



Hawkesbury City Council

attachment 1
to
item 28

Community Survey
- December 2009

date of meeting: 23 February 2010
location: council chambers
time: 6:30 p.m.



Hawkesbury City Council Community Research

A research report prepared for

Hawkesbury City Council

December 2009



10/1 Bounty Close, Tuggerah Business Park, 2259
ABN 14 003 179 440

Telephone: (02) 4352 2388 Fax: (02) 4352 2117
Email: inquiries@micromex.com.au
www.micromex.com.au

The information contained herein is believed to be reliable and accurate. However, no guarantee is given as to its accuracy and reliability, and no responsibility or liability for any information, opinions or commentary contained herein, or for any consequences of its use, will be accepted by Micromex Research, or by any person involved in the preparation of this report.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Background	1
Methodology	1
Foreword	3
Key Findings	5

Results

Three things that best describe the Hawkesbury LGA for residents	17
--	----

Importance and Satisfaction Ratings of Services and Facilities

Looking After People and Places	19
Supporting Businesses and Local Jobs	27
Linking the Hawkesbury	34
Caring for Our Environment	41
Shaping Our Future Together	48

Customer Service

Overall satisfaction with the performance of Council for the last 12 months	53
Contact with Council in the last 12 months	57
Methods of sourcing information about Council	61
Satisfaction with Council's consultation with the community	63
Knowledge of the Hawkesbury Community Strategic Plan 'Shaping Our Future'	64
Interest in participating in the Resident's Panel	65

Demographics

Age	66
Suburb/Town	66
Gender	66

Appendix

Questionnaire	
---------------	--

Background

Hawkesbury City Council sought to examine community attitudes and perceptions towards current and future services and facilities provided by Council. Key objectives of the research included:

- To assess and establish the community's priorities and satisfaction in relation to Council activities, services and facilities
- To identify the community's overall level of satisfaction with Council's performance
- To identify the community's level of satisfaction with regards to contact they have had with Council staff
- To identify trends and benchmark results against the 2007 research

To facilitate this, Micromex Research was contracted to develop a survey template that enabled Council to effectively analyse attitudes and trends within the community.

Methodology

Questionnaire

Micromex, together with Hawkesbury City Council, developed the questionnaire.

A copy of the questionnaire is provided in the Appendix.

Data collection period

The survey was conducted during the period 25th November to 1st December 2009 from 4:30pm to 8:30pm, Monday to Thursday.

Survey area

Hawkesbury City Council Local Government Area.

Sample selection

The sample consisted of a total of 400 residents. The selection of respondents was by means of a computer based random selection process using electronic White Pages.

Participants

Individuals in the household, 18 years or older, were selected using the 'last birthday' selection procedure.

If the person was not at home, the call-backs were scheduled for a later time. Unanswered calls were retried to a maximum of 3 times throughout the period of the survey.

On completion of the survey, additional interviews were conducted where certain sections were underrepresented. A quota sampling procedure was used to eliminate the need for heavily weighting the survey.

The compliance rate achieved was 53%, which represents a good cross section of the community and provides a sound basis for gauging community opinion.

Methodology (Cont'd)

Sampling error

A sample size of 400 residents provides a maximum sampling error of plus or minus 4.9% at 95% confidence.

Interviewing

Interviewing was conducted in accordance with IQCA (Interviewer Quality Control Australia) Standards and the Market Research Society Code of Professional Conduct.

Prequalification

Participants in this survey were pre-qualified as having lived in the Hawkesbury Council area for a minimum of six months.

Data analysis

The data within this report was analysed using SPSS V15 and SPSS Text Analysis. To identify the statistically significant difference between the two groups of means (Community Survey results for 2007 and 2009), a 't-test of independent samples using a two tailed test' was used.

Ratings questions

The Likert Scale of 1 to 5 was used in all ratings questions, where 1 was of the least importance or satisfaction and 5 the highest importance or satisfaction. This scale allowed for a mid range position for those who had a divided or neutral opinion.

