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The project aimed to engage the Waverley community, represented by a random sample of renters, resident ratepayers and business operators from the Waverley Local Government Area, and to provide them with sufficient detail about Waverley Council’s Community Strategic Plan (*Waverley Together 2: 2010-22*) to enable them to make informed judgments about associated funding issues identified by the Council.

Computer Aided Telephone Interviewing (CATI) survey in two stages:

- Initial recruitment of a stratified sample of 988 renters, ratepayers and business operators (Tuesday 24 August to Friday 5 November, 2010, inclusive); response rate 84 per cent of eligible contacts.

- Distribution of a four-page information packet, enclosing three separate sheets listing Vision statement, current Waverley Council (Council) services, and proposed enhancements to services.

- Main survey, conducted Wednesday 8 September to Thursday 11 November, 2010, inclusive; response rate 93 per cent of eligible recruits. Final sample of 534 respondents.

**Results**

- Ratepayers, eligible respondents aged between 40 and 70, and those who had previously heard of *Waverley Together 2*, were more likely to participate in the main survey.

- Results are summarised here for the sample as a whole, and detailed in the report for the “interest groups”, being renters, ratepayers, and business operators. Renters were in general more positive than ratepayers in their attitudes toward Council, the importance of the services it provides, and the proposals for financial restructuring; business operators were in general less positive than ratepayers. The results for the sample as a whole may be a conservative assessment of the response of the whole Waverley community, since business operators were over-represented by virtue of the stratification...
requirements, and renters were under-represented due to their lower level of participation in the study.

- Almost 90 per cent of respondents confirmed that the Vision statement expresses their sense of how life in Waverley should be, ideally.

- All 14 statements comprising the Vision were rated as important or very important by the majority of all groups in the survey.

- Council and the community were seen as the most important partners in making the Vision real. Just over half the respondents agreed that all five partners would be able to work together, but another quarter were sceptical about this. Respondents were evenly divided over whether the other partners could fill the gap if Council had to cut or reduce services.

- All existing Council services were rated as important or very important. Key issues were maintenance of shared assets (roads, footpaths, etc.), rubbish removal, maintenance of playgrounds and parks, planning and control of transport and traffic, services for vulnerable groups (older people, those with disabilities, children), control of building activity and planning residential development.

- Ratings and rankings closely paralleled the results of the 2009 Waverley community survey, despite the difference in respondent selection criteria and semantic labels on rating scales.

- Proposed enhancements to services (Service Plus) were also rated as important or very important, though not quite as important as existing services. Key issues were more and safer access to public places, transport and vital services; and more cleaning and greening of shared spaces.

- The most widely understood message from the information packet was that services will cost more in the long run if not paid for now, followed by services will be cut if rates are not raised. Less than half accepted the concept that Council has done all it can to find alternatives to rate rises.

- Two thirds thought current rates in Waverley were good value for money, and a slightly lower proportion saw the proposed rate increase as a reasonable price to pay to maintain current services.

- Just over half agreed that the higher level of proposed rate increase would be a reasonable price to pay to maintain services AND make all the enhancements in Service Plus, and a slightly higher majority said the higher level of increase would be affordable for them. Attitudes to the higher proposed level of rate rise were significantly related to the dollar amount of current rates paid, with a majority of those who paid lower rates seeing the rate rise as a reasonable price to pay, while those who paid rates in the top quartile were polarised on this question.
Ratepayers expressed a clear preference for rate rises to be implemented more slowly and over a longer period (rather than bigger rises over a shorter period), and for a flat amount each year rather than a percentage increase.

Well over half the respondents nominated maintenance of shared assets, and maintenance and cleaning of beaches among the five services they would most want to retain if services had to be cut out or reduced. Priorities for some other “most wanted” services (those for vulnerable groups and environmental issues) were clearly impacted by the age structure of the sample.

The services respondents were most comfortable to have cut out or reduced were also those that ranked as less important, although none were nominated by a majority.

Almost half the sample expected the quality of life in Waverley would be worse if Council services were cut out or reduced, and half expected it would remain the same.

On balance, all groups disagreed with all suggested alternative revenue-raising measures, with increased metered parking charges the most strongly opposed.

Participation in the study was itself reported as having an impact on respondents: 40 per cent were surprised by the range of Council’s current services, and 60 per cent were surprised by the comparative council rates.

Over half reported that they were had more positive attitudes to Waverley Council as a result of their participation, in terms of how well Council is performing in long term planning, the importance of the services it provides, and the importance of its role in delivering a better lifestyle to the Waverley community. Almost half were more positive in their attitudes to Council as a trusted partner with the community in delivering a better lifestyle.
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1 Introduction and aims of the project

The NSW State Government has changed the way local councils do their planning and funding of services. Councils are now required by law to make long-term (10 year) plans for their community (Community Strategic Plans), which are supported by long-term resourcing strategies and a series of rolling four-year plans for financing, staffing and asset management. In formulating these plans, councils must consult with and involve the community and other stakeholders to a greater extent than ever before, and integrate State and Federal Government planning. In this context, councils must show what services they will deliver to their community and how they plan to pay for them.

Waverley Council (hereinafter referred to as Council) has undertaken the first 10 year planning process: it has consulted with the community (including the Waverley community survey conducted by HVRF in 2009) to formulate a vision for Waverley for the 12 years ahead, which is documented in Waverley Together 2. As part of the process, priorities for the maintenance and enhancement of Council services to 2022 have been set. As a result, Council has identified issues with the structure of its funding and major shortfalls in its ability to fund the services it currently provides to the local community, much less enhancements to those services. The financial shortfalls mean that Council expects to be unable to provide the services required to meet the vision outlined in Waverley Together 2, which includes both current and enhanced services identified by the community.

Council has prepared a marketing plan and associated materials, titled Service Plus, which outlines how Council would change its services over the next 12 years to meet the Waverley Together 2 vision. A specialist marketing consultancy was retained for the branding and marketing of Service Plus. The aim of Service Plus is to inform the Waverley community about Council’s plans to continue existing services plus increase services in areas such as recreation, health, cultural expression, better access to public places and essential services, and more cleaning and greening of public spaces.

It is projected by Council that at current rate levels (including the maximum expected rises allowed by the State Government) it cannot pay for the existing level of services it provides to the community. Therefore, the increase in services outlined in Service Plus will also be unaffordable.
To continue services at their current level into the future, Council estimates that rates will need to rise by 8.79 per cent each year for seven years (from 2011/12 to 2017/18 inclusive). To continue services at their current level AND pay for the additional services outlined in Service Plus, rates would need to rise by 12.59 per cent each year for seven years. The problem of future financial security for Waverley is compounded by

- Current rates for a typical Waverley rate payer being substantially lower than those levied in surrounding Local Government Areas (LGAs);
- Council being in the main dependent on variable sources of income, such as parking services.

Council has therefore identified a need to completely revise its funding structure to achieve long term sustainability. As part of the restructure, Council will apply for a special rate variation and must include an assessment of the attitudes of the Waverley community towards

(a) paying more for the continuation of their existing Council provided services
(b) paying an additional amount for services that are beyond what Council already provides
(c) options for reduction of services or increase in other forms of funding, should the special rate variation not occur.

The HVRF notes that Council wishes to use the project as an opportunity to engage with the community in determining the best way to secure the future of the services that have been identified as vital to the Waverley Together 2 vision.
2 Methods of data collection and analysis

2.1 Study design

The study involved two stages, designed to address the complexity of the issues, and the requirement that Council engage with the community around the financial implications of the community Vision in Waverley Together 2. The first stage was recruitment of a representative sample of Waverley residents and ratepayers, who were sent a package of information that succinctly summarised the issues. The second stage was the main survey of recruits.

The package of information was developed in consultation with the client, based on the content of the Waverley Together 2 document and the series of Fact Sheets, numbered 1 through 7, published by Council on its website prior to the start of recruitment for the study. It included the Vision statement and lists of current services and Service Plus enhancements to facilitate the main survey.

2.2 Questionnaire development

Two questionnaires were developed, in consultation with Council’s project manager:

- A short recruitment questionnaire, which outlined the task and collected basic demographic information about recruits to the main survey.

- A detailed survey questionnaire, which sought respondents’ attitudes to the Vision statement and its elements; current Council services and the 51 planned enhancements in Service Plus; current rates in Waverley and proposed rate rises; and various issues if rates are not raised as proposed.

The recruitment questionnaire, information packet for recruits, and survey questionnaire were piloted before the start of data collection. There were no changes to any of the questionnaires as a result of the pilot (the only outcome being the addition of identifying letters on all items in the enclosed lists), so responses to the pilot have been included in the analysis of results.

The full text of the recruitment questionnaire and the survey questionnaire is provided in Appendix I, together with a sample of the information packet.

2.3 Data collection

The following methods were used to conduct the recruitment and survey of Waverley residents and ratepayers.
**Technique:**
Computer assisted telephone interviews (CATI).

**Data collection period:**
Recruitment: Tuesday 24 August to Friday 5 November, 2010, inclusive. (Pilot: Monday 15 August to Monday 23 August, inclusive.)
Main survey: Wednesday 8 September to Thursday 11 November, 2010, inclusive. (Pilot: Friday 20 August to Tuesday 7 September, inclusive.)

**Survey area:**
Waverley Local Government Area (LGA).

**Sample selection:**
Random selection of telephone numbers in the survey area from the White Pages directory for renters and ratepayers; from the Yellow Pages for additional business operators. Respondents excluded from the survey population are those without a landline telephone connection, and those who have changed telephone number recently.

The selected respondent was asked to confirm that his/her household was located in the survey area. If the selected household was not in any of the suburbs within the survey area the interview did not proceed and a replacement telephone number was randomly selected.

**Sample stratification:**
The sample was stratified to ensure a sufficient number of respondents in each interest group (renters, ratepayers, business operators) to allow statistically robust analysis of differences in response patterns. Note that non-resident ratepayers were not included in the sample, as contact details were not available due to privacy considerations.

The natural sample of business operators obtained through random selection of numbers from the White Pages was augmented by random selection of numbers from the Yellow Pages, since businesses are a very small proportion of properties in Waverley.

**Respondent selection:**
The n\(^{th}\) oldest adult permanent resident who contributes to paying rent or Council rates. The person answering the telephone was asked for the number of such people in the household aged 18 or over and the phone answerer’s age position within that number. The respondent was then chosen from these eligible adults using a randomly generated number which specified his/her age position in the household.
For businesses, the eligible respondent was the business owner or manager.

If the selected household or business did not answer or the number was engaged, up to five calls back were made at different times and on different days. When the required respondent was not available, an appointment to call back was made via the person answering the telephone and up to five calls back were made to secure a recruitment interview with the required person (i.e. a total of up to 11 contact attempts). Where this procedure did not result in a successful interview a replacement telephone number was randomly selected.

At least five attempts were made, at different times on different days, to recontact each recruit to complete the main survey. Up to 20 calls back were made to ensure that every recruit had opportunity to participate in the main survey, with an average of five calls to each recruit.

**Final sample size:** 534 completed interviews.

A sample size of 500 yields a sample variation of ±4.5 per cent at a confidence level of 95 per cent, given a response probability of 50 per cent.

In practical terms, this means that if 50 per cent of the randomly selected respondents in the sample answered "yes" to a yes/no question (the result with the highest possible variation in statistical accuracy), the true proportion of the population who would answer "yes" (if all were surveyed) would lie between 45.5 per cent and 54.5 per cent, 95 times out of 100.

Demographic characteristics of the sample of recruits and final survey respondents are provided in Appendix II.

**Average interview length:** 6 minutes for recruitment interview; 29 minutes for main survey. These estimates do not include time spent with residents who declined to participate in the survey.

**Response rate:** Recruitment interviews were completed with representatives from 84 per cent of the households contacted who were eligible to participate in the survey.

Main survey interviews were completed with 93 per cent of eligible recruits who were able to be recontacted after sending them the information packet. However, 15 per cent of recruits could not be recontacted (11 per cent appeared to use an answering machine to screen calls and could not be directly contacted); and 22 per cent were
found to be *ineligible* on recontact primarily due to ill health or unavailability during the survey period.

**Contact rate (recruitment):** 50 per cent for the recruitment survey. The contact rate is calculated as the ratio of eligible contacts to ‘legitimate’ contacts (total numbers called less numbers out of the area, as well as disconnected, business and fax/data numbers, and numbers dialled by mistake; and quota filled for that group in the case of a stratified survey).

The contact rate for the recruitment survey in part reflects the focus on recruitment of a sufficient number of renters to support robust statistical analysis. This focus substantially lowered the contact rate by increasing the number of ‘illegitimate’ numbers called.

Details of all telephone contacts for the Waverley recruitment survey are provided in Table 1.
Table 1  Response and contact rates – Waverley recruitment survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ineligible</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>No. as % of total</th>
<th>No. as % of eligible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call back appointment with household</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent unsuitable</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answering machine</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in survey area</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business number</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disconnected number</td>
<td>1391</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged/busy signal</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax/data line</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language difficulty</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unavailable for survey period</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No eligible person at home</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ineligible</td>
<td>5,573</td>
<td>82.42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligible</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>83.5%*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed interviews</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household refusal</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal refusal</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminated</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total eligible</td>
<td>1,183</td>
<td>17.54%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (eligible + ineligible)</td>
<td>6,756</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact rate                                    | 50.2%* |

* See above for the definition of legitimate contacts and the method of calculating the response and contact rates.
Contact rate (main): 59 per cent for the main survey, including separately recruited business respondents. The contact rate was impacted by the proportion of recruits who were ‘unsuitable’ to do the main survey (13.6%), due primarily to ill health, or work or family commitments; those ‘unavailable for survey period’ (10.4%) due to travel or time constraints; and those who appeared to screen calls via answering machine (10.5%) who did not respond after multiple messages were left. These groups were then deemed ‘ineligible’.

