | 15 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 18-34 | 32 | 41 | 22 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 37 | 42 | 17 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 37 | 42 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 65+ | 33 | 45 | 16 | 3 | 1 | 2 |

**2016 Local Streets and Footpaths Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for the condition of local streets and footpaths is 57. This is significant decrease of 1 point from 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2016 average of 57:

* Metropolitan, score of 63
* 18-34, score of 60
* Men, score of 58

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2016 average of 57:

* Women, score of 56
* 50-64, score of 55
* Large Rural, score of 53

Performance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* 18-34, down 2 points from 62 in 2015 to 60 in 2016
* Men, down 1 point from 59 in 2015 to 58 in 2016
* Women, down 1 point from 57 in 2015 to 56 in 2016

**2016 Local Streets and Footpaths Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 12 | 34 | 28 | 14 | 8 | 3 |
| 2015 Overall | 13 | 34 | 28 | 15 | 7 | 3 |
| 2014 Overall | 13 | 34 | 28 | 15 | 7 | 2 |
| 2013 Overall | 14 | 33 | 28 | 15 | 8 | 1 |
| 2012 Overall | 13 | 34 | 28 | 15 | 9 | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 16 | 42 | 25 | 11 | 5 | 1 |
| Interface | 10 | 37 | 27 | 15 | 8 | 3 |
| Regional Centres | 15 | 33 | 26 | 16 | 8 | 1 |
| Large Rural | 11 | 29 | 30 | 16 | 11 | 4 |
| Small Rural | 12 | 34 | 28 | 14 | 7 | 5 |
| Men | 13 | 35 | 26 | 14 | 8 | 3 |
| Women | 12 | 32 | 29 | 15 | 8 | 3 |
| 18-34 | 16 | 36 | 26 | 14 | 7 | 2 |
| 35-49 | 12 | 34 | 28 | 15 | 9 | 3 |
| 50-64 | 9 | 34 | 29 | 15 | 9 | 4 |
| 65+ | 13 | 32 | 29 | 14 | 8 | 4 |

**2016 Traffic Management Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for traffic management is 72. This is up a significant increase of 1 point since 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2016 average of 72:

* Metropolitan, score of 75
* Women, score of 75

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2016 average of 72:

* Large Rural, score of 70
* 18-34, score of 70
* Men, score of 69
* Small Rural, score of 63

Importance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* Women, up 2 points from 73 in 2015 to 75 in 2016
* 18-34, up 2 points from 68 in 2015 to 70 in 2016

**2016 Traffic Management Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 27 | 41 | 24 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 2015 Overall | 25 | 41 | 26 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 2014 Overall | 23 | 42 | 27 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 26 | 42 | 25 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 2012 Overall | 29 | 42 | 23 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 32 | 43 | 19 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Interface | 25 | 41 | 25 | 5 | 2 | 2 |
| Regional Centres | 25 | 42 | 25 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Large Rural | 23 | 41 | 27 | 7 | 1 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 15 | 34 | 37 | 10 | 2 | 2 |
| Men | 23 | 40 | 27 | 7 | 2 | 1 |
| Women | 30 | 43 | 21 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 24 | 40 | 27 | 7 | 1 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 28 | 38 | 26 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 28 | 41 | 24 | 6 | 2 | \* |
| 65+ | 27 | 46 | 20 | 5 | 1 | 1 |

**2016 Traffic Management Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for traffic management is 59. This is a significant decrease of 1 point from 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2016 average of 59:

* Small Rural, score of 65
* Large Rural, score of 62
* 18-34, score of 61
* Women, score of 60

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2016 average of 59:

* Men, score of 57
* 35-49, score of 57
* 50-64, score of 57
* Metropolitan, score of 56

Performance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* Men, down 2 points from 59 in 2015 to 57 in 2016

**2016 Traffic Management Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 10 | 38 | 30 | 13 | 6 | 4 |
| 2015 Overall | 10 | 40 | 31 | 12 | 5 | 3 |
| 2014 Overall | 10 | 40 | 30 | 12 | 5 | 3 |
| 2013 Overall | 10 | 39 | 31 | 13 | 5 | 3 |
| 2012 Overall | 9 | 38 | 31 | 13 | 5 | 3 |
| Metropolitan | 8 | 36 | 30 | 15 | 7 | 4 |
| Interface | 7 | 35 | 37 | 11 | 5 | 6 |
| Regional Centres | 11 | 39 | 27 | 12 | 7 | 3 |
| Large Rural | 10 | 41 | 28 | 10 | 4 | 6 |
| Small Rural | 15 | 41 | 28 | 8 | 3 | 4 |
| Men | 9 | 36 | 31 | 14 | 6 | 4 |
| Women | 10 | 40 | 29 | 12 | 5 | 5 |
| 18-34 | 12 | 39 | 27 | 13 | 5 | 4 |
| 35-49 | 8 | 39 | 30 | 13 | 7 | 3 |
| 50-64 | 7 | 39 | 31 | 14 | 5 | 4 |
| 65+ | 11 | 36 | 31 | 11 | 5 | 6 |

**2016 Parking Facilities Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for parking facilities is 70. This is equal to 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2016 average of 70:

* Women, score of 74
* Regional Centres, score of 73
* 65+, score of 73
* Metropolitan, score of 72

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2016 average of 70:

* Large Rural, score of 68
* 18-34, score of 68
* Men, score of 66
* Small Rural, score 65

**2016 Parking Facilities Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 24 | 41 | 27 | 7 | 1 | 1 |
| 2015 Overall | 24 | 41 | 27 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 2014 Overall | 24 | 40 | 28 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 25 | 42 | 26 | 6 | 1 | \* |
| 2012 Overall | 24 | 42 | 27 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 27 | 42 | 24 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Interface | 20 | 41 | 30 | 7 | 1 | \* |
| Regional Centres | 29 | 43 | 22 | 5 | \* | \* |
| Large Rural | 21 | 39 | 28 | 9 | 2 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 19 | 36 | 34 | 8 | 2 | 1 |
| Men | 19 | 39 | 31 | 9 | 2 | 1 |
| Women | 29 | 42 | 23 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 21 | 40 | 30 | 8 | 1 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 24 | 38 | 30 | 7 | 1 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 25 | 39 | 27 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| 65+ | 27 | 45 | 20 | 5 | 2 | 1 |

**2016 Parking Facilities Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for parking facilities is 56. This is a significant decrease of 1 point from 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2016 average of 56:

* Small Rural, score of 61
* Large Rural, score of 58

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2016 average of 56:

* Metropolitan, score of 54
* Regional Centres, score of 54

Performance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* 18-34, down 2 points from 59 in 2015 to 57 in 2016
* Men, down 2 points from 58 in 2015 to 56 in 2016

**2016 Parking Facilities Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 9 | 34 | 32 | 14 | 7 | 3 |
| 2015 Overall | 9 | 36 | 32 | 15 | 6 | 3 |
| 2014 Overall | 10 | 35 | 32 | 15 | 6 | 2 |
| 2013 Overall | 9 | 36 | 33 | 14 | 6 | 3 |
| 2012 Overall | 9 | 35 | 33 | 15 | 6 | 2 |
| Metropolitan | 7 | 32 | 33 | 16 | 8 | 3 |
| Interface | 8 | 33 | 36 | 14 | 5 | 4 |
| Regional Centres | 10 | 31 | 31 | 17 | 9 | 2 |
| Large Rural | 9 | 37 | 32 | 12 | 6 | 4 |
| Small Rural | 12 | 40 | 27 | 11 | 6 | 4 |
| Men | 9 | 34 | 32 | 14 | 7 | 3 |
| Women | 9 | 34 | 31 | 14 | 7 | 3 |
| 18-34 | 9 | 37 | 32 | 13 | 7 | 3 |
| 35-49 | 10 | 35 | 32 | 15 | 6 | 2 |
| 50-64 | 8 | 33 | 33 | 15 | 8 | 3 |
| 65+ | 10 | 31 | 31 | 16 | 8 | 4 |

**2016 Enforcement of Local Laws Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for enforcement of local laws is 70. This is significant decrease of 1 point since 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2016 average of 70:

* Women, score of 74
* Interface, score of 73

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2016 average of 70:

* Men, score of 66

Importance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* Men, down 1 point from 67 in 2015 to 66 in 2016

**2016 Enforcement of Local Laws Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 26 | 38 | 27 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| 2015 Overall | 25 | 41 | 27 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 2014 Overall | 24 | 40 | 28 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 27 | 40 | 26 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 2012 Overall | 24 | 41 | 27 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 26 | 41 | 26 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| Interface | 33 | 34 | 24 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| Regional Centres | 24 | 39 | 29 | 6 | \* | 2 |
| Large Rural | 24 | 37 | 29 | 7 | 2 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 25 | 37 | 26 | 9 | 2 | 1 |
| Men | 20 | 37 | 31 | 9 | 2 | 1 |
| Women | 31 | 39 | 24 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 27 | 35 | 28 | 7 | 2 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 26 | 36 | 30 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 26 | 38 | 27 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| 65+ | 25 | 43 | 24 | 6 | 1 | 2 |

**2016 Enforcement of Local Laws Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for enforcement of local laws is 63. This is a significant decrease of 3 points from 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2016 average of 63:

* 18-34, score of 67
* Women, score of 65
* Metropolitan, score of 64

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2016 average of 63.