Within the report, the mean ratings for each of the criteria have been assigned a determined 'level of importance or satisfaction'. This determination is based on the following groupings:

Mean rating:	1.9 or less	'Very low' level of importance/satisfaction
	2.0 – 2.4	'Low' level of importance/satisfaction
	2.5 – 2.9	'Moderately low' level of importance/satisfaction
	3.0 – 3.5	'Moderate' level of importance/satisfaction
	3.6 – 3.8	'Moderately high' level of importance/satisfaction
	3.9 – 4.1	'High' level of importance/satisfaction
	4.2+	'Very high' level of importance/satisfaction

Comparisons with the 2007 Community Research

Throughout this report comparisons have been made with the results of the 2007 Community Research.

Note: In 2009, the following services/facilities were changed compared to 2007:

- 'Gallery/Museum' was 'Art Gallery/Museum'
- 'Access to services & facilities for people with a disability' was 'services & facilities for people with a disability'
- 'Supporting business development' was 'Economic development'
- 'Supporting tourism facilities & industry' was 'Tourism facilities'
- 'Value and protect the Hawkesbury's heritage areas' was 'Protecting heritage values and buildings'

Errors: Data in this publication is subject to sampling variability because it is based on information relating to a sample of residents rather than the total number. This difference (sampling error) may occur due to imperfections in reporting and errors made in processing the data. This may occur in any enumeration, whether it is a full count or sample.

Efforts have been made to reduce the non-sampling error by careful design of the questionnaire and detailed checking of completed questionnaires.

Foreword

Hawkesbury City Council commissioned a random community survey of 400 residents in an effort to assess the priorities of the community and their attitudes to Council's performance.

This survey, conducted by Micromex Research in November 2009, provides a good assessment of where the community perceives that Council is performing well and meeting the priorities of its residents, and also identifies priority areas that require improvement.

Hawkesbury City Council is in the business of serving a population of approximately 66,000 residents with a wide diversity of needs, priorities and expectations for service, many of which are competing. The challenge for Hawkesbury City Council is to ensure a good balance of meeting the majority of needs, the majority of priorities and the majority of expectations for service, most of the time, with a limited budget.

Overall, the survey identifies the high levels of importance residents attach to the services or facilities provided by Council. Of the 50 services or facilities rated, 35 were rated overall by residents in the range of high to very high importance, with the service/facility rated overall as the lowest in importance, still having 36% of respondents stating that it was 'important' to 'very important'.

These high levels of importance reflect the difficulty of adequately providing such a variety of services and facilities to the expectations of the community.

Satisfaction levels with the services or facilities rated varied widely and ranged from low to very high. Importantly, when comparing the results of the 2009 research with that conducted in 2007, we identify that compared to 2007, resident satisfaction has increased significantly for 5 of the 23 comparable services and decreased significantly for only 1 of the 23 comparable services.

Analysis of the importance and satisfaction ratings given for each of the prompted services or facilities, allowed for the current high priority areas for the community to be ranked in order.

When reviewing these priority rankings it is important that the data is not misinterpreted so as to suggest that those services or facilities with the lowest priority scores were of the least importance to the community. What the priority ranking indicates is that for the lowest priority scores, these are the services and facilities where the community believes that Council is performing well and should continue operating in a similar manner, in this area. Those services and facilities with the highest priority ranking are where the community believes changes should be considered, to improve their provision to the community.

The highest ranked services or facilities were therefore identified as follows.

Priority ranking	Service / Facility	Priority score
1	Road maintenance	8.96
2	Healthy & sustainable Hawkesbury River & waterways	7.24
3	Improving services & infrastructure (generally)	6.64
4	Lobbying State & Federal government for funding and improved service levels	6.48
5	Road safety	6.44
6	Engaging the community in making decisions	6.20
7	Providing transparent, accountable and respected leadership	6.04
8	Stormwater management & re-use	5.80
9	Reducing energy consumption	5.28

Foreword (Cont'd)

Overall, the survey shows that 49% of the respondents were 'satisfied' and 5% 'very satisfied' with Council's performance, whilst 29% were neutral and 18% expressed dissatisfaction. This level of satisfaction is moderate and marginally lower than the developed LGA Benchmark, however, has increased from 2007.

Importantly, the research also indicates that whilst satisfaction with the way Council consults with the community is still only moderate, this too has increased from 2007.

In summary the research indicates general increases in satisfaction from 2007, with:

- Service/facility delivery
- Council's overall performance
- Council's consultation with the community

As you can appreciate, this survey presents a great deal of information. We hope you find the feedback useful in guiding future decisions and representing the needs of your residents.

Micromex Research

Key Findings

The character of the area

In this open ended question, residents were asked the three things that describe for them the character of the Hawkesbury Local Government Area.