Details of all telephone contacts for the Waverley main survey are provided in Table 2.
### Table 2  Response and contact rates – Waverley main survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ineligible</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>No. as % of total</th>
<th>No. as % of eligible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call back appointment with household</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent unsuitable</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answering machine</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in survey area</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business number</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disconnected number</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged/busy signal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax/data line</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language difficulty</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unavailable for survey period</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No eligible person at home</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total ineligible</strong></td>
<td>402</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligible</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed interviews</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>93.0%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household refusal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal refusal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminated</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total eligible</strong></td>
<td>574</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (eligible + ineligible)</strong></td>
<td>976</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contact rate**  
59.3%*  

* See above for the definition of legitimate contacts and the method of calculating the response and contact rates.
2.4 Data analysis

(i) Data weighting

The survey data presented in this report is in general not weighted. A broad-based survey of the community, such as the 2009 Waverley Community Survey conducted by the HVRF, can be weighted to match the age and gender profile of that community, using the most recent Census data, to ensure that the overall results can be generalised to the community as a whole.

In the survey reported here, eligible respondents were those who contributed to payment of rates or rent, who would be most directly affected by rate increases. The sample thus had an inherently older age profile than the adult community as a whole. Further, Census data was not readily available to provide a basis for weighting the data.

The only reliable data on which to base weighting of the non-business part of the sample of respondents was the distribution of rate brackets.

(ii) Mean ratings

In different questions in the survey, respondents were asked to indicate:

- Their agreement with the Vision statement in Waverley Together 2, current rates as value for money, reasonableness of the proposed rate rises as the price to pay to maintain current services and to maintain and make the 51 enhancements in Service Plus, alternative sources of income if rates are not raised;
- The importance of the Vision elements, specified services and facilities currently provided by Council, proposed enhancements to services (Service Plus);
- Whether they think quality of life in Waverley will be worse or better if Council services are cut or reduced;
- Whether they felt more negative or positive about Waverley Council as a result of reading the information and participating in the survey.

The following scales were used, respectively, for these questions:

**Agreement**

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Neither disagree nor agree (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)
Importance

- Very unimportant (1)
- Unimportant (2)
- Neither (3)
- Important (4)
- Very important (5)

Quality of life

- Much worse (1)
- Worse (2)
- Same (3)
- Better (4)
- Much better (5)

Impact on views of Waverley Council

- Much more negative (1)
- More negative (2)
- The same (3)
- More positive (4)
- Much more positive (5)

Note that for these, a neither or same score of 3 out of 5 suggests a ‘neutral’ opinion: no strong feelings either way.

Average (mean) ratings were calculated by assigning the value shown in parentheses next to each of the components within the scale, with all don’t know and other non-scale responses excluded from the calculation. Tables in the following section which present mean ratings also indicate the number of respondents who provided a rating on the 1 to 5 scale (i.e. excluding “Don’t Know” responses). Table 3 provides an example of the calculation of a mean rating.
### Table 3  Illustration of a mean rating calculation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>No. points</th>
<th>No. responses</th>
<th>Calculation: no. points x no. responses</th>
<th>Mean rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5 x 30 = 150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4 x 100 = 400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3 x 30 = 90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2 x 60 = 120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1 x 40 = 40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>Not included in calculation</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Not included in calculation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>Not included in calculation</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Not included in calculation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>Mean = 3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean is calculated by dividing 800 by the number of responses using the 1 to 5 scale (in this case 300-40=260): 800/260 = 3.1.

In this manner a mean rating of 1 would indicate that all respondents who provided a rating **strongly disagreed** with the specified statement; conversely, a mean of 5 would indicate that they all **strongly agreed** with it. Therefore, a **higher** rating represents a relatively more favourable response.

When reviewing the detailed results it is important to consider:

- The **distribution** of ratings, since this may be masked in the mean score: for example, ratings which are evenly spread over the 1 to 5 scale may yield the same mean as those which are relatively polarised at either end of the scale.
- The level of non-response (that is, the number of **don’t know** and other non-scale responses).

In Section 3 the mean importance ratings were broadly classified as follows:

- Above 3.5 – **very** important
- 3.0 – 3.5 – **important**
- Below 3.0 – **low** importance

Similarly the mean agreement ratings were broadly classified as:

- Above 3.5 – **strong** agreement
- 3.0 – 3.5 – **moderate** agreement
- Below 3.0 – **low** agreement
(iii) Statistical analysis

Statistical significance was been measured at the 95 per cent confidence level. Note that a significant change referred to in Section 3 means a statistically significant change.

For the Waverley survey, the following tests were applied to determine statistically significant differences in responses between demographic groups, and between the sample of recruits and final respondents:

- **Analysis of variance (f test)** – a statistically significant result indicates a difference in the mean ratings which is considered to be a ‘true’ difference and not a difference attributable to chance.

- **Chi-square analysis** – a statistically significant result indicates a difference in the frequency of responses which is considered to be a ‘true’ difference and not a difference attributable to chance.

2.5 Presentation of the results

In the tables in the following chapter responses are sorted, where relevant, in descending order of either frequency of response or the mean ratings. Note that:

(i) Totals relate to the number of respondents who were asked the question, not the number of answers provided. Where more than one response to a question was given, the components will not sum to the totals shown.

(ii) A blank cell indicates that no-one responded in the manner indicated.

(iii) Don’t know and refused responses are necessarily excluded from calculation of mean ratings, but are included in presentation of response frequencies.

(iv) Statistically significant differences in responses are indicated by grey shading in the relevant cells.
3 Results

The results are presented in this Section in a standard format, showing mean ratings (where appropriate) and frequencies for the interest groups (renters, ratepayers, business operators) separately, together with the results for the sample as a whole. The order of presentation broadly follows the order of questions in the main survey.

Note that business operators are overrepresented in the total sample, relative to their incidence in the community, and renters are underrepresented. This is in part due to the stratification process (in the case of business operators) and in part due to the differential propensity of demographic groups to participate in the main survey, as discussed below. The net effect is that mean ratings and frequencies for the sample as a whole are a conservative estimate of the responses of the broader Waverley community, since business operators as a group were generally more critical of Council’s role and plans, and renters as a group generally less so, than were ratepayers as a group.

3.1 Profile of final participants

There were some statistically significant differences between sub-groups of recruits in their propensity to participate in the main survey, as indicated by the data in Table 4.

Thus:

- Recruits aged under 40 or over 70 were less likely to be eligible to participate in the main survey (primarily due to time constraints for the younger and health issues for the older recruits);
- Ratepayers had a considerably greater propensity to participate in the main survey than did renters or business operators (many of the latter indicated their inability to make time available during the survey period);
- Men were somewhat more likely than women to remain eligible;
- A much higher proportion of recruits who had heard of Waverley Together 2 participated in the main survey (albeit only one in five recruits had heard of Waverley Together 2).
Table 4  Difference in propensity of different groups to participate in main survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Interest group</th>
<th>Heard of WT2</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>37.6% Renters 48.8%</td>
<td>Heard of WT2 69.8%</td>
<td>Male 58.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-49</td>
<td>52.2% Ratepayers 62.2%</td>
<td>Not heard of WT2 50.8%</td>
<td>Female 51.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>64.5% Business 29.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 +</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2  Attitudes to the Vision in Waverley Together 2

There was substantial agreement among respondents that the Vision statement expresses your sense of how community life in Waverley should be – ideally, with 64.4 per cent agreeing and a further 23.4 per cent strongly agreeing with the statement (a combined total of almost 90 per cent).

The 14 statements comprising the Vision were rated by each respondent in terms of their importance on a scale of 1 (very unimportant) to 5 (very important). The mean scores are presented in Table 5 for each interest group, together with the percentage of all respondents who rated the item as important or very important. The statements are presented in order of their importance, as rated by the community, rather than their order in the Vision. All were rated as important or very important by a majority of all groups in the survey.

The mean scores and percentages indicate that the community as a whole rated safety, natural beauty, and accessibility of services as very important, followed by compassionate action, sensitive architectural development, sharing of resources and community participation.

Reconciliation with our indigenous past and inspired and able to renew physical and spiritual wellbeing appeared to resonate least with all groups, but were still rated as important or very important by more than 50 per cent of respondents.

Renters rated all elements of the Vision as more important than did ratepayers or business operators, and these differences were significant for the services shaded in grey in Table 5. The most notable impact of these differences was that taking a leading place in achieving the environmental aims of a global society ranked 8th in importance with renters, compared with 9th for business operators and 11th for ratepayers.

Females rated all of the statements as significantly more important than did males, with a differential of between 0.2 and 0.5 in the mean scores on 13 of the 14 items, however this did not affect the rank order of the elements. There were no consistent differences by age group.
Table 5  Mean importance of Vision elements to interest groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of each element of Vision</th>
<th>Rate-payer</th>
<th>Renter</th>
<th>Business operator</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of all respondents who rate as 4 or 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We are safe</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The beauty of our beaches, cliffs and coastal lands endures</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>95.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vital services are fully accessible</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We act together as a compassionate society</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>82.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The architectural landscape is cared for and developed at a human scale and design is sensitive to the natural, historical and social contexts</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>80.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarce resources are conserved and fairly shared</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>81.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone is welcomed to participate positively in community life</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>83.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local economic prosperity provides opportunity for all</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>75.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are confident our leaders will reflect thoughtfully on our views and best interests when making decisions for our future</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We can express our essential selves through our traditions, our arts, our cultures, and our lifestyles</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a community we have the courage to take a leading place in achieving the environmental aims of a global society</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections within families and between generations remain unbroken</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are inspired and able to renew our physical and spiritual wellbeing</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>53.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are reconciled with and value our indigenous past</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of respondents: 319 to 324, 136 to 141, 67 to 69, 519 to 531, 534

Notes: (1) Means scores close to 5 indicate the item is very important; mean scores close to 1 indicate the item is very unimportant.  
(2) Shaded cells indicate a statistically significant difference at the .95 level of confidence 
(3) Don’t know and refused responses are excluded from mean scores, but included in calculation of percentages

3.2.1 Making the Vision a reality

The survey results indicated a degree of scepticism among respondents when asked if they thought that local people, local businesses, Waverley Council, and the State and Federal Governments will be able to work together to make the Vision real. Just over half the respondents (55.4%) agreed or strongly agreed that these groups could work together, whereas just over one quarter (26.0%) disagreed or strongly disagreed. The remainder were neutral (14.0%) or could not decide (4.5%).

Nevertheless, the majority of respondents rated all five groups as important to the process, as shown in Table 6. Waverley Council was seen as the most important group with a mean score indicating it was very important to most people, followed by the local community. State Government and local businesses were rated equally important, and the Federal Government was generally seen as the least, but still important, contributor to making the Vision real.
Table 6 Importance of partners in making the Vision a reality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of partners in making the Vision a reality</th>
<th>Ratepayer</th>
<th>Renter</th>
<th>Business operator</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of all respondents who rate as 4 or 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waverley Council</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>87.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The local community</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>79.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local businesses</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>317 to 323</td>
<td>139 to 141</td>
<td>68 to 69</td>
<td>524 to 533</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  
(1) Means scores close to 5 indicate the item is very important; mean scores close to 1 indicate the item is very unimportant.  
(2) Shaded cells indicate a statistically significant difference at the .95 level of confidence  
(3) Don’t know and refused responses are excluded from mean scores, but included in calculation of percentages

The differences in distribution of responses and mean scores between groups were generally not significant, except that here, too, females rated each item as significantly more important than did males.

3.3 Attitudes to current services

Respondents were asked to rate the importance of each of 24 service categories, currently provided by Council, to helping to make the Vision for life in Waverley possible. The service categories were listed on the yellow sheet in the information packet sent to each respondent. The results are presented in Table 7 in the form of mean scores out of 5 for each of the interest groups, together with the percentage of all respondents who rated each service category as important or very important. The service categories are listed in decreasing order of rated importance.
Table 7  Importance of current Council services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of each service in helping to make the Vision for life in Waverley possible</th>
<th>Rate-payer</th>
<th>Renter</th>
<th>Business operator</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of respondents who rate as 4 or 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of shared assets such as roads, footpaths, kerbs.</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach cleaning, maintenance and lifeguard services</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>93.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumped rubbish removal</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness and maintenance of playgrounds</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness and maintenance of parks</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local traffic planning and management</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>86.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for &amp; management of recreational facilities such as parks, picnic areas.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>89.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport planning and management</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>84.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and services for older people</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>86.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of building activity</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>83.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and services for children</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>84.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and services for people with disabilities</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>83.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood streetscape cleaning, maintenance and beautification</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>85.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for residential development</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of neighbourhood amenity and disturbance</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>80.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of the natural environment including management of programs for greenhouse gas reduction, water conservation,</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>80.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement in decision making</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and services for young people</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>77.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library services, including access to information on the web</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for and management of sporting facilities</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>75.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for and management of meeting places including shopping centres, malls, and neighbourhood villages</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term planning and vision for desired social, environmental, economic and civic leadership outcomes</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>70.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing residents about Council's activities</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities for and management of arts, entertainment and cultural events</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of respondents</strong></td>
<td><strong>319 to 324</strong></td>
<td><strong>140 to 141</strong></td>
<td><strong>67 to 69</strong></td>
<td><strong>527 to 534</strong></td>
<td><strong>534</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: (1) Means scores close to 5 indicate the item is very important; mean scores close to 1 indicate the item is very unimportant. (2) Shaded cells indicate a statistically significant difference at the .95 level of confidence (3) Don’t know and refused responses are excluded from mean scores, but included in calculation of percentages
Further, the results of the 2010 survey, in terms of both relative and absolute importance to the community of Council services, closely paralleled the results of the 2009 Waverley community survey, conducted by the HVRF eighteen months earlier. The comparison can be seen in Appendix III. This shows that the differences in mean scores of the same or similar service descriptions were minimal, despite the difference in approach to respondent selection (the 2009 community survey had a younger age profile, being based on a random sample of all residents, rather than household decision makers) and the difference between semantic labels on the 5-point importance rating scales used in the two surveys.