* Men, score of 62
* 65+, score of 62
* Interface, score of 61
* 50-64, score of 61

Performance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* 18-34, down 3 points from 70 in 2015 to 67 in 2016
* Women, down 2 points from 67 in 2015 to 65 in 2016
* 35-49, down 2 points from 65 in 2015 to 63 in 2016
* Men, down 2 points from 64 in 2015 to 62 in 2016
* 65+, down 2 points from 64 in 2015 to 62 in 2016
* 50-64, down 2 points from 63 in 2015 to 61 in 2016

**2016 Enforcement of Local Laws Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 12 | 37 | 26 | 8 | 4 | 14 |
| 2015 Overall | 13 | 40 | 26 | 6 | 3 | 12 |
| 2014 Overall | 14 | 41 | 25 | 7 | 3 | 11 |
| 2013 Overall | 13 | 40 | 25 | 7 | 3 | 12 |
| 2012 Overall | 13 | 40 | 26 | 7 | 3 | 11 |
| Metropolitan | 12 | 37 | 25 | 8 | 3 | 15 |
| Interface | 11 | 32 | 28 | 9 | 4 | 16 |
| Regional Centres | 13 | 38 | 26 | 8 | 4 | 11 |
| Large Rural | 12 | 37 | 27 | 7 | 4 | 13 |
| Small Rural | 12 | 39 | 25 | 7 | 4 | 13 |
| Men | 11 | 37 | 27 | 9 | 5 | 12 |
| Women | 12 | 38 | 25 | 7 | 3 | 15 |
| 18-34 | 15 | 41 | 24 | 6 | 3 | 11 |
| 35-49 | 12 | 40 | 24 | 8 | 4 | 13 |
| 50-64 | 9 | 36 | 28 | 9 | 4 | 14 |
| 65+ | 11 | 33 | 27 | 8 | 4 | 17 |

**2016 Family Support Services Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for family support services is 73. This is equal to 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2016 average of 73:

* Women, score of 77
* Interface, score of 75
* 18-34, score of 75

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2016 average of 73:

* Large Rural, score of 72
* 65+, score of 71
* 50-64, score of 70
* Men, score of 68

Importance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* 50-64, down 2 points from 72 in 2015 to 70 in 2016

**2016 Family Support Services Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 28 | 41 | 22 | 5 | 2 | 3 |
| 2015 Overall | 28 | 42 | 23 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| 2014 Overall | 26 | 42 | 24 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| 2013 Overall | 27 | 44 | 22 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| 2012 Overall | 27 | 44 | 22 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Metropolitan | 27 | 43 | 21 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| Interface | 33 | 39 | 21 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| Regional Centres | 28 | 41 | 22 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| Large Rural | 28 | 39 | 23 | 5 | 2 | 3 |
| Small Rural | 27 | 40 | 22 | 5 | 2 | 4 |
| Men | 21 | 39 | 27 | 7 | 2 | 3 |
| Women | 34 | 42 | 17 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 18-34 | 32 | 41 | 21 | 4 | \* | 2 |
| 35-49 | 31 | 40 | 22 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 26 | 38 | 25 | 7 | 2 | 2 |
| 65+ | 23 | 43 | 21 | 4 | 2 | 6 |

**2016 Family Support Services Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for family support services is 66. This is a significant decrease of 1 point from 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2016 average of 66:

* Metropolitan, score of 69
* 65+, score of 69
* Women, score of 67

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2016 average of 66:

* Large Rural, score of 64
* 50-64, score of 62

Performance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* 65+, down 1 point from 70 in 2015 to 69 in 2016
* Women, down 1 point from 68 in 2015 to 67 in 2016
* Men, down 1 point from 67 in 2015 to 66 in 2016
* 18-34, down 1 point from 67 in 2015 to 66 in 2016
* 50-64, down 3 points from 65 in 2015 to 62 in 2016

**2016 Family Support Services Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 10 | 31 | 21 | 4 | 2 | 32 |
| 2015 Overall | 11 | 34 | 21 | 4 | 1 | 29 |
| 2014 Overall | 12 | 33 | 20 | 4 | 1 | 29 |
| 2013 Overall | 11 | 33 | 21 | 4 | 1 | 29 |
| 2012 Overall | 11 | 34 | 22 | 5 | 2 | 26 |
| Metropolitan | 10 | 31 | 18 | 3 | 1 | 37 |
| Interface | 9 | 30 | 23 | 5 | 1 | 31 |
| Regional Centres | 12 | 33 | 23 | 5 | 2 | 26 |
| Large Rural | 10 | 30 | 23 | 5 | 2 | 29 |
| Small Rural | 10 | 30 | 21 | 4 | 2 | 33 |
| Men | 10 | 30 | 22 | 4 | 2 | 33 |
| Women | 11 | 31 | 20 | 5 | 2 | 32 |
| 18-34 | 11 | 36 | 23 | 5 | 2 | 23 |
| 35-49 | 11 | 34 | 22 | 5 | 2 | 27 |
| 50-64 | 7 | 26 | 23 | 5 | 2 | 37 |
| 65+ | 12 | 27 | 16 | 3 | 1 | 41 |

**2016 Elderly Support Services Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for elderly support services is 78. This is a significant decrease of 1 point from 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2016 average of 78:

* Women, score of 82
* Small Rural, score of 79
* 50-64, score of 79
* 65+, score of 79

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2016 average of 78:

* 18-34, score of 77
* Men, score of 75

Performance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* 65+, down 1 point from 80 in 2015 to 79 in 2016

**2016 Elderly Support Services Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 36 | 44 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 2015 Overall | 36 | 44 | 16 | 2 | \* | 1 |
| 2014 Overall | 35 | 46 | 16 | 2 | \* | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 36 | 45 | 15 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 2012 Overall | 37 | 46 | 14 | 2 | \* | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 34 | 46 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Interface | 37 | 43 | 14 | 3 | \* | 3 |
| Regional Centres | 34 | 45 | 17 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Large Rural | 37 | 43 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 38 | 42 | 15 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Men | 28 | 45 | 21 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| Women | 43 | 43 | 11 | 1 | \* | 2 |
| 18-34 | 33 | 44 | 19 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 35 | 46 | 16 | 2 | \* | 1 |
| 50-64 | 38 | 42 | 15 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 65+ | 36 | 44 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 3 |

**2016 Elderly Support Services Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for elderly support services is 68. This is a significant decrease of 1 point from 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2016 average of 68:

* 65+, score of 71
* Small Rural, score of 70
* Metropolitan, score of 69
* Women, score of 69

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2016 average of 68:

* Men, score of 67
* 18-34, score of 67
* Regional centres, score of 66
* Large Rural, score of 66
* 50-64, score of 66
* 35-49, score of 65
* Interface, score of 59

Performance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* 65+, down 3 points from 74 in 2015 to 71 in 2016
* Men, down 2 points from 69 in 2015 to 67 in 2016

**2016 Elderly Support Services Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 14 | 30 | 20 | 5 | 2 | 30 |
| 2015 Overall | 15 | 34 | 19 | 4 | 2 | 26 |
| 2014 Overall | 16 | 34 | 17 | 4 | 2 | 27 |
| 2013 Overall | 15 | 33 | 19 | 4 | 1 | 28 |
| 2012 Overall | 15 | 34 | 20 | 5 | 2 | 25 |
| Metropolitan | 12 | 28 | 17 | 3 | 1 | 38 |
| Interface | 5 | 24 | 27 | 5 | 3 | 37 |
| Regional Centres | 12 | 34 | 21 | 7 | 2 | 24 |
| Large Rural | 14 | 30 | 22 | 6 | 2 | 25 |
| Small Rural | 18 | 33 | 19 | 4 | 2 | 25 |
| Men | 12 | 30 | 21 | 4 | 2 | 30 |
| Women | 16 | 30 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 29 |
| 18-34 | 11 | 31 | 21 | 4 | 1 | 32 |
| 35-49 | 9 | 28 | 20 | 5 | 1 | 37 |
| 50-64 | 12 | 30 | 21 | 5 | 2 | 29 |
| 65+ | 22 | 32 | 17 | 5 | 2 | 22 |

**2016 Disadvantaged Support Services Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for disadvantaged support services is 73. This is equal to 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2016 average of 73:

* Women, score of 76
* 18-34, score of 75

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2016 average of 73:

* 50-64, score of 71
* Men, score of 69

**2016 Disadvantaged Support Services Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 27 | 42 | 22 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| 2015 Overall | 28 | 42 | 23 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| 2014 Overall | 25 | 44 | 23 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| 2013 Overall | 27 | 43 | 23 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| 2012 Overall | 27 | 43 | 23 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Metropolitan | 27 | 43 | 22 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| Interface | 25 | 43 | 22 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| Regional Centres | 28 | 42 | 21 | 6 | 1 | 2 |
| Large Rural | 27 | 40 | 24 | 5 | 2 | 3 |
| Small Rural | 28 | 43 | 21 | 3 | 1 | 5 |
| Men | 22 | 41 | 25 | 7 | 2 | 3 |
| Women | 32 | 43 | 20 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| 18-34 | 30 | 42 | 22 | 4 | \* | 2 |
| 35-49 | 28 | 41 | 22 | 6 | 1 | 2 |
| 50-64 | 26 | 39 | 26 | 5 | 2 | 2 |
| 65+ | 24 | 44 | 20 | 5 | 2 | 5 |

**2016 Disadvantaged Support Services Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for disadvantaged support services is 61. This is a significant decrease of 1 point from 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2016 average of 61:

* 65+, score of 64
* Metropolitan, score of 62

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2016 average of 61:

* Women, score of 60
* Regional centres, score of 59
* 35-49, score of 59
* 50-64, score of 59
* Interface, score of 58
* Small Rural, score of 57

Performance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* Women, down 2 points from 62 in 2015 to 60 in 2016
* 18-34, down 2 points from 62 in 2015 to 60 in 2016
* 35-49, down 2 points from 61 in 2015 to 59 in 2016

