



Wyndham City Council

***2017 Annual Community Survey
Overview Report***

November 2017



Prepared for:

Wyndham City Council

Prepared by:

Metropolis Research
ACN 083 090 993

© Wyndham City Council, 2017

© Metropolis Research, 2017 (*Governing Melbourne*)

This work is copyright. Apart from any use permitted under the Copyright Act 1968, no part may be reproduced by any process without written permission from the Manager Corporate Planning & Advocacy, Wyndham City Council.

Disclaimer

Any representation, statement, opinion or advice, expressed or implied in this publication is made in good faith but on the basis that Metropolis Research Pty Ltd, its agents and employees are not liable (whatever by reason of negligence, lack of care or otherwise) to any person for any damages or loss whatsoever which has occurred or may occur in relation to that person taking action in respect of any representation, statement, or advice referred to above.

Contact details

This report was prepared by Metropolis Research on behalf of the Wyndham City Council. For more information, please contact:

Dale Hubner

Managing Director
Metropolis Research Pty Ltd
Level 1, 74 Victoria Street
CARLTON VIC 3053

(03) 9272 4600

d.hubner@metropolis-research.com

Sibel Gradinscak

Corporate Planning Officer
City of Wyndham
45 Princes Hwy
Werribee Vic 3030

(03) 9742 0705

Sibel.Gradinscak@wyndham.vic.gov.au



Table of contents

INTRODUCTION	4
RATIONALE	4
METHODOLOGY.....	5
RESPONSE RATE.....	5
GOVERNING MELBOURNE	6
GLOSSARY OF TERMS	6
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	8
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS.....	11
COUNCIL’S OVERALL PERFORMANCE	11
GOVERNANCE AND LEADERSHIP	11
ISSUES FOR COUNCIL TO ADDRESS IN COMING TWELVE MONTHS.....	12
COUNCIL SERVICES AND FACILITIES.....	12
<i>Importance of Council services and facilities</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>Satisfaction with Council services and facilities</i>	<i>12</i>
CONTACT WITH COUNCIL (CUSTOMER SERVICE)	13
HEALTHY LIVING AND COMMUNITY	14
SAFETY IN PUBLIC AREAS OF THE CITY OF WYNDHAM	14
COMMUTING TO WORK.....	15
COUNCIL’S OVERALL PERFORMANCE	16
OVERALL PERFORMANCE BY RESPONDENT PROFILE.....	19
CHANGE IN COUNCIL’S OVERALL PERFORMANCE.....	22
REASONS FOR CHANGE IN COUNCIL’S OVERALL PERFORMANCE.....	23
GOVERNANCE AND LEADERSHIP.....	25
PLANNING FOR POPULATION GROWTH.....	27
REASONS FOR DISSATISFACTION WITH COUNCIL PLANNING FOR POPULATION GROWTH	30
CURRENT ISSUES IN THE CITY OF WYNDHAM	31
ISSUES BY PRECINCT	35
ISSUES BY RESPONDENT PROFILE.....	37
CONTACT WITH COUNCIL.....	40
CONTACTED COUNCIL IN THE LAST TWELVE MONTHS.....	40
METHOD OF CONTACTING COUNCIL	40
SATISFACTION WITH ASPECTS OF CUSTOMER SERVICE	41
IMPORTANCE OF AND SATISFACTION WITH COUNCIL SERVICES.....	45
IMPORTANCE OF COUNCIL SERVICES AND FACILITIES TO THE COMMUNITY.....	45
SATISFACTION WITH COUNCIL SERVICES AND FACILITIES	48
IMPORTANCE AND SATISFACTION CROSS TABULATION.....	51
SATISFACTION BY BROAD SERVICE AREAS.....	52
SATISFACTION BY COUNCIL DEPARTMENT.....	54
RESPONDENT PROFILE	55
AGE STRUCTURE	55
GENDER.....	56
LANGUAGE	56
HOUSEHOLD STRUCTURE	58
HOUSEHOLD MEMBER WITH A DISABILITY.....	59
HOUSING SITUATION	59
PERIOD OF RESIDENCE.....	60
APPENDIX ONE – SURVEY FORM.....	61



Introduction

Metropolis Research was commissioned by Wyndham City Council to undertake this, its fifth *Annual Community Survey*.

The survey has been designed to measure community satisfaction with a range of Council services and facilities as well as to measure community sentiment across a range of additional issues of concern in the municipality.

The *Annual Community Survey* program comprises the following core components which are included each year:

- ⊗ Satisfaction with Council's overall performance and change in performance.
- ⊗ Satisfaction with aspects of governance and leadership.
- ⊗ Satisfaction with Council's planning for population growth.
- ⊗ Importance of and satisfaction with a range of Council services and facilities.
- ⊗ Issues of importance for Council to address in the coming year, and priorities for the next ten to fifteen years.
- ⊗ Community perception of safety in public areas of Wyndham.
- ⊗ Satisfaction with Council customer service.
- ⊗ Respondent profile.

In addition to these core components that are to be included every year, the *Wyndham City Council – 2017 Annual Community Survey* includes questions exploring current issues of importance that reflect Council's current requirements. The 2017 survey includes questions related to the following issues:

- ⊗ Commuting / public transport use and barriers to use.
- ⊗ Aspects of healthy living.

Rationale

The *Annual Community Survey* has been designed to provide Council with a wide range of information covering community satisfaction, community sentiment and community feel and involvement.

The survey meets the requirements of the Local Government Victoria (LGV) annual satisfaction survey by providing importance and satisfaction ratings for the major Council services and facilities as well as scores for satisfaction with Council overall.



The *Annual Community Survey* provides an in depth examination of community satisfaction with a wide range of Council services and facilities, as well as additional community issues, and expectations of Council. This information is critical to informing Council of the attitudes, levels of satisfaction and issues facing the community in the City of Wyndham.

In addition, the *Annual Community Survey* includes a range of respondent profiling questions, to ensure that the respondent sample effectively reflects the underlying demographic profile of the Wyndham community. This detailed respondent profile is also critical as it underpins a more comprehensive understanding of the variations in residents' views across the diverse range of communities that make up the broader Wyndham community. Identifying the groups within the community that have differing issues, levels of engagement with and requirements of Council and other levels of government is a key objective of the survey.

The insights from the survey help inform Council's strategic and organisational planning, service delivery and policy development endeavors to best meet the needs of all the residents of Wyndham.

Methodology

The *Wyndham City Council – 2016 Annual Community Survey* was conducted as a door-to-door interview style survey of twelve hundred households drawn randomly from across the municipality from August to October 2017. The final results have been weighted by precinct to ensure that each precinct within Wyndham contributes proportionally to the municipal result. The precinct weightings have been based on the City of Wyndham population forecasts; forecast.id, as published on Council's website.

Trained Metropolis Research survey staff conducted face-to-face interviews of approximately twenty minutes duration with householders. This methodology has produced highly consistent results in terms of the demographics of those surveyed, although it should be noted that face-to-face interviews will tend to slightly over represent families, in particular parents with younger children, and slightly under represent residents who speak a language other than English.

Response rate

A total of 7,027 households were approached to participate in the *Wyndham City Council – 2017 Annual Community Survey*. Of these 3,607 were unattended when Metropolis Research called on the household and were therefore not invited to participate and played no further part in the research.

Of the households personally invited to participate in the research by a staff member of Metropolis Research, 2,220 refused to participate in the research and 1,200 completed surveys.



This provides a response rate of 35.1%, which is somewhat higher than the 31.3% recorded in 2016, and which is very similar to the 30.8% recorded across metropolitan Melbourne for *Governing Melbourne* in 2017.

The 95% confidence interval of these results is plus or minus 2.8%, at the fifty percent level. In other words, if a yes / no question obtains a result of fifty percent yes, it is 95% certain that the true value of this result is within the range of 47.2% and 52.8%. This is based on a total sample size of 1,200 respondents, and an underlying population of the City of Wyndham of approximately two hundred thousand.

Governing Melbourne

Governing Melbourne is a service provided by Metropolis Research since 2010. *Governing Melbourne* is a survey of one thousand respondents drawn in equal numbers from every municipality in metropolitan Melbourne. *Governing Melbourne* provides an objective, consistent and reliable basis on which to compare the results of the *Wyndham City Council – 2017 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey*. It is not intended to provide a “league table” for local councils, rather to provide a context within which to understand the results.

This report provides some comparisons against the metropolitan Melbourne average, which includes all municipalities located within the Melbourne Greater Capital City Statistical Area as well as the western region, which includes the municipalities of Maribyrnong, Hobsons Bay, Wyndham, Brimbank, Melton, and Moonee Valley.

Glossary of terms

Precinct

The term precinct is used by Metropolis Research to describe the small areas utilised by Council in the *Community Profile*. Readers seeking to use precinct results should seek clarification of specific precinct boundaries if necessary.

Measurable and statistically significant

A measurable difference is one where the difference between or change in results is sufficiently large to ensure that they are in fact different results, i.e. the difference is statistically significant. This is due to the fact that survey results are subject to a margin of error or an area of uncertainty.



Significant result

Metropolis Research uses the term *significant result* to describe a change or difference between results that Metropolis Research believes to be of sufficient magnitude that they may impact on relevant aspects of policy development, service delivery and the evaluation of performance and are therefore identified and noted as significant or important.

Somewhat / notable / marginal

Metropolis Research will describe some results or changes in results as being marginally, somewhat, or notably higher or lower. These are not statistical terms rather they are interpretive. They are used to draw attention to results that may be of interest or relevant to policy development and service delivery. These terms are often used for results that may not be statistically significant due to sample size or other factors but may nonetheless provide some insight.

95% confidence interval

Average satisfaction results are presented in this report with a 95% confidence interval included. These figures reflect the range of values within which it is 95% certain that the true average satisfaction falls.

The 95% confidence interval based on a one-sample t-test is used for the mean scores presented in this report. The margin of error around the other results in this report at the municipal level is plus or minus 3.4%.

Satisfaction categories

Metropolis Research typically categorises satisfaction results to assist in the understanding and interpretation of the results. These categories have been developed over many years as a guide to the scores presented in the report and are designed to give a general context, and are defined as follows:

- ⊗ **Excellent** - scores of 7.75 and above are categorised as excellent
- ⊗ **Very good** - scores of 7.25 to less than 7.75 are categorised as very good
- ⊗ **Good** - scores of 6.5 to less than 7.25 are categorised as good
- ⊗ **Solid** - scores of 6 to less than 6.5 are categorised as solid
- ⊗ **Poor** - scores of 5.5 to less than 6 are categorised as poor
- ⊗ **Very Poor** - scores of 5 to less than 5.5 are categorised as very poor
- ⊗ **Extremely Poor** – scores of less than 5 are categorised as extremely poor.



Executive summary

Satisfaction with the performance of Wyndham City Council across all areas of responsibility (overall performance) increased by less than one percent in 2017, up from 6.65 to 6.69, and remains at a level best categorised as “good”.

This result reflects a stabilisation of satisfaction with Council following the significant (seven percent) decline recorded in 2016. It does appear that satisfaction with Council is trending higher, and that the significant decline in 2016 may well have been a reflection largely of one-off issues around local politics, as well as the negative influence of the local council elections held that year. The impact of local council elections was observed across metropolitan Melbourne and was not unique to the City of Wyndham.

It is important to note that since the *Annual Community Survey* program commenced in 2013, overall satisfaction with Council has increased by 8.1%, from a low of 6.19 in 2013 to 6.69 in 2017.

This result is marginally higher than both the metropolitan Melbourne (6.53) and western region councils’ average (6.55), and measurably higher than the growth area councils’ average (6.25) as recorded in the independent Metropolis Research *Governing Melbourne* research.

- **More satisfied than average** - younger respondents (age 15 to 34 years), new residents (less than one year in Wyndham), rental household respondents, and respondents from multi-lingual households were measurably more satisfied than average with Council’s overall performance.
- **Less satisfied than average** – adults, middle-aged and older adults (respondents aged 35 to 74 years), English speaking household respondents, mortgagee household respondents, long-term residents (more than ten years in Wyndham), respondents from Tarneit, and respondents from households with a member with a disability were measurably less satisfied with Council’s overall performance.

As in previous years, close to twice as many respondents considered that Council’s overall performance had improved (14.8% down from 16.1%) than considered that performance had deteriorated (8.9% up from 8.3%) in the last twelve months.

The main reasons why respondents considered that Council’s overall performance had improved in the last twelve months related to generally positive comments (17.9%), improvements to roads and traffic (17.4%), improvements to Council services, facilities, and events (16.9%), and improvements to the general maintenance of the area (11.8%).

The main reasons why respondents considered that Council’s overall performance had deteriorated in the last twelve months related to issues with roads and traffic (19.1%), issues with Council services and facilities (14.5%), and issues with communication and consultation (13.6%).



Governance and leadership

Satisfaction with the included aspects of governance and leadership increased by an average of 2.2% in 2017, up from 6.32 to 6.46, although it remains categorised as “solid”. The solid increases in satisfaction with aspects of governance and leadership this year reinforce the view that the decline last year was related to one-off governance related issues, which appear to have diminished this year. Satisfaction with governance and leadership is now marginally higher than the metropolitan Melbourne average, which is an improvement on the reverse finding in 2016. This again reflects the improvement in respondent satisfaction with Council’s governance and leadership performance this year compared to last.