The data reflect a general tendency for renters to rate Council services as more important, and business operators to rate them as somewhat less important, than ratepayers do. These differences were significant only for cleanliness and maintenance of playgrounds; planning for and management of recreational facilities; facilities and services for people with disabilities; community involvement in decision making; informing residents about Council’s activities; and planning for and management of arts, entertainment and cultural events. There was some impact on the importance ranking of services, with renters ranking services for people with disabilities as the 6th most important service, and placing relatively greater importance on community involvement in decision making and management of the natural environment than ratepayers or business operators did. Similarly, business operators placed relatively greater importance on neighbourhood streetscape cleaning, maintenance and beautification, ranking this service 7th in importance.

As with the importance of elements of the Vision, females had mean scores of between 0.2 and 0.5 points higher than males for all service categories, indicating that women see the services as significantly more important than men do. As a result of these differences, women ranked management of meeting places and informing residents about Council’s activities as more important than library services and sporting facilities.

The overall importance ratings and rankings of current Council services are in part influenced by the age profile of renters and ratepayers, who have an older age profile than the community as a whole. Maintenance of shared assets and beach cleaning and maintenance rank among the top three most important current services for all age groups. However the data reflect significant differences between generations (15-year age groups) in relation to several other important current Council services. In particular, the importance of library services, services for older people and for people with disabilities, planning and management of meeting places, maintenance of neighbourhood streetscapes, and dumped rubbish removal all increase significantly in importance with age. There are other, less clear-cut, differences between age groups. The impact on the ranking of current Council services in terms of their importance to respondents of different generations is summarised in Table 8 for the most important services.
### Table 8 Generational differences in importance rank of current Council services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance Ranking</th>
<th>Under 35</th>
<th>35-49</th>
<th>50-64</th>
<th>65and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Maintenance of shared assets such as roads, footpaths, kerbs, Beach cleaning, maintenance and lifeguard services</td>
<td>Maintenance of shared assets such as roads, footpaths, kerbs, Beach cleaning, maintenance and lifeguard services</td>
<td>Maintenance of shared assets such as roads, footpaths, kerbs, Beach cleaning, maintenance and lifeguard services</td>
<td>Maintenance of shared assets such as roads, footpaths, kerbs,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Transport planning and management</td>
<td>Maintenance of shared assets such as roads, footpaths, kerbs, Beach cleaning, maintenance and lifeguard services</td>
<td>Beach cleaning, maintenance and lifeguard services</td>
<td>Dumped rubbish removal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Beach cleaning, maintenance and lifeguard services</td>
<td>Dumped rubbish removal</td>
<td>Dumped rubbish removal</td>
<td>Beach cleaning, maintenance and lifeguard services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Local traffic planning and management</td>
<td>Cleanliness and maintenance of parks</td>
<td>Cleanliness and maintenance of playgrounds</td>
<td>Local traffic planning and management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dumped rubbish removal</td>
<td>Planning for &amp; management of recreational facilities</td>
<td>Cleanliness and maintenance of parks</td>
<td>Cleanliness and maintenance of parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cleanliness and maintenance of playgrounds</td>
<td>Cleanliness and maintenance of playgrounds</td>
<td>Facilities and services for older people</td>
<td>Cleanliness and maintenance of playgrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cleanliness and maintenance of parks</td>
<td>Facilities and services for children</td>
<td>Control of building activity</td>
<td>Facilities and services for people with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Community involvement in decision making</td>
<td>Transport planning and management</td>
<td>Local traffic planning and management</td>
<td>Facilities and services for older people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Management of the natural environment including management of programs for</td>
<td>Local traffic planning and management</td>
<td>Planning for &amp; management of recreational facilities such as parks, picnic</td>
<td>Planning for &amp; management of recreational facilities such as parks, picnic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Control of neighbourhood amenity and disturbance</td>
<td>Control of building activity</td>
<td>Transport planning and management</td>
<td>Control of building activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Planning for &amp; management of recreational facilities such as parks, picnic</td>
<td>Management of the natural environment including management of programs for greenhouse gas</td>
<td>Planning for residential development</td>
<td>Neighbourhood streetscape cleaning, maintenance and beautification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Facilities and services for children</td>
<td>Facilities and services for older people</td>
<td>Neighbourhood streetscape cleaning, maintenance and</td>
<td>Transport planning and management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Facilities and services for people with disabilities</td>
<td>Facilities and services for people with disabilities</td>
<td>Facilities and services for people with disabilities</td>
<td>Facilities and services for children</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4 Attitudes to proposed enhancements to services

The list of 51 proposed enhancements to Council services (*Service Plus*), grouped into six categories, was provided to respondents in the green sheet included in the information packet. The estimated cost over 12 years, the percentage of the cost for which funds had already been identified by Council, and the average extra increase to rates each year needed to fund the shortfall was included for each category of enhancements.
Respondents were asked how important they thought each of these categories of improvement will be in the next 12 years in making the Vision possible. The results are presented in Table 9, in order of importance to respondents. The Table shows the mean score for each interest group on a scale from 1 (very unimportant) to 5 (very important), together with the percentage of all respondents who rated that type of improvement as important or very important.

The data indicate that all six categories of service enhancements in Service Plus were rated by a majority of respondents as important or very important in achieving the Vision, albeit the percentages were somewhat lower than for most of the existing services. The rank order is generally consistent with the importance ranking of existing services shown in Table 7.

Table 9 Importance of Service Plus categories in making the Vision possible

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Category</th>
<th>Ratepayer</th>
<th>Renter</th>
<th>Business operator</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of respondents who rate 4 or 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More and safer access to public places, to transport and to vital services</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>77.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More cleaning and greening of all the spaces we share</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>71.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnering with a more engaged, connected and inspired community actively involved in decision making and in preserving the things we value most</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A more sustainable environment with increased protection from global warming and preservation of natural ecosystems</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More opportunities for recreation, health, wellbeing and artistic and cultural expression</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>61.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More inviting streetscapes and restful local neighbourhoods</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of respondents</td>
<td>319 to 321</td>
<td>140 to 141</td>
<td>69 to 69</td>
<td>528 to 530</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: (1) Means scores close to 5 indicate the item is very important; mean scores close to 1 indicate the item is very unimportant.  
(2) Shaded cells indicate a statistically significant difference at the .95 level of confidence  
(3) Don’t know and refused responses are excluded from mean scores, but included in calculation of percentages

**More and safer access to public places, to transport and to vital services** was rated as the most important of the enhancement categories, with a similar rating to the 19th most important existing service. The next four categories, in order of importance, were rated as slightly more important than the lowest ranked current service, with **more inviting streetscapes and restful local neighbourhoods** ranked lowest.

In a similar pattern to that for existing services, renters tended to rate all categories as more important, and business operators as less important, than did ratepayers. These differences were significant only for **community engagement** and **environmental sustainability**.
Differences between the responses of males and females were again significant for all categories, and were even more marked than for current services, with the difference between mean scores varying between 0.3 and 0.6. The greatest differential was for environmental sustainability.

As a consequence of the differences in mean scores between particular groups of respondents, a more sustainable environment with increased protection from global warming and preservation of natural ecosystems was ranked as the second most important category by renters, and as third most important by women. Men ranked it as second lowest in importance, a result consistent with several recent studies that have found men to be significantly more sceptical about climate change than women.

3.5 Perceptions of information about Waverley Together 2

As a preliminary to questions about the importance of the enhancements in Service Plus, and their reactions to the proposed rate rises, respondents were asked what messages they had gleaned from the information sent to them.

Table 10 shows the percentage of respondents in each interest group who said yes to each of four statements, in order of decreasing acceptance.

The results indicate that the most widely accepted message from the information was that if the community doesn’t want to pay for improvement to Council services now, it will cost more in the long run; followed by if rates are not raised, services in Waverley will be cut by 10%. Just over half of all respondents accepted that rates in Waverley are low now, and need to be raised more than normal to pay for services the community wants; 40 per cent responded no to this statement, and the remainder did not know or did not respond. Business operators were equally divided in their response to this statement, but differences in response patterns were not sufficient to be significant for any of these three statements based on interest group, land value, life cycle stage, or gender.

Table 10 Respondents’ views of information provided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please tell me if the information made you think that…</th>
<th>Ratepayer</th>
<th>Renter</th>
<th>Business operator</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of respondents who say ‘yes’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the community doesn’t want to pay for improvements to Council services now, it will cost more in the long run</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If rates are not raised, services in Waverley will be cut by 10%</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates in Waverley are low now, and need to be raised more than normal to pay for services the community wants</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council has done everything it can to identify alternative sources of income and cost saving</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of respondents 324 141 69 534

Note: Shaded cells indicate a statistically significant difference at the .95 level of confidence.
In contrast, the statement that *Council has done everything it can to identify alternative sources of income and cost saving* was least accepted by all groups, and outright rejected by business operators almost two to one (60 per cent no to 32 per cent yes). It is not clear from the data whether the response means that that material was not included in the information provided, or whether those who responded no do not accept the assertion by Council that it has taken all possible measures to identify alternative sources of income and cost saving. However, those who responded no were significantly more likely to offer spontaneous comment, particularly related to the efficiency of Council, than those who gave other responses.

### 3.6 Attitudes to current rates and proposed rises

During the interview, respondents were given:

- A dollar figure for average rates for their type of dwelling in their suburb this year (2010/11), including the environmental levy;
- The dollar amount those rates would need to rise each year to maintain services at their current level; and how much those rates would be (in dollars per year) in 2011/12, 2012/13 and 2017/18 if the maximum proposed increase in rates to maintain current services was applied;
- The equivalent set of dollar amounts for the increase in rates needed to maintain Council services at their current level and make the 51 Service Plus improvements listed in the information packet sent to them.

Respondents were asked to what extent they:

- Saw the *total package of services currently provided by Council as good value for money for the rates or rent they pay now*;
- Thought the *proposed rate rise would be a reasonable price to pay to ensure the whole package of current Council services continues at today’s levels*;
- Thought the *higher level of proposed rate rises would be a reasonable price to pay to keep all current council services AND get the improvements AS A WHOLE PACKAGE*;
- Personally would be *able to afford the proposed rises to keep all current Council services AND get the improvements AS A WHOLE PACKAGE*.

The results are presented in Table 11 in terms of mean scores on a scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*) for each interest group and the sample as a whole, together with the percentage of all respondents who agree or strongly agree (rate as 4 or 5) and who disagree or strongly disagree (rate as 2 or 1) with each item.

The data indicate broad agreement in the community that current rates are good value for money (67.2%), and that the proposed rate rises would be a reasonable price to pay to maintain services
at current levels (63.5%). Agreement was less marked that the higher proposed level of rate rises would be a reasonable price to pay to maintain current services and make all the enhancements in Service Plus: 52.3 per cent of all respondents agreed; 33.4 per cent disagreed; and the remainder were neutral or did not know. The question of affordability of the higher level of rate increase produced a similar, though slightly more positive, response than the question of reasonableness.

The pattern of responses around the issues of value for money and affordability differs from the attitudes of sub-groups to the elements of the Vision, and from attitudes to current and proposed services. Most notably, there were no significant differences between men and women in relation to these issues. There were some differences between sub-groups:

- Renters were significantly more likely than others to agree that both levels of rate rise are reasonable; business operators disagreed on balance that the higher level of rate rise is reasonable.
- Those under 35 were more likely to agree that proposed rate rises to maintain services are reasonable, but also more likely to disagree that the higher level of rate rises is affordable for them.

However, the strongest association was between the absolute amount of rates and attitudes to value for money, reasonableness of proposed rate rises, and affordability. This was particularly true for attitudes to the higher level of proposed rate rises, where the percentage of respondents who disagreed increased in line with the dollar amount of their current (and therefore proposed future) annual rates. Ratepayers whose current rates are in the top quartile (over $930p.a) were polarised between those who disagreed (44.4%) and those who agreed (42.2%) that the higher level of rate increase would be a reasonable price to pay. Those who disagreed held those views more strongly, which has the effect of reducing the mean for this group to 2.9, just below the neutral point of 3.0.

Almost five per cent of respondents did not know if the higher level of rate rise would be affordable for them, and this was particularly so for renters.
### Table 11 Value for money, reasonableness and affordability of various levels of rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes to various levels of rates</th>
<th>Ratepayer</th>
<th>Renter</th>
<th>Business operator</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of all respondents who</th>
<th>Rate 4 or 5</th>
<th>Rate 1 or 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waverley Council provides all these services now. Considering this, how strongly do you disagree or agree that this total package of services, listed on the yellow sheet, is good value for money for the rates or rent</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you Agree/Disagree that these maximum rises would be a reasonable price to pay to ensure the whole package of current Council services continues at today's levels?</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How strongly do you disagree/agree the proposed rises would be a reasonable price to pay to keep all current council services AND get the improvements AS A WHOLE PACKAGE?</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How strongly do you disagree or agree that YOU would be able to afford the proposed rises to keep all current council services AND get the improvements AS A WHOLE PACKAGE?</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of respondents</td>
<td>305 to 319</td>
<td>137 to 140</td>
<td>64 to 67</td>
<td>509 to 525</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>534</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  
(1) Means scores close to 5 indicate the item is very important; mean scores close to 1 indicate the item is very unimportant.  
(2) Shaded cells indicate a statistically significant difference at the .95 level of confidence  
(3) Don’t know and refused responses are excluded from mean scores, but included in calculation of percentages

### 3.6.1 Preferred modes if rates rise

Ratepayers, including business operators who owned property in Waverley, were asked whether they would prefer to pay rate rises, if these were approved, over 5 years (faster than the amounts quoted to them), over 7 years (the amounts quoted) or over 10 years (slower than the amounts quoted); and whether they would prefer rate rises as a flat amount each year, or increasing gradually over the 12 year period. It is clear from the results, presented in Table 12, that the majority of ratepayers would prefer increases to be applied over a longer period (smaller rises each year but they would go on longer before levelling out) and by the same amount each year, rather than increasing (as they would do if a compounding percentage increase were applied).
Table 12  Preferred formats for rate rises among Waverley property owners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred formats if rate rises are approved</th>
<th>Ratepayer</th>
<th>Business operator</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 5 years - faster</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 7 years</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 years - slower</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know/Refused</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same each year</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know/Refused</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of respondents</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were no significant differences in terms of interest group, gender, or amount of current rates. There was some indication that the preference for a longer, slower rate rise increased with age, and a significantly lower percentage of those over 65 preferred the same increase each year (60%) compared with younger respondents.