**2016 Disadvantaged Support Services Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 6 | 24 | 23 | 6 | 2 | 39 |
| 2015 Overall | 7 | 28 | 23 | 6 | 2 | 35 |
| 2014 Overall | 8 | 28 | 22 | 5 | 1 | 35 |
| 2013 Overall | 7 | 27 | 22 | 6 | 2 | 36 |
| 2012 Overall | 8 | 28 | 23 | 6 | 2 | 34 |
| Metropolitan | 5 | 23 | 19 | 5 | 1 | 46 |
| Interface | 7 | 23 | 21 | 8 | 4 | 37 |
| Regional Centres | 8 | 24 | 28 | 9 | 2 | 29 |
| Large Rural | 7 | 26 | 23 | 6 | 3 | 36 |
| Small Rural | 5 | 22 | 30 | 6 | 4 | 32 |
| Men | 6 | 24 | 23 | 5 | 3 | 39 |
| Women | 6 | 24 | 22 | 7 | 2 | 39 |
| 18-34 | 6 | 27 | 25 | 6 | 3 | 34 |
| 35-49 | 5 | 22 | 23 | 7 | 2 | 41 |
| 50-64 | 5 | 22 | 23 | 7 | 2 | 41 |
| 65+ | 9 | 25 | 19 | 5 | 2 | 41 |

**2016 Recreational Facilities Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for recreational facilities is 73. This is a significant increase of 1 point from 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2016 average of 73:

* Women, score of 75
* 35-49, score of 75

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2016 average of 73:

* Large Rural, score of 72
* 18-34, score of 72
* Men, score of 71
* 65+, score of 71

Importance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* Women, up 2 points from 73 in 2015 to 75 in 2016
* 18-34, up 2 points from 70 in 2015 to 72 in 2016

**2016 Recreational Facilities Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 25 | 45 | 24 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 2015 Overall | 23 | 46 | 26 | 3 | 1 | \* |
| 2014 Overall | 23 | 47 | 26 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 23 | 47 | 26 | 3 | 1 | \* |
| 2012 Overall | 22 | 49 | 25 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 24 | 48 | 25 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Interface | 27 | 44 | 25 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 26 | 47 | 22 | 4 | 1 | \* |
| Large Rural | 26 | 44 | 24 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 25 | 44 | 24 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Men | 22 | 45 | 26 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Women | 28 | 46 | 22 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 25 | 42 | 28 | 4 | 1 | \* |
| 35-49 | 29 | 46 | 22 | 3 | 1 | \* |
| 50-64 | 26 | 46 | 23 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 65+ | 21 | 48 | 23 | 4 | 2 | 2 |

**2016 Recreational Facilities Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for recreational facilities is 69. This is a significant decrease of 1 point from 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2016 average of 69:

* Metropolitan, score of 73
* 65+, score of 72

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2016 average of 69:

* Small Rural, score of 68
* Interface, score of 67
* 35-49, score of 67
* 50-64, score of 67
* Large Rural, score of 65

Performance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* 65+, down 1 point from 73 in 2015 to 72 in 2016
* Women, down 1 point from 70 in 2015 to 69 in 2016
* 50-64, down 2 points from 69 in 2015 to 67 in 2016

**2016 Recreational Facilities Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 21 | 43 | 23 | 7 | 3 | 4 |
| 2015 Overall | 22 | 43 | 23 | 6 | 2 | 3 |
| 2014 Overall | 23 | 44 | 21 | 6 | 2 | 3 |
| 2013 Overall | 22 | 44 | 22 | 7 | 2 | 3 |
| 2012 Overall | 21 | 44 | 22 | 7 | 2 | 3 |
| Metropolitan | 26 | 45 | 19 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| Interface | 17 | 45 | 24 | 7 | 3 | 5 |
| Regional Centres | 23 | 42 | 23 | 6 | 2 | 3 |
| Large Rural | 17 | 41 | 25 | 8 | 4 | 4 |
| Small Rural | 21 | 41 | 23 | 8 | 3 | 5 |
| Men | 21 | 42 | 23 | 7 | 3 | 4 |
| Women | 21 | 43 | 22 | 7 | 3 | 5 |
| 18-34 | 21 | 45 | 23 | 7 | 2 | 2 |
| 35-49 | 20 | 42 | 24 | 8 | 4 | 3 |
| 50-64 | 19 | 41 | 25 | 8 | 4 | 4 |
| 65+ | 24 | 42 | 20 | 5 | 2 | 7 |

**2016 Appearance of Public Areas Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for the appearance of public areas is 74. This is a significant increase of 1 point from 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2016 average of 74:

* Women, score of 76
* 35-49, score of 75
* 50-64, score of 75
* 65+, score of 75

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2016 average of 74:

* Men, score of 72
* 18-34, score of 72

Performance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* Women, up 1 point from 75 in 2015 to 76 in 2016
* 65+, up 1 point from 74 in 2015 to 75 in 2016
* Men, up 1 point from 71 in 2015 to 72 in 2016
* 18-34, up 2 points from 70 in 2015 to 72 in 2016

**2016 Appearance of Public Areas Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 26 | 48 | 23 | 2 | 1 | \* |
| 2015 Overall | 24 | 47 | 25 | 2 | \* | \* |
| 2014 Overall | 25 | 48 | 25 | 2 | \* | \* |
| 2013 Overall | 26 | 48 | 23 | 2 | \* | \* |
| 2012 Overall | 23 | 49 | 25 | 2 | \* | \* |
| Metropolitan | 24 | 50 | 23 | 2 | \* | \* |
| Interface | 28 | 46 | 23 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 26 | 49 | 22 | 3 | \* | \* |
| Large Rural | 26 | 47 | 23 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 27 | 45 | 23 | 3 | 1 | \* |
| Men | 22 | 48 | 26 | 3 | 1 | \* |
| Women | 30 | 48 | 20 | 2 | \* | 1 |
| 18-34 | 23 | 46 | 27 | 3 | 1 | \* |
| 35-49 | 29 | 46 | 22 | 2 | \* | \* |
| 50-64 | 28 | 47 | 23 | 2 | \* | \* |
| 65+ | 25 | 52 | 20 | 2 | \* | 1 |

**2016 Appearance of Public Areas Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for the appearance of public areas is 71. This is a significant decrease of 1 point from 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2016 average of 71:

* Regional centres, score of 73
* Small Rural, score of 73
* Metropolitan, score of 72
* 18-34, score of 72
* 65+, score of 72

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2016 average of 71:

* Large Rural, score of 69
* 50-64, score of 69
* Interface, score of 66

Performance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* 18-34, down 1 point from 73 in 2015 to 72 in 2016
* Women, down 1 point from 72 in 2015 to 71 in 2016

**2016 Appearance of Public Areas Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 24 | 46 | 21 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| 2015 Overall | 24 | 47 | 20 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| 2014 Overall | 25 | 46 | 20 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 24 | 46 | 22 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| 2012 Overall | 23 | 48 | 21 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 23 | 49 | 20 | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| Interface | 16 | 44 | 29 | 8 | 2 | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 26 | 47 | 19 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| Large Rural | 21 | 44 | 24 | 7 | 2 | 2 |
| Small Rural | 27 | 45 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| Men | 23 | 47 | 20 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| Women | 24 | 45 | 22 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 24 | 47 | 21 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 23 | 48 | 21 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 21 | 46 | 22 | 6 | 3 | 1 |
| 65+ | 26 | 44 | 20 | 5 | 2 | 2 |

**2016 Art Centres and Libraries Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for art centres and libraries is 66. This is a significant increase of 1 point from 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2016 average of 66:

* Women, score of 70
* Metropolitan, score of 68

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2016 average of 66:

* Regional centres, score of 64
* 18-34, score of 64
* Large Rural, score of 63
* Men, score of 60

**2016 Art Centres and Libraries Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 18 | 40 | 30 | 9 | 3 | 1 |
| 2015 Overall | 16 | 40 | 33 | 8 | 2 | 1 |
| 2014 Overall | 17 | 40 | 33 | 8 | 1 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 16 | 42 | 33 | 7 | 1 | \* |
| 2012 Overall | 17 | 42 | 33 | 7 | 2 | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 19 | 43 | 28 | 7 | 1 | 1 |
| Interface | 19 | 37 | 33 | 7 | 3 | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 15 | 39 | 32 | 11 | 2 | 1 |
| Large Rural | 17 | 37 | 31 | 11 | 4 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 18 | 37 | 31 | 8 | 4 | 1 |
| Men | 14 | 35 | 33 | 13 | 4 | 1 |
| Women | 22 | 44 | 28 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 16 | 38 | 33 | 10 | 3 | \* |
| 35-49 | 19 | 39 | 31 | 9 | 2 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 19 | 38 | 31 | 9 | 3 | 1 |
| 65+ | 18 | 43 | 27 | 8 | 3 | 2 |

**2016 Art Centres and Libraries Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for the appearance of public areas is 72. This is a significant decrease of 1 point from 2015

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2016 average of 72:

* Regional Centres, score of 75
* 65+, score of 75
* Metropolitan, score of 74
* Women, score of 74

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2016 average of 72:

* 18-34, score of 71
* Large Rural, score of 70
* Men, score of 70
* Interface, score of 68

Performance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* Women, down 1 point from 75 in 2015 to 74 in 2016
* 18-34, down 2 points from 73 in 2015 to 71 in 2016
* Men, down 2 points from 72 in 2015 to 70 in 2016