Planning for population growth

There was a measurable and significant increase in satisfaction with “planning for population growth” (of all levels of government) observed in the City of Wyndham in 2017, up 8.6% from 5.38 to 5.84.

Despite this increase, satisfaction is at a level categorised as “poor”, although up from the previous “very poor” recorded in 2016.

Metropolis Research is of the view that the 14.9% decline in satisfaction with planning for population growth in 2016 may well have been, at least in part, impacted by the fact that local council elections were held in 2016. The elections may well have highlighted population growth related issues in the municipality in 2016.

The most significant concerns respondents have in relation to planning for population growth remained the perceived lack of services and infrastructure to support the additional population. This is evident in relation to roads and traffic, general infrastructure, as well as access to health and human services.

Council services and facilities

The average satisfaction with the forty-two Council services and facilities included in the 2017 survey increased marginally, up 1.1% to 7.38, and remains at a level categorised as “very good”. This result is almost identical to the metropolitan Melbourne average of 7.37, but is somewhat higher than the western region councils’ average of 7.28.

These results confirm that Wyndham City Council’s provision of services and facilities is consistent with the performance of local government across metropolitan Melbourne. Given the significant community concerns around planning for population growth and the perceived impacts on services and infrastructure, this result for satisfaction with services and facilities is considered a strong result for Council.



Services and facilities that obtained very high levels of satisfaction included the main waste and recycling services as well as many of the health and human services provided by Council. These services also tend to be the services and facilities that respondents considered most important.

The three services and facilities with the lowest levels of satisfaction were the maintenance and repair of sealed local roads (6.38), parking enforcement (6.30) and local traffic management (5.55). The only service to be categorised as “poor” was local traffic management.

Customer service

There was a decline in satisfaction with customer service recorded in 2017, with the average satisfaction with the eight aspects of customer service declining 2.2% to 7.78. Overall satisfaction with the customer service experience also declined, down less than one percent to 7.45. Despite these declines, satisfaction with the customer service of Wyndham City Council remains comfortably above the metropolitan Melbourne average of 7.51.

Attention is again in 2017 drawn however to the fact that respondents visiting Council in person were on average 9.6% more satisfied than those telephoning Council. This gap between satisfaction in person and via telephone is larger than has been observed elsewhere and may be worthy of additional attention by Council.

Issues in Wyndham

The major issues to be addressed in the City of Wyndham in 2017 are consistent with previous years, and are dominated by the following:

- **Traffic management and road maintenance and repairs** – these issues were identified by close to half the respondents in 2017. It is noted that these issues exert a mildly negative influence on satisfaction with Council’s overall performance.
- **Safety, policing and crime related issues** – identified by approximately one-sixth of respondents this year, these issues remain important to many in the Wyndham community. Metropolis Research does note however that concerns around safety, policing and crime have spiked significantly in the outer western regions of metropolitan Melbourne in recent times, and it is noted that this trend has not been observed as strongly in the City of Wyndham as in some neighbouring municipalities. Whilst a significant number of respondents raised issues around safety, policing and crime, these respondents were on average actually more satisfied with Council’s overall performance than the average. This suggests that they do not see this issue as a negative influence on their satisfaction with Council’s performance.
- **Parks, gardens, and open space issues** – whilst identified by a little less than ten percent of respondents this year, Metropolis Research does note that the 113 respondents identifying these issues were on average measurably less satisfied with Council’s overall performance than the municipal average result. This does imply that for these respondents, issues around parks and gardens may well be exerting a negative influence on their overall satisfaction with Council.



Summary of findings

The following are the key findings for each section of the *City of Wyndham – 2017 Annual Community Survey*.

Council's overall performance

- ⊗ Satisfaction with Council's overall performance increased very marginally in 2017, up 0.6% from 6.65 to 6.69, but remains at a level of best categorised as "good". The 95% confidence interval of this result is 6.58 to 6.81.
- ⊗ Satisfaction with Council's overall performance was marginally higher than the metropolitan Melbourne (6.53) and western region councils' (6.55), and measurably higher than the growth area councils' (6.25) averages.
- ⊗ Respondents from Hoppers Crossing (6.86) and Werribee (6.84) rated satisfaction with the overall performance of Council marginally but not measurably higher than the municipal average.
- ⊗ There was a significant decline in satisfaction recorded in Tarneit (6.49 down from 6.97), and is now at a level categorised as "solid".
- ⊗ A little more than one seventh (14.8% down from 16.1%) of respondents considered Council's overall performance had improved in the last twelve months whilst 8.9% (up from 8.3%) considered that it had deteriorated.
- ⊗ The most common reasons why respondents considered that Council's overall performance had improved in the last twelve months related to general positive (17.9% of responses), improvements to roads and traffic (17.4%), Council facilities, events and services (16.9%), the maintenance of the local area (11.8%), and parks and open spaces (9.7%).
- ⊗ The most common reasons why respondents considered that Council's overall performance had deteriorated in the last twelve months related to traffic and roads (19.1% of responses), Council services and facilities (14.5%), communication and consultation (13.6%), the maintenance of the area (8.2%), and Council governance and management related issues (8.2%).

Governance and leadership

- ⊗ Satisfaction with the six aspects of governance and leadership as a group was 6.46, up 2.2% on the 2016 average of 6.32, and remains at a level of satisfaction categorised as "solid". It is comprised of the following:
 - Community consultation and engagement (6.57 up from 6.51)
 - Representation, lobbying and advocacy (6.33 up from 6.28)
 - Making decisions in interests of the community (6.40 up from 6.17)
 - Responsiveness to community needs (6.42 up from 6.21)
 - Maintaining community trust and confidence (6.31 up from 6.17)
 - Providing information to the community (6.71 up from 6.46).



- ⊗ Satisfaction with “planning for population growth” (of all levels of government) increased 8.6% in 2017, reversing some of the 14.9% decline recorded last year
(5.84 up from 5.38).
- ⊗ The most common reasons why respondents were dissatisfied with planning for population growth related most often to concerns about increased demand for services and pressure on infrastructure resulting from increased population.

Issues for Council to address in coming twelve months

- ⊗ A total of 954 respondents (79.5% up from 78.1%) provided 2,022 individual responses.
- ⊗ The most commonly identified issues in 2017 were:
 - Traffic management *(35.9% up from 26.0%)*
 - Roads maintenance and repairs *(17.4% down from 19.8%)*
 - Safety, policing and crime *(16.9% down from 17.2%)*
 - Parking *(10.8% down from 12.8%).*
 - Parks, gardens, and open space issues *(9.4% down from 13.2%).*
- ⊗ It is noted that the 113 respondents that identified parks, gardens, and open spaces as an issue to address in the coming twelve months were on average measurably less satisfied with Council’s overall performance than the average of all respondents.

Council services and facilities

Importance of Council services and facilities

- ⊗ The average importance of the forty-two services and facilities included in 2017 was 8.56 (up from 8.54).
- ⊗ The five most important services and facilities included in the 2017 survey were:
 - Weekly garbage collection *(9.43 stable 9.43)*
 - Maintenance of food safety standards *(9.13, new)*
 - Local traffic management *(9.09 up from 8.81)*
 - Provision and maintenance of street lighting *(9.08 up from 8.99)*
 - Maintenance and repairs of sealed local roads *(9.02 up from 8.80).*

Satisfaction with Council services and facilities

- ⊗ Average satisfaction with the forty-two services and facilities included in the 2017 survey was 7.38, up 1.1% on the 2016 result.
- ⊗ The average satisfaction with services and facilities remains at a level of satisfaction best categorised as “very good”.
- ⊗ This result is almost identical to the metropolitan Melbourne (7.37) average, and marginally but not measurably higher than the western region councils’ average (7.28).



⊗ The five services with the highest satisfaction scores in 2017 were all rated “excellent”, as follows:

- Weekly garbage collection (8.79 up from 8.63)
- Immunisation services (8.78 up from 8.49)
- Local library (8.53 down from 8.54)
- Regular recycling (8.37 up from 8.19)
- Green waste collection (8.33 up from 8.24).

⊗ The five services with the lowest satisfaction scores in 2017 were as follows, with public toilets and public art rated “good”, and local traffic management rated “poor”:

- Public toilets (6.56 up from 6.21)
- Public art (6.51 down up from 6.53)
- Maintenance and repair of sealed local roads (6.38 up from 6.31)
- Parking enforcement (6.30 up from 6.27)
- Local traffic management (5.55 down from 6.06).

⊗ Satisfaction with the forty-two services and facilities by broad category of services is as follows:

- Waste and recycling services (7.82 up from 7.77)
- Community and leisure services (7.73 up from 7.56)
- Communications services (7.13 stable)
- Local laws (6.99 up from 6.84)
- Infrastructure (6.89 stable).

Contact with Council (customer service)

⊗ A little less than one-third of the respondents (31.9% down from 37.7%) had contact with Council in the last twelve months.

⊗ The most common forms of contact remain telephone (70.9% up from 63.5%) and visits in person (13.1% down from 19.9%).

⊗ A little more than ten percent (11.5% up from 10.5%) were internet-based (email or website) and none were via social media this year.

⊗ Satisfaction with the eight aspects of customer service as a group was 7.78 (down from 7.96), but remains at a level of satisfaction best categorised as “very good”.

⊗ This result was measurably higher than the metropolitan Melbourne average of 7.49. Wyndham has consistently recorded higher than average satisfaction with customer service.

⊗ Satisfaction with the more subjective “satisfaction with overall experience” was measurably lower at 7.45 (down from 7.52), although it is also at a level categorised as “very good”.

⊗ Overall satisfaction with the customer service experience appears to be lower than the average satisfaction with the eight aspects as a result of the negative influence of lower satisfaction with “speed of service”.



⊗ Satisfaction with the seven of the aspects of customer service were rated either as “excellent” or “very good”, whilst “speed of service” was rated as “good”, as follows:

- Understand language needs (multi-lingual only) (8.47 down from 8.58)
- Opening hours (8.09 down from 8.16)
- Ease understanding information from Council (7.97 down from 8.38)
- Courtesy of service (7.82 down from 8.01)
- Access to relevant staff / officer (7.64 down from 7.70)
- Ease accessing information from Council (7.64, new)
- Care and attention to enquiry (7.44 down from 7.71)
- Speed of service (7.17 down from 7.40).

Healthy living and community

⊗ Respondents were asked their level of agreement with eight statements relating to healthy living and community. Respondents on average strongly agreed with each of these statements:

- I can get help from friends, family or neighbours when needed (7.89 up from 7.77)
- Community events should offer healthy food / drink options (7.75 down from 7.96)
- There are enough opportunities for people in my local area to exercise (7.40 down from 7.56)
- I feel happy and safe walking in my local area (7.40 down from 7.52)
- Council activities and programs are accessible to and inclusive of the community (7.18 stable)
- There are adequate support services for vulnerable community members (7.03 up from 6.82)
- I feel there are enough opportunities to connect socially with people in the local area (7.03 up from 6.95)
- I can easily get to a supermarket or fruit and vegetable store without a car (6.39 down from 6.93).

⊗ There was measurable and significant variation in these results across the six precincts comprising the City of Wyndham.

Safety in public areas of the City of Wyndham

⊗ Respondents continued to rate their perception of safety in the public areas of the City of Wyndham as on average safe, as follows:

- In public areas of Wyndham during the day (7.94 down from 7.95)
- In and around the local shopping district (7.52 down from 7.70)
- Travelling on trains (6.98 up from 6.79)
- In public areas of Wyndham at night (6.01 up from 5.83).



- ⊗ The perception of safety in the public areas of the City of Wyndham remains measurably and significantly lower than the metropolitan Melbourne average.
- ⊗ The most common reasons for respondents feeling unsafe in the public areas of the City of Wyndham in 2017 were issues with “youths, gangs, etc” (26.6%), crime related issues including theft, robbery, violence, and break-ins (18.2%), and safety at night issues including lighting (17.2%).

Commuting to work

- ⊗ Three-quarter (75.0% up from 67.4%) of respondents reported that a household member commuted to work regularly by car. This is the highest proportion recorded over the last five years.
- ⊗ The average (two-way) commuting times did decrease somewhat in 2017, as follows:
 - Less than thirty minutes *(21.8% up from 18.3%)*
 - Thirty minutes to less than one hour *(38.9% up from 30.1%)*
 - One hour to less than ninety minutes *(22.1% down from 25.9%)*
 - Ninety minutes or more *(17.3% down from 25.7%)*
- ⊗ Respondents rated “most convenient method” (9.12 up from 8.98), and “quickest method” (8.70 down from 8.84) as the most important of the four included factors affecting the decision to commute by car.
- ⊗ Respondents were asked to rate the importance of ten barriers to commuting by public transport, with the average importance scores outlined below.
 - Lack of car parking at train stations *(7.72 down from 8.16)*
 - Takes too long by public transport *(7.21 down from 8.23)*
 - Trains are too overcrowded *(7.10 down from 7.86)*
 - Buses are too infrequent *(6.83 down from 7.38)*
 - Too many changes of p/t mode required *(6.62 down from 7.48)*
 - Public transport is not conveniently located *(6.36 down from 6.85)*
 - Working flexible hours not conducive to p/t *(6.30 down from 7.17)*
 - Public transport is too unreliable *(5.76 down from 6.40)*
 - Buses do not connect with trains *(5.64 down from 6.34)*
 - I don’t feel safe using public transport *(5.05 down from 5.40)*



Council’s overall performance


Respondents were asked:

“On a scale of 0 (lowest) to 10 (highest), can you please rate your personal level of satisfaction with the performance of Council across all areas of responsibility?”