3.7  Preferred options if rates are not raised

Respondents were asked to choose which FIVE services they would MOST want to retain at their current level, at least, if a rate rise is not approved and services have to be cut back. They were also asked which FIVE services they would be MOST comfortable to have cut out or reduced. The results are presented in terms of the cumulative response, such that any service nominated as one of the five by a respondent was counted equally, and the total number of responses add to 500 per cent of the number of respondents. Note that the accumulation process automatically excludes don’t know and refused responses from the totals.

3.7.1  Most wanted current services

It might be expected that the current services that were ranked as the most important would also be those that the community most wanted to keep. This is clearly so for the top two: maintenance of shared assets (roads, footpaths, etc.) and beach cleaning and maintenance. Both garnered well over 50 per cent of “votes” across the community. However, the third most wanted service was
### Table 13  Services most wanted to keep at current level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service most wanted to keep at current level at least</th>
<th>Ratepayer</th>
<th>Renter</th>
<th>Business operator</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of shared assets such as roads, footpaths, kerbs,</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach cleaning, maintenance and lifeguard services</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and services for older people</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumped rubbish removal</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and services for people with disabilities</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness and maintenance of parks</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of building activity</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and services for children</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local traffic planning and management</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of the natural environment including management of programs for greenhouse gas reduction, water conservation</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for residential development</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport planning and management</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood streetscape cleaning, maintenance and beautification</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for &amp; management of recreational facilities such as parks, picnic areas,</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library services, including access to information on the web</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of neighbourhood amenity and disturbance</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness and maintenance of playgrounds</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement in decision making</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and services for young people</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term planning and vision for desired social, environmental, economic and civic leadership outcomes</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities for and management of arts, entertainment and cultural events</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing residents about Council's activities</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for and management of meeting places including shopping centres, malls, and neighbourhood</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for and management of sporting facilities</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of respondents</strong></td>
<td><strong>316</strong></td>
<td><strong>138</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
<td><strong>522</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages are the total of respondents’ FIVE most wanted services to keep, and add to 500 per cent.

facilities and services for older people ahead of dumped rubbish removal, and was closely followed by facilities and services for people with disabilities, ahead of *cleanliness and maintenance of playgrounds and parks*. These results in part reflect the age profile of respondents, who were all
household decision-makers who contributed to payment of rates or rent, and therefore somewhat older than the community as a whole. Two per cent of the sample did not respond to this question.

The results are presented in Table 13 in terms of the cumulative percentage of respondents in each interest group who nominated each service as one of their five most wanted to keep at current levels. Significant differences are shaded in grey. The differences in importance of current services to different groups are magnified when they are asked which they most want to keep at current levels, and there were differences between interest groups that affected rank ordering. Thus, renters “voted” for facilities and services for children, management of the natural environment, and facilities and services for people with disabilities ahead of dumped rubbish removal. Ratepayers were more interested in retaining control of building activity and maintenance of parks. Business operators “voted” for dumped rubbish removal as the fourth most wanted service, and had facilities and services for particular groups (older people, people with disabilities, and children) high on the list.

There were also significant differences in the most wanted services by age group. The impact of these age group effects was that facilities and services for older people and for people with disabilities “leapfrog” cleanliness and maintenance of playgrounds and, to a lesser extent, of parks, and even dumped rubbish removal, by virtue of their strong link with increasing age of respondent. In the same way, facilities and services for children and management of the natural environment rank in the top five current services for younger respondents, and their overall ranking is thereby relatively improved. Cleanliness and maintenance of playgrounds, ranked fourth in importance based on mean scores, slips to 17th on the most wanted list. Even among younger residents, who are the most likely users, it slips to 9th or 10th place. Similarly, planning for and management of recreational facilities has slipped from 6th rank based on mean scores to 14th on the most wanted list, across all age groups.

There were no significant differences in order of most wanted current services between men and women, nor between different current rate liabilities.

The “top 10” most wanted services are shown in rank order in Table 14 for ratepayers, renters and business operators.
Table 14 Rank order of services most wanted to keep within interest group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services most wanted to keep at current levels</th>
<th>Ratepayer</th>
<th>Renter</th>
<th>Business operator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Maintenance of shared assets such as roads, footpaths, kerbs,</td>
<td>Maintenance of shared assets such as roads, footpaths, kerbs,</td>
<td>Maintenance of shared assets such as roads, footpaths, kerbs,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Beach cleaning, maintenance and lifeguard services</td>
<td>Beach cleaning, maintenance and lifeguard services</td>
<td>Beach cleaning, maintenance and lifeguard services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Facilities and services for older people</td>
<td>Facilities and services for older people</td>
<td>Facilities and services for older people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Control of building activity</td>
<td>Facilities and services for children</td>
<td>Dumped rubbish removal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Cleanliness and maintenance of parks</td>
<td>Management of the natural environment including management of programs for greenhouse gas reduction, water conservation,</td>
<td>Facilities and services for people with disabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Dumped rubbish removal</td>
<td>Facilities and services for people with disabilities</td>
<td>Cleanliness and maintenance of parks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Facilities and services for people with disabilities</td>
<td>Dumped rubbish removal</td>
<td>Facilities and services for children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Local traffic planning and management</td>
<td>Local traffic planning and management</td>
<td>Local traffic planning and management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Neighbourhood streetscape cleaning, maintenance and beautification</td>
<td>Library services, including access to information on the web</td>
<td>Control of building activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Management of the natural environment including management of programs for greenhouse gas reduction, water conservation,</td>
<td>Transport planning and management</td>
<td>Management of the natural environment including management of programs for greenhouse gas reduction, water conservation,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Planning for residential development</td>
<td>Control of building activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7.2 Least wanted current services

The current services that respondents were most comfortable to have cut out or reduced, if a rate rise is not approved, closely paralleled the services that were ranked as least important. The “top” five were long term planning and vision; facilities for and management of arts, entertainment and cultural events; informing residents about Council’s activities; planning for and management of place; and of sporting facilities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services respondents would be most comfortable to have cut out or reduced</th>
<th>Ratepayer</th>
<th>Renter</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long term planning and vision for desired social, environmental, economic and civic leadership outcomes</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities for and management of arts, entertainment and cultural events</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing residents about Council’s activities</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for and management of meeting places including shopping centres, malls, and neighbourhood villages</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for and management of sporting facilities</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement in decision making</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library services, including access to information on the web</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of neighbourhood amenity and disturbance</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and services for young people</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of the natural environment including management of programs for greenhouse gas reduction, water conservation,</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of building activity</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local traffic planning and management</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport planning and management</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood streetscape cleaning, maintenance and beautification</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for residential development</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and services for children</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for &amp; management of recreational facilities such as parks, picnic areas,</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and services for older people</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness and maintenance of playgrounds</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumped rubbish removal</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and services for people with disabilities</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach cleaning, maintenance and lifeguard services</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness and maintenance of parks</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of shared assets such as roads, footpaths, kerbs,</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of respondents</strong></td>
<td><strong>307</strong></td>
<td><strong>133</strong></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
<td><strong>507</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Percentages are the total of respondents’ FIVE most services to cut out or have reduced, and add to approximately 500 per cent.*
The list of “least wanted” services broadly mirrored that of the “most wanted”, although cleanliness and maintenance of playgrounds and planning for and management of recreational facilities, which did not figure strongly in the most wanted list relative to their importance ranking, were not conversely high on the “comfortable to have cut” list. The results are presented in descending order in Table 15 in terms of cumulative percentage of respondents who nominated each service as one of their five most comfortable to have cut out or reduced, with five per cent of the sample not responding.

As with the “most wanted” services, there were some significant differences in rankings, although to a lesser extent. The differential effect on ranking between interest groups is shown in Table 16 for each of the interest groups.

Table 16 Rank order of services most comfortable to have cut out or reduced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services most comfortable to have cut or reduced</th>
<th>Ratepayer</th>
<th>Renter</th>
<th>Business operator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Long term planning and vision for desired social, environmental, economic and civic leadership outcomes</td>
<td>Long term planning and vision for desired social, environmental, economic and civic leadership outcomes</td>
<td>Planning for and management of meeting places including shopping centres, malls, and neighbourhood villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Facilities for and management of arts, entertainment and cultural events</td>
<td>Planning for and management of sporting facilities</td>
<td>Facilities for and management of arts, entertainment and cultural events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Planning for and management of meeting places including shopping centres, malls, and neighbourhood villages</td>
<td>Informing residents about Council’s activities</td>
<td>Informing residents about Council’s activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Informing residents about Council’s activities</td>
<td>Planning for and management of meeting places including shopping centres, malls, and neighbourhood villages</td>
<td>Long term planning and vision for desired social, environmental, economic and civic leadership outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Planning for and management of sporting facilities</td>
<td>Facilities for and management of arts, entertainment and cultural events</td>
<td>Community involvement in decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Community involvement in decision making</td>
<td>Library services, including access to information on the web</td>
<td>Planning for and management of sporting facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Library services, including access to information on the web</td>
<td>Control of neighbourhood amenity and disturbance</td>
<td>Library services, including access to information on the web</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Control of neighbourhood amenity and disturbance</td>
<td>Community involvement in decision making</td>
<td>Control of building activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Management of the natural environment including management of programs for greenhouse gas reduction, water conservation,</td>
<td>Control of building activity</td>
<td>Control of neighbourhood amenity and disturbance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Facilities and services for young people</td>
<td>Facilities and services for young people</td>
<td>Facilities and services for young people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.8 Perceived impacts and alternatives to service cuts

3.8.1 Quality of life

Respondents were asked if they thought the quality of life in Waverley would be better, worse or unchanged if rates were not raised and Council services were cut or reduced. About half the respondents (50.6%) thought that quality of life would remain the same, almost as many though it would be worse (45.7%) and the remaining 3.8 per cent thought it would be better or did not know.

3.8.2 Attitudes to alternatives

Five other alternative sources of income, which Council could consider increasing if a rate rise is not approved, were canvassed with respondents. The results are shown in Table 17 in terms of mean scores for each interest group, and the percentage of all respondents who disagreed or strongly disagreed. The data indicate that the community did not favour any of the proposed alternatives to rate rises, and were most strongly opposed to increases in on-street metered parking fees.

Table 17 Reaction to possible alternative sources of increased Council income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How strongly do you disagree or agree that charging more is an acceptable way for Council to increase income?</th>
<th>Ratepayer</th>
<th>Renter</th>
<th>Business operator</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of all respondents who scored 1 or 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents’ annual beach parking passes</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-street parking in commercial centres</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential parking permits</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing parking fines</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-street metered parking</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of respondents</td>
<td>313 to 320</td>
<td>138 to 141</td>
<td>68 to 69</td>
<td>520 to 530</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: (1) Means scores close to 5 indicate the item is very important; mean scores close to 1 indicate the item is very unimportant.
(2) Shaded cells indicate a statistically significant difference at the .95 level of confidence
(3) Don’t know and refused responses are excluded from mean scores, but included in calculation of percentages
Business operators were significantly more opposed to most of these alternatives than other interest groups, particularly in relation to increasing parking fines and on-street metered parking fees. Almost three quarters of business operators in the sample were opposed to each of these latter options.

There were no significant differences between age groups, levels of rate liability, or gender in relation to increasing these alternative sources of income.

3.8.3 Perceived capacity of partners to fill the gap

The question of whether Council’s partners in achieving the Vision (the local community, local business, and State and Federal Governments) will be able to fill the gap if Council had to cut services divided respondents almost down the middle. Thirty-four per cent agreed or strongly agreed that the partners would be able to fill the gap, 35 per cent disagreed or strongly disagreed, and the remaining 28 per cent were neutral or did not know. The net result was slightly on the side of disagreement.

There were no significant differences in the pattern of responses between any of the sub-groups.

3.9 Impact of participation on views about Council and Waverley’s future

Respondents were asked whether they were surprised by the information they received about the range and number of services provided by Council, and by Waverley’s rates compared to other local councils.

Most respondents (59%) were not surprised by the information about the number and range of services, but 40 per cent were surprised. These proportions were reversed in relation to the comparative rates information in the packet sent to them, with 57 per cent saying the information surprised them, and 36 per cent saying that it did not.

Those aged under 50 years were significantly more likely to be surprised by the comparative rates than were older respondents. There were no other significant differences between sub-groups.

It was thought that the process of engagement in considering the information provided, and participating in the survey itself, may have some impact on participants’ perceptions of Waverley Council, and respondents were asked about this aspect of the survey. The results are presented in Table 18 in terms of mean scores for each interest group on a scale from 1 (much worse) to 5 (much better), and the percentage of all respondents who felt better or much better in relation to each item.

The data indicate that the greatest impact from participation was on Council’s performance in long term planning, with almost 70 per cent of respondents changing their views, mostly for the better.
Approximately 40 per cent of respondents were unaffected in their attitudes to the importance of services provided by Council, Council’s role in delivering a better lifestyle, Council as a trusted partner and the value for money of Waverley Council services. Again, the effect on those whose views did change was predominantly for the better.

This was significantly more so for renters, and significantly less so for business operators on all items, as indicated by the grey shading in Table 18. Women were significantly more positive toward Council than men on all items except value for money, where there was no significant difference. Age group was not related to the effects of participation in the survey.