**2016 Art Centres and Libraries Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 23 | 42 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 10 |
| 2015 Overall | 24 | 44 | 18 | 4 | 1 | 9 |
| 2014 Overall | 27 | 44 | 17 | 3 | 1 | 8 |
| 2013 Overall | 25 | 44 | 18 | 4 | 2 | 8 |
| 2012 Overall | 24 | 44 | 19 | 5 | 2 | 7 |
| Metropolitan | 24 | 44 | 17 | 4 | 1 | 9 |
| Interface | 15 | 39 | 27 | 5 | 2 | 12 |
| Regional Centres | 29 | 41 | 17 | 4 | 2 | 6 |
| Large Rural | 21 | 39 | 20 | 6 | 2 | 11 |
| Small Rural | 19 | 46 | 17 | 6 | 1 | 11 |
| Men | 20 | 42 | 20 | 5 | 2 | 11 |
| Women | 27 | 43 | 17 | 4 | 1 | 8 |
| 18-34 | 21 | 43 | 20 | 6 | 1 | 9 |
| 35-49 | 22 | 43 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 10 |
| 50-64 | 21 | 42 | 21 | 5 | 1 | 10 |
| 65+ | 28 | 41 | 15 | 3 | 2 | 11 |

**2016 Community and Cultural Activities Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for community and cultural activities is 62. This is equal to 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2016 average of 62:

* Women, score of 66
* 18-34, score of 64

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2016 average of 62:

* Men, score of 58

**2016 Community and Cultural Activities Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 12 | 37 | 38 | 10 | 2 | 1 |
| 2015 Overall | 11 | 37 | 40 | 10 | 2 | \* |
| 2014 Overall | 11 | 37 | 41 | 9 | 1 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 11 | 37 | 41 | 9 | 2 | 1 |
| 2012 Overall | 11 | 37 | 39 | 10 | 2 | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 12 | 38 | 38 | 10 | 2 | 1 |
| Interface | 14 | 34 | 41 | 7 | 2 | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 12 | 37 | 38 | 11 | 2 | 1 |
| Large Rural | 13 | 35 | 38 | 11 | 3 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 15 | 37 | 39 | 8 | 1 | \* |
| Men | 10 | 32 | 41 | 13 | 3 | 1 |
| Women | 15 | 41 | 36 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 15 | 37 | 40 | 8 | 1 | \* |
| 35-49 | 12 | 37 | 39 | 11 | 1 | \* |
| 50-64 | 12 | 34 | 40 | 10 | 3 | 1 |
| 65+ | 11 | 38 | 35 | 11 | 3 | 2 |

**2016 Community and Cultural Activities Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for community and cultural activities is 69. This is equal to 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2016 average of 69:

* Metropolitan, score of 71
* Women, score of 70
* 35-49, score of 70

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2016 average of 69:

* 18-34, score of 68
* Large Rural, score of 67
* Men, score of 67
* 50-64, score of 67
* Small Rural, score of 65
* Interface, score of 63

Performance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* Women, down 1 point from 71 in 2015 to 70 in 2016
* 65+, down 2 points from 71 in 2015 to 69 in 2016
* Men, down 1 point from 68 in 2015 to 67 in 2016

**2016 Community and Cultural Activities Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 17 | 41 | 25 | 5 | 2 | 9 |
| 2015 Overall | 18 | 43 | 25 | 5 | 1 | 7 |
| 2014 Overall | 18 | 44 | 24 | 5 | 1 | 8 |
| 2013 Overall | 17 | 44 | 25 | 5 | 1 | 8 |
| 2012 Overall | 15 | 44 | 26 | 5 | 1 | 9 |
| Metropolitan | 20 | 42 | 22 | 4 | 1 | 10 |
| Interface | 11 | 37 | 29 | 10 | 1 | 11 |
| Regional Centres | 18 | 41 | 26 | 5 | 1 | 8 |
| Large Rural | 15 | 42 | 27 | 6 | 2 | 8 |
| Small Rural | 14 | 39 | 28 | 6 | 3 | 9 |
| Men | 15 | 40 | 28 | 6 | 2 | 10 |
| Women | 20 | 43 | 23 | 5 | 1 | 8 |
| 18-34 | 18 | 42 | 26 | 6 | 1 | 7 |
| 35-49 | 19 | 44 | 23 | 5 | 1 | 8 |
| 50-64 | 14 | 42 | 27 | 6 | 2 | 9 |
| 65+ | 18 | 39 | 24 | 5 | 2 | 13 |

**2016 Waste Management Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for waste management is 80. This is a significant increase of 1 point from 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2016 average of 80:

* Metropolitan, score of 82
* Women, score of 82
* 50-64, score of 81

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2016 average of 80:

* Large Rural, score of 79
* Small Rural, score of 79
* 18-34, score of 79
* Men, score of 78

Importance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* Women, up 2 points from 80 in 2015 to 82 in 2016
* 65+, up 1 point from 79 in 2015 to 80 in 2016
* 18-34, up 3 points from 76 in 2015 to 79 in 2016
* Men, up 1 point from 77 in 2015 to 78 in 2016

**2016 Waste Management Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 38 | 45 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 2015 Overall | 35 | 46 | 16 | 1 | \* | \* |
| 2014 Overall | 35 | 47 | 16 | 1 | \* | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 36 | 47 | 15 | 1 | \* | \* |
| 2012 Overall | 32 | 49 | 16 | 1 | \* | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 41 | 46 | 11 | 2 | \* | \* |
| Interface | 41 | 44 | 13 | 1 | 1 | \* |
| Regional Centres | 34 | 48 | 15 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Large Rural | 37 | 45 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 36 | 45 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Men | 34 | 46 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Women | 42 | 44 | 12 | 1 | \* | \* |
| 18-34 | 37 | 44 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 40 | 42 | 15 | 2 | \* | \* |
| 50-64 | 41 | 44 | 13 | 2 | 1 | \* |
| 65+ | 35 | 51 | 11 | 2 | \* | 1 |

**2016 Waste Management Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for waste management is 70. This is a significant decrease of 2 point from 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2016 average of 70:

* Metropolitan, score of 76
* 65+, score of 74

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2016 average of 70:

* Small Rural, score of 69
* 35-49, score of 68
* 50-64, score of 67
* Large Rural, score of 66

Performance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* 65+, down 1 point from 75 in 2015 to 74 in 2016
* Men, down 2 points from 72 in 2015 to 70 in 2016
* Women, down 2 points from 72 in 2015 to 70 in 2016
* 18-34, down 3 points from 73 in 2015 to 70 in 2016
* 50-64, down 3 points from 70 in 2015 to 67 in 2016

**2016 Waste Management Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 24 | 45 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 2 |
| 2015 Overall | 25 | 47 | 17 | 6 | 3 | 2 |
| 2014 Overall | 26 | 47 | 16 | 5 | 3 | 2 |
| 2013 Overall | 24 | 47 | 18 | 6 | 3 | 2 |
| 2012 Overall | 24 | 48 | 17 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| Metropolitan | 30 | 48 | 14 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Interface | 24 | 47 | 19 | 7 | 2 | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 22 | 45 | 21 | 7 | 3 | 2 |
| Large Rural | 21 | 42 | 19 | 9 | 7 | 3 |
| Small Rural | 22 | 43 | 20 | 7 | 4 | 3 |
| Men | 24 | 44 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 2 |
| Women | 24 | 45 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 2 |
| 18-34 | 23 | 47 | 19 | 7 | 3 | 2 |
| 35-49 | 22 | 45 | 18 | 7 | 5 | 3 |
| 50-64 | 22 | 42 | 20 | 8 | 5 | 2 |
| 65+ | 29 | 44 | 16 | 5 | 3 | 3 |

**2016 Business and Community Development and Tourism Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for business and community development and tourism is 67. This is equal to 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2016 average of 67:

* Regional Centres, score of 73
* Small Rural, score of 71
* Women, score of 70
* Large Rural, score of 69

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2016 average of 67:

* Men, score of 64
* Metropolitan, score of 60

Importance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* Women, up 1 point from 69 in 2015 to 70 in 2016
* 18-34, up 2 points from 65 in 2015 to 67 in 2016

Importance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* 50-64, down 2 points from 69 in 2015 to 67 in 2016

**2016 Business and Community Development and Tourism Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 21 | 38 | 30 | 8 | 2 | 2 |
| 2015 Overall | 21 | 38 | 31 | 7 | 2 | 1 |
| 2014 Overall | 20 | 38 | 31 | 8 | 1 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 20 | 39 | 31 | 8 | 2 | 1 |
| 2012 Overall | 18 | 39 | 31 | 9 | 2 | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 11 | 35 | 36 | 14 | 2 | 2 |
| Interface | 17 | 37 | 31 | 11 | 2 | 2 |
| Regional Centres | 28 | 41 | 25 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Large Rural | 24 | 39 | 27 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 27 | 37 | 27 | 5 | 2 | 2 |
| Men | 19 | 35 | 31 | 11 | 3 | 2 |
| Women | 23 | 40 | 28 | 6 | 1 | 2 |
| 18-34 | 20 | 36 | 33 | 8 | 1 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 24 | 36 | 30 | 8 | 2 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 22 | 37 | 29 | 9 | 3 | 1 |
| 65+ | 18 | 41 | 27 | 8 | 2 | 3 |

**2016 Business and Community Development and Tourism Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for business and community development and tourism is 60. This is a significant decrease of 1 point from 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2016 average of 60:

* 18-34, score of 63
* Metropolitan, score of 62
* Regional Centres, score of 62
* Women, score of 62
* 65+, score of 62

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2016 average of 60:

* Large Rural, score of 59
* Men, score of 59

Performance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* Women, down 1 point from 63 in 2015 to 62 in 2016