The responses were analysed, with 53% of all respondents describing the character as 'rural lifestyle'.

	Count	Column %
Rural lifestyle	213	53.3%
Peace and quiet	70	17.5%
History	67	16.8%
Close knit community	52	13.0%
Picturesque	44	11.0%
Open spaces	41	10.3%
Friendly	30	7.5%
River	26	6.5%
Relaxed	22	5.5%
People	21	5.3%
Other	247	61.8%
Total	400	100.0%

Overall satisfaction with the performance of Council

- 49% of the respondents were 'satisfied' and 5% 'very satisfied' with Council's performance overall, whilst 29% were neutral and 18% expressed dissatisfaction
- Respondents in 2009 expressed higher levels of satisfaction than in 2007
- There was no statistically significant difference in satisfaction by age or gender

	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female	2007	2009
Satisfaction mean ratings	3.45	3.27	3.33	3.35	3.35	3.21	3.35

Mean ratings: 1 = very dissatisfied, 5 = very satisfied

In a follow up question those respondents who were dissatisfied were asked the reason for their dissatisfaction. The predominant response related to 'roads/transport'.

Key Findings (Cont'd)

Contact with Council

- 43% of the respondents had contact with Council in the last 12 months
- Respondents aged 35-54 were the most likely to have contacted Council

Of those that had contact, the predominant means of contact were:

- Phone 77%
- In person 33%
- Email 16%
- Mail 8%

Overall, satisfaction with the way the contact was handled by phone or in person was moderately high, however, significant levels of dissatisfaction were recorded.

Satisfaction with Council contact	Dissatisfied	Neither	Satisfied	Mean
Phone	19%	16%	65%	3.7
In person	17%	18%	65%	3.7

Note: The samples of respondents for email and mail were too low to gather statistically valid responses on satisfaction.

Sourcing information about Council

Respondents indicated that they sourced information about Council from a variety of sources with the most predominant being:

- Local newspaper 81%
- Word of mouth 66%
- Letters 50%
- Community newsletters 47%

Satisfaction with the way Council consults with the community

- 41% of the respondents were 'satisfied' and 3% 'very satisfied' with the way Council consults with the community. 32% were 'neutral' and 24% expressed 'dissatisfaction'
- Respondents in 2009 expressed higher levels of satisfaction than in 2007
- There was no statistically significant difference in satisfaction by age or gender

	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female	2007	2009
Satisfaction mean ratings	3.23	3.15	3.16	3.16	3.19	2.99	3.18

Mean ratings: 1 = very dissatisfied, 5 = very satisfied

Knowledge of the Hawkesbury Community Strategic Plan 'Shaping Our Future'

- 38% of respondents had heard about the Hawkesbury Community Strategic Plan "Shaping Our Future"
- Of the respondents who had not heard about the plan, 56% indicated that they would like information on the plan

Interest in participating in the Resident's Panel

- 35% of respondents indicated that they would be interested in participating in the Resident's Panel

Key Findings (Cont'd)

Part A: Importance and satisfaction with 50 different services and facilities and their priority rankings

Respondents were asked to rate the importance of, and their satisfaction with, each of 50 different services or facilities on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 = low importance or satisfaction and 5 = high importance or satisfaction.

The **importance** mean ratings ranged from a very high 4.6 for 'road safety', which 95% of the residents rated as 'important' or 'very important', to a low of 2.9 for the 'Gallery/Museum', which 36% of the residents rated as 'important' or 'very important'.

Importance ranking	Service/facility	Importance mean ratings
1	Road safety	4.64
2	Crime prevention	4.62
3	Emergency service planning including flood and fire	4.61
4	Healthy & sustainable Hawkesbury River & waterways	4.61
5	Road maintenance	4.56
6	Value and protect the Hawkesbury's heritage areas	4.50
7	Improving services & infrastructure (generally)	4.49
8	Garbage services	4.45
9	Recycling services	4.43
10	Supporting & valuing volunteers	4.41
11	Lobbying State & Federal government for funding and improved service levels	4.40
12	Reducing water consumption	4.38
13	Engaging the community in making decisions	4.34
14	Protecting bushland, open space & natural habitats	4.33
15	Providing transparent, accountable and respected leadership	4.32
16	Reducing energy consumption	4.32
17	Improving air quality	4.30
18	Stormwater management & re-use	4.29
19	Supporting & valuing community organisations	4.28
20	Car parks	4.25
21	Promoting local employment opportunities	4.24
22	Provision of mains sewerage	4.20
23	Supporting training and career opportunities	4.16
24	Supporting business development	4.12
25	Building partnerships with residents, community groups & institutions	4.11
26	Helping to create thriving town centres	4.09
27	Supporting a wider communications network	4.09
28	Footpaths and cycleways	4.08
29	On-site health inspections such as food and septic	4.06
30	Supporting rural based activities	4.05