### Table 18 Impact of participation on respondents’ views of Waverley Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The information and taking part in the survey may have changed your views. Do you now feel worse or better about Waverley Council in terms of…</th>
<th>Ratepayer</th>
<th>Renter</th>
<th>Business operator</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of all respondents who scored 4 or 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How Council is performing in long term planning to ensure Waverley's future for everyone</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The importance of services provided by Council</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The importance of Council's role in delivering a better lifestyle for the community</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council as a trusted partner with the community to deliver a better lifestyle in Waverley</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The value for money of Waverley Council services</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of respondents</td>
<td>317 to 322</td>
<td>138 to 141</td>
<td>68 to 69</td>
<td>525 to 532</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: (1) Means scores close to 5 indicate the item is very important; mean scores close to 1 indicate the item is very unimportant.
(2) Shaded cells indicate a statistically significant difference at the .95 level of confidence.
(3) Don’t know and refused responses are excluded from mean scores, but included in calculation of Percentages

### 3.9.1 Ease of participation

The final question for all respondents to the main survey was about how easy to understand they found the information sent to them and the survey itself. These questions were originally introduced as part of the pilot process, and were retained in the main survey to provide additional information about the community engagement process.

Three quarters of respondents (74.9%) said they found the information easy or very easy to understand, and the great majority (81.6%) said they found the survey easy or very easy to understand. While some allowance should be made for respondents not wanting to appear...
unintelligent, these results suggest that the overall task, while challenging, was manageable for those who were able to participate in the main survey. Comments from respondents covered the full range from those who wanted more detail to those who thought there was too much detail in the information; and from those who thought there should have been more detailed questions in some areas to those who thought the survey was too long. It is also clear from the comments of recruits who were unable to participate in the main survey due to, for example, health issues, that the overall task was too demanding for some groups.

3.10 Attitudes of property investors

3.10.1 Expected impact of rate rises on rents and land values

The views of non-resident ratepayers could not be sought, since there was no cost-effective way of identifying and contacting members of this stakeholder group. However, 61 respondents to the survey owned more than one property in Waverley, and these were treated as a surrogate for property investors generally.

These "property investors" were asked their views about the impact of the proposed rate rises on rents, and the effect on the value of investment property in Waverley if services had to be cut. On balance, investors expected the proposed rate raises would result in a moderate increase in rents, and have a somewhat negative impact on land values.

With respect to the impact of the proposed rate rises, 15 per cent of investors thought there would be *no change* to rents, 53 per cent expected a *slight increase*, and 31 per cent thought there would be a *big increase* in rents as a result.

Similarly, while 57 per cent of investors thought the proposed rate rises would *neither increase nor decrease* land values, one third (34.4%) thought the effect would be *negative* and seven per cent thought the proposed rate rises would have a *positive* effect on land values.

The views of the “property investors” differed significantly from those of ordinary resident ratepayers in a number of respects, in that they appeared to attribute a generally less significant role to Council and the services it provides. In particular, “property investors”:

- rated *reconciliation with our indigenous past, confidence in our leaders*, and having the *courage to take a leading place in achieving the environmental aims of a global society* as significantly less important than did ordinary ratepayers (differences in means of approximately 0.6);
- were significantly more likely to *disagree* than *agree* that Waverley Council and its partners would be able to work together to achieve the Vision;
- rated the current facilities and services provided by Waverley Council as significantly less important than did ordinary ratepayers, with the exception of *maintenance of shared assets*, and services related to *beaches, parks, playgrounds* and *dumped rubbish removal*;
rated more opportunities for recreation, health and wellbeing, and a more sustainable environment as significantly less important than did ordinary ratepayers.

Nevertheless, and despite the significantly greater value of their primary property (56 per cent of investors lived in properties that were in the top quartile of land values in Waverley), there were no significant differences between investors as a group and ordinary ratepayers in their attitudes to value for money of current rates, or reasonableness of the proposed rate rises.
APPENDIX I

RECRUITMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Good morning/afternoon/evening, my name is __________, calling on behalf of Waverley Council. We are conducting an independent survey of the Waverley community about the Council's plans for the next 12 years and how the plans will be funded.

[IF NECESSARY] Your telephone number was selected at random from the White Pages.

[IF PHONE ANSWERER APPEARS HESITANT OR REQUESTS MORE INFORMATION SAY: 'I can send you a letter about the study, or give you the Waverley Council website."

qlga. In which Council Area do you live / is your property?

[IF NECESSARY, EXPLAIN EITHER WHERE RESPONDENT LIVES OR OWNS PROPERTY]

#   1. Waverley
2. Randwick
3. Woollahra

7. OTHER
9. REFUSED

If selecting renters:
Qrent. Are you or others living here paying rent on this home? (or Flat/Unit)

1. Paying Rent (Yes)            [7. NOT IN WAVERLEY - NOT APPLICABLE]
2. NO (Owners or Rent Free)      [8. DON'T KNOW  9. REFUSED          ]

If not eligible:
Sorry, we are only interviewing people who live in Waverley Council area or own property there.

If selecting renters:
Sorry, we are only interviewing people who live in rented premises in Waverley Council area at the moment.

[INTERVIEWER-IF ASKED 'WHY NOT OWNERS' SAY - We are but need renters currently]

Thank you all the same

Firstly, can you tell me how many permanent residents aged 18 or over in your household either contribute to paying the rent or the council rates.

(IF NECESSARY - ratepayers have ownership of the house, unit, building, land)

[EXPLAIN IF NECESSARY THE RESPONDENT MUST BE CHOSEN BY COMPUTER]

[IF ABSOLUTELY REFUSES TERMINATE AND Pg Up]

Does this person pay (1)RENT or (2)RATES?
OR
Do these people pay (1) RENT or (2) RATES?

1. RENT
2. RATES
3. BOTH (If possible page back and enter only the number of ratepayers)
4. NEITHER (Clarify - rent free?)
5. DON'T KNOW
6. REFUSED

The computer has chosen [age order] person as the one I should speak to from your household.

[IF HOUSEHOLD SIZE OR AGE ORDER REFUSED: The computer has chosen the person in your household with the LAST birthday as the person I should speak to. [REPEAT AGE RANGE IF NECESSARY]]

[INTERVIEWER: FREECALL IF HOUSEHOLD REFUSAL]

Could I please speak to .... [CHOSEN RESPONDENT].

[IF NECESSARY, ARRANGE CALL BACK: When would be the best time to call back to speak to this person?]

RECORD ON THE LOG SHEET.

[INTERVIEWER: OFFER FREECALL IF HOUSEHOLD REFUSAL]

WHEN REQUIRED PERSON IS ON PHONE ASK
Good morning/afternoon/evening, are you [RESPONDENT]? My name is ___________, calling on behalf of Waverley Council. We are conducting an independent survey of the Waverley community about the Council's plans to provide services to the community for the next 12 years and how the services will be funded.

You are invited to take part in the survey. Waverley Council is very keen to have your input, as a member of the community, into its planning for the future.

[IF RENTERS ONLY: Almost half the residents in Waverley pay rent rather rates, and your views are very important to the survey. This is your chance to have your say.]

Your answers will be confidential, and there will be no identifying information in the results given to the Council.

If you agree, we will mail some information to you about the plans, called 'Waverley Together 2', or we can email it if you prefer. The information tells you what services Council provides now, what services the community has told Council it would like, and what options Council sees to pay for those services.

We will call you back in about a week, when you've had time to read the information, and ask you to do a 20 minute phone interview. The information gives the background to the choices facing Waverley Council. We encourage you to read it, but the interview is all about YOUR opinions, it is not a test and there are no right or wrong answers. There are three coloured sheets with the information and we will ask you to look at these during the interview.

[HVRF CONTACT: Vivienne Lunn - Study supervisor - Freecall 1800 355 534]
Will you be able to help us with this survey?

[IF HESITANT - OFFER LETTER and WEBSITE
We can send a letter to any address you nominate [POST OR EMAIL].
OR we can give you a webpage.

The webpage for Waverly Council is: www.waverley.nsw.gov.au

[IF NEEDED: It doesn't have to be your home address - anywhere you can pick up a letter will do.]

# [3. YES, WEBPAGE  1. YES, SEND LETTER  2. NO - REFUSED]

[IF NO - 'Thankyou for your time']

[IF YES TO LETTER - <Enter> AND RECORD DETAILS
I'll call back in a few days after you have received the letter]

[IF YES TO WEBPAGE: 'I'll call back in a day or so' [Record in COMMENTS]

[IF REFUSE ASK: May I ask a couple of very quick questions before you go to make sure we have contacted a wide range of Waverley community members [19.YES 2.NO]

[IF ANSWER MACHINE, LEAVE UP TO 3 DIFFERENT MESSAGES ON 2ND 4TH AND FINAL CALLS; DIFFERENT TIMES ON DIFFERENT DAYS
MESSAGE 1: Hello. I'm calling on behalf of Waverley Council. We're conducting an independent survey of the Waverley community about the Council's plans for the next 12 years and how the plans will be funded. We'll call again another time.

SUBSEQUENT: Hello. I'm calling on behalf of Waverley Council. We're conducting an independent survey of the Waverley community about the Council's plans for the next 12 years and how the plans will be funded. Could a member of your household call the Hunter Valley Research Foundation on freecall 1800 355 534 between 9am and 8pm Mon to Thurs.

FINAL: Hello. I'm calling on behalf of Waverley Council. We're conducting an independent survey of the Waverley community about the Council's plans for the next 12 years and how the plans will be funded. If you would like to take part please call the Hunter Valley Research Foundation on freecall 1800 355 534 between 9am and 8pm Mon to Thurs.]

First, may I ask a couple of questions to make sure we have talked to a wide range of Waverley residents about the survey. This will take about 2 minutes.

Qstrat. Do you (1)own or (2)rent this property?

#  1. Owner (resident ratepayer)
    2. Renter (resident non-ratepayer)
    3. Business operator (non-ratepayer)
    4. Investor (non-resident ratepayer)
    9. REFUSED

IF Qstrat=1
Qstrat 1. Is the property... [READ ITEMS]?

# 1. Your home
2. An residential investment property
3. A business property
7. OTHER [DO NOT READ]
9. REFUSED [DO NOT READ]

Qmult. Do you own any "+iif(qstrat=1,"other","")+" property in the Waverley Council area?

Qheard. Had you heard of Waverley Council's plans, called Waverley Together 2, before this phone call?

[INTERVIEWER: DO NOT ASK THIS QUESTION UNLESS NECESSARY]

Q1. Are you male or female?

# M = Male
F = Female

Q2. Could you please tell me how old you are? [IN YEARS]
# [999. REFUSED - ATTEMPT AGE RANGE QUESTION NEXT PAGE]

Q2r. What is your age group? Is it ...
# 1. 18 - 24 6. 45 - 49 11. 70 and over
2. 25 - 29 7. 50 - 54
3. 30 - 34 8. 55 - 59 99. REFUSED
4. 35 - 39 9. 60 - 64
5. 40 - 44 10. 65 - 69

Q3. What best describes YOUR work status? [READ OPTIONS]

1. Paid full-time employment
2. Paid part-time employment
3. Self Employed
4. Looking for paid employment
5. Student
6. Home duties
7. On a pension other than the age pension
8. Retired [EITHER ON AGE PENSION OR SELF-FUNDED SUPER]
9. Other

[USE CODES IF POSSIBLE - TYPE IN OTHER - 99. REFUSED]
Q4. How long have you lived or owned property in Waverley Council area?

- **Years** - Range: 0 - 80; 88. DON'T KNOW 99. REFUSED
- **Months** - Range: 1 - 18; 77. Less than a month 88. DON'T KNOW 99. REFUSED

Q5. In 5 years from now, do you think you would be most likely to be living in...

1. Waverley LGA
2. Elsewhere in Sydney
3. Somewhere else
4. DON'T KNOW [DO NOT READ]
5. REFUSED [DO NOT READ]

We can send the information by email if you would prefer?

Qmedia. Which type of address would you prefer to use?

1. Post
2. Email

Thank you for your answers and your interest in the survey.

May we have your name and address so we can send the information to you.

NAME #
ADD1 #
ADD2 #
SUBURB #
POSTCODE #

Could I have your email address?

You will be able to read all the information on the screen but we'd like you to print out four pages - called inserts - to have in front of you when we call back to do the interview.

NAME #
EMAIL #

qcons1. Is this the best phone number to contact you on when we call again? [CURRENT LISTED NUMBER]

1. YES 2. NO

IF NO:
qcons2. What number do you prefer to be contacted on?
qcons2. Do you have another number you can be contacted on?

[IF THE NUMBER BELONGS TO ANOTHER PERSON WRITE A NOTE ABOUT THIS]
- ALSO NOTE IF THE NUMBER IS A WORK NUMBER OR SIMILAR.]

[ENTER NUMBER - 22. NO OTHER NUMBER]
#

--------------------
Qtime. What day of the week would suit you best? Would you prefer to be called morning, afternoon or evening?

DAY: #

TIME: #

[TYPE IN RESPONSE - 22. NO SPECIAL TIME  22. NO SPECIAL DAY]

[Interviewer: Suggest the same day and time if this is not inconvenient.]

Thank you very much.
My name is ... calling from Hunter Valley Research Foundation on behalf of Waverley Council. If you have any concerns about this interview please contact my supervisor on 1800 355 534.

My name is ... calling from Hunter Valley Research Foundation on behalf of Waverley Council. The information should reach you in the next couple of days. If it doesn't or if you have any other concerns about this interview please contact my supervisor on 1800 355 534.

Please remember to have the coloured sheets with you to look at during the interview.

# <Enter> to Finish
INFORMATION FOR RESIDENTS AND RATEPAYERS
RESPONDING TO Waverley Together 2 SURVEY

Background
The NSW Government now requires all local councils to engage with their residents and ratepayers to develop long term plans that address the whole of their community’s goals for the future. In 2009 Waverley Council undertook the required community consultation with businesses and residents. You can see the report on this detailed consultation on Council’s website at http://www.waverley.nsw.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0012/10047/ReportOnIntegratedEngagementStrategy.pdf

Facts about Waverley Council services and finances
Currently:
- Waverley Council delivers 148 services; broad categories are in Insert 1 (yellow sheet). You can see more details at http://www.waverley.nsw.gov.au/council_services/a-z_listing. The range of services has more than doubled in the last 12 years.
- On average, rates in Waverley are about $150 a year less than rates in the rest of Sydney.
- Most councils’ rates cover ½ their income, but Waverley rates yield less than 1/3 of its income.
- Waverley Council has improved productivity in the last 10 years, even though it has had to absorb increased costs shifted from other levels of government.
- Council has found innovative ways to fund and manage assets to reduce the cost of renewing old assets (roads, footpaths, drains, retaining walls, buildings etc.) by 84% and the cost of maintaining assets by 35% over the last 5 years.
- Waverley Council received the Federal Government’s National Award for Local Government in Asset and Financial Management in 2010 as recognition of this work.