Satisfaction with the performance of Council across all areas of responsibility (overall performance) increased marginally, albeit not measurably in 2017, up less than one percent to 6.69. Satisfaction with Council’s overall performance has now increased 8.1% since 2013.

This level of satisfaction is categorised as “good, the same categorisation that the City of Wyndham has now obtained in four of the five years of the *Annual Community Survey* program.


By way of comparison, the *Governing Melbourne* research conducted independently by Metropolis Research reported a metropolitan Melbourne average satisfaction with overall performance of local government of 6.53, very marginally but not measurably lower than this City of Wyndham result. This City of Wyndham result is however measurably and significantly higher than the growth area council’s average satisfaction of 6.25, which was rated as “solid”.



The most common satisfaction ratings with the overall performance of Council in 2017 were seven out of ten (262 respondents or 25.3% of respondents providing a rating) and eight out of ten (226 respondents or 21.8%).




Satisfaction with performance of Council across all areas of responsibility
Wyndham City Council - 2017 Annual Community Survey
(number of responses)




The following graph provides a breakdown of these results into those very satisfied (rating eight to ten), those neutral to somewhat satisfied (rating five to seven), and those dissatisfied (rating zero to four). In 2017 there was a small decline in the proportion of respondents dissatisfied with Council’s overall performance (down from 12.9% to 10.3%). There was however also a marginal decline in the proportion of respondents very satisfied (down from 36.7% to 35.6%).

Satisfaction with performance of Council's across all areas of responsibility
Wyndham City Council - 2017 Annual Community Survey
(Percent of respondents providing a response)



There was no statistically significant variation in satisfaction with Council’s overall performance observed across the six precincts comprising the City of Wyndham. Attention is however drawn to the fact that respondents from Tarneit rated satisfaction somewhat, albeit not measurably lower than the municipal average, and at a level categorised as “solid”.

Metropolis Research draws attention to the fact that satisfaction with the Wyndham City Council in 2017 was marginally but not measurably higher than the western region council’s average of 6.55, the metropolitan Melbourne average of 6.53, and measurably higher than the growth area council’s average of 6.25. These comparisons are sourced from the 2017 *Governing Melbourne* research.




There was relatively little significant variation in the raw percentage results observed at the precinct level in 2017, although it is noted that 43.7% of respondents from Werribee were very satisfied with Council’s overall performance.

Particular attention is drawn to the fact that there was no measurable variation in the proportion of respondents dissatisfied with Council’s overall performance.

It is noted that less than ten percent of respondents from Hoppers Crossing (7.4%), Truganina (9.2%), and Point Cook (9.7%) were dissatisfied.





Overall performance by respondent profile

This section of the report provides a breakdown of satisfaction with Council’s overall performance by the various aspects of the respondent profile including; age structure, gender, language spoken at home, household disability status, household structure, housing situation, and the period of residence in the City of Wyndham.


There was measurable and significant variation in satisfaction with Council’s overall performance by respondent profile, with attention drawn to the following:

- **Age structure** – adolescents and young adults (aged 15 to 34 years) were measurably more satisfied with Council’s overall performance, whilst senior citizens (aged 75 years and over) were somewhat, albeit not measurably more satisfied. Adults, middle-aged and older adults (aged 35 to 74 years) were somewhat, albeit not measurably less satisfied. Metropolis Research has typically found that middle-aged and older adults (aged 45 to 74 years) are the least satisfied with Council’s overall performance.
- **Gender** – there was no meaningful variation in satisfaction with Council’s overall performance observed between male and female respondents.
- **Language spoken at home** – respondents from multi-lingual households were measurably more satisfied with Council’s overall performance than respondents from English speaking households.




- **Housing situation** – mortgagee household respondents were somewhat, albeit not measurably less satisfied with Council’s overall performance, whilst rental household respondents were significantly more satisfied.
- **Period of residence** – consistent with the findings in previous years, overall satisfaction with Council tends to decline with the respondents’ period of residence in the City of Wyndham. In 2017 new residents (less than one year in Wyndham) were measurably and significantly more satisfied than average and rated satisfaction at a level categorised as “very good”, whilst long term residents (ten years or more in Wyndham) were measurably less satisfied.
- **Disability status** – respondents from households with a member with a disability were measurably and significantly less satisfied with Council’s overall performance than were other households, and rated satisfaction at a level categorised as “poor”.
- **Household structure** – whilst there was no statistically significant variation in overall satisfaction with Council observed based on the respondents’ household structure (mainly due to sample size), it is noted that respondents from group households (unrelated housemates) and sole person households were notably, albeit not measurably more satisfied than average.

Satisfaction with Council's overall performance by respondent profile
Wyndham City Council - 2017 Annual Community Survey
scale from 0 (very dissatisfied) to 10 (very satisfied)




Satisfaction with Council's overall performance by housing situation, period of residence and disability

Wyndham City Council - 2017 Annual Community Survey
scale from 0 (very dissatisfied) to 10 (very satisfied)



Satisfaction with Council's overall performance by household structure

Wyndham City Council - 2017 Annual Community Survey
scale from 0 (very dissatisfied) to 10 (very satisfied)



Change in Council's overall performance

Respondents were asked:

“Over the past twelve months, do you think that Wyndham City Council's performance has improved, stayed the same or deteriorated?”

There was no statistically significant variation in the results in relation to the change in Council's overall performance observed between 2016 and 2017, as outlined in the following table.

Metropolis Research notes that consistent with previous years, a little more than half of the respondents considered that Council's overall performance had stayed the same.

It is noted that since 2013, when the proportion of respondents considering that Council's overall performance had improved was almost identical to the proportion considering that performance had deteriorated, in recent years a significantly larger proportion of respondents considered that performance had improved (14.8% in 2017) than considered that performance had deteriorated (8.9% in 2017).

Change in Council's overall performance
Wyndham City Council - 2017 Annual Community Survey
(Number and percent of total respondents)


Response	2017		2016	2015	2014	2013
	Number	Percent				
Improved	178	14.8%	16.1%	17.5%	15.1%	10.2%
Stayed the same	649	54.1%	54.5%	63.0%	60.4%	59.9%
Deteriorated	107	8.9%	8.3%	5.8%	6.0%	10.4%
Can't say	266	22.2%	21.1%	13.8%	18.6%	19.5%
Total	1,200	100%	1,200	800	803	801

These results are very consistent with the metropolitan Melbourne average results recorded in the 2017 *Governing Melbourne* research, and broadly consistent with both the growth area council's and western region council's results.

Whilst there was no statistically significant variation in these change in performance results observed across the six precincts comprising the City of Wyndham, attention is drawn to the following:

- **Werribee and Truganina** – respondents were somewhat, albeit not measurably more likely than average to consider that Council's overall performance had improved in the last twelve months.





Reasons for change in Council's overall performance

Respondents who considered that Council's performance had changed were asked:

"What was the most important factor influencing your answer?"

Respondents were provided an open-ended opportunity to outline the reasons why they considered that Council's overall performance had either improved or deteriorated. A total of 195 responses were received from respondents that considered that Council's overall performance had improved, and 110 responses from respondents that considered that performance had deteriorated.

The open-ended responses received from these respondents have been broadly categorised, as outlined in the following table.

The most common reasons why respondents considered that Council's overall performance had improved in the last twelve months were related to "general improvement" (17.9% of responses), improvements to roads and traffic (17.4%), Council facilities, events and services (16.9%), the maintenance of the local area (11.8%), parks and open spaces (9.7%), and planning / population growth (9.2%).

The most common reasons why respondents considered that Council's overall performance had deteriorated in the last twelve months related to traffic and roads (19.1% of responses), Council services and facilities (14.5%), and communication and consultation (13.6%).



Attention is drawn to the fact that a number of respondents raised issues around roads and traffic as reasons for their view that performance had improved as well as for those considering that performance had deteriorated. Clearly the provision of new and improved roads across the municipality will result in some variation in the perception of roads and traffic by different groups of respondents.

Summary reasons why Council's overall performance has improved / deteriorated

Wyndham City Council - 2017 Annual Community Survey

(Number and percent of respondents providing a response)

Reason	2017		2016	2015	2014	2013
	Number	Percent				
Improved						
General positive	35	17.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Roads and traffic	34	17.4%	22.7%	21.0%	35.3%	36.4%
Council facilities, events and services	33	16.9%	18.8%	19.3%	33.3%	29.1%
Maintenance of the area	23	11.8%	10.9%	6.7%	17.6%	14.9%
Parks and open spaces	19	9.7%	13.1%	10.1%	2.0%	3.6%
Planning for population growth / development	18	9.2%	3.5%	7.6%	2.0%	0.0%
Communication / consultation	10	5.1%	11.8%	8.4%	2.0%	3.3%
Infrastructure	10	5.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Public transport	5	2.6%	3.1%	16.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Safety	4	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other	4	2.1%	14.8%	9.2%	2.0%	4.8%
Reason not stated	0		0	21	71	22
Total	195	100%	229	140	122	82
Deteriorated						
Traffic and roads	21	19.1%	21.7%	45.7%	11.9%	11.0%
Council services and facilities	16	14.5%	5.4%	0.0%	15.4%	0.0%
Communication / consultation	15	13.6%	5.4%	2.2%	9.0%	12.1%
Maintenance of the area	9	8.2%	17.4%	6.5%	10.4%	8.9%
Council governance and management	9	8.2%	10.9%	0.0%	0.0%	18.5%
Safety and security	9	8.2%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%	3.5%
General negative	9	8.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Building and planning	7	6.4%	13.0%	6.5%	6.0%	5.6%
Financial management / rates	5	4.5%	6.5%	8.7%	4.5%	5.7%
Parking	5	4.5%	0.0%	6.5%	10.4%	0.0%
Other	5	4.5%	16.3%	19.6%	3.0%	6.5%
Reason not stated	0		8	0	0	0
Total	110	100%	100	46	67	77



Governance and leadership

Respondents were asked:

“On a scale of 0 (lowest) to 10 (highest), can you please rate your personal level of satisfaction with the following aspects of Council’s performance?”


The average satisfaction with the six aspects of governance and leadership increased somewhat, albeit not measurably in 2017, up 2.2% from 6.32 to 6.46. This result remains very marginally lower than the 2014 result of 6.52. It is however significantly lower than the high point of 7.06 recorded in 2015 (which does not include “providing information to the community” which was included for the first time in 2016).

Despite this small increase in average satisfaction with governance and leadership this year, the average satisfaction remains at a level categorised as “solid”.

Satisfaction with the six aspects of governance and leadership can best be summarised as follows:

- ⊗ **Good** – for providing information to the community and community consultation and engagement.
- ⊗ **Solid** – for responsiveness to local community needs, making decisions in the interests of the community, representation, lobbying and advocacy, and maintaining the trust and confidence of the local community.


Metropolis Research notes that consistent with results observed over a long period of time, satisfaction with aspects of governance and leadership tend to be somewhat, albeit not measurably lower than satisfaction with Council’s overall performance.



The following graph provides a breakdown of these results into respondents that were dissatisfied (rating satisfaction from zero to four), neutral to somewhat satisfied (rating five to seven), and very satisfied (rating eight or more).

Metropolis Research notes the following points in relation to these results:

- ⊗ Between twice and three-times as many respondents were very satisfied than were dissatisfied with each aspect of governance and leadership.
- ⊗ There was a decline in the proportion of respondents dissatisfied with each of the six aspects of governance and leadership in 2017 compared to the unusually low results recorded in 2016.




The following graph provides a comparison of satisfaction with the five aspects of governance and leadership that are included in both this Wyndham survey as well as *Governing Melbourne*. A comparison is provided to the western region and the metropolitan Melbourne average.

Respondents in the City of Wyndham in 2017 were somewhat more satisfied with each of the five aspects of governance and leadership than either the western region or metropolitan Melbourne averages.

This result is a strong improvement over the results recorded in 2016 in which satisfaction with the five aspects of governance and leadership were lower in the City of Wyndham than the metropolitan Melbourne and western region averages as recorded in *Governing Melbourne*.





Planning for population growth

Respondents were asked:

“On a scale of 0 (lowest) to 10 (highest), can you please rate your satisfaction with planning for population growth?”


Satisfaction with Council’s planning for population growth increased measurably and significantly in 2017, up 8.6% from 5.38 to 5.84. This increase reverses the significant decline of 14.9% recorded in 2016. This result is almost identical to the long-term average result of 5.83 recorded since 2013.

This level of satisfaction is best categorised as “poor”, an improvement over the “very poor” recorded in 2016.

Metropolis Research notes that the decline in satisfaction with Council’s planning for population growth was the largest decline recorded in the 2016 survey, and appears to have been one of the significant drivers of lower levels of satisfaction with Council’s overall performance in that year. As was discussed in the report in 2016, the results to this question highlights the significant concern of some in the community around the provision of infrastructure and services to meet the needs of the growing Wyndham community.


This City of Wyndham result is marginally, albeit not measurably lower than the western region and growth area councils’ average satisfaction with planning for population growth, but marginally higher than the metropolitan Melbourne average.






There was some measurable variation in satisfaction with planning for population growth observed across the municipality, with attention drawn to the following:

- **Truganina** – respondents were somewhat, albeit not measurably more satisfied than average with planning for population growth, rating satisfaction as “solid”.
- **Wyndham Vale** – respondents were somewhat, albeit not measurably less satisfied than average with planning for population growth, rating satisfaction as “very poor”.