Continued on the following page

Key Findings (Cont'd)

Importance and satisfaction with 50 different criteria and their priority rankings (Cont'd)

Importance ranking	Service/facility	Importance mean ratings
<i>Average importance mean rating = 4.04</i>		
31	Tree preservation	4.02
32	Supporting tourism facilities & industry	4.01
33	Train services	3.98
34	Disabled ramps & access	3.93
35	Parks and reserves	3.91
36	Management of sewerage waste (pump-out)	3.88
37	Public toilets	3.88
38	Bus services (school and public)	3.78
39	Companion animal shelter (pound) services	3.76
40	Access to services & facilities for people with a disability	3.75
41	Libraries	3.70
42	Playgrounds	3.58
43	Child care centres	3.49
44	Senior's centre and programs	3.46
45	Community centres and community halls	3.39
46	Youth centres and facilities	3.34
47	Sporting and recreational facilities	3.33
48	Public swimming pools	3.17
49	Programs for people from diverse cultures including Indigenous Australians	3.08
50	Gallery/Museum	2.94

Note: In 2009, the following services/facilities were changed compared to 2007:

- 'Gallery/Museum' was 'Art Gallery/Museum'
- 'Access to services & facilities for people with a disability' was 'Services & facilities for people with a disability'
- 'Supporting business development' was 'Economic development'
- 'Supporting tourism facilities & industry' was 'Tourism facilities'
- 'Value and protect the Hawkesbury's heritage areas' was 'Protecting heritage values and buildings'

Key Findings (Cont'd)

Importance and satisfaction with 50 different criteria and their priority rankings (Cont'd)

The **satisfaction** mean ratings ranged from a high of 4.3 for 'libraries', which 85% of the residents rated with **high** satisfaction, to a low of 2.3 for 'road maintenance', which only 14% of the residents rated with satisfaction.

When comparing the results of the 2009 research with that conducted in 2007, we identify that compared to 2007, resident satisfaction has increased significantly for 5 of the 23 applicable services and decreased for only 1 of the 23 applicable services.



Satisfaction ranking	Service/facility	Satisfaction mean	Statistically significant change from 2007
1	Libraries	4.27	
2	Garbage services	3.92	
3	Gallery/Museum	3.91	Increased
4	Recycling services	3.87	
5	Child care centres	3.86	
6	Companion animal shelter (pound) services	3.85	
7	Emergency service planning including flood and fire	3.77	
8	Community centres and community halls	3.75	
9	Sporting and recreational facilities	3.66	
10	Parks and reserves	3.61	
11	Playgrounds	3.59	
12	On-site health inspections such as food and septic	3.57	
13	Protecting bushland, open space & natural habitats	3.57	
14	Senior's centre and programs	3.56	
15	Supporting & valuing volunteers	3.51	
16	Public swimming pools	3.50	Increased
17	Tree preservation	3.43	
18	Supporting tourism facilities & industry	3.37	
19	Value and protect the Hawkesbury's heritage areas	3.36	Decreased
20	Management of sewerage waste (pump-out)	3.34	
21	Provision of mains sewerage	3.31	Increased
22	Programs for people from diverse cultures including Indigenous Australians	3.28	
23	Supporting & valuing community organisations	3.27	
24	Crime prevention	3.25	
Average satisfaction mean rating = 3.25			

Continued on the following page

Key Findings (Cont'd)

Importance and satisfaction with 50 different criteria and their priority rankings (Cont'd)