The average residential rate in Waverley is approximately $150 a year lower than the average rate for other Sydney residents.

Waverley residential rates are on average $200 a year lower than in Randwick and $250 lower than in Woollahra.

Half the ratepayers in Waverley are on the lowest rate level ($387 per year in 2010/11).

This is almost $500 a year less than the average Sydney ratepayer.

The plan
The Waverley Together 2 plan was developed based on community consultation. It is a strategic plan of what Waverley Council needs to do and who it needs to work with over the next 12 years to achieve the community’s vision for a better life in Waverley. The Plan has four main themes: sustainable community; sustainable living including a sustainable local economy; a sustainable environment and sustainable governance including the community’s participation in decision making.

As well as maintaining existing services, the 2009 survey found that some Council services were not as good as the community would like. To improve services, enhancements have been proposed and costed to deliver:
- More opportunities for recreation, health, wellbeing and artistic and cultural expression,
- More and safer access to public places, to transport and to vital services,
- More cleaning and greening of all the shared spaces,
- More inviting streetscapes and restful local neighbourhoods,
- A more sustainable environment with protection from global warming and preservation of natural resources and ecosystems, and
- A more engaged, connected and inspired community actively involved in decision making.
The Waverley Together 2 plan includes:

- **Vision statement**: The vision statement is enclosed as Insert 2 (Blue sheet).

- **Specific targets**: There are 60 measureable targets in Waverley Together 2 that will help monitor our success in making the vision a reality. You can see the targets in full detail on pages 33-44 of Waverley Together 2 at [http://www.waverley.nsw.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0019/12907/WT2StrategicPlan.pdf](http://www.waverley.nsw.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0019/12907/WT2StrategicPlan.pdf)


**The service package**

Called Service Plus, it has been developed by Council to help achieve the Vision. It has 12 components:

- Component 1 allows Council to maintain all 148 existing services.
- Components 2 to 12 contain 51 improvements to existing services summarised in Insert 3 (Green sheet).

**A funding shortfall**

The long term plans have highlighted an important decision point for the Waverley community about how Council services will be funded in future. Over the next 12 years:

- The cost of existing services will increase by 50%, but
- Council’s income will increase by only 31% under current financial arrangements.

Despite the work done to keep costs as low as possible, Council’s Long Term Financial plan shows a funding shortfall for the services needed to meet the Waverley Together 2 targets.

![12 year funding shortfall diagram](image)

Over the 12 years of the plan:
- **Existing services** will cost – $1.4billion
- **Improvements** will cost – an extra $213 million

Council has identified reasonably reliable sources of funding for:
- 91% of the cost of existing services
- 54% of the cost of improvements

The shortfalls over 12 years are:
- For existing services – $125million
- For the improvements – $99million
- Total shortfall – $224million

**The options**

Waverley Council is considering three options:

- **Raising rates.** Council would have to seek a special variation to rates, which would have to be approved by the Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal of NSW. The impact of rate rises on households is shown in the table at the end of this fact sheet.

- **Raising other revenues.** Council has already included sale of some assets, increases in user fees such as parking and developer charges, and increased investment earnings in the Long Term Financial Plan.

- **Cutting costs and/or services.** This would be contrary to the community’s expressed wishes and vision. However, this is still an option.
The cost of a rate rise to your household

The cost to your household of the rate rise needed to cover the shortfall depends on current rates, and the land value of the property. To fund *Service Plus*, rates could be raised uniformly each year over a seven year period, as shown in the table below.

For most **ratepayers**, the maximum increase would average out at about $1 extra per week each year over seven years to maintain services, and just under $2 per week extra each year to maintain services and include all the enhancements to services.

For **renters**, the maximum increase in rates is a “worst case scenario” – it is unlikely that landlords would pass on the full cost of the rate rise, as rates are generally a small part of the total cost of owning an investment property.

**Find the value of your property in the left hand column**, then read across that line to see the average weekly increase, and the maximum annual rates that would apply next year (2011/12) and by the end of the special variation to rates (2017/18). The 12-year plan assumes rate rises would be capped after 2017/18 at increases in the Consumer Price Index.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential land value bracket</th>
<th>% of households in bracket</th>
<th>Service Plus Component 1 only: maintain existing services</th>
<th>Service Plus Components 1-12: existing plus enhanced services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average increase each year</td>
<td>Maximum annual rates</td>
<td>Average increase each year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>2011/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to $341,850</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$42 ($0.80/wk)</td>
<td>$405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$341,851 to $500,000</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>$61 ($1.18/wk)</td>
<td>$592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,001 to $633,000</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>$78 ($1.49/wk)</td>
<td>$750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$633,001 to $800,000</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>$98 ($1.88/wk)</td>
<td>$948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$800,001 to $884,000</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>$108 ($2.08/wk)</td>
<td>$1,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$884,001 to $1,000,000</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>$122 ($2.35/wk)</td>
<td>$1,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000,001 to $1,500,000</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>$184 ($3.53/wk)</td>
<td>$1,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,500,001 to $2,000,000</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>$245 ($4.71/wk)</td>
<td>$2,369</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE THAT:**
- Pensioners would still receive pensioner discount on the rates applying to their property
Domestic waste charges are not included in the rate rise calculations  
The environment levy is included in the rates for 2010/11 and stops after that.

What happens if Waverley Council is not able to raise rates and charges enough to support Service Plus?

- **Rates would still rise** – by about 25% over the next 7 years, in line with inflation - instead of by 70% to maintain existing services or by 120% to include the enhancements.
- **Council spending on services would be cut** by about $10million each year.
- Child care centres, cemetery services, parking services, affordable housing and waste services would continue – they do not depend on income from rates.
- **All other services** depend to some degree on rates and would be at risk of being cut or reduced some time in the next five years.
- The number of **jobs at Waverley Council would be reduced by up to 10%**.
- Eventually most of the improvements in **Service Plus** will have to be made, and Council believes some investments are already long overdue. The longer they are delayed, the more they will eventually cost.
- Council believes that if services are delayed or deleted the targets in **Waverley Together 2** will not be met, and that the Waverley community will move backwards from the targets.

PLEASE READ THE INSERTS AND HAVE THEM IN FRONT OF YOU WHEN YOU ANSWER THE PHONE INTERVIEW.


If you have any questions about **Waverley Together 2** or the information in this sheet, you can call Waverley Council on 9369 8078. Record your question and a Council officer will answer your query as soon as possible before your interview.

IF YOU WISH TO CHANGE THE TIME OF YOUR PHONE INTERVIEW WITH Hunter Valley Research Foundation PLEASE CONTACT THE FOUNDATION DIRECT ON 1800 355 534.
EXISTING WAVERLEY COUNCIL SERVICES

A. Maintenance of shared assets such as roads, footpaths, kerbs, drains, community buildings, retaining walls, malls, bus shelters, stairs, rails, fences, seats, rock pools and signs

B. Beach cleaning, maintenance and lifeguard services

C. Facilities and services for people with disabilities

D. Facilities and services for older people

E. Facilities and services for children

F. Facilities and services for young people

G. Facilities for and management of arts, entertainment and cultural events

H. Informing residents about Council’s activities

I. Planning for residential development

J. Control of building activity

K. Control of neighbourhood amenity and disturbance

L. Management of the natural environment including management of programs for greenhouse gas reduction, water conservation, waste reduction, local flora and fauna preservation, bush care, and air and water pollution control

M. Long term planning and vision for desired social, environmental, economic and civic leadership outcomes

N. Community involvement in decision making

O. Library services, including access to information on the web

P. Cleanliness and maintenance of parks

Q. Cleanliness and maintenance of playgrounds

R. Planning for and management of meeting places including shopping centres, malls, and neighbourhood villages

S. Planning for and management of sporting facilities

T. Planning for and management of recreational facilities such as parks, picnic areas, coastal and cliff walks, and green walking links between villages

U. Local traffic planning and management

V. Transport planning and management

W. Neighbourhood streetscape cleaning, maintenance and beautification

X. Dumped rubbish removal
Waverley Together 2 Vision Statement

Our Community’s Vision for life in Waverley by 2022

We are united by a common passion for our beautiful home between the city and the sea.

Inspired by the magnificent landscape of Waverley and by the gifts we have inherited from those who have been here before us, we dream of fulfilling life where...

A. we are safe
B. we are reconciled with and value our indigenous past
C. connections within families and between generations can remain unbroken
D. we are inspired and able to renew our physical and spiritual wellbeing
E. everyone is welcomed to participate positively in community life
F. we can express our essential selves through our traditions, our arts, our cultures and our lifestyles
G. we act together as a compassionate society
H. the beauty of our beaches, cliffs and coastal lands endures
I. the architectural landscape is cared for and developed at a human scale and design is sensitive to the natural historical and social contexts
J. vital services are fully accessible
K. scarce resources are conserved and fairly shared
L. local economic prosperity provides opportunity for all
M. as a local community we have the courage to take a leading place in achieving the environmental aims of a global society

and

N. we are confident our leaders will reflect thoughtfully on our views and best interests when making decisions for our future

These are the aspirations of our hopeful generation.

We recognise the need to commit to this vision of our future with energy
So that we can pass these gifts to our children
And they to theirs.
### PLANNED ENHANCEMENTS TO EXISTING SERVICES

#### More opportunities for recreation, health, wellbeing and artistic and cultural expression

**Total cost over 12 years:** $24,058,195  
68% funded  
**Rate rise required to fund shortfall:** 0.32% pa or $0.07 extra per week each year to the average ratepayer

**Included Enhancements**
1. New sporting facilities including cricket pitches, netball courts, bocce courts, fields, seating and changing rooms at Waverley Park, Rodney Reserve and Hugh Bamford Reserve.
2. Ongoing playground upgrades at a series of local parks and reserves.
3. Upgrades to facilities in Bondi Park, Bronte Park, Tamarama Park and Waverley Park, including toilets, lighting, bubs, showers, and shade structures.
4. A new Waverley Park Pavilion (fully funded by asset sales and grants).
5. Continued refurbishment of the Bondi Pavilion for better theatre productions and events, alongside current kids’ classes, music productions, art exhibitions and film festivals (partly funded by asset sales and grants).

#### More and safer access to public places, transport and vital services

**Total cost over 12 years:** $102,221,606  
56% funded  
**Rate rise required to fund shortfall:** 1.78% pa or $0.43 extra per week each year to the average ratepayer

**Included Enhancements**
6. Keeping a minimum of 80% of footpaths in top or near top condition.
8. More 40 kilometre speed safety zones for traffic.
9. More pedestrian safety works in the busiest areas of Bondi Junction and Bondi Beach.
10. Improved traffic planning and management services and faster implementation of traffic plans.
11. Improved public transport planning services.
12. Renewal of vital aged infrastructure throughout Waverley including drainage, retaining walls, stairs, fences, bus shelters, promenades, tunnels and cemetery infrastructure. This is additional to major infrastructure renewals provided within the existing service array.
13. Increased services for the aged and improved referrals to support provided by other agencies.
14. Increased capacity to deal with homelessness.
15. Improved cemetery and funeral services (fully funded by sale of rights of burial and associated cemetery services).
16. A new early learning, family day care and child care centre in Bondi Junction (fully funded by asset sales and grants).
17. Ongoing optimisation of public parking on-street and off-street for better access to vital services (fully funded by income from parking services and asset sales).
18. Establishment of Waverley Council as an affordable housing trust (fully funded by developer contributions).

#### More cleaning and greening of all the spaces we share

**Total cost over 12 years:** $43,314,286  
73% funded  
**Rate rise required to fund shortfall:** 0.44% pa or $0.12 extra per week each year to the average ratepayer

**Included Enhancements**
19. Increased frequency of mowing, weeding, mulching, rubbish removal and increased planting in parks, reserves and village centres.
20. Increased removal of graffiti.
21. Increased tree maintenance and tree protection.
22. Increased tree planting – up to 400 trees a year.
23. Improved depot facilities, preferably within Waverley for staff doing cleaning and greening (fully funded by asset sales).
25. Acquisition of land for open space in Bondi Junction and other areas which Council is likely to be compelled to acquire.
| More opportunities for recreation, health, wellbeing and artistic and cultural expression | Total cost over 12 years: $24,058,195  
68% funded  
Rate rise required to fund shortfall: 0.32% pa or $0.07 extra per week each year to the average ratepayer |
|--------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| More inviting streetscapes and restful local neighbourhoods | Total cost over 12 years: $9,145,235  
39% funded  
Rate rise required to fund shortfall: 0.21% pa or $0.06 extra per week each year to the average ratepayer |
| Included Enhancements  
26. An increase in the presence of Rangers, especially during major events and for prevention of dumped rubbish, and quicker response to complaints about noise, anti-social behaviour, obstruction of footways, and pollution from developments.  
27. Local village streetscape improvements including upgrade of footpaths, seating, signage and greening.  
29. Eastgate Car Park façade upgrade (fully funded by asset sales and investment returns).  
30. Boot Factory to be renovated or included in redevelopment of Mill Hill Centre (yet to be determined but fully funded by future asset sales). |
| A more sustainable environment with increased protection from global warming and preservation of natural resources and ecosystems | Total cost over 12 years: $22,916,929  
12% funded  
Rate rise required to fund shortfall: 0.73% pa or $0.20 extra per week each year to the average ratepayer |
| Included Enhancements  
In addition to existing environmental services this component includes service enhancements to achieve ambitious targets for reduction of greenhouse gas emissions by the community:  
31. Retrofitting Council’s buildings with energy saving technologies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and energy bills.  
32. Changing street light fittings to further reduce emissions.  
33. Working with the community to provide access to discount solar hot water, solar power and other water and energy saving devices.  
34. Working with the community to increase the purchase of energy from renewable sources.  
35. Working with the community to facilitate climate change adaptation.  
36. Working with business especially in Bondi Junction to install alternative energy systems for heating, cooling, lighting and general power use.  
37. Working to meet targets for increased use of public transport and reduced travel by private car.  
38. Completion of more bike paths and associated facilities.  
39. Improved waste recycling and recovery to reduce disposal of waste to landfill and greenhouse gas emissions (fully funded by the domestic waste charge).  
This component also includes services to conserve water and protect local flora and fauna:  
40. Creating a permanent bushcare team for restoration of remnant native vegetation in parks and reserves.  
41. Remediation of Bronte Gully and Tamarama Gully including hydrological, weed management, soil contamination, geotechnical and revegetation works.  
42. Reconnection and increase of wildlife corridors and habitat throughout Waverley.  
43. Two new stormwater harvesting systems at Bondi Beach and Tamarama Gully.  
44. Increased water recycling in parks and reserves.  
45. Programs for maintaining and improving water quality at beaches. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Description</th>
<th>Total cost over 12 years:</th>
<th>Funded percentage</th>
<th>Rate rise required to fund shortfall:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More opportunities for recreation, health, wellbeing and artistic and cultural expression</td>
<td>$24,058,195</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>0.32% pa or $0.07 extra per week each year to the average ratepayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnering with a more engaged connected and inspired community, actively involved in decision making</td>
<td>$11,729,587</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0.32% pa or $0.09 extra per week each year to the average ratepayer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Included Enhancements**

46. Improved web communications about services, development applications, parking, events, and issues and policies under consideration by Council.