**2016 Business and Community Development and Tourism Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 10 | 32 | 31 | 10 | 3 | 14 |
| 2015 Overall | 11 | 34 | 31 | 10 | 3 | 12 |
| 2014 Overall | 11 | 35 | 30 | 9 | 3 | 12 |
| 2013 Overall | 10 | 35 | 30 | 9 | 3 | 13 |
| 2012 Overall | 10 | 35 | 31 | 9 | 3 | 12 |
| Metropolitan | 9 | 29 | 30 | 8 | 2 | 24 |
| Regional Centres | 13 | 35 | 30 | 9 | 4 | 9 |
| Large Rural | 10 | 32 | 32 | 11 | 5 | 10 |
| Small Rural | 12 | 34 | 31 | 10 | 4 | 9 |
| Men | 9 | 31 | 31 | 11 | 4 | 14 |
| Women | 12 | 33 | 31 | 8 | 3 | 14 |
| 18-34 | 11 | 35 | 32 | 9 | 2 | 11 |
| 35-49 | 9 | 32 | 30 | 11 | 5 | 13 |
| 50-64 | 9 | 30 | 32 | 10 | 4 | 15 |
| 65+ | 12 | 31 | 29 | 8 | 3 | 17 |

**2016 Council’s General Town Planning Policy Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for Council’s general town planning policy is 73. This is a significant increase of 1 point from 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2016 average of 73:

* Small Rural, score of 77
* 50-64, score of 76
* Women, score of 75

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2016 average of 73:

* Men, score of 71
* 18-34, score of 68

Importance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* Women, up 1 point from 74 in 2015 to 75 in 2016
* 18-34, up 2 points from 66 in 2015 to 68 in 2016

**2016 Council’s General Town Planning Policy Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 27 | 40 | 24 | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| 2015 Overall | 25 | 41 | 25 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| 2014 Overall | 25 | 41 | 25 | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| 2013 Overall | 25 | 42 | 25 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| 2012 Overall | 25 | 42 | 24 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| Metropolitan | 27 | 38 | 25 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| Interface | 26 | 38 | 23 | 4 | 2 | 7 |
| Regional Centres | 23 | 42 | 25 | 4 | \* | 5 |
| Large Rural | 27 | 40 | 24 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| Small Rural | 33 | 42 | 18 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Men | 24 | 40 | 26 | 4 | 2 | 4 |
| Women | 29 | 40 | 22 | 3 | 1 | 5 |
| 18-34 | 18 | 36 | 34 | 5 | 1 | 6 |
| 35-49 | 31 | 37 | 24 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| 50-64 | 32 | 42 | 18 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 65+ | 26 | 44 | 19 | 3 | 1 | 7 |

**2016 Council’s General Town Planning Policy Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for Council’s general town planning policy is 52. This is a significant decrease of 2 points from 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2016 average of 52:

* 18-34, score of 57
* Metropolitan, score of 54
* Regional Centres, score of 54
* Women, score of 53

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2016 average of 52:

* Large Rural, score of 51
* Men, score of 51
* 35-49, score of 50
* Small Rural, score of 49
* 50-64, score of 48

Performance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* 18-34, down 2 points from 59 in 2015 to 57 in 2016
* Women, down 2 points from 55 in 2015 to 53 in 2016
* 65+, down 2 points from 54 in 2015 to 52 in 2016
* Men, down 3 points from 54 in 2015 to 51 in 2016
* 35-49, down 3 points from 53 in 2015 to 50 in 2016
* 50-64, down 3 points from 51 in 2015 to 48 in 2016

**2016 Council’s General Town Planning Policy Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 5 | 25 | 30 | 14 | 7 | 19 |
| 2015 Overall | 5 | 28 | 31 | 12 | 6 | 17 |
| 2014 Overall | 6 | 28 | 31 | 12 | 6 | 17 |
| 2013 Overall | 5 | 29 | 32 | 12 | 5 | 17 |
| 2012 Overall | 5 | 29 | 32 | 14 | 6 | 15 |
| Metropolitan | 5 | 26 | 29 | 13 | 6 | 21 |
| Interface | 6 | 24 | 31 | 14 | 7 | 18 |
| Regional Centres | 5 | 26 | 32 | 14 | 5 | 18 |
| Large Rural | 5 | 24 | 31 | 15 | 8 | 17 |
| Small Rural | 4 | 23 | 30 | 14 | 9 | 20 |
| Men | 5 | 25 | 30 | 15 | 8 | 16 |
| Women | 5 | 24 | 30 | 13 | 6 | 22 |
| 18-34 | 6 | 29 | 29 | 10 | 5 | 21 |
| 35-49 | 4 | 23 | 31 | 15 | 8 | 19 |
| 50-64 | 4 | 22 | 32 | 18 | 9 | 16 |
| 65+ | 6 | 24 | 30 | 14 | 7 | 19 |

**2016 Planning and Building Permits Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for planning and building permits is 71. This is equal to 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2016 average of 71:

* Metropolitan, score of 74
* Women, score of 74
* 50-64, score of 74
* 65+, score of 74

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2016 average of 71:

* Regional Centres, score of 69
* Men, score of 69
* 18-34, score of 67

Performance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* Women, up 1 point from 73 in 2015 to 74 in 2016

**2016 Planning and Building Permits Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 26 | 39 | 25 | 6 | 2 | 3 |
| 2015 Overall | 26 | 39 | 27 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| 2014 Overall | 25 | 41 | 25 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| 2013 Overall | 25 | 40 | 27 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| 2012 Overall | 25 | 41 | 25 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| Metropolitan | 30 | 40 | 22 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| Interface | 24 | 35 | 28 | 7 | 1 | 4 |
| Regional Centres | 22 | 39 | 30 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| Large Rural | 25 | 38 | 26 | 6 | 2 | 3 |
| Small Rural | 25 | 38 | 23 | 7 | 2 | 5 |
| Men | 23 | 38 | 26 | 7 | 2 | 3 |
| Women | 29 | 39 | 23 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| 18-34 | 20 | 36 | 32 | 7 | 2 | 3 |
| 35-49 | 27 | 37 | 27 | 6 | 1 | 2 |
| 50-64 | 31 | 40 | 21 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| 65+ | 28 | 42 | 19 | 4 | 2 | 6 |

**2016 Planning and Building Permits Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for planning and building permits is 50. This is up a significant decrease of 4 points from 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2016 average of 50:

* Regional Centres, score of 55
* 18-34, score of 55
* Women, score of 52

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2016 average of 50:

* Men, score of 49
* 35-49, score of 48
* 50-64, score of 48
* Interface, score of 46

Performance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* 18-34, down 3 points from 58 in 2015 to 55 in 2016
* Women, down 2 points from 54 in 2015 to 52 in 2016
* 65+, down 3 points from 53 in 2015 to 50 in 2016
* Men, down 4 points from 53 in 2015 to 49 in 2016
* 35-49, down 5 points from 53 in 2015 to 48 in 2016
* 50-64, down 3 points from 51 in 2015 to 48 in 2016

**2016 Planning and Building Permits Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 5 | 22 | 25 | 13 | 8 | 27 |
| 2015 Overall | 6 | 25 | 28 | 12 | 6 | 23 |
| 2014 Overall | 5 | 25 | 26 | 12 | 7 | 25 |
| 2013 Overall | 6 | 26 | 27 | 12 | 6 | 23 |
| 2012 Overall | 5 | 26 | 27 | 12 | 7 | 23 |
| Metropolitan | 4 | 23 | 24 | 14 | 9 | 25 |
| Interface | 3 | 19 | 27 | 17 | 10 | 24 |
| Regional Centres | 5 | 25 | 26 | 10 | 6 | 27 |
| Large Rural | 4 | 22 | 26 | 13 | 8 | 27 |
| Small Rural | 5 | 20 | 25 | 13 | 8 | 29 |
| Men | 4 | 23 | 26 | 14 | 10 | 24 |
| Women | 5 | 21 | 25 | 12 | 7 | 30 |
| 18-34 | 4 | 26 | 27 | 9 | 6 | 27 |
| 35-49 | 4 | 22 | 25 | 16 | 9 | 24 |
| 50-64 | 4 | 20 | 26 | 15 | 11 | 23 |
| 65+ | 6 | 20 | 23 | 13 | 8 | 31 |

**2016 Environmental Sustainability Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for environmental sustainability is 73. This is equal to 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2016 average of 73:

* Interface, score of 77
* Women, score of 77
* 18-34, score of 77
* Metropolitan, score of 74

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2016 average of 73:

* Regional Centres, score of 71
* 65+, score of 71
* Men, score of 69

Importance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* 18-34, up 2 points from 75 in 2015 to 77 in 2016

**2016 Environmental Sustainability Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 30 | 40 | 21 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| 2015 Overall | 29 | 41 | 23 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 2014 Overall | 29 | 40 | 24 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 27 | 42 | 24 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| 2012 Overall | 26 | 41 | 24 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 31 | 41 | 20 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| Interface | 37 | 37 | 20 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| Regional Centres | 26 | 42 | 23 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| Large Rural | 30 | 39 | 22 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 35 | 35 | 21 | 7 | 1 | 1 |
| Men | 25 | 39 | 24 | 8 | 3 | 1 |
| Women | 35 | 42 | 18 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 35 | 42 | 18 | 5 | 1 | \* |
| 35-49 | 30 | 38 | 23 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 31 | 39 | 22 | 6 | 2 | \* |
| 65+ | 25 | 42 | 22 | 6 | 2 | 2 |

**2016 Environmental Sustainability Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for environmental sustainability is 63. This is a significant decrease of 1 point from 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2016 average of 63:

* Metropolitan, score of 64
* 18-34, score of 64

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2016 average of 63:

* Large Rural, score of 62
* Men, score of 62
* Small Rural, score of 61
* 50-64, score of 61
* Interface, score of 60

Performance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* Women, down 1 point from 64 in 2015 to 63 in 2016
* 65+, down 2 points from 65 in 2015 to 63 in 2016
* Men, down 2 points from 64 in 2015 to 62 in 2016