Satisfaction ranking	Service/facility	Satisfaction mean	Statistically significant change from 2007
25	Reducing water consumption	3.21	
26	Helping to create thriving town centres	3.19	
27	Supporting rural based activities	3.18	
28	Access to services & facilities for people with a disability	3.15	Increased
29	Supporting business development	3.10	
30	Youth centres and facilities	3.10	
31	Building partnerships with residents, community groups & institutions	3.09	
32	Disabled ramps & access	3.08	
33	Improving air quality	3.08	
34	Promoting local employment opportunities	3.08	
35	Supporting training and career opportunities	3.07	
36	Car parks	3.04	
37	Road safety	3.03	
38	Reducing energy consumption	3.00	
39	Supporting a wider communications network	2.90	
40	Footpaths and cycleways	2.86	
41	Stormwater management & re-use	2.84	Increased
42	Improving services & infrastructure (generally)	2.83	
43	Providing transparent, accountable and respected leadership	2.81	
44	Healthy & sustainable Hawkesbury River & waterways	2.80	
45	Engaging the community in making decisions	2.79	
46	Lobbying State & Federal government for funding and improved service levels	2.78	
47	Train services	2.74	
48	Public toilets	2.66	
49	Bus services (school and public)	2.45	
50	Road maintenance	2.32	

 = A significantly higher level of importance than the previous period
 = A significantly lower level of importance than the previous period

Key Findings (Cont'd)

Gap analysis

Gap analysis establishes the gap between importance and satisfaction, which was calculated by subtracting the mean satisfaction score from the mean importance score.

The higher the differential between importance and satisfaction, the greater the difference is between the provision of that criteria and the expectation of the community.

Gap analysis enables us to provide a priority ranking for all 50 criteria.

Performance gap ranking	Criteria	Importance mean	Satisfaction mean	Performance gap
1	Road maintenance	4.56	2.32	2.24
2	Healthy & sustainable Hawkesbury River & waterways	4.61	2.80	1.81
3	Improving services & infrastructure (generally)	4.49	2.83	1.66
4	Lobbying State & Federal government for funding and improved service levels	4.40	2.78	1.62
5	Road safety	4.64	3.03	1.61
6	Engaging the community in making decisions	4.34	2.79	1.55
7	Providing transparent, accountable and respected leadership	4.32	2.81	1.51
8	Stormwater management & re-use	4.29	2.84	1.45
9	Crime prevention	4.62	3.25	1.37
10	Bus services (school and public)	3.78	2.45	1.33
11	Reducing energy consumption	4.32	3.00	1.32
12	Train services	3.98	2.74	1.24
13	Footpaths and cycleways	4.08	2.86	1.22
14	Improving air quality	4.30	3.08	1.22
15	Public toilets	3.88	2.66	1.22
16	Car parks	4.25	3.04	1.21
17	Supporting a wider communications network	4.09	2.90	1.19
18	Reducing water consumption	4.38	3.21	1.17
19	Promoting local employment opportunities	4.24	3.08	1.16
20	Value and protect the Hawkesbury's heritage areas	4.50	3.36	1.14
21	Supporting training and career opportunities	4.16	3.07	1.09
22	Building partnerships with residents, community groups & institutions	4.11	3.09	1.02
23	Supporting business development	4.12	3.10	1.02
24	Supporting & valuing community organisations	4.28	3.27	1.01
25	Supporting & valuing volunteers	4.41	3.51	0.90

Continued on the following page

Key Findings (Cont'd)

Gap analysis (Cont'd)

Performance gap ranking	Criteria	Importance mean	Satisfaction mean	Performance gap
26	Helping to create thriving town centres	4.09	3.19	0.90
27	Provision of mains sewerage	4.20	3.31	0.89
28	Supporting rural based activities	4.05	3.18	0.87
29	Disabled ramps & access	3.93	3.08	0.85
30	Emergency service planning including flood and fire	4.61	3.77	0.84
31	Protecting bushland, open space & natural habitats	4.33	3.57	0.76
32	Supporting tourism facilities & industry	4.01	3.37	0.64
33	Access to services & facilities for people with a disability	3.75	3.15	0.60
34	Tree preservation	4.02	3.43	0.59
35	Recycling services	4.43	3.87	0.56
36	Management of sewerage waste (pump-out)	3.88	3.34	0.54
37	Garbage services	4.45	3.92	0.53
38	On-site health inspections such as food and septic	4.06	3.57	0.49
39	Parks and reserves	3.91	3.61	0.30
40	Youth centres and facilities	3.34	3.10	0.24
41	Playgrounds	3.58	3.59	-0.01
42	Companion animal shelter (pound) services	3.76	3.85	-0.09
43	Senior's centre and programs	3.46	3.56	-0.10
44	Programs for people from diverse cultures including Indigenous Australians	3.08	3.28	-0.20
45	Sporting and recreational facilities	3.33	3.66	-0.33
46	Public swimming pools	3.17	3.50	-0.33
47	Community centres and community halls	3.39	3.75	-0.36
48	Child care centres	3.49	3.86	-0.37
49	Libraries	3.70	4.27	-0.57
50	Gallery/Museum	2.94	3.91	-0.97