47. Improved information for decision making and opportunities for comment.

48. Ongoing best practice in long term planning for services and financial management.

49. Easier payment and progress systems for services including lodgement of development applications.

50. Compliance with ever increasing standards for transparency and ethics in decision making, protection of public information and business efficiency and probity.

51. Improved management of major meeting places for community interaction and connection.

The quoted rate rises to fund shortfalls on each component would be cumulative for seven years and would be additional to average rises of 8.79% pa or $1.49 per week for seven years to fund the expected shortfalls on existing services in Component 1 of Service Plus.
MAIN SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Good morning/afternoon/evening, this is… calling on behalf of Waverley Council. May I please speak to [RECRUIT NAME].

Is it OK to talk to you now?

[IF NO, ARRANGE ALTERNATIVE TIME FOR TELEPHONE INTERVIEW]

[WHEN REQUIRED PERSON IS ON PHONE REPEAT INTRODUCTION IF NECESSARY]

Good morning/afternoon/evening, this is… calling on behalf of Waverley Council.

We recently sent you some background information concerning proposed changes to Council's rates & services.

The ONLY information you will require to complete the survey are the three coloured inserts.

Have you received the information and had a chance to read it?

# 1. YES      [9. REFUSED] (EXPLAIN IN COMMENTS)

3. NO - INFORMATION NOT RECEIVED - NEED TO CHECK ADDRESS AND RESEND

4. INFORMATION RECEIVED BUT NOT READ - ARRANGE CALLBACK

5. INFORMATION RECEIVED BUT NOT READ - RESPONDENT ELECTS TO DO SURVEY NOW

[IF ANSWER MACHINE, LEAVE 3 DIFFERENT MESSAGES ON 2ND, 4TH AND FINAL CALL; DIFFERENT TIMES ON DIFFERENT DAYS:]

MESSAGE 1: Hello. I'm calling on behalf of Waverley Council. We're calling [RECRUIT NAME] for the Waverley community survey about Council's plans for the next 12 years. [RECRUIT NAME] agreed to take part. We'll call again another time.

SUBSEQUENT: Hello. I'm calling on behalf of Waverley Council regarding the Waverley community survey about the Council's plans for the next 12 years. [RECRUIT NAME] agreed to take part. Could you please call the Hunter Valley Research Foundation on freecall 1800 355 534 between 9am and 8pm Mon to Thurs.

FINAL: Hello. I'm calling on behalf of Waverley Council regarding the Waverley community survey about the Council's plans for the next 12 years. If you would still like to take part please call the Hunter Valley Research Foundation on freecall 1800 355 534 between 9am and 8pm Mon to Thurs.]

This interview may be monitored for quality and training purposes.

Do you have the inserts to the information we sent in front of you - the 3 coloured sheets?

IF NO - ASK RESPONDENT TO LOCATE AND LOOK AT THE INSERTS
Before we start, I just need to check are you...?

[INTERVIEWER NOTE: RESPONDENT CAN SAY YES TO ONE OR MORE]

(1. Yes  2. No       [9. REFUSED])

# A Residential tenant (Renter)
# A business operator
# A property owner

In the Waverley Council area

[IF NO TO ALL THE ABOVE:

Thank you for your time but to do the interview we need renters or owners in Waverley Council Area]

# HIT ENTER TO CONTINUE

IF PROPERTY OWNER

How many properties do you own in Waverley?

# [999. REFUSED]

And do you live in that property / one of those properties?

# 1. Yes  2. No       [9. REFUSED]

Please think about the property you live in when answering the questions

[IF RENTS AND OWNS PROPERTY IN WAVERLEY:

Please think about the property you own in answering the questions]

Qtype. Is the property a....

1. Detached house
2. Semi-detached or row house
3. Townhouse
4. Unit
5. Block of Units (in which you live)
[OR IF BUSINESS OPERATOR]
6. Shop
7. Office

# [9. REFUSED]
First, I’d like to ask a few questions about the community vision in Waverley Together 2. Would you please look at Insert 2 (the blue sheet) - called Waverley Together 2 Vision Statement.

Q1. Do you [READ SCALE] that the Vision statement expresses your sense of how community life in Waverley should be - ideally?

!RANDOMLY INVERT SCALE

1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree
3. [NEITHER]
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

# [8. DON'T KNOW 9. REFUSED]

Q2. The Vision for Waverley Together 2 has 14 parts. Looking at the statements on the blue sheet, on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is very unimportant and 5 is very important, how important is …

[READ LETTER. IF NEEDED, READ STATEMENT]

[PROMPT FOR DEGREE OF IMPORTANCE OR UNIMPORTANCE]

1. Very unimportant
2. Unimportant
3. [NEITHER 8. DON'T KNOW 9. REFUSED]
4. Important
5. Very important

# A) We are safe
# B) We are reconciled with and value our indigenous past
# C) Connections within families and between generations can remain unbroken
# D) We are inspired and able to renew our physical and spiritual wellbeing
# E) Everyone is welcomed to participate positively in community life
# F) We can express our essential selves through our traditions, our arts, our cultures, and our lifestyles
# G) We act together as a compassionate society
# H) The beauty of our beaches, cliffs and coastal lands endures
# I) The architectural landscape is cared for and developed at a human scale and design is sensitive to the natural, historical and social contexts
# J) Vital services are fully accessible
# K) Scarce resources are conserved and fairly shared
# L) Local economic prosperity provides opportunity for all
# M) As a local community we have the courage to take a leading place in
achieving the environmental aims of a global society

# N) We are confident our leaders will reflect thoughtfully on our views and
best interests when making decisions for our future

Q3. Local people, local businesses, Waverley Council, and State and Federal
Governments will need to work together if the Vision is to be made a reality
within the next 12 years. Do you [READ SCALE] that these groups will be
able to work together to make the Vision real?

!RANDOMLY INVERT SCALE

1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree
3. NEITHER
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

# [8. DON'T KNOW  9. REFUSED]

!RANDOM

Q4. On a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is very unimportant and 5 is very important,
how important do you think each of the groups will be in making the vision for
Waverley real? That is...[READ EACH GROUP]

[READ LETTER. IF NEEDED, READ SERVICE]

1. Very unimportant
2. Unimportant
3. NEITHER 8. DON'T KNOW 9. REFUSED
4. Important
5. Very important

# The local community (including local community groups)

# Local businesses

# Waverley Council

# State Government

# Federal Government

Please look now at Insert 1 - the yellow sheet called Existing Waverley
Services.

Q5. On a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is very unimportant and 5 is very important
How important do you think each of these Council services, labelled (a) to
(x), will be in helping to make the Vision for life in Waverley possible?

[READ LETTER. IF NEEDED, READ SERVICE]

1. Very unimportant
2. Unimportant
3. NEITHER 8. DON'T KNOW 9. REFUSED
4. Important
5. Very important
# A) Maintenance of shared assets such as roads, footpaths, kerbs, drains, community buildings, retaining walls, malls, bus shelters, stairs, rails, fences, seats, rock pools and signs
# B) Beach cleaning, maintenance and lifeguard services
# C) Facilities and services for people with disabilities
# D) Facilities and services for older people
# E) Facilities and services for children
# F) Facilities and services for young people
# G) Facilities for and management of arts, entertainment and cultural events
# H) Informing residents about Council's activities
# I) Planning for residential development
# J) Control of building activity
# K) Control of neighbourhood amenity and disturbance
# L) Management of the natural environment including management of programs for greenhouse gas reduction, water conservation, waste reduction, local flora and fauna preservation, bush care, and air and water pollution control.
# M) Long term planning and vision for desired social, environmental, economic and civic leadership outcomes
# N) Community involvement in decision making
# O) Library services, including access to information on the web
# P) Cleanliness and maintenance of parks
# Q) Cleanliness and maintenance of playgrounds
# R) Planning for and management of meeting places including shopping centres, malls, and neighbourhood villages
# S) Planning for and management of sporting facilities
# T) Planning for & management of recreational facilities such as parks, picnic areas, coastal and cliff walks, and green walking links between villages.
# U) Local traffic planning and management
# V) Transport planning and management
# W) Neighbourhood streetscape cleaning, maintenance and beautification
# X) Dumped rubbish removal

Q5a. Waverley Council provides all these services now. Considering this, how strongly do you disagree or agree that this total package of services, listed on the yellow sheet, is good value for money for the rates or rent you pay now?

[PROMPT FOR EXTENT OF AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT]

!RANDOMLY INVERT SCALE

1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neither
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

# [8. DON'T KNOW  9. REFUSED]

!RANDOM

Q6.
We sent you some information about current Council services and funding, the plans to maintain & improve services in Waverley over the next 12 years, & the issues Council has identified in its ability to maintain or improve services.

[IF RENTER:]
Rate rises could mean a similar increase in rents.
I'm going to read four statements to you. Please tell me - yes or no - if the information made you think that ..... [READ STATEMENTS]


# Rates in Waverley are low now, and need to be raised more than normal to pay for services the community wants

# If rates are not raised, services in Waverley will be cut by 10%

# If the community doesn't want to pay for improvements to Council services now, it will cost more in the long run

# Council has done everything it can to identify alternative sources of income and cost saving

COMMENTS

#

[IF RESPONDENT GAVE NO POSITIVE RESPONSES TO LAST SET OF QUESTIONS, READ:

The information we sent you shows that Waverley Council will not have enough income from 2012 onwards to deliver its CURRENT services. The Council has already cut costs, sold assets, & increased income from parking, developer charges and investments to help keep all rates low.

Income from rates covers less than one third of the current cost of Waverley Council services. Council has received a report that it cannot continue to provide the current range of services in the long term with rates at these levels.

The report to Council said that services would have to be cut if this situation does not change, and that small increases in rates at a slow and steady pace each year for up to 10 years would go some way to addressing the issue. ]

Waverley Council wants to know how willing community members are to pay the higher rates needed to maintain current services and make the planned improvements.

You can see how the rate rises work in the table on page 3 of the information sheet we sent you. I'll give you an idea of what the rate rises would mean to you before I ask the next question.

FOR RATEPAYERS: [MAY NEED TO GIVE RESPONDENT TIME TO WRITE RESULTS DOWN.]

The average rates for a [RESPONDENT DWELLING TYPE] in your area this year (2010/11) is [AMOUNT] including the environmental levy.

To maintain Council services at their current level, your rates would need to
rise by AT MOST [MAX INCREASE] each year.

So

Next year (2011/12) your rates would be AT MOST [2011/12 AMOUNT]
The following year (2012/13) your rates would be AT MOST [2012/13 AMOUNT]
And so on, up to 2017/18 when your rates would be AT MOST [2017/18 AMOUNT]
NOTE that Pensioners will still get their rebate back off these maximum rates

FOR RENTERS:

Rents could be raised by as much as the increase in rates as a direct result.
This is probably a worst case scenario, as rates are only a part of the cost to property owners. Provided we have not underestimated the rates on this property and if all of the rate rise were added to your rent, then,

To maintain Council services at their current level, your rent could rise by AT MOST [MAX INCREASE] per week each year. So

Next year (2011/12) your rent could rise by AT MOST [MAX INCREASE] per week as a result of the rate rises.
The following year (2012/13) your rent could rise by AT MOST another [MAX INCREASE] per week
And so on, up to 2017/18 when your rent could rise by AT MOST [MAX INCREASE x 7] per week above WHAT IT IS NOW as a result of the rate rises.

[INTERVIEWER - IF NECESSARY - We have tried to slightly overestimate the rates]

Q7. Do you [READ SCALE] that these maximum rises would be a reasonable price to pay to ensure the whole package of current Council services continues at today's levels?

[PROMPT FOR EXTENT OF AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT]

!RANDOMLY INVERT SCALE

1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree
3. NEITHER
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree
# [8. DON'T KNOW 9. REFUSED]

Now I'd like to ask you about IMPROVING Council's services. Please look at Insert 3 - the green sheet called "Planned enhancements to existing services". It sets out all the 51 improvements the community has said it would like. Council thinks that, if they can be funded, the improvements will give the best chance of meeting the community's goals for lifestyle in Waverley. You can see the improvements are grouped into types.
Q8. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is very unimportant and 5 is very important, how important do you think each of these types of improvement will be in the next 12 years in making the Vision possible? [READ STATEMENT]

[READ STATEMENT]

1. Very unimportant
2. Unimportant
3. Neither
4. Important
5. Very important

# More opportunities for recreation, health, wellbeing and artistic and cultural expression

# More and safer access to public places, to transport and to vital services

# More cleaning and greening of all the spaces we share

# More inviting streetscapes and restful local neighbourhoods

# A more sustainable environment with increased protection from global warming and preservation of natural ecosystems

# Partnering with a more engaged, connected and inspired community actively involved in decision making and in preserving the things we value most

Council has identified funds for about half the improvements from special grants and user charges. The other half would have to come from a rate rise in addition to the rate rise we have already talked about to maintain current services.