**2016 Environmental Sustainability Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 11 | 36 | 30 | 8 | 3 | 13 |
| 2015 Overall | 10 | 39 | 30 | 7 | 2 | 13 |
| 2014 Overall | 11 | 39 | 29 | 6 | 2 | 12 |
| 2013 Overall | 11 | 40 | 29 | 7 | 2 | 12 |
| 2012 Overall | 11 | 39 | 29 | 7 | 2 | 12 |
| Metropolitan | 11 | 38 | 28 | 7 | 2 | 14 |
| Interface | 8 | 32 | 31 | 10 | 2 | 18 |
| Regional Centres | 12 | 35 | 32 | 7 | 3 | 12 |
| Large Rural | 11 | 34 | 32 | 9 | 3 | 11 |
| Small Rural | 9 | 34 | 31 | 8 | 4 | 14 |
| Men | 10 | 36 | 30 | 8 | 3 | 12 |
| Women | 11 | 35 | 30 | 8 | 2 | 14 |
| 18-34 | 11 | 38 | 30 | 7 | 3 | 11 |
| 35-49 | 10 | 37 | 29 | 8 | 3 | 13 |
| 50-64 | 10 | 33 | 31 | 9 | 3 | 13 |
| 65+ | 11 | 34 | 29 | 7 | 2 | 16 |

**2016 Emergency and Disaster Management Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for emergency and disaster management is 80. This is equal to 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2016 average of 80:

* Women, score of 84
* Interface, score of 83
* Small Rural, score of 82

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2016 average of 80:

* Metropolitan, score of 76
* Men, score of 76

**2016 Emergency and Disaster Management Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | | Can't say | |
| 2016 Overall | 45 | 36 | 14 | 3 | 1 | 1 | |
| 2015 Overall | 44 | 35 | 15 | 4 | 1 | 1 | |
| 2014 Overall | 45 | 34 | 14 | 4 | 1 | 1 | |
| 2013 Overall | 46 | 34 | 14 | 4 | 1 | 1 | |
| 2012 Overall | 43 | 38 | 14 | 4 | 1 | 1 | |
| Metropolitan | 36 | 39 | 17 | 5 | 1 | 2 | |
| Interface | 50 | 33 | 11 | 2 | 1 | 2 | |
| Regional Centres | 44 | 36 | 15 | 3 | 1 | 1 | |
| Large Rural | 47 | 35 | 13 | 3 | 1 | 1 | |
| Small Rural | 48 | 35 | 12 | 3 | 1 | 2 | |
| Men | 38 | 36 | 17 | 5 | 2 | 1 | |
| Women | 51 | 35 | 10 | 2 | \* | 1 | |
| 18-34 | 45 | 36 | 14 | 3 | \* | 1 | |
| 35-49 | 47 | 32 | 14 | 4 | 2 | 1 | |
| 50-64 | 46 | 33 | 14 | 4 | 1 | 1 | |
| 65+ | 41 | 40 | 13 | 3 | 2 | 3 | |

**2016 Emergency and Disaster Management Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for emergency and disaster management is 69. This is a significant decrease of 1 point since 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2016 average of 69:

* Small Rural, score of 71
* Women, score of 71
* 18-34, score of 71
* 65+, score of 71
* Large Rural, score of 70

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2016 average of 69:

* Men, score of 68
* 50-64, score of 67

Performance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* 18-34, down 2 points from 73 in 2015 to 71 in 2016
* Men, down 1 point from 69 in 2015 to 68 in 2016

**2016 Emergency and Disaster Management Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 17 | 36 | 19 | 4 | 2 | 21 |
| 2015 Overall | 17 | 39 | 19 | 5 | 2 | 18 |
| 2014 Overall | 20 | 38 | 18 | 4 | 2 | 18 |
| 2013 Overall | 19 | 37 | 20 | 5 | 2 | 17 |
| 2012 Overall | 19 | 38 | 20 | 5 | 2 | 16 |
| Metropolitan | 10 | 34 | 18 | 3 | 1 | 33 |
| Interface | 18 | 37 | 20 | 6 | 2 | 18 |
| Regional Centres | 17 | 34 | 21 | 5 | 3 | 21 |
| Large Rural | 20 | 37 | 20 | 5 | 3 | 15 |
| Small Rural | 20 | 37 | 19 | 4 | 2 | 17 |
| Men | 17 | 35 | 21 | 5 | 3 | 20 |
| Women | 18 | 37 | 18 | 4 | 2 | 21 |
| 18-34 | 19 | 41 | 19 | 4 | 2 | 16 |
| 35-49 | 15 | 36 | 20 | 5 | 2 | 21 |
| 50-64 | 15 | 33 | 22 | 5 | 3 | 21 |
| 65+ | 20 | 33 | 18 | 4 | 2 | 23 |

**2016 Planning for Population Growth Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for planning for population growth in the area is 76. This is a significant increase of 1 point since 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2016 average of 76:

* Interface, score of 79

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2016 average of 76:

* Large Rural, score of 74
* Men, score of 74
* 18-34, score of 74

Importance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* 18-34, up 4 points from 70 in 2015 to 74 in 2016

Importance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* 50-64, down 2 points from 79 in 2015 to 77 in 2016

**2016 Planning for Population Growth Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 35 | 37 | 20 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| 2015 Overall | 34 | 38 | 21 | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| 2014 Overall | 33 | 38 | 21 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| 2013 Overall | 34 | 38 | 20 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 2012 Overall | 34 | 39 | 19 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 36 | 35 | 20 | 6 | 1 | 2 |
| Interface | 42 | 37 | 14 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 34 | 39 | 21 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| Large Rural | 33 | 38 | 21 | 5 | 2 | 2 |
| Men | 33 | 38 | 21 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| Women | 38 | 36 | 19 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| 18-34 | 34 | 33 | 24 | 6 | 1 | 2 |
| 35-49 | 38 | 37 | 19 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 39 | 37 | 17 | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| 65+ | 32 | 42 | 17 | 5 | 2 | 3 |

**2016 Planning for Population Growth Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for planning for population growth in the area is 51. This is a significant decrease of 3 points since 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2016 average of 51:

* Regional Centres, score of 59
* Interface, score of 55
* 18-34, score of 55

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2016 average of 51.

* 35-49, score of 49
* 50-64, score of 48
* Large Rural, score of 47

Performance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* 18-34, down 5 points from 60 in 2015 to 55 in 2016
* Men down 2 points from 54 in 2015 to 52 in 2016
* 65+, down 2 points from 54 in 2015 to 52 in 2016
* Women, down 4 points from 55 in 2015 to 51 in 2016
* 35-49, down 2 points from 51 in 2015 to 49 in 2016

**2016 Planning for Population Growth Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 6 | 23 | 30 | 16 | 8 | 16 |
| 2015 Overall | 7 | 28 | 30 | 14 | 6 | 15 |
| 2014 Overall | 7 | 28 | 30 | 15 | 6 | 15 |
| 2013 Overall | 7 | 26 | 31 | 14 | 6 | 17 |
| 2012 Overall | 6 | 25 | 31 | 16 | 7 | 14 |
| Metropolitan | 5 | 24 | 30 | 16 | 7 | 18 |
| Interface | 10 | 28 | 27 | 16 | 7 | 11 |
| Regional Centres | 11 | 28 | 31 | 10 | 4 | 16 |
| Large Rural | 4 | 19 | 32 | 18 | 11 | 16 |
| Men | 7 | 24 | 29 | 17 | 8 | 14 |
| Women | 6 | 23 | 32 | 15 | 7 | 18 |
| 18-34 | 7 | 27 | 32 | 13 | 6 | 14 |
| 35-49 | 6 | 22 | 29 | 19 | 9 | 15 |
| 50-64 | 6 | 21 | 30 | 18 | 11 | 15 |
| 65+ | 7 | 21 | 30 | 15 | 7 | 20 |

**2016 Roadside Slashing and Weed Control Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for roadside slashing and weed control is 73. This is equal to 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2016 average of 73:

* Interface, score of 76
* 50-64, score of 76
* Large Rural, score of 75
* Women, score of 75

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2016 average of 73:

* Men, score of 71
* 18-34, score of 69
* Metropolitan, score of 64

Performance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* 18-34, up 4 points from 65 in 2015 to 69 in 2016

**2016 Roadside Slashing and Weed Control Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 28 | 42 | 23 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 2015 Overall | 28 | 40 | 26 | 5 | 1 | \* |
| 2014 Overall | 32 | 40 | 23 | 4 | 1 | \* |
| 2013 Overall | 30 | 42 | 24 | 4 | 1 | \* |
| 2012 Overall | 24 | 42 | 28 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 11 | 43 | 34 | 9 | 1 | 2 |
| Interface | 36 | 39 | 21 | 4 | \* | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 23 | 46 | 22 | 8 | \* | \* |
| Large Rural | 31 | 41 | 21 | 5 | 1 | \* |
| Men | 24 | 42 | 26 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| Women | 32 | 42 | 20 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 25 | 38 | 26 | 11 | 1 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 31 | 41 | 23 | 4 | 1 | \* |
| 50-64 | 33 | 42 | 21 | 3 | 1 | \* |
| 65+ | 26 | 46 | 22 | 4 | 1 | 1 |

**2016 Roadside Slashing and Weed Control Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for roadside slashing and weed control is 56.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2016 average of 56:

* Metropolitan, score of 68
* Regional Centres, score of 62
* 18-34, score of 61

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2016 average of 56:

* Large Rural, score of 54
* 65+, score of 54
* 50-64, score of 52
* Small Rural, score of 51

Performance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* Women, up 2 points from 55 in 2015 to 57 in 2016