There was measurable and significant variation in satisfaction with Council’s planning for population growth observed by respondent profile, with attention drawn to the following:

- ⊗ **Age structure** – satisfaction with Council’s planning for population growth declined measurably and significantly with respondents’ age structure (with the exception of senior citizens). Particular attention is drawn to the fact that adolescents and young adults (aged 15 to 34 years) were measurably and significantly more satisfied than older respondents, rating satisfaction at levels categorised as “good” and “solid” respectively.
- ⊗ **Gender** – there was no statistically significant variation in satisfaction with Council’s planning for population growth observed between male and female respondents.
- ⊗ **Language spoken at home** – respondents from multi-lingual households were measurably and significantly more satisfied with Council’s planning for population growth than respondents from English speaking households.




The following graph provides the average satisfaction with Council’s planning for population growth by the respondents’ period of residence in Wyndham.

As is clearly evident in the graph, and consistent with the age structure variation discussed above, Metropolis Research notes that satisfaction with planning for population growth declines substantially with the period of residence in the City of Wyndham, most particularly for respondents that have lived in the municipality for ten years or more.

This trend of satisfaction declining with age has been consistently observed across a number of councils across metropolitan Melbourne.



This reflects the fact younger respondents and new residents (which overlap significantly) are moving into the area by choice, whereas older respondents that have lived in the area for a long period of time are more likely to feel they are being negatively impacted by the increased pressure on infrastructure from the growing population, as well as any perceived change in the character of the community.



Reasons for dissatisfaction with Council planning for population growth

Respondents that were dissatisfied with Council’s planning for population growth were provided an open-ended opportunity to describe why they were dissatisfied.

These open-ended responses have been broadly categorised for ease of analysis as outlined in the following table. Metropolis Research notes that many of these categories do overlap somewhat, as it can be difficult to narrowly define broad statements from respondents as to the reasons for their dissatisfaction.

The three most common reasons for dissatisfaction with planning for population growth related to planning and housing development generally (27.3% up from 12.9%), infrastructure related issues such as the lack of infrastructure to support the additional population (26.0% down from 34.3%, and issues around roads such as the lack of adequate roads for the increased population (18.2% down from 22.4%).

These results have consistently shown over a number of years now that some in the community (mainly older adults who have lived in the municipality for many years) are concerned about the impacts of increased population on the provision of infrastructure, services and facilities.



There is also some concern around a perceived change in the nature of the Wyndham community as it increases the stock of new housing which makes the area more urban and less rural-urban fringe.

Reasons for dissatisfaction with Council planning for population growth

Wyndham City Council - 2017 Annual Community Survey

(Number of respondents dissatisfied with Council planning for pop'n growth and providing a response)

Response	2017		2016	2015	2014
	Number	Percent			
Planning and development	63	27.3%	12.9%	19.3%	14.8%
Infrastructure issues (i.e. lack of)	60	26.0%	34.3%	23.5%	23.5%
Roads	42	18.2%	22.4%	14.3%	22.2%
Council services and facilities	21	9.1%	3.2%	0.0%	0.0%
Traffic management	17	7.4%	14.8%	24.4%	23.5%
Public transport	12	5.2%	6.1%	2.5%	6.8%
Safety	4	1.7%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%
Other	7	3.0%	4.5%	16.0%	9.3%
Not stated	5		0	5	28
Total responses	231	98%	379	124	190

Current issues in the City of Wyndham

Respondents were asked:

“Can you please list what you consider to be the top three issues for the City of Wyndham at the moment?”

Respondents were again in 2017 asked to identify what they considered to be the top three issues for the City of Wyndham at the moment. A little more than three-quarters (79.5% up from 78.1%) of respondents provided a total of 2,022 responses, at an average of 2.1 issues per respondent.

The open-ended responses received from respondents have been broadly categorised into a set of approximately seventy categories to facilitate analysis and time series, and other comparisons.

It is important to bear in mind that these responses are not technically complaints about the performance of Council, nor do they only reflect services, facilities and issues within the specific remit of the Wyndham City Council. Many of the issues respondents identify in the municipality are within the general remit of other levels of government.

A number of issues were somewhat less commonly identified in the City of Wyndham than the metropolitan Melbourne average, including: parking (10.8% compared to 15.8%),



cleanliness and general maintenance of the area (6.3% compared to 10.3%), building, housing, planning and development (5.3% compared to 10.9%), street lighting (4.7% compared to 9.2%), and footpath maintenance and repairs (4.5% compared to 8.5%).

The most significant issues in the City of Wyndham area as follows:

Traffic management and road maintenance and repairs

Consistent with the results recorded in the previous three surveys, the most commonly identified issues in the City of Wyndham in 2017 related to traffic management, followed by issues with road maintenance and repairs. Naturally there is some overlap in these two groups of issues, with issues focused on traffic and congestion typically categorised into traffic management, whilst issues focused on the condition of roads are typically categorised into road maintenance and repairs.

Taken together, these two issues were identified by a little more than half (53.3%) of the respondents in 2017. Metropolis Research does draw attention to the fact that the proportion of respondents identifying these two issues did decline from a high of 71.4% in 2013 and 65.1% in 2014, to be 52.5% in 2015, 45.8% in 2016 and is now 53.3%

It is noted that the proportion of respondents identifying traffic management increased substantially in 2017, up from the unusually low result of 26.0% in 2016 to 35.9% in 2017.

The proportion of respondents identifying traffic management (35.9%) in 2017 was significantly higher than both the growth area councils' average of 21.3% and the metropolitan Melbourne average of 20.6%. Respondents in the City of Wyndham (17.4%) were also significantly more likely than respondents in the growth area councils (10.9%) or metropolitan Melbourne (11.3%) to identify road maintenance and repair.

Public transport

Metropolis Research notes that the proportion of respondents identifying public transport as an issue has also declined slowly over the last four years. In 2013 almost one-sixth (16.1%) of respondents identified public transport, falling to 13.8% in 2014, 9.1% in 2015, 7.4% in 2016, and is now 6.9%. Despite this steady decline in the proportion of respondents identifying public transport, the result remains marginally higher than both the growth area councils' average of 5.0% and the metropolitan Melbourne average of 5.2%.

Safety policing and crime

The proportion of respondents identifying safety, policing and crime related issues declined very marginally in 2017, down from 17.2% to 16.9%. The average proportion of respondents identifying these issues over the period from 2013 to 2015 was 6.7%, but was almost three times this in 2016 (17.2%).



This result is now somewhat lower than the growth area councils' average of 21.9%, which does highlight the degree to which this issue has grown in the outer suburban growth areas of metropolitan Melbourne.

Parking

The proportion of respondents identifying parking related issues has remained relatively stable at an average of around ten percent, and is 10.8% in 2017. This result is lower than both the growth area councils' average of 18.0% and the metropolitan Melbourne average of 15.8%.

Other issues

The issues of parking and parks, gardens and open spaces has averaged around ten percent over the course of the survey program, and is 9.4% in 2017 (down from 13.2% in 2016). Metropolis Research does note this issue however as it has consistently been found that respondents identifying parks, gardens, and open space related issues are on average measurably less satisfied with Council's overall performance than the average of all respondents.

This does imply that for some of the 113 respondents identifying parks, gardens, and open space related issues, these issues are a negative influence on their satisfaction with Council's overall performance.



Top issues for Council to address in the coming twelve months

Wyndham City Council - 2017 Annual Community Survey

(Number and percent of total respondents)

Issue	2017		2016	2015	2014	metro. Melb 2017*	Growth Area 2017#
	Number	Percent					
Traffic management	431	35.9%	26.0%	42.3%	48.5%	20.6%	21.3%
Roads maintenance and repairs	209	17.4%	19.8%	10.2%	16.6%	11.3%	10.9%
Safety, policing and crime	203	16.9%	17.2%	4.7%	7.2%	15.2%	21.9%
Parking	129	10.8%	12.8%	7.7%	12.5%	15.8%	18.0%
Parks, gardens, and open space	113	9.4%	13.2%	9.9%	10.3%	7.2%	8.9%
Public transport	83	6.9%	7.4%	9.1%	13.8%	5.2%	5.0%
Cleanliness and general maintenance of area	75	6.3%	5.4%	2.9%	3.6%	10.4%	13.6%
Building, planning, housing & development	63	5.3%	3.5%	2.9%	5.5%	10.9%	3.0%
Provision and maintenance of street trees	61	5.1%	3.9%	3.0%	2.0%	6.0%	7.8%
Street lighting	56	4.7%	4.4%	1.9%	2.1%	10.4%	9.2%
Footpath maintenance and repairs	54	4.5%	3.9%	4.1%	2.5%	8.5%	8.5%
Consultation, communication & prov. of info	36	3.0%	3.3%	1.6%	2.2%	2.6%	2.1%
Provision and maintenance of infrastructure	35	2.9%	4.4%	3.4%	6.2%	2.1%	1.8%
Education and schools	33	2.8%	4.4%	2.9%	5.0%	1.5%	1.2%
Rubbish and waste issues incl. garbage	33	2.8%	3.3%	1.7%	4.0%	4.2%	1.5%
Prov. & maint. of sports & recreation facility	29	2.4%	3.0%	1.9%	2.0%	2.3%	2.0%
Council rates	24	2.0%	2.1%	2.2%	1.9%	3.6%	4.8%
Animal management	22	1.8%	1.9%	0.6%	2.1%	4.1%	2.4%
Hard rubbish collection	21	1.8%	1.6%	1.4%	0.5%	2.8%	4.8%
Council customer service	20	1.7%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.4%
Noise	18	1.5%	0.1%	0.6%	0.9%	0.9%	3.1%
Environment and conservation	15	1.3%	1.1%	1.2%	1.1%	3.0%	2.0%
Activities and facilities for children	14	1.2%	1.5%	1.2%	1.0%	1.0%	2.2%
Graffiti and vandalism	14	1.2%	1.3%	0.6%	2.0%	1.5%	1.3%
Promote or improve community atmosphere	13	1.1%	0.3%	0.6%	1.2%	1.2%	2.1%
Prov. and maint. of cycling / walking paths	12	1.0%	1.8%	1.0%	0.7%	3.8%	1.3%
Health and medical services	12	1.0%	1.0%	0.6%	2.2%	1.4%	1.1%
Green waste collection	12	1.0%	0.8%	1.1%	0.1%	1.4%	0.7%
Services & facilities for the elderly	12	1.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.9%	2.1%	2.0%
Activities, services & facilities for youth	11	0.9%	2.9%	0.0%	1.2%	2.3%	3.6%
Employment and job creation	11	0.9%	1.1%	1.6%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Drains maintenance and repairs	11	0.9%	0.9%	0.0%	0.1%	1.8%	2.0%
Community activities, events, arts and culture	9	0.8%	1.8%	0.7%	1.2%	2.0%	2.7%
Recycling collection	8	0.7%	1.1%	0.0%	0.6%	0.9%	0.0%
Provision and maint. of community facilities	8	0.7%	1.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.4%
Quality and provision of community service	7	0.6%	0.2%	0.0%	0.7%	1.2%	1.2%
Street cleaning and maintenance	7	0.6%	0.4%	1.5%	0.1%	2.2%	1.0%
All other issues	98	8.2%	8.9%	6.2%	4.2%	11.4%	18.0%
Total responses	2,022		2,112	1,115	1,420	1,479	373
<i>Total respondents providing a response</i>	954 (79.5%)		78.1%	68.0%	79.9%	85.3%	87.7%

(*) Metropolis Research, Governing Melbourne 2017

(#) Growth Areas Councils including Whittlesea, Melton, Hume, Casey, Cardinia, Knox and Wyndham



Issues by precinct

There was some variation in the top issues for the City of Wyndham in the next twelve months observed across the six precincts comprising the City of Wyndham, with attention drawn to the following:

- ⊗ ***Point Cook*** – respondents were measurably more likely than average to identify traffic management and somewhat more likely than average to identify parks, gardens, and open spaces as issues to address in the coming year.
- ⊗ ***Truganina*** – respondents were measurably more likely than average to identify parks, gardens, and open spaces, and somewhat more likely than average to identify parking, cleanliness and maintenance of the area, and education and schools as issues to address in the coming year.
- ⊗ ***Wyndham Vale*** – respondents were somewhat more likely than average to identify safety, policing and crime and street lighting as issues to address in the coming year.