Council wants to check whether you think these improvements would be affordable and if rate rises would be an acceptable way of paying for the improvements, if they were made gradually over several years.

I'll give you an idea of what the increases would mean to you in total before I ask the next question.

FOR RATEPAYERS:

[MAY NEED TO GIVE RESPONDENT TIME TO WRITE RESULTS DOWN.]

To maintain Council services at their current level AND make the improvements listed in Insert 3, your rates would need to rise by AT MOST [MAX INCREASE] each year.

So

Next year (2011/12) your rates would be AT MOST [2011/12 AMOUNT]
The following year (2012/13) your rates would be AT MOST [2012/13 AMOUNT]
And so on, up to 2017/18 when your rates would be AT MOST [2017/18 AMOUNT]

NOTE that Pensioners will still get their rebate back off these maximum rates

Rate increases would then return to normal - that is, keeping pace with inflation.
FOR RENTERS:

Remember, this is a worst case scenario as a direct result of rate rises.

To maintain current services AND make the improvements listed in Insert 3, your rent could rise by AT MOST [MAX INCREASE] per week each year. So

Next year (2011/12) your rent could rise by AT MOST [MAX INCREASE] per week as a result of the rate rises.

The following year (2012/13) your rent could rise by AT MOST another [MAX INCREASE] per week

And so on, up to 2017/18 when your rent could rise by AT MOST [MAX INCREASE x 7] per week above WHAT IT IS NOW as a result of the rate rises.

Rent rises would then return to normal.

Q9. How strongly do you disagree or agree that the proposed rises would be a reasonable price to pay to keep all current council services AND get the improvements AS A WHOLE PACKAGE? Do you ... [READ SCALE]?

[PROMPT FOR EXTENT OF AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT]

!RANDOMLY INVERT SCALE

1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree
3. NEITHER
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

# [8. DON'T KNOW  9. REFUSED]

Q9a. How strongly do you disagree or agree that YOU would be able to afford the proposed rises to keep all current council services AND get the improvements AS A WHOLE PACKAGE? Do you ... [READ SCALE]?

[PROMPT FOR EXTENT OF AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT]

!RANDOMLY INVERT SCALE

1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree
3. NEITHER
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

# [8. DON'T KNOW  9. REFUSED]

[RATEPAYERS ONLY FOR Q10 AND Q10a]

Q10.
Council can not make the final decision on whether there will be a rate rise.
That is for the State Government to decide. The amounts I gave you were based on the rate rise being made over 7 years. It could be done over 5 years - this would mean bigger rises each year, but rates would level out quicker. Or it could be done over 10 years - this would mean smaller rises each year but they would go on longer before levelling out.

If a rate rise were approved, would you prefer to pay the rises...

[READ ALL OPTIONS]

1. Over 5 years - rates would rise faster than we talked about
2. Over 7 years - rates would rise as we talked about
3. Over 10 years - rates would rise slower than we talked about

# 8. DON'T KNOW 9. REFUSED

Q10a. Rate rises could be made as a flat amount each year, as in the example I gave you, or they could be increased gradually - so the rises would be a bit less in the first few years and a bit more in the last few years. Would you prefer rate rises to be the same amount each year, or start with smaller amounts and get bigger?

# 3. Same each year 4. Increasing

8. DON'T KNOW 9. REFUSED

Q11m. Looking at Insert 1 again (the yellow sheet). If a rate rise is not approved and services are to be cut back, which FIVE of the services labelled (A) to (X) would you MOST want to keep at their current level at least? [INTERVIEWER - R may not be happy with current level - stress AT LEAST]

A) Maintenance of shared assets such a M) Long term planning & vision for des
B) Beach cleaning, maintenance & lifeg N) Community involvement in decision m
C) Facilities & services for people wi O) Library services, including access
D) Facilities & services for older peo P) Cleanliness & maintenance of parks
E) Facilities & services for children Q) Cleanliness & maintenance of playgr
F) Facilities & services for young peo R) Planning for & management of meetin
G) Facilities for & management of arts S) Planning for & management of sporti
H) Informing residents about Council's T) Planning for & management of recrea
I) Planning for residential developmen U) Local traffic planning & management
J) Control of building activity V) Transport planning & management
K) Control of neighbourhood amenity & W) Neighbourhood streetscape cleaning,
L) Management of the natural environme X) Dumped rubbish removal

# 1 8. DON'T KNOW 9. REFUSED
# 2 8. DON'T KNOW 9. REFUSED
# 3 8. DON'T KNOW 9. REFUSED
# 4 8. DON'T KNOW 9. REFUSED
# 5 8. DON'T KNOW 9. REFUSED

Q11l. Still looking at Insert 1. If a rate rise is not approved and service are to be cut back, which FIVE of the services labelled (A) to (X) would you MOST comfortable to have cut out or reduced?

A) Maintenance of shared assets such a M) Long term planning & vision for des
B) Beach cleaning, maintenance & lifeg N) Community involvement in decision m

8. DON'T KNOW 9. REFUSED
Q12. If a rate rise is not approved and current Council services are cut or reduced, do you think quality of life in Waverley will be...? [READ SCALE]

1. Much worse
2. Worse
3. Same
4. Better
5. Much better

#                  [8. DON'T KNOW    9. REFUSED]

Q13. Council is sure that increasing investment in services in the short term will lower the long run cost, and vice versa - delaying investment will cost more in the long run. If a rate rise is not approved, Council could consider increasing five other sources of income to head off escalating costs. This would be additional increases in these charges over and above increases already planned to spread the load of investment.

On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is strongly disagree and 5 is strongly agree, how strongly do you disagree or agree that each of these options is an acceptable way for Council to increase income?

1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neither
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

# Charging more for residents' annual beach parking passes
# Charging more for residential parking permits
# Charging more for on-street metered parking
# Charging more for off-street parking in commercial centres
# Increasing parking fines
Q14. Council's partners in achieving the Vision for Waverley are the local community, local business, and State and Federal Governments. If Council is forced to cut services and so is less able to work toward the community's goals, how strongly do you disagree or agree that these partners will be able to fill the gap and make the Vision real by 2022?

[PROMPT FOR EXTENT OF AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT]

!RANDOMLY INVERT SCALE
1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree
[3. NEITHER]
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

# [8. DON'T KNOW  9. REFUSED]

Now some questions about how taking part in this survey affects your views about Council and the future of Waverley:

Q15. Were you surprised by the information about the range and number of services provided by Council - yes or no?

# 1. YES  2. NO  [8. DON'T KNOW  9. REFUSED]

Q15a. And were you surprised by the information on Waverley's rates compared to other local councils?

# 1. YES  2. NO  [8. DON'T KNOW  9. REFUSED]

!RANDOM
Q16. The information we sent you and taking part in this survey may have changed your views about Waverley Council. Do you now feel [READ SCALE] about Waverley Council in terms of.... [PROMPT FOR DEGREE]

!RANDOMLY INVERT SCALE
1. Much more negative
2. More negative
3. The Same [8. DON'T KNOW  9. REFUSED]
4. More positive
5. Much more positive

# The importance of services provided by Council

# The importance of Council's role in delivering a better lifestyle for the community

# Council as a trusted partner with the community to deliver a better lifestyle in Waverley

# The value for money of Waverley Council services?

# How Council is performing in long term planning to ensure Waverley's future for everyone?
[IF RATEPAYER AND OWNS MORE THAN ONE PROPERTY]

Q20. As an investment property owner, how much do you think rents would be increased if the proposed rate rises were approved? [READ OPTIONS]

!RANDOMLY INVERT SCALE
1. No change
2. A slight increase
3. A big increase

#  [8. DON’T KNOW  9. REFUSED]

Q21. And if services had to be cut, do you think the effect on the value of investment property in Waverley would be [READ SCALE]? [PROMPT FOR DEGREE]

!RANDOMLY INVERT SCALE
1. Very negative
2. Negative
3. Neither
4. Positive
5. Very positive

#  [8. DON’T KNOW  9. REFUSED]

Just a few questions to make sure we’ve talked to a wide range of the Waverley community.

QD1. [OBSERVE - Ask only if necessary - Are you male or female?]

#  M. Male     F. Female     [9. REFUSED ]

QD2. Could you tell me how old you are? [OVER 90=95]

#  [INTERVIEWER - ENTER ACTUAL AGE IF GIVEN]

IF REFUSED ASK - What age group are you? [READ OUT]

1. 18-24
2. 25-34
3. 35-49
4. 50-64
5. 65-69
6. 70 and over
[9. REFUSED - DON’T READ OUT]

QD3. And YOUR work status? [READ OPTIONS]

1. Paid full-time employment
2. Paid part-time employment
3. Self-employed (full or part-time)
4. Looking for paid employment
5. Student
6. Home duties
7. On a pension other than the age pension
8. Retired [EITHER ON AGE PENSION OR SELF-FUNDED SUPER]
-. Other [TYPE IN RESPONSE]
QDR4. In which country were you born?

1. Australia [9. REFUSED - DO NOT READ]
2. OTHER (TYPE IN NAME)

QD5. How many people live in your household?

[7. 7 or MORE] [99. REFUSED]

QD5a. And how many are aged 18 or over?

[7. 7 or MORE] [99. REFUSED]

Would you be willing to have Waverley Council contact you direct to invite you to take part in future surveys or consultation?

1. YES 2. NO [8. DON'T KNOW 9. REFUSED]

IF YES

Do you have an email address?

[IF YES - Could I have your email address please]

2. NO - No email address 3. YES But will not give it.

ELSE type in address (Must include an @ )

What is the best phone number for Council to contact you?

[1. THIS NUMBER - ]

Qpr1. How do you USUALLY find out about Waverley Council and its activities, facilities and services? Is it from.


Waverley Council website

Council's quarterly newsletter, Waverley in Focus

Local newspapers

Word of mouth [FRIENDS, FAMILY, WORK COLLEAGUES ETC.]

Council fliers or posters
Qpr1a. Would you be interested in receiving Council information by email in the future if such a service was available?


Qpr2. Do you regularly read a local paper?


IF YES

Qpr3. Which ones do you read?


[READ OUT ]

# Wentworth Courier
# Bondi View
# Spectator
# The Beast

Qpr4. Do you RECEIVE Council's quarterly newsletter, Waverley in Focus?


IF YES OR SOMETIMES

Qpr5. Do you READ the newsletter?


Do you want to make any other comment about the survey?

#

#

How easy to understand did you find the information we sent you? Was it ...

!RANDOMLY INVERT SCALE
1. Very difficult
2. Difficult
3. Neither
4. Easy
5. Very easy

#

How easy to understand did you find this survey?

!RANDOMLY INVERT SCALE
1. Very difficult
2. Difficult
3. Neither
4. Easy
5. Very easy

#

Thank you very much for all the time you've put into this, and for your answers. Waverley Council will make the overall results of the survey public as part of their consultation process.

My name is ..... calling on behalf of Waverley Council from the Hunter Valley Research Foundation. If you have any concerns about the survey, please contact my supervisor on freecall 1800 355 534.

[INTERVIEWER - WAS A MOBILE NUMBER USED]

# 1. Yes 2. No
## APPENDIX II

### DEMOGRAPHICS OF FINAL RESPONDENTS AND RECRUITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main survey</th>
<th>Recruits</th>
<th>Ratepayer</th>
<th>Renter</th>
<th>Business operator</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>% of respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-49</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 and over</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFUSED</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work status</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paid full-time</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid part-time</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking for paid</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home duties</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On a pension other</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired/EAP/REFIND</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/refused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of birth</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other country</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>324</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX III

#### CURRENT WAVERLEY COUNCIL SERVICES

**COMPARISON OF IMPORTANCE RATINGS – 2009 AND 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Description</th>
<th>2010 Importance</th>
<th>2009 Importance</th>
<th>Importance of all services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of shared assets such as roads, footpaths, kerbs</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Rubbish collection services</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach cleaning, maintenance and lifeguard services</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Maintenance and control of beaches and beach facilities</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumped rubbish removal</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Recycling services</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness and maintenance of playgrounds</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Removal of dumped rubbish from roadside areas</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness and maintenance of parks</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Long-term planning and vision</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local traffic planning and management</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Cleanliness of parks</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for &amp; management of recreational facilities such as parks, picnic areas</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Maintenance of footpaths</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport planning and management</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Maintenance of parks</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and services for older people</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Maintenance of the road network</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of building activity</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Facilities and services for people with disabilities</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and services for children</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Local traffic management</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and services for people with disabilities</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Cleanliness of playgrounds</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood streetscape cleaning, maintenance and beautification</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Environmental management and education</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for residential development</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Control of building activity</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of neighbourhood amenity and disturbance</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>The way Council employees deal with the public</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of the natural environment including management of programs for greenhouse gas reduction, water conservation</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Planning for residential development</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement in decision making</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Kerb, gutter and street cleaning</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and services for young people</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Maintenance of the streetscapes</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library services, including access to information on the web</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>On-street parking management</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for and management of sporting facilities</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Community involvement in Council's decision-making</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for and management of meeting places including shopping centres, malls, and neighbourhood villages</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Greening and tree maintenance</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term planning and vision for desired social, environmental, economic and civic leadership outcomes</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Library services</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing residents about Council's activities</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Facilities and services for older people,</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities for and management of arts, entertainment and cultural events</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Maintenance of playgrounds</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing residents about Council activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting and recreational facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of Council-owned buildings</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and playgrounds for children up to 5 years old</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and services for children</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for shopping areas</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and playgrounds for children aged 6-11</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and services for young people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, entertainment and cultural EVENTS</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, entertainment and cultural FACILITIES</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>