**2016 Roadside Slashing and Weed Control Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 11 | 34 | 28 | 15 | 9 | 3 |
| 2015 Overall | 10 | 32 | 30 | 16 | 9 | 2 |
| 2014 Overall | 11 | 32 | 28 | 17 | 10 | 3 |
| 2013 Overall | 11 | 35 | 28 | 16 | 8 | 2 |
| 2012 Overall | 14 | 38 | 28 | 12 | 5 | 3 |
| Metropolitan | 14 | 52 | 21 | 7 | 3 | 4 |
| Interface | 8 | 38 | 30 | 15 | 8 | 2 |
| Regional Centres | 15 | 41 | 22 | 16 | 4 | 3 |
| Large Rural | 11 | 31 | 29 | 16 | 11 | 3 |
| Small Rural | 10 | 28 | 29 | 17 | 13 | 2 |
| Men | 11 | 34 | 27 | 16 | 10 | 3 |
| Women | 11 | 35 | 29 | 14 | 8 | 3 |
| 18-34 | 13 | 44 | 24 | 10 | 8 | 2 |
| 35-49 | 11 | 35 | 29 | 14 | 9 | 2 |
| 50-64 | 9 | 28 | 31 | 19 | 10 | 2 |
| 65+ | 11 | 31 | 27 | 16 | 10 | 5 |

**2016 Maintenance of Unsealed Roads Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for maintenance of unsealed roads is 79. This is a significant increase of 1 point since 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2016 average of 79:

* Small Rural, score of 81
* Women, score of 80

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2016 average of 79:

* Large Rural, score of 78
* Men, score of 77
* Regional centres, score of 70

Importance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* 18-34, up 2 points from 76 in 2015 to 78 in 2016

**2016 Maintenance of Unsealed Roads Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 40 | 37 | 17 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| 2015 Overall | 39 | 39 | 18 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 2014 Overall | 39 | 38 | 17 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 44 | 39 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 2012 Overall | 41 | 39 | 15 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Interface | 42 | 35 | 18 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| Regional Centres | 24 | 37 | 26 | 9 | \* | 4 |
| Large Rural | 38 | 39 | 17 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| Small Rural | 46 | 36 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Men | 36 | 39 | 18 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Women | 44 | 36 | 16 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| 18-34 | 40 | 35 | 19 | 5 | \* | 1 |
| 35-49 | 39 | 36 | 19 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 44 | 35 | 16 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 65+ | 37 | 42 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 3 |

**2016 Maintenance of Unsealed Roads Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for maintenance of unsealed roads is 43. This is a significant decrease of 2 points since 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2016 average of 43:

* 18-34, score of 46
* 65+, score of 45

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2016 average of 43:

* 50-64, score of 40

Performance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* Men, down 2 points from 45 in 2015 to 43 in 2016
* Women, down 2 points from 45 in 2015 to 43 in 2016
* 35-49, down 2 points from 44 in 2015 to 42 in 2016
* 50-64, down 3 points from 43 in 2015 to 40 in 2016

**2016 Maintenance of Unsealed Roads Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 5 | 20 | 29 | 22 | 16 | 7 |
| 2015 Overall | 5 | 22 | 30 | 22 | 15 | 7 |
| 2014 Overall | 5 | 22 | 30 | 22 | 14 | 7 |
| 2013 Overall | 6 | 20 | 29 | 24 | 16 | 4 |
| 2012 Overall | 7 | 22 | 29 | 21 | 15 | 7 |
| Interface | 3 | 23 | 29 | 23 | 14 | 9 |
| Large Rural | 5 | 20 | 29 | 22 | 17 | 7 |
| Small Rural | 5 | 20 | 30 | 22 | 16 | 6 |
| Men | 5 | 21 | 28 | 22 | 18 | 6 |
| Women | 4 | 20 | 30 | 22 | 15 | 8 |
| 18-34 | 6 | 25 | 29 | 19 | 16 | 5 |
| 35-49 | 4 | 20 | 31 | 24 | 17 | 5 |
| 50-64 | 4 | 18 | 30 | 24 | 19 | 5 |
| 65+ | 6 | 20 | 27 | 21 | 14 | 12 |

**2016 Business and Community Development Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for the business and community development is 70.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2016 average of 70:

* 35-49, score of 73
* Women, score of 72
* 18-34, score of 72

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2016 average of 70:

* 65+, score of 67

Performance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* 35-49, up 3 points from 70 in 2015 to 73 in 2016
* 18-34, up 3 points from 69 in 2015 to 72 in 2016
* Men, up 2 points from 67 in 2015 to 69 in 2016

**2016 Business and Community Development Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 22 | 43 | 27 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| 2015 Overall | 20 | 42 | 31 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 2014 Overall | 20 | 45 | 27 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Interface | 20 | 42 | 30 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| Large Rural | 22 | 44 | 26 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Men | 20 | 44 | 28 | 5 | 2 | 2 |
| Women | 24 | 43 | 27 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| 18-34 | 22 | 46 | 28 | 3 | \* | 2 |
| 35-49 | 24 | 45 | 28 | 2 | \* | 1 |
| 50-64 | 22 | 42 | 27 | 7 | 2 | 1 |
| 65+ | 19 | 41 | 28 | 6 | 3 | 3 |

**2016 Business and Community Development Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for business and community development is 60. This is equal to 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2016 average of 60:

* 18-34, score of 63
* Metropolitan, score of 62

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2016 average of 60:

* Interface, score of 58
* Large Rural, score of 58
* 50-64, score of 56

Performance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* 65+, down 2 points from 61 in 2015 to 59 in 2016
* 50-64, down 2 points from 58 in 2015 to 56 in 2016

**2016 Business and Community Development Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 7 | 33 | 29 | 10 | 3 | 17 |
| 2015 Overall | 8 | 34 | 31 | 9 | 3 | 15 |
| 2014 Overall | 8 | 35 | 30 | 8 | 2 | 17 |
| Metropolitan | 7 | 36 | 26 | 7 | 2 | 22 |
| Interface | 6 | 31 | 30 | 9 | 3 | 21 |
| Regional Centres | 11 | 35 | 31 | 11 | 4 | 9 |
| Large Rural | 7 | 32 | 30 | 12 | 4 | 16 |
| Small Rural | 9 | 38 | 22 | 9 | 3 | 19 |
| Men | 8 | 32 | 28 | 11 | 4 | 16 |
| Women | 7 | 34 | 30 | 9 | 3 | 18 |
| 18-34 | 10 | 40 | 26 | 10 | 2 | 12 |
| 35-49 | 6 | 37 | 29 | 10 | 3 | 14 |
| 50-64 | 6 | 28 | 33 | 10 | 5 | 18 |
| 65+ | 7 | 28 | 28 | 9 | 3 | 25 |

**2016 Tourism Development Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for the tourism development is 63. This is a significant decrease of 2 points since 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2016 average of 63:

* Large Rural, score of 67
* Women, score of 65

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2016 average of 63:

* Interface, score of 57

Performance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* 65+, down 3 points from 67 in 2015 to 64 in 2016

**2016 Tourism Development Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | | Not at all important | | Can't say | |
| 2016 Overall | 18 | 34 | 35 | 10 | 3 | | 1 | |
| 2015 Overall | 19 | 36 | 32 | 10 | 3 | | 1 | |
| 2014 Overall | 18 | 37 | 31 | 10 | 2 | | 1 | |
| Interface | 12 | 27 | 38 | 16 | 5 | | 2 | |
| Large Rural | 20 | 37 | 33 | 7 | 2 | | 1 | |
| Men | 17 | 31 | 35 | 10 | 5 | | 2 | |
| Women | 18 | 36 | 34 | 9 | 2 | | 1 | |
| 18-34 | 16 | 30 | 37 | 13 | 2 | | 2 | |
| 35-49 | 19 | 31 | 37 | 9 | 3 | | 1 | |
| 50-64 | 18 | 34 | 34 | 9 | 3 | | 1 | |
| 65+ | 17 | 38 | 30 | 8 | 4 | | 2 | |

**2016 Tourism Development Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for tourism development is 63. This is equal to 2015.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2016 average of 63:

* Regional Centres, score of 71

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2016 average of 63:

* 50-64, score of 60
* Interface, score of 56
* Metropolitan, score of 54

Performance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2015:

* 65+, down 3 points from 65 in 2015 to 62 in 2016

**2016 Tourism Development Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 13 | 34 | 27 | 9 | 3 | 13 |
| 2015 Overall | 12 | 35 | 28 | 9 | 3 | 13 |
| 2014 Overall | 13 | 36 | 28 | 9 | 2 | 13 |
| Metropolitan | 4 | 21 | 34 | 12 | 3 | 26 |
| Interface | 5 | 26 | 31 | 11 | 4 | 22 |
| Regional Centres | 25 | 42 | 22 | 5 | 3 | 3 |
| Large Rural | 13 | 38 | 27 | 8 | 3 | 11 |
| Small Rural | 18 | 36 | 22 | 11 | 5 | 8 |
| Men | 12 | 34 | 26 | 10 | 4 | 14 |
| Women | 13 | 35 | 28 | 9 | 3 | 13 |
| 18-34 | 12 | 39 | 25 | 9 | 3 | 12 |
| 35-49 | 13 | 35 | 28 | 9 | 3 | 12 |
| 50-64 | 11 | 34 | 29 | 10 | 4 | 11 |
| 65+ | 14 | 31 | 26 | 9 | 4 | 17 |

**DETAILED DEMOGRAPHICS**

**Gender Split**

Men: 49% of sample

Women: 51% of sample

**Age Split**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Age | % |
| 18-24 | 9% |
| 25-34 | 17% |
| 35-49 | 25% |
| 50-64 | 21% |
| 65+ | 28% |
|  |  |