Top issues for Council to address in the coming twelve months by precinct

Wyndham City Council - 2017 Annual Community Survey

(Percent of total respondents)

Hoppers Crossing		Point Cook	
Traffic management	29.5%	Traffic management	49.7%
Roads maintenance and repairs	21.0%	Safety, policing & crime	20.6%
Safety, policing & crime	13.5%	Parks, gardens & open space	14.1%
Parking	6.5%	Parking	13.1%
Street lighting	5.5%	Roads maintenance & repairs	13.1%
Parks, gardens and open space	4.5%	Cleanliness & general maintenance of area	8.5%
Building, planning, housing & development	4.5%	Public transport	7.5%
Public transport	4.5%	Building, planning, housing & development	5.5%
Rubbish and waste issues inc garbage	4.5%	Provision & maintenance of street trees	5.5%
All other issues	44.5%	All other issues	63.3%

Tarneit		Truganina	
Traffic management	27.2%	Traffic management	39.5%
Roads maintenance & repairs	22.3%	Parks, gardens & open space	19.5%
Safety, policing & crime	17.8%	Roads maintenance & repairs	17.0%
Parking	10.9%	Parking	14.5%
Parks, gardens & open space	9.4%	Safety, policing & crime	12.5%
Public transport	8.4%	Cleanliness & general maintenance of area	11.5%
Provision & maintenance of street trees	6.4%	Public transport	10.5%
Building, planning, housing & development	5.0%	Education & schools	6.5%
Cleanliness & general maintenance of area	4.5%	Provision & maintenance of street trees	5.5%
All other issues	49.0%	All other issues	

Werribee		Wyndham Vale	
Traffic management	31.2%	Traffic management	33.5%
Roads maintenance & repairs	17.1%	Safety, policing & crime	21.0%
Safety, policing & crime	15.6%	Roads maintenance & repairs	14.5%
Parking	12.1%	Street lighting	9.0%
Building, planning, housing & development	6.5%	Parks, gardens & open space	7.5%
Footpath maintenance & repairs	6.0%	Public transport	7.5%
Provision & maintenance of street trees	5.5%	Footpath maintenance & repairs	7.0%
Cleanliness & general maintenance of area	5.0%	Cleanliness & general maintenance of area	6.5%
Public transport	4.5%	Building, planning, housing & development	6.5%
All other issues	46.2%	All other issues	60.5%

Western region		metro. Melbourne	
Traffic management	18.9%	Traffic management	20.6%
Parking	17.8%	Car parking	15.8%
Roads maintenance and repairs	11.7%	Safety, policing, crime and vandalism	15.2%
Lighting	11.7%	Roads maintenance and repairs	11.3%
Cleanliness and maintenance of area	11.1%	Building, planning, housing & development	10.9%
Safety, policing, crime and vandalism	10.6%	Lighting	10.4%
Building, planning, housing, development	8.9%	Cleanliness and maintenance of area	10.4%
Public transport	6.1%	Footpath maintenance and repairs	8.5%
Parks, gardens and open space	5.0%	Parks, gardens and open space	7.2%
All other issues	69.4%	All other issues	73.2%



Issues by respondent profile

There was significant variation in the issues to address in the City of Wyndham in the coming year observed by the respondents' age structure, gender and language spoken at home, with attention drawn to the following:

- ⊗ ***Adolescents (aged 15 to 19 years)*** – respondents were more likely than average to identify cleanliness and general maintenance of the area and public toilets as issues to address in the coming year.
- ⊗ ***Adults (aged 36 to 45 years)*** – respondents were more likely than average to identify traffic management, safety, policing and crime, parks, gardens and open spaces, and education and schools related issues to address in the coming year.
- ⊗ ***Middle-aged adults (46 to 60 years)*** – respondents were more likely than average to identify parking as issues to address in the coming year.
- ⊗ ***Older adults (aged 60 to 75 years)*** – respondents were more likely than average to identify road and footpath maintenance and repairs as issues to address in the coming year.
- ⊗ ***Senior citizens (aged 76 years and over)*** – respondents were more likely than average to identify footpath and drain maintenance and repairs as well as services and facilities for the elderly as issues to address in the coming year.
- ⊗ ***Males*** – respondents were more likely than female respondents to identify traffic management as an issue to address in the coming year.
- ⊗ ***English speaking households*** – respondents from English speaking households were more likely than those from multi-lingual households to identify traffic management and road maintenance and repairs as issues to address in the coming year.
- ⊗ ***Multi-lingual households*** – respondents from multi-lingual households were more likely than those from English speaking households to identify safety, policing and crime, parks, gardens, and open space, and street trees as issues to address in the coming year.



Top issues for Council to address in the coming twelve months by age structure

Wyndham City Council - 2017 Annual Community Survey

(Percent of total respondents)

Adolescents (15 to 19 years)		Young adults (20 to 35 years)	
Traffic management	25.7%	Traffic management	31.4%
Cleanliness & general maintenance of area	20.0%	Safety, policing and crime	17.0%
Safety, policing and crime	14.3%	Roads maintenance and repairs	13.0%
Public transport	8.6%	Parking	10.8%
Parks, gardens and open space	5.7%	Parks, gardens and open space	7.9%
Roads maintenance and repairs	5.7%	Street lighting	7.1%
Public toilets	5.7%	Cleanliness & general maintenance of area	6.2%
Animal management	5.7%	Public transport	5.7%
Education and schools	2.9%	Provision and maintenance of street trees	4.8%
All other issues	40.0%	All other issues	47.9%

Adults (36 to 45 years)		Middle aged adults (46 to 55 years)	
Traffic management	44.6%	Traffic management	35.5%
Safety, policing and crime	22.7%	Roads maintenance and repairs	20.5%
Roads maintenance and repairs	17.9%	Parking	15.0%
Parks, gardens and open space	15.1%	Safety, policing and crime	12.5%
Parking	11.4%	Parks, gardens and open space	7.0%
Public transport	9.4%	Building, planning, housing & development	6.5%
Education & schools	6.0%	Cleanliness & general maintenance of area	6.0%
Building, planning, housing & development	5.4%	Public transport	6.0%
Cleanliness & general maintenance of area	5.1%	Provision and maintenance of street trees	6.0%
All other issues	55.4%	All other issues	56.0%

Older adults (56 - 75 years)		Senior citizens (76 years and over)	
Traffic management	34.8%	Footpath maintenance and repairs	14.7%
Roads maintenance and repairs	23.7%	Traffic management	14.7%
Safety, policing and crime	13.4%	Roads maintenance and repairs	11.8%
Parking	8.0%	Safety, policing and crime	8.8%
Footpath maintenance and repairs	7.6%	Parking	5.9%
Building, planning, housing & development	7.6%	Services & facilities for the elderly	5.9%
Cleanliness & general maintenance of area	7.1%	Drains maintenance and repairs	5.9%
Public transport	7.1%	Parks, gardens & open space	2.9%
Provision and maintenance of street trees	6.3%	Street lighting	2.9%
All other issues	56.7%	All other issues	20.6%



Top issues for Council to address in the coming twelve months by respondent profile

Wyndham City Council - 2017 Annual Community Survey

(Percent of total respondents)

Males		Females	
Traffic management	38.3%	Traffic management	33.6%
Roads maintenance and repairs	18.5%	Safety, policing and crime	16.8%
Safety, policing and crime	17.1%	Roads maintenance and repairs	16.1%
Parking	10.1%	Parking	11.5%
Parks, gardens and open space	9.4%	Parks, gardens and open space	9.4%
Public transport	7.0%	Public transport	7.1%
Cleanliness & general maintenance of area	5.9%	Cleanliness & general maintenance of area	6.0%
Building, planning, housing & development	5.6%	Footpath maintenance and repairs	5.5%
Provision and maintenance of street trees	5.0%	Provision & maintenance of street trees	5.1%
All other issues	52.9%	All other issues	54.9%

English speaking household		Multi-lingual household	
Traffic management	37.8%	Traffic management	33.9%
Roads maintenance and repairs	19.9%	Safety, policing and crime	19.0%
Safety, policing and crime	15.5%	Roads maintenance and repairs	14.1%
Parking	10.9%	Parks, gardens and open space	11.5%
Parks, gardens and open space	7.8%	Parking	11.1%
Public transport	7.2%	Cleanliness & general maintenance of area	7.7%
Street lighting	5.7%	Public transport	7.1%
Cleanliness & general maintenance of area	5.3%	Provision and maintenance of street trees	6.3%
Building, planning, housing & development	5.1%	Building, planning, housing & development	5.7%
All other issues	50.9%	All other issues	59.6%



Contact with Council

Contacted Council in the last twelve months

Respondents were asked:

“Have you contacted Wyndham City Council in the last twelve months?”

Consistent with the results recorded in the previous three surveys, a little less than one-third (31.9% down from 37.7) of respondents had contacted Council in the last twelve months.

Contacted Council in the last twelve months
Wyndham City Council - 2016 Annual Community Survey
(Number and percent respondents providing a response)

Response	2016		2015	2014	2013
	Number	Percent			
Yes	452	37.7%	33.6%	42.1%	41.8%
No	748	62.3%	66.4%	57.9%	58.2%
Total	1,200	100%	800	803	801

Method of contacting Council

Respondents who had contacted Council were asked:

“When you last contacted the Council, was it....?”

The most common forms of contacting Council in 2017 remain consistent with those recorded in previous years. A little more than two-thirds (70.9% up from 63.5%) of respondents contacted Council by telephone, and a little less than one-sixth (13.1% down from 19.9%) visited Council in person.

The aim of this set of questions is to measure community satisfaction with the traditional aspects of customer service.

Metropolis Research notes that many residents, when asked if they had contacted Council, consider visiting in person, writing a letter, emailing or personally telephoning Council to be what is still commonly interpreted as “contact”.

The results do not and are not designed to measure the proportion of respondents that have visited the Council website or engaged in some way with Council on social media. In the experience of Metropolis Research in the order of one-third to half of the respondents in municipalities around metropolitan Melbourne will have visited their council website.



However when asked typically less than five percent of respondents will identify the website as the method by which they contacted Council (as is the case for Wyndham).

Form of contact with Wyndham City Council
Wyndham City Council - 2016 Annual Community Survey
 (Number and percent of respondents who contacted Council)

Response	2016		2015	2014	2013
	Number	Percent			
Telephone	284	63.5%	65.5%	59.8%	63.9%
Visit in person	89	19.9%	21.8%	25.0%	19.3%
E-mail	31	6.9%	5.7%	2.4%	3.3%
Website	16	3.6%	2.3%	2.1%	3.0%
Telephone (after hours)	6	1.3%	1.1%	1.5%	0.3%
Mail	5	1.1%	1.1%	0.9%	1.5%
Social media	3	0.7%	0.0%	1.2%	na
Multiple	13	2.9%	2.3%	7.1%	8.7%
Not stated	5		8	2	3
Total	452	100%	269	338	335

Satisfaction with aspects of customer service

Respondents who had contacted Council were asked:

“On a scale of 0 to 10 (0 being the lowest and 10 the highest), how satisfied are you with the following aspects of service when you last contacted the Wyndham City Council?”

Respondents who had contacted Council in the last twelve months were asked to rate their satisfaction with eight aspects of customer service as well as their overall satisfaction with the experience.

The average satisfaction with the eight aspects of customer service was 7.78 in 2017, a decline of 2.8% on the 8.01 recorded in 2016, although it remains categorised as “excellent”.


Metropolis Research notes that the average satisfaction with the eight aspects of customer service (7.78) was somewhat higher than the average “overall satisfaction with the experience” (7.45).


It is clear from this result that the speed of service is the aspect of customer service which is negatively influencing the respondents’ overall satisfaction with the customer service experience.

Satisfaction with the nine aspects of customer service can best be summarised as follows:

- ⊗ **Excellent** – for staff understanding language needs (of respondents from multi-lingual households only), opening hours, how easy it was to understand the information from Council, and courtesy of service. Approximately three-quarters or more of respondents were very satisfied (rating 8 or more) with each of these aspects, and between four and eleven percent were dissatisfied with each of these aspects.
- ⊗ **Very Good** – for access to relevant staff member, how easy it was to access the information required, the overall satisfaction with the experience, and care and attention to enquiry. Approximately two-thirds of respondents were very satisfied with each of these aspects, and between ten and fifteen percent were dissatisfied with each.
- ⊗ **Good** – for speed of service. Whilst almost two-thirds were very satisfied with the speed of service, a little more than one-sixth were dissatisfied.

Metropolis Research notes that satisfaction with customer service is again the strongest set of results contained in the 2017 survey, despite the small declines recorded in both 2016 and 2017. Despite these declines, respondents’ satisfaction with customer service continue to reflect well on the service provided by Council both on the telephone and most particular when residents’ visit in person.





There were five aspects of customer service that were included identically in both the Wyndham *Annual Community Survey* and *Governing Melbourne*. A comparison of satisfaction with these five aspects is outlined in the following graph.

Satisfaction with four of these five aspects of customer service was higher in the City of Wyndham than the metropolitan Melbourne average, with access to relevant staff being measurably higher.

This result of higher satisfaction with customer service in the City of Wyndham than the metropolitan Melbourne average was also identified by Metropolis Research in the 2015 and 2016 surveys, and appears to be a consistent result, despite the small decline in satisfaction with customer service recorded in the last two years.






The following graph provides a comparison of the average satisfaction with the nine aspects of customer service between respondents that visited Council in person and respondents that telephoned Council.

It is noted that respondents that visited Council in person were on average more satisfied than those that telephoned Council with all nine aspects of customer service including their overall satisfaction with the experience.

Particular attention is drawn to the fact that respondents that visited Council in person were 9.6% more satisfied with the overall experience than were respondents that telephoned Council. This result is almost identical to the 9.4% gap identified in the 2016 report.





Importance of and satisfaction with Council services

Respondents were asked:

“On a scale of 0 to 10 (0 being the lowest and 10 the highest), can you please rate the importance to the community, and your personal level of satisfaction with each of the following Council provided services?”

Importance of Council services and facilities to the community

Respondents were asked to rate how important they considered each of the forty-two Council provided services and facilities are to the community as a whole, rather than to them as individuals.

The average importance of the forty-one Council provided services and facilities was 8.56 out of ten in 2017, a very marginal increase on the 8.54 recorded in 2016 (forty-one services).