**Household Structure**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | % |
| Married or living with partner with children 16 or under at home | 26 |
| Married or living with partner, no children | 23 |
| Married or living with partner with children but none 16 or under at home | 18 |
| Single person living alone | 16 |
| Single living with friends or housemates | 9 |
| Single with children but none 16 or under living at home | 3 |
| Single living with children 16 or under | 2 |
| Do not wish to answer | 3 |

**Years Lived in Area**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 0-5  years | 5-10 years | 10-20 years | 20 – 30 years | 30+ years | Can't say |
| 2016 Overall | 15 | 16 | 16 | 17 | 27 | \* |
| Metropolitan | 17 | 15 | 15 | 18 | 23 | \* |
| Interface | 15 | 27 | 27 | 13 | 15 | \* |
| Regional Centres | 17 | 15 | 15 | 17 | 26 | - |
| Large Rural | 12 | 15 | 15 | 17 | 32 | \* |
| Small Rural | 15 | 12 | 12 | 16 | 38 | \* |
| Men | 15 | 15 | 15 | 17 | 27 | \* |
| Women | 16 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 28 | \* |
| 18-34 | 29 | 21 | 21 | 19 | 6 | \* |
| 35-49 | 15 | 24 | 24 | 11 | 16 | - |
| 50-64 | 7 | 10 | 10 | 23 | 38 | \* |
| 65+ | 7 | 8 | 8 | 14 | 54 | \* |

**Home Ownership**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Own | Rent |
| 2016 Overall | 79 | 20 |
| 2015 Overall | 82 | 17 |
| 2014 Overall | 83 | 16 |
| 2013 Overall | 83 | 16 |
| 2012 Overall | 81 | 18 |
| Metropolitan | 68 | 31 |
| Regional Centres | 88 | 11 |
| Small Rural | 92 | 7 |
| Men | 77 | 23 |
| Women | 81 | 18 |
| 18-34 | 59 | 41 |
| 35-49 | 87 | 13 |
| 50-64  65+ | 91  92 | 8  7 |

**Languages Spoken at Home**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | % |
| English | 61 |
| Total Other | 39 |
| Italian | 6 |
| Chinese | 4 |
| Greek | 4 |
| Vietnamese | 3 |
| Hindi | 2 |
| Croatian | 1 |
| French | 1 |
| Arabic | 1 |
| Spanish | 1 |
| German | 1 |

**Countries of Birth**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | % |
| Australia | 58 |
| INDIA | 5 |
| UNITED KINGDOM | 3 |
| CHINA | 2 |
| NEW ZEALAND | 2 |
| GREECE | 1 |

**APPENDIX A: FURTHER PROJECT INFORMATION**

**BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES**

The survey was revised in 2012. As a result:

* The survey is now conducted as a representative random probability survey of residents aged 18 years or over in local councils, whereas previously it was conducted as a ‘head of household’ survey.
* As part of the change to a representative resident survey, results are now weighted post survey to the known population distribution of the State according to the most recently available Australian Bureau of Statistics population estimates, whereas the results were previously not weighted.
* The service responsibility area performance measures have changed significantly and the rating scale used to assess performance has also changed.

As such, the results of the 2012 State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey should be considered as a benchmark. Please note that comparisons should not be made with the State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey results from 2011 and prior due to the methodological and sampling changes. **Comparisons in the period 2012-2016 have been made throughout this report as appropriate.**

**MARGINS OF ERROR**

The sample size for the 2015 State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey was n=28,108. Unless otherwise noted, this is the total sample base for all reported charts and tables.

The maximum margin of error on a sample of approximately n=28,108 interviews is +/-0.6% at the 95% confidence level for results around 50%. Margins of error will be larger for any sub-samples. As an example, a result of 50% can be read confidently as falling midway in the range 49.4% - 50.6%.

Maximum margins of error are listed in the table below, based on a population of 3,663,000 people aged 18 years or over overall, according to ABS estimates.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Demographic | Actual survey sample size | Weighted base | Maximum margin of error at 95% confidence interval |
| Overall | 28108 | 27600 | +/-0.6 |
| Men | 12239 | 13604 | +/-0.9 |
| Women | 15869 | 13996 | +/-0.8 |
| 18-34 years | 2900 | 7070 | +/-1.8 |
| 35-49 years | 4859 | 6818 | +/-1.4 |
| 50-64 years | 8705 | 5848 | +/-1.0 |
| 65+ years | 11644 | 7864 | +/-0.9 |

**ANALYSIS AND REPORTING**

In 2016, 69 of the 79 Victorian councils chose to participate in this survey. For consistency of analysis and reporting across all projects, Local Government Victoria has aligned its presentation of data to use standard council groupings, as classified below. Accordingly, the council reports for the community satisfaction survey provide analysis using these standard council groupings.

Please note that councils participating in 2012-2015 vary slightly to those participating in 2016, and that council groupings have changed for 2016. As such, comparisons to previous council group results have not been made within the report.



**Index Scores**

Many questions ask respondents to rate council performance on a five-point scale, for example, from ‘very good’ to ‘very poor’, with ‘can’t say’ also a possible response category. To facilitate ease of reporting and comparison of results over time, starting from the 2012 benchmark survey and measured against the State-wide result and the council group, an ‘Index Score’ has been calculated for such measures.

The Index Score is calculated and represented as a score out of 100 (on a 0 to 100 scale), with ‘can’t say’ responses excluded from the analysis. The ‘% RESULT’ for each scale category is multiplied by the ‘INDEX FACTOR’. This produces an ‘INDEX VALUE’ for each category, which are then summed to produce the ‘INDEX SCORE’, equating to ‘60’ in the following example.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scale Categories | % Result | Index Factor | Index Value |
| Very good | 9% | 100 | 9 |
| Good | 40% | 75 | 30 |
| Average | 37% | 50 | 19 |
| Poor | 9% | 25 | 2 |
| Very poor | 4% | 0 | 0 |
| Can’t say | 1% | -- | INDEX SCORE 60 |

Similarly, an Index Score has been calculated for the Core question ‘Performance direction in the last 12 months’, based on the following scale for each performance measure category, with ‘Can’t say’ responses excluded from the calculation.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scale Categories | % Result | Index Factor | Index Value |
| Improved | 36% | 100 | 36 |
| Stayed the same | 40% | 50 | 20 |
| Deteriorated | 23% | 0 | 0 |
| Can’t say | 1% | -- | INDEX SCORE 56 |

**Index Scores Significant Difference Calculation**

The test applied to the Indexes was an Independent Mean Test, as follows:

Z Score = ($1 - $2) / Sqrt (($3\*2 / $5) + ($4\*2 / $6))

Where:

* + $1 = Index Score 1
  + $2 = Index Score 2
  + $3 = unweighted sample count 1
  + $4 = unweighted sample count 1
  + $5 = standard deviation 1
  + $6 = standard deviation 2

All figures can be sourced from the detailed cross tabulations.

The test was applied at the 95% confidence interval, so if the Z Score was greater than +/- 1.954 the scores are significantly different.

**Core, Optional and Tailored Questions**

Over and above necessary geographic and demographic questions required to ensure sample representativeness, a base set of questions for the 2016 State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey was designated as ‘Core’ and therefore compulsory inclusions for all participating Councils.

These core questions comprised:

* Overall performance last 12 months (Overall performance)
* Lobbying on behalf of community (Advocacy)
* Community consultation and engagement (Consultation)
* Decisions made in the interest of the community (Making community decisions)
* Condition of sealed local roads (Sealed local roads)
* Contact in last 12 months (Contact)
* Rating of contact (Customer service)
* Overall council direction last 12 months (Council direction)

Reporting of results for these core questions can always be compared against other participating councils in the council group and against all participating councils State-wide. Alternatively, some questions in the 2016 State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey were optional. Councils also had the ability to ask tailored questions specific only to their council.

**Reporting**

Every council that participated in the 2016 State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey receives a customised report. In addition, the state government is supplied with a State-wide summary report of the aggregate results of ‘Core’ and ‘Optional’ questions asked across all council areas surveyed.

Tailored questions commissioned by individual councils are reported only to the commissioning council and not otherwise shared unless by express written approval of the commissioning council.

The Overall State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Report is available at <http://www.delwp.vic.gov.au/local-government/strengthening-councils/council-community-satisfaction-survey>.

**GLOSSARY OF TERMS**

**Core questions**: Compulsory inclusion questions for all councils participating in the CSS.

**CSS**: 2016 Victorian Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey.

**Council** **group:** One of five classified groups, comprising: metropolitan, interface, regional centres, large rural and small rural.

**Council group average**: The average result for all participating councils in the council group.

**Highest / lowest:** The result described is the highest or lowest result across a particular demographic sub-group e.g. men, for the specific question being reported. Reference to the result for a demographic sub-group being the highest or lowest does not imply that it is significantly higher or lower, unless this is specifically mentioned.

**Index score:** A score calculated and represented as a score out of 100 (on a 0 to 100 scale). This score is sometimes reported as a figure in brackets next to the category being described, e.g. men 50+ (60).

**Optional questions:** Questions which councils had an option to include or not.

**Percentages**: Also referred to as ‘detailed results’, meaning the proportion of responses, expressed as a percentage.

**Sample**: The number of completed interviews, e.g. for a council or within a demographic sub-group.

**Significantly higher / lower**: The result described is significantly higher or lower than the comparison result based on a statistical significance test at the 95% confidence limit. If the result referenced is statistically higher or lower then this will be specifically mentioned, however not all significantly higher or lower results are referenced in summary reporting.

**State-wide average**: The average result for all participating councils in the State.

**Tailored questions:** Individual questions tailored by and only reported to the commissioning council.

**Weighting:** Weighting factors are applied to the sample for each council based on available age and gender proportions from ABS census information to ensure reported results are proportionate to the actual population of the council, rather than the achieved survey sample.