A new service was included in the 2017 survey, that being “maintenance of food safety standards”.

Metropolis Research notes that all forty-two services and facilities were rated at more than seven out of ten, i.e. somewhat important, and that the spread of importance scores reflect the degree of importance rather than identifying any Council services and facilities that respondents consider unimportant (i.e. less than five out of ten).



Increased importance

The importance of twenty services and facilities increased in 2017.

This includes a statistically significant increase in the importance of art exhibitions and experiences (up 5.5%), parking enforcement (up 4.1%), Council's Facebook page (up 3.7%), the provision and maintenance of street trees (up 3.5%), footpath maintenance and repairs (3.4%), the management of environmental pests and weeds (up 3.2%), drains maintenance and repairs (up 3.2%), local traffic management (up 3.1%), the maintenance and repair of sealed local roads (up 2.5%), public art (up 2.1%), and animal management (up 2.0%).

Decreased importance

The importance of twenty services and facilities declined somewhat in 2017.

There were significant declines in the importance placed on a number of the health and human services in 2017, including services for seniors or people with a disability (down 3.9%), services for children from birth to five years of age (down 3.8%), immunisation services (down 3.3%), and services for youth (3.2%). That said it is important to note that the importance of all of these services was rated at more than eight out of ten.

Other services to decline measurably include public toilets (down 3.2%), Community Centres and Neighbourhood hubs (down 3.0%), regular recycling (down 2.7%), the provision and maintenance of playgrounds (down 2.4%), on and off road bike paths (down 1.8%), and green waste collection (down 1.8%).

Comparison to metropolitan Melbourne average satisfaction

Metropolis Research also notes that when compared to the metropolitan Melbourne average importance as recorded in the 2017 *Governing Melbourne* research (twenty-seven services included in both surveys) that respondents in the City of Wyndham rated the importance of Council's website (2.9% higher) higher, drains maintenance and repairs (2.1% higher), local traffic management (2.0% higher), the *Wyndham News* (1.9% higher), and the maintenance and repair of sealed local roads (1.8% higher).

Services and facilities that were rated somewhat less important by respondents in the City of Wyndham than the metropolitan Melbourne average included; arts and cultural services (4.2% lower), regular recycling (4.1% lower), services for people with a disability (3.1% lower), and services for children from birth to five years of age (1.8% lower).



Importance of selected Council services and facilities
Wyndham City Council - 2017 Annual Community Survey
 (Index score scale 0 to 10)

	Service / facility	Number	2017			2016	2015	2014	metro. Melb 2017
			Lower	Mean	Upper				
Higher than average importance	Weekly garbage collection	1,197	9.37	9.43	9.48	9.43	9.34	9.46	9.35
	Maintenance of food safety standards	1,110	9.06	9.13	9.20	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
	Local traffic management	1,193	9.02	9.09	9.15	8.81	9.11	8.92	8.91
	Provision and maintenance of street lighting	1,196	9.01	9.08	9.15	8.99	9.14	9.02	8.95
	Maintenance and repairs of sealed local roads	1,199	8.95	9.02	9.09	8.80	8.95	8.79	8.86
	Drains maintenance and repairs	1,188	8.94	9.01	9.08	8.73	8.91	8.69	8.83
	Footpath maintenance and repairs	1,193	8.93	9.00	9.07	8.70	8.97	8.76	8.90
	Litter collection in public areas	1,194	8.92	8.98	9.05	8.82	9.04	8.79	n.a.
	Provision of parks and gardens	1,189	8.89	8.95	9.02	8.82	9.05	8.75	8.95
	Maintenance of parks and gardens	1,188	8.86	8.93	9.00	8.77	9.03	8.69	8.95
	Management of illegal dumping of rubbish	1,184	8.84	8.91	8.97	8.99	8.98	8.92	n.a.
	Regular recycling	1,184	8.82	8.90	8.98	9.15	8.99	9.28	9.28
	Hard rubbish collection	1,173	8.81	8.89	8.97	8.97	8.95	9.06	8.97
	Local libraries	1,157	8.76	8.85	8.94	8.91	8.80	9.12	8.79
	Services for seniors or people with a disability	1,114	8.69	8.78	8.88	9.13	8.72	9.23	9.06
	Green waste collection	1,149	8.69	8.78	8.87	8.94	8.89	9.11	8.92
Protecting the natural environment	1,121	8.69	8.78	8.86	8.88	8.88	8.89	n.a.	
Management of environmental pests and weeds	1,125	8.70	8.77	8.85	8.50	8.70	8.55	n.a.	
Average importance	Immunisation services	1,137	8.64	8.74	8.84	9.04	8.74	9.09	n.a.
	Services for children from birth to 5 years of age	1,129	8.63	8.73	8.83	9.08	8.70	9.15	8.89
	Maintenance & cleaning of shopping strips	1,157	8.61	8.69	8.78	8.60	8.84	8.57	8.71
	Provision and maintenance of street trees	1,190	8.60	8.68	8.77	8.39	8.88	8.34	8.71
	Services for youth	1,105	8.55	8.65	8.75	8.94	8.59	9.09	8.77
	Provision and maintenance of playgrounds	1,164	8.55	8.64	8.73	8.85	8.60	8.90	n.a.
	Sports ovals	1,162	8.54	8.64	8.73	8.77	8.53	8.89	8.71
	On and off road bike paths	1,164	8.49	8.58	8.67	8.74	8.69	8.97	8.71
	Wyndham beaches and coastal foreshore	1,151	8.48	8.57	8.66	8.50	8.38	8.59	n.a.
	Provision of aquatic facilities	1,145	8.46	8.55	8.64	8.61	8.69	n.a.	8.63
	Public toilets	1,179	8.43	8.52	8.62	8.81	8.72	9.10	8.60
	Community Centres and Neighbourhood Hubs	1,160	8.39	8.49	8.59	8.75	8.56	8.68	n.a.
	Maintenance and cleaning of Watton Street	974	8.33	8.44	8.55	8.54	8.78	8.46	8.90
	Activities promoting envir. & sustainability	1,089	8.32	8.42	8.52	8.33	8.55	8.19	n.a.
Lower than average importance	Animal management	1,126	8.26	8.36	8.46	8.20	8.68	8.35	8.32
	Parking enforcement	1,170	8.06	8.17	8.29	7.85	8.39	8.00	8.13
	Council's website	1,124	8.06	8.17	8.29	8.12	8.34	8.32	7.94
	Provision of Council events	1,122	8.02	8.12	8.22	8.15	8.27	8.42	n.a.
	Arts and cultural services	1,108	7.81	7.92	8.03	7.85	8.19	8.14	8.27
	Art exhibitions and experiences	1,001	7.65	7.78	7.92	7.37	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
	Wyndham News (Council's bi-monthly publicatio	1,055	7.44	7.58	7.72	7.62	8.28	7.66	7.44
	Public art (including temporary and permanent)	1,011	7.39	7.54	7.68	7.38	8.08	7.45	n.a.
Council advertisements in local papers	976	7.23	7.38	7.52	7.45	8.01	7.47	n.a.	
Council's Facebook page	1,025	6.92	7.08	7.23	6.82	6.78	6.64	n.a.	
Average importance of services / facilities			8.47	8.56	8.66	8.54	8.67	8.63	8.70



Satisfaction with Council services and facilities

Respondents were asked to rate their personal level of satisfaction with all twenty-three core services and facilities, and their satisfaction with each of the ninety non-core services and facilities that they or members of their household had used in the last twelve months.

The average satisfaction with the forty-one included Council services and facilities increased 1.1% in 2017, up from 7.30 to 7.38. Average satisfaction with Council services and facilities remains at a level best categorised as “very good”. This result is almost identical to the *Governing Melbourne* average satisfaction with twenty-seven services and facilities of 7.37.

Increased satisfaction

The average satisfaction with twenty-four services and facilities increased in 2017, with significant increases recorded for; services for people with a disability (up 9.3%), services for youth (up 7.2%), public toilets (up 5.6%), Council’s website (up 5.3%), drains maintenance and repairs (up 4.8%), hard rubbish collection (up 4.4%), arts and cultural services (up 3.5%), immunisation services (up 3.4%), Wyndham beach and foreshore (up 3.3%) services for children from birth to five years of age (3.3%), the provision and maintenance of playgrounds (up 3.1%), management of environmental pests and weeds (up 2.7%), and art exhibitions and experiences (up 2.6%).

Decreased satisfaction

Fifteen of the forty-two Council services and facilities recorded a decline in satisfaction in 2017, with particular attention drawn to satisfaction with local traffic management which declined by a statistically significant 8.3% in 2017. This service was the only one of the forty-two services and facilities included in the 2017 survey to be categorised as “poor”.

Some of the other services to record a decline in satisfaction in 2017 include the maintenance and cleaning of shopping strips (down 3.3%), Council advertisements in local newspapers (down 3.1%), Council performance protecting the natural environment (down 2.9%), the maintenance and cleaning of Watton Street (down 2.6%), the *Wyndham News* (down 2.3%), the maintenance of parks and gardens (down 2.2%), the provision of parks and gardens (down 2.0%), and activities promoting environment and sustainability (down 2.0%).

It is noted that although satisfaction with some of these services and facilities declined measurably in 2017, most remain categorised at “good” or “very good” levels of satisfaction.



Relative satisfaction with Council services and facilities

The average satisfaction with the forty-two included Council services and facilities can best be summarised as follows:

- ⊗ **Excellent** – for the weekly garbage collection, immunisation services, local libraries, regular recycling, green waste collection, services for children from birth to five years of age, hard rubbish collection, sports ovals, Community Centres and Neighbourhood Hubs, services for people with a disability, services for youth, the provision of Council events, and the provision of aquatic facilities. It is noted that satisfaction with all these services and facilities was measurably higher than the average satisfaction.
- ⊗ **Very Good** – for the maintenance of food safety standards, arts and cultural services, Council’s website, the provision and maintenance of playgrounds, drains maintenance and repairs, Wyndham beaches and foreshore, Council’s Facebook page, on and off road bike paths, the provision and maintenance of street lighting, the provision of parks and gardens, and animal management.
- ⊗ **Good** – for the maintenance and cleaning of Watton Street, the maintenance of parks and gardens, protecting the natural environment, the maintenance and cleaning of shopping strips, the provision and maintenance of street trees, the management of environmental pest and weeds, litter collection in public areas, activities promoting environment and sustainability, the *Wyndham News*, art exhibitions and experiences, footpath maintenance and repairs, the management of illegal dumping of rubbish, Council advertisements in local newspapers, public toilets, and public art.
- ⊗ **Solid** – for the maintenance and repair of sealed local roads and parking enforcement.
- ⊗ **Poor** – for local traffic management.

Metropolis Research notes that of the forty-two included Council services and facilities only local traffic management obtained a satisfaction score categorised as “poor”. This is a decline on the “solid” recorded for local traffic management in 2016, but is consistent with the “poor” recorded in 2015.



Satisfaction with Council services and facilities
Wyndham City Council - 2017 Annual Community Survey
(Index score scale 0 to 10)

	Service / facility	Number	2017			2016	2015	2014	metro. Melb 2017
			Lower	Mean	Upper				
Higher than average satisfaction	Weekly garbage collection	1,198	8.70	8.79	8.87	8.63	8.54	8.74	8.71
	Immunisation services	340	8.61	8.78	8.96	8.49	8.73	8.52	n.a.
	Local libraries	687	8.43	8.53	8.64	8.54	8.63	8.46	8.55
	Regular recycling	1,003	8.28	8.37	8.47	8.19	8.26	8.38	8.55
	Green waste collection	771	8.21	8.33	8.45	8.24	8.34	8.51	8.47
	Services for children from birth to 5 yrs of age	337	8.08	8.28	8.48	8.02	8.44	8.01	7.69
	Hard rubbish collection	750	8.04	8.17	8.29	7.82	8.15	8.30	7.99
	Sports ovals	588	7.94	8.07	8.20	8.05	8.28	8.07	7.85
	Community Centres and Neighbourhood Hubs	419	7.86	8.01	8.16	8.01	8.16	7.90	n.a.
	Services for seniors or people with a disability	158	7.62	7.93	8.23	7.26	8.30	7.71	6.96
	Services for youth	209	7.70	7.91	8.12	7.38	8.08	7.64	7.45
	Provision of Council events	329	7.61	7.78	7.96	7.74	7.98	7.79	n.a.
	Provision of aquatic facilities	580	7.62	7.77	7.91	7.72	7.78	n.a.	7.87
	Maintenance of food safety standards	947	7.61	7.72	7.84	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
	Average satisfaction	Arts and cultural services	302	7.53	7.71	7.89	7.45	7.86	7.61
Council's website		574	7.53	7.68	7.82	7.29	7.73	7.55	7.43
Provision and maintenance of playgrounds		621	7.52	7.65	7.79	7.43	7.83	7.36	n.a.
Drains maintenance and repairs		1,138	7.46	7.57	7.69	7.23	7.25	7.54	7.08
Wyndham beaches and coastal foreshore		637	7.31	7.44	7.58	7.20	7.60	7.43	n.a.
Council's Facebook page		160	7.15	7.43	7.71	7.46	7.22	7.17	n.a.
On and off road bike paths		741	7.28	7.41	7.55	7.25	7.86	7.52	7.23
Provision and maintenance of street lighting		1,188	7.27	7.39	7.51	7.52	7.63	7.72	6.94
Provision of parks and gardens		1,136	7.21	7.33	7.44	7.48	7.69	7.53	7.67
Animal management		1,045	7.16	7.29	7.42	7.22	7.29	7.33	7.39
Lower than average satisfaction	Maintenance and cleaning of Watton Street	889	7.01	7.13	7.25	7.32	7.36	7.44	7.01
	Maintenance of parks and gardens	1,132	6.97	7.09	7.21	7.25	7.49	7.37	7.67
	Protecting the natural environment	1,050	6.96	7.08	7.20	7.29	7.25	7.44	n.a.
	Maintenance & cleaning of shopping strips	1,128	6.94	7.05	7.16	7.29	7.37	7.35	7.13
	Provision and maintenance of street trees	1,177	6.83	6.95	7.08	6.95	7.26	7.02	6.97
	Management of environmental pests and weeds	1,060	6.83	6.95	7.06	6.76	7.02	7.15	n.a.
	Litter collection in public areas	1,172	6.77	6.89	7.01	6.91	7.23	7.19	n.a.
	Activities promoting envir. & sustainability	994	6.70	6.83	6.96	6.97	7.09	7.14	n.a.
	Wyndham News (Council's bi-monthly publicatio	984	6.69	6.83	6.97	6.99	7.13	7.20	6.96
	Art exhibitions and experiences	861	6.66	6.80	6.93	6.62	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
	Footpath maintenance and repairs	1,183	6.55	6.68	6.81	6.63	6.98	6.83	6.52
	Management of illegal dumping of rubbish	1,163	6.50	6.62	6.74	6.65	6.98	6.97	n.a.
	Council advertisements in local papers	871	6.44	6.59	6.74	6.80	6.94	7.11	n.a.
	Public toilets	531	6.35	6.56	6.77	6.21	6.67	6.27	6.44
	Public art (including temporary and permanent)	886	6.37	6.51	6.65	6.53	6.91	6.88	n.a.
Maintenance and repairs of sealed local roads	1,193	6.24	6.38	6.51	6.31	6.64	6.61	6.90	
Parking enforcement	1,112	6.16	6.30	6.45	6.27	6.47	6.39	6.61	
Local traffic management	1,190	5.41	5.55	5.70	6.06	5.56	5.87	6.58	
Average satisfaction of Council services and facilities			7.24	7.38	7.53	7.30	7.55	7.47	7.37



Importance and satisfaction cross tabulation


The following graph provides a cross-tabulation of the average importance of each of the forty-one included Council services and facilities against the average satisfaction with each service and facility. The blue cross-hairs represent the average importance (8.56) and the average satisfaction (7.38).

Services and facilities located in the top right hand quadrant are therefore more important than average and have obtained higher than average satisfaction. The services in the lower right hand quadrant are those that are more important than average, but with which respondents are less satisfied than average. This quadrant represents the services and facilities of most concern.

Attention is drawn to the following:

- ⊗ Many of the most important services are also those with the highest levels of satisfaction, including all the rubbish and recycling collection services, the libraries, and many of the community services.
- ⊗ The services and facilities of most concern are local traffic management and the maintenance and repair of sealed local roads.
- ⊗ Attention is also drawn to the management of illegal dumping of rubbish, the maintenance and repair of footpaths, and litter collection in public areas, all of which recorded lower than average satisfaction but higher than average importance.
- ⊗ Many of the communication and arts and cultural services are of lower than average importance, and some received lower than average satisfaction scores. The lower levels of satisfaction may well be, at least in part, related to the lower importance scores, as some respondents will mark down satisfaction if they are of the view that Council has over-invested in the services.
- ⊗ Council's Facebook page continues to be the least important service provided by Council, however it is noted elsewhere in this report that the importance of this service has increased slowly but steadily since 2013 (despite a marginal decline this year), and is likely to continue to increase over time.
- ⊗ Parking enforcement was marginally less important than average but also received a measurably lower than average satisfaction score. This result has commonly been observed by Metropolis Research elsewhere in *Governing Melbourne* as well as in research for a number of other metropolitan Melbourne municipalities. Many respondents that are dissatisfied with parking enforcement because they believe there is too much enforcement will tend to mark down the importance of the service accordingly. There are other respondents naturally who are dissatisfied with parking enforcement because they believe that Council is conducting too little enforcement.





Satisfaction by broad service areas

The forty-two services and facilities included in the 2017 survey have been categorised into five broad categories. These five categories are as follows:

- ⊗ **Infrastructure** – includes on and off road bike paths, provision of maintenance of street lighting, drains, parks and gardens, street trees, footpaths, roads, public toilets and traffic management.
- ⊗ **Waste and recycling** – includes weekly garbage, green waste, regular recycling, hard rubbish, maintenance & cleaning of Watton Street, maintenance and cleaning of shopping strips along roads, litter collection in public areas.
- ⊗ **Community** – includes local library, services for children, sports ovals, community centres, services for youth, provision of Council events, the provision of aquatic facilities, services for seniors or people with a disability, arts and cultural services, Wyndham Foreshore, provision and maintenance of playgrounds, activities promoting environment and sustainability, public art and immunisation services
- ⊗ **Local laws** – includes animal management, parking enforcement and management of illegal dumping rubbish




- ⊗ **Communications** – includes Council ads in local papers, Wyndham News, and Council's website and Facebook page.

Satisfaction with three of the five broad service areas increased somewhat in 2017, although none were statistically significant.

Satisfaction with the five broad service areas can best be summarised as follows:

- ⊗ **Excellent** – for waste and recycling services.
- ⊗ **Very Good** – for community services.
- ⊗ **Good** – for communications services, infrastructure, and local laws.




The average satisfaction with the five broad service areas were all marginally lower than the metropolitan Melbourne average as recorded in the 2017 *Governing Melbourne* research.

Whilst all five broad service areas recorded lower satisfaction than the metropolitan Melbourne average, the difference was very marginal and not statistically significant. It is also important to bear in mind that the list of services included in *Governing Melbourne* (twenty-seven services and facilities) was somewhat less than the expanded list included in the City of Wyndham survey (forty-two services and facilities).


It is interesting to note that again in 2017, whilst satisfaction with services and facilities was marginally lower on average in the City of Wyndham than the metropolitan Melbourne average; overall satisfaction with Council was higher than the metropolitan Melbourne average.





Satisfaction by Council department

Satisfaction with three of the four departments increased somewhat in 2017, with satisfaction with infrastructure services remaining stable. The average satisfaction with three of the four Council departments was at levels categorised as “very good”, whilst satisfaction with infrastructure services remains categorised as “good”.



Respondent profile

The following section provides the demographic profile of respondents to the *Wyndham City Council – 2017 Annual Community Survey*.

These questions have been included in the survey for two purposes; firstly to allow checking that the sample adequately reflects the underlying population of the municipality and secondly to allow for more detailed examination of the results of other questions in the survey.

Age structure

The age structure of the sample of respondents to the 2017 survey remains relatively consistent with that obtained in previous years. This is a very solid result that reflects extremely well on the methodology employed to select the sample.

It is noted however that there was a small increase in 2017 in the proportion of adults (aged 36 to 45 years) and a small decrease in the proportion of older adults (aged 56 to 75 years).

Age group
Wyndham City Council - 2017 Annual Community Survey
(Number and percent of respondents providing a response)

Age cohort	2017		2016	2015	2014	2013
	Number	Percent				
Adolescents (15 to 19 years)	35	2.9%	3.8%	2.5%	3.9%	2.3%
Young adults (20 to 35 years)	353	29.5%	29.6%	26.4%	29.4%	28.7%
Adults (36 to 45 years)	352	29.4%	24.8%	25.6%	24.8%	27.5%
Middle aged adults (46 to 55 years)	200	16.7%	15.8%	16.7%	19.7%	17.9%
Older adults (56 - 75 years)	224	18.7%	22.4%	24.1%	18.2%	19.4%
Senior citizens (76 years and over)	34	2.8%	3.7%	4.6%	4.0%	4.1%
Not stated	2		1	4	0	4
Total	1,200	100%	1,200	800	803	801



Gender

Consistent with the results recorded in previous years, a little more than half of the respondents were male respondents and a little less than half were female respondents.

Gender
Wyndham City Council - 2017 Annual Community Survey
 (Number and percent of respondents providing a response)

Gender	2017		2016	2015	2014	2013
	Number	Percent				
Male	626	52.5%	52.3%	51.1%	53.1%	52.2%
Female	565	47.4%	47.6%	48.2%	46.9%	47.8%
Other or non-specific gender	1	0.1%	0.1%	0.8%	0.0%	na
Not stated	8		5	3	2	0
Total	1,200	100%	1,200	800	803	801

Language

A little more than forty percent (41.9% down from 43.6%) of respondents providing a response to the question reported that members of their household preferred to speak a language other than English at home.

This is a very positive result that reflects well on the ability of the door-to-door interview style methodology to include the entire Wyndham community, regardless of the languages spoken at home.

Attention is drawn to the fact that the 2017 survey included respondents from households that speak a total of ninety-six different languages.

A number of residents were surveyed in their native language, with the Metropolis Research fieldwork team speaking a range of Chinese, Indian, and other languages.



Language spoken at home
Wyndham City Council - 2017 Annual Community Survey
 (Number and percent of respondents providing a response)

Response	2017		2016	2015	2014	2013
	Number	Percent				
English	682	58.1%	56.4%	69.7%	64.9%	60.3%
Hindi	68	5.8%	5.6%	5.8%	5.0%	4.1%
Italian	31	2.6%	3.3%	1.4%	2.2%	2.6%
Mandarin	31	2.6%	3.6%	1.4%	3.4%	2.1%
Punjabi	27	2.3%	2.7%	1.5%	2.0%	1.8%
Greek	14	1.2%	0.9%	1.0%	0.8%	1.3%
Arabic	12	1.0%	1.6%	1.3%	1.3%	2.3%
Maltese	12	1.0%	0.5%	0.5%	0.6%	1.2%
Tagalog (Filipino)	12	1.0%	2.5%	2.0%	2.3%	0.9%
Tamil	11	0.9%	1.1%	0.9%	0.5%	0.6%
Vietnamese	11	0.9%	0.8%	0.4%	0.9%	0.5%
Macedonian	10	0.9%	0.4%	0.4%	0.8%	0.3%
Urdu	10	0.9%	1.0%	0.6%	0.9%	1.4%
Gujarati	9	0.8%	0.8%	0.3%	0.6%	1.3%
Spanish	8	0.7%	1.1%	1.0%	0.6%	1.1%
Polish	8	0.7%	0.8%	0.3%	0.5%	0.7%
Bengali	7	0.6%	0.8%	0.3%	0.3%	0.8%
Thai	7	0.6%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%
Croatian	6	0.5%	0.2%	0.0%	0.5%	0.3%
Korean	6	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%
Malayalam	6	0.5%	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%	1.0%
Nepali	6	0.5%	0.3%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%
Somali	6	0.5%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%
French	5	0.4%	0.4%	0.8%	0.6%	0.9%
Samoan	5	0.5%	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	0.6%
Indonesian	4	0.3%	0.6%	0.5%	0.1%	0.5%
Tongan	4	0.3%	0.5%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%
Turkish	4	0.4%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%
Afrikaans	3	0.3%	0.5%	0.0%	0.2%	0.3%
Cantonese	3	0.2%	0.1%	0.9%	0.3%	0.3%
Chinese, n.f.d	3	0.3%	0.6%	1.5%	0.9%	2.2%
German	3	0.3%	0.2%	0.6%	0.3%	0.3%
Portugese	3	0.3%	0.7%	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%
Teluga	3	0.3%	0.6%	0.0%	1.0%	1.5%
Multiple	62	5.3%	2.3%	0.0%	0.9%	0.1%
All other languages (62 languages)	71	6.0%	7.4%	5.5%	5.8%	7.2%
Not stated	25		5	7	19	5
Total	1,200	100%	1,200	800	803	801



Household structure

The household structure of respondents to the survey has remained remarkably stable over the last four years, with a little more than half from two parent families, one-fifth couple-households, and the remained a combination of one parent families, sole person, and group households.

Household structure
Wyndham City Council - 2017 Annual Community Survey
 (Number and percent of respondents providing a response)

Structure	2017		2016	2015	2014	2013
	Number	Percent				
Two parent family total	709	59.3%	55.4%	52.9%	59.2%	52.1%
<i>youngest child 0 - 4 years</i>	225	18.8%	20.8%	17.5%	20.9%	22.9%
<i>youngest child 5 - 12 years</i>	232	19.4%	16.9%	17.9%	17.5%	14.5%
<i>youngest child 13 - 18 years</i>	91	7.6%	8.0%	8.3%	8.0%	6.8%
<i>adult children only</i>	161	13.5%	9.7%	9.6%	13.3%	8.5%
One parent family total	80	6.7%	7.0%	5.5%	5.7%	7.2%
<i>youngest child 0 - 4 years</i>	6	0.5%	0.8%	1.0%	0.9%	0.5%
<i>youngest child 5 - 12 years</i>	28	2.3%	2.1%	1.6%	1.4%	3.0%
<i>youngest child 13 - 18 years</i>	9	0.8%	1.4%	0.5%	1.1%	0.6%
<i>adult children only</i>	37	3.1%	2.8%	2.4%	2.4%	3.2%
Couple only household	243	20.3%	20.3%	26.4%	20.2%	25.3%
Group household	81	6.8%	7.7%	5.9%	6.4%	5.6%
Sole person household	72	6.0%	7.3%	8.5%	7.2%	7.4%
Other	11	0.9%	2.3%	0.1%	0.5%	1.3%
Not stated	4		3	6	7	9
Total	1,200	100%	1,200	803	803	801



Household member with a disability

The proportion of respondents from households with a member with a disability declined marginally but not measurably in 2017, down from fifteen to 12.1%. This is consistent with the average of 12.1% recorded since 2013.

Household member with a disability
Wyndham City Council - 2017 Annual Community Survey
 (Number and percent of respondents providing a response)

Response	2017		2016	2015	2014	2013
	Number	Percent				
Yes	144	12.1%	15.0%	12.7%	10.6%	10.1%
No	1,050	87.9%	85.0%	87.3%	89.4%	89.9%
Not stated	6		7	19	7	9
Total	1,200	100%	1,200	803	803	801

Housing situation

Consistent with the results in previous years, a little less than half (47.0%) of respondents owned their home outright, a little less than one-third (29.7%) were mortgagee households, and a little more than one-fifth (21.4%) were rental household respondents.

These results have remained very consistent over time.

Housing situation
Wyndham City Council - 2017 Annual Community Survey
 (Number and percent of respondents providing a response)

Situation	2017		2016	2015	2014	2013
	Number	Percent				
Fully own home	557	47.0%	41.8%	45.6%	38.2%	38.3%
Purchasing home	352	29.7%	32.8%	25.2%	38.6%	38.8%
Renting home	254	21.4%	24.1%	27.5%	22.3%	22.2%
Other arrangement	22	1.9%	1.3%	1.8%	0.9%	0.6%
Not stated	15		6	17	15	8
Total	1,200	100%	1,200	800	803	801

Period of residence

The period of residence in the City of Wyndham results have remained very stable over time, as is clearly evident in the table.

Metropolis Research notes that almost one-third (28.8%) had lived in the municipality for less than five years, a little more than one-fifth (21.8%) had lived in Wyndham for between five and ten years, and almost half (49.5%) for ten years or more.

It is important to note that respondents' satisfaction with the overall performance of Council did vary measurably and significantly by the respondents' period of residence in the municipality.

Period of residence in Wyndham
Wyndham City Council - 2017 Annual Community Survey
(Number and percent of respondents providing a response)

Period	2017		2016	2015	2014	2013
	Number	Percent				
Less than one year	85	7.1%	7.9%	7.3%	10.3%	9.7%
One to less than five years	259	21.7%	23.3%	21.6%	21.9%	27.8%
Five to less than ten years	260	21.8%	23.8%	24.4%	25.0%	22.2%
Ten years or more	591	49.5%	45.0%	46.7%	42.8%	40.3%
Not stated	5		4	5	4	9
Total	1,200	100%	1,200	800	803	801



Appendix One – Survey form



1

On a scale of 0 (lowest) to 10 (highest), please rate the importance to the community, and your personal level of satisfaction with each of the following.

1. Maintenance and repair of sealed local roads	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
2. Drains maintenance & repairs	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
3. Footpath maintenance & repairs	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
4. Weekly garbage collection	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
5. Provision of parks and gardens	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
6. Maintenance of parks and gardens	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
7. Provision and maintenance of street trees	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
8. Provision and maintenance of street lighting	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
9. Litter collection in public areas	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
10. Maintenance & cleaning of shopping strips along roads	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
11. Maintenance & cleaning of Watton Street	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
12. Parking enforcement	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
13. Local traffic management	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
14. Animal management	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
15. Wyndham News <i>(Council's bi-monthly publication)</i>	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
16. Council advertisements in <i>Star Weekly</i> (i.e. upcoming Council events, not articles)	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
17. Council activities promoting environment and sustainability (e.g. recycling, litter prevention and Green Living)	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
18. Protecting the natural environment	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99

1

On a scale of 0 (lowest) to 10 (highest), please rate the importance to the community, and your personal level of satisfaction with each of the following.

19. Management of illegal dumping of rubbish	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
20. Management of environmental pests and weeds	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
21. Public art (<i>including temporary and permanent</i>)	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
22. Art exhibitions and experiences (<i>e.g. music and art events</i>)	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
23. The maintenance of food safety standards in Wyndham	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99

2

On a scale of 0 (lowest) to 10 (highest), please rate the importance of the following services to the community, followed by your personal level of satisfaction with only the services you or a family member has used in the past 12 months?

(Survey note: Ask importance, then use, then satisfaction only if service has been used in last twelve months)

1. Council's website	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Used	Yes					No						
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
2. Council's FACEBOOK pages (<i>e.g. Wyndham City Living, Experience Wyndham</i>)	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Used	Yes					No						
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
3. Regular recycling	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Used	Yes					No						
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
4. Green waste collection	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Used	Yes					No						
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
5. Hard rubbish collection	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Used	Yes					No						
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
6. Local libraries	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Used	Yes					No						
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
7. Sports ovals	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Used	Yes					No						
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
8. Wyndham beaches and coastal foreshore	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Used	Yes					No						
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99

On a scale of 0 (lowest) to 10 (highest), please rate the importance of the following services to the community, followed by your personal level of satisfaction with only the services you or a family member has used in the past 12 months?

(Survey note: Ask importance, then use, then satisfaction only if service has been used in last twelve months)

9. Public toilets	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	
	Used	Yes					No							
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	
10. Community Centres and Neighbourhood Hubs	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	
	Used	Yes					No							
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	
11. Immunisation services	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	
	Used	Yes					No							
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	
12. Services for children from birth to 5 years of age <i>(e.g. MCH, playgroups, kindergarten)</i>	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	
	Used	Yes					No							
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	
13. Services for youth <i>(e.g. school holiday programs, music & dance events, youth sports, Youth Resource Centre)</i>	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	
	Used	Yes					No							
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	
14. Services for seniors or people with a disability <i>(e.g. Planned activity groups, respite, personal or domestic care, home)</i>	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	
	Used	Yes					No							
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	
15. On & off road bike and / or walking paths <i>(including shared pathways)</i>	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	
	Used	Yes					No							
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	
16. Provision of aquatic facilities <i>(e.g. Wyndham Outdoor Pool, AquaPulse)</i>	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	
	Used	Yes					No							
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	
17. Provision and maintenance of playgrounds	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	
	Used	Yes					No							
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	
18. Arts and cultural services	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	
	Used	Yes					No							
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	
19. Provision of Council events <i>(e.g. Children's Week Picnic, Pet Expo, State Rose & Garden Show)</i>	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	
	Used	Yes					No							
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	

3

On a scale of 0 (lowest) to 10 (highest), can you please rate your satisfaction with the following?

(Please circle one number only for each aspect)

1. Council's performance in community consultation and engagement	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
2. Council's representation, lobbying and advocacy on behalf of the community with other levels of government and private organisations on key issues	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
3. Council's performance making decisions in the interests of the community	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
4. The responsiveness of Council to local community needs	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
5. Council's performance in maintaining the trust and confidence of the local community	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
6. Council's performance in providing information to the community on Council programs, services, and processes	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
7. Performance of Council across all areas of responsibility	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99

4

Over the past twelve months, do you think Wyndham City Council's overall performance has?

Improved	1	Deteriorated	3
Stayed the same	2	Don't know, can't say	9

If answered improved or deteriorated, what was the most important factor influencing your answer?

5

Can you please list what you consider to be the top three issues for the City of Wyndham at the moment?

Issue One:	
Issue Two:	
Issue Three:	

6

Have you contacted Wyndham City Council in the last twelve months? (This could be to ask for information or to ask Council to do something)

Yes (continue)	1	No (go to Q.16)	2
----------------	---	-----------------	---

7

When you last contacted the Council, was it? *(Please circle one only)*

Visit in person	1	Social media	5
Telephone <i>(during office hours)</i>	2	E-mail	6
Telephone <i>(after hours service)</i>	3	Website	7
Mail	4		

8

Was this the method by which you would prefer to have connected with Council?

Yes	1	No	2
-----	---	----	---

If No, how would you have preferred to connect with Council?

9

What did you contact Council about?

Issue:	
--------	--

10

Did your enquiry require a follow-up from Council or was it dealt with immediately?

Dealt with straight away <i>(go to Q.14)</i>	1	Required follow-up	2
--	---	--------------------	---

11

Did Council tell you what the next step was for your question / issue?

Yes	1	No	2
-----	---	----	---

12

Did Council tell you how long it would take for the next step to happen?

Yes	1	No <i>(go to Q.14)</i>	2
-----	---	------------------------	---

13

Did you get a response from Council in that time?

Yes	1	No	2
-----	---	----	---

14

How was your question or request resolved?

I got what I needed from Council	1	I had to contact Council again	3
Council couldn't help	2	I'm still waiting for Council response	4

15

On a scale of 0 (lowest) to 10 (highest), how satisfied were you with the following aspects of service when you last contacted the Wyndham City Council?

1. Care and attention to your enquiry	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
2. Speed of service	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
3. Courtesy of service	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
4. Opening hours	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
5. Access to relevant staff member	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
6. Staff's understanding of your language needs	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
7. How easy it was to understand the information from Council	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
8. How easy it was to access the information or service you were after	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
9. Overall satisfaction with the experience	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99

The State Government has planned for the population of Wyndham to continue growing by approximately 200,000 over the next 20 years. The responsibility for providing services, transport infrastructure, and facilities rests with both Council and the State Government.

16

On a scale of 0 (lowest) to 10 (highest), can you please rate your satisfaction with?

1. Planning for population growth	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	<i>Can't say</i>
If you rated satisfaction less than 5, what concerns you most about population growth in the City of Wyndham?												

17

On a scale of 0 (lowest) to 10 (highest), how safe do you feel in public areas in the City of Wyndham?

1. During the day	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
2. At night	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
3. Travelling on / waiting for public transport	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
4. In and around Pacific Werribee	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
5. In and around Point Cook Shopping Centre	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
6. In and around Watton Street	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
4. In and around your local shopping district / centre	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
If rated less than 5, why?												

18

On a scale of 0 (strongly disagree) to 10 (strongly agree), please rate your agreement with following statements regarding healthy living and community.

1. I can easily get to a supermarket or fruit and vegetable store without a car	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
2. Community events and sporting / recreation facilities should offer more healthy food and drink options	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
3. I feel happy and safe walking in my local area	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
4. I feel there are enough opportunities for people in my local area to exercise	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
5. I feel there are enough opportunities to connect socially with people in the local area	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
6. I can get help from friends, family or neighbours when needed	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
7. There are adequate support services for vulnerable community members	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
8. Council activities and programs are accessible to, and inclusive of the community	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99

19

In the past 12 months, were there any times that your household ran out of food and couldn't afford to buy more?

Never	1	Monthly or almost every month	4
Once	2	More than once a month	5
A couple of times	3	Can't say	9

20

Do you or someone in your household commute to work regularly by car?

Yes	1	No (<i>go to q.23</i>)	2
-----	---	--------------------------	---

21

On average, how long does it take in total to travel both to and from work?

(Please circle one only)

Less than 30 minutes	1	One hour to less than 90 minutes	3
30 minutes to less than one hour	2	90 minutes or more	4

22

On a scale of 0 (very unimportant) to 10 (very important), how important are each of the following in your decision to travel to work by car?

1. It is the quickest method	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
2. It is the most convenient method	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
3. Need to drop children at school, kinder or childcare	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
4. Working flexible hours is easier using the car to travel to work	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99

23

On a scale of 0 (very unimportant) to 10 (very important), how important are the following barriers to using public transport?

1. Takes too long to travel by public transport	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
2. Public transport is not conveniently located to home or work	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
3. Too many changes of public transport mode required to reach destination	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
4. Buses are too infrequent	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
5. Buses don't connect with trains	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
6. Working flexible hours is not conducive to using public transport	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
7. Lack of car parking at railway stations	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
8. Trains are too overcrowded	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
9. I don't feel safe using public transport	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
10. Public transport is too unreliable	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99

24

Please indicate which of the following best describes you.

15 - 19 Years	1	46 - 55 Years	4
20 - 35 Years	2	56 - 75 Years	5
36 - 45 Years	3	76 Years or Over	6

25

With what gender do you identify?

Male	1	Other / not specific gender	2
Female	2	Prefer not to say	9

26

Do any members of this household speak a language other than English at home?

English only	1	Other (please specify): _____	2
--------------	---	-------------------------------	---

27

What is the structure of this household?

(Please circle one only)

Two parent family (youngest 0 - 4 yrs)	1	One parent family (youngest 13-18 yrs)	7
Two parent family (youngest 5 – 12 yrs)	2	One parent family (adult child only)	8
Two parent family (youngest 13 - 18 yrs)	3	Group household	9
Two parent family (adult child only)	4	Sole person household	10
One parent family (youngest 0 - 4 yrs)	5	Couple only household	11
One parent family (youngest 5 – 12 yrs)	6	Other (please specify): _____	12

28

Do any members of this household have a permanent or long-term disability or illness?

Yes	1	No	2
-----	---	----	---

29

Which of the following best describes the current housing situation of this household?

Own this home	1	Renting this home	3
Mortgage (paying-off this home)	2	Other arrangement	4

30

How long have you lived in the City of Wyndham?

Less than 1 year	1	5 to less than 10 years	3
1 to less than 5 years	2	10 years or more	4

If less than 5 years, what was your previous Council

31

Do you have any further comments you would like to make?