Key Findings (Cont'd)

Quadrant analysis

Quadrant analysis is a useful way of analysing the importance and satisfaction ratings in combination with each other. The quadrant is developed by calculating mean scores for both importance and satisfaction for all of the 50 services or facilities and plotting them against each other in a higher or lower quadrant.

- The services or facilities in the upper left quadrant are those that were rated higher in importance but lower in satisfaction
- The upper right quadrant represents Council's strengths
- The lower right quadrant represents, to the community, areas of higher satisfaction but lower importance
- The lower left quadrant represents lower priority services or facilities

	Higher importance - Lower satisfaction	Higher importance - Higher satisfaction	
Higher priorities	Road maintenance Healthy & sustainable Hawkesbury River & waterways Improving services & infrastructure (generally) Lobbying State & Federal government for funding and improved service levels Road safety Engaging the community in making decisions Providing transparent, accountable and respected leadership Stormwater management & re-use Reducing energy consumption Footpaths and cycleways Improving air quality Car parks Supporting a wider communications network Reducing water consumption Promoting local employment opportunities Supporting training and career opportunities Building partnerships with residents, community groups & institutions Supporting business development Helping to create thriving town centres Supporting rural based activities	Crime prevention Value and protect the Hawkesbury's heritage areas Supporting & valuing community organisations Supporting & valuing volunteers Provision of mains sewerage Emergency service planning including flood and fire Protecting bushland, open space & natural habitats Recycling services Garbage services On-site health inspections such as food and septics	Council's strengths
Lower priorities	Lower importance - Lower satisfaction Bus services (school and public) Train services Public toilets Disabled ramps & access Access to services & facilities for people with a disability Youth centres and facilities	Lower importance - Higher satisfaction Supporting tourism facilities & industry Tree preservation Management of sewerage waste (pump-out) Parks and reserves Playgrounds Companion animal shelter (pound) services Senior's centre and programs Programs for people from diverse cultures including Indigenous Australians Sporting and recreational facilities Public swimming pools Community centres and community halls Child care centres Libraries Gallery/Museum	

Key Findings (Cont'd)

Combined priority ranking

By combining the results of the quadrant analysis and the gap analysis, priority scores have been developed for the 50 criteria. The table below lists the criteria in ranked order and highlights those criteria identified as high priorities in both the quadrant and gap analysis.

It is important to note that a 'low priority' score does not signify a community's suggestion that spending be reduced in this area. A low priority score signifies that the community's needs are currently being met in this area.

Priority ranking	Service / Facility	Priority score	
1	Road maintenance	8.96	Higher priority
2	Healthy & sustainable Hawkesbury River & waterways	7.24	
3	Improving services & infrastructure (generally)	6.64	
4	Lobbying State & Federal government for funding and improved service levels	6.48	
5	Road safety	6.44	
6	Engaging the community in making decisions	6.20	
7	Providing transparent, accountable and respected leadership	6.04	
8	Stormwater management & re-use	5.80	
9	Reducing energy consumption	5.28	
10	Footpaths and cycleways	4.88	
11	Improving air quality	4.88	
12	Car parks	4.84	
13	Supporting a wider communications network	4.76	
14	Reducing water consumption	4.68	
15	Promoting local employment opportunities	4.64	
16	Supporting training and career opportunities	4.36	
17	Crime prevention	4.11	
18	Building partnerships with residents, community groups & institutions	4.08	
19	Supporting business development	4.08	
20	Helping to create thriving town centres	3.60	
21	Supporting rural based activities	3.48	
22	Value and protect the Hawkesbury's heritage areas	3.42	
23	Supporting & valuing community organisations	3.03	

Continued on the following page

Key Findings (Cont'd)

Combined priority ranking (Cont'd)

Priority ranking	Service / Facility	Priority score		
24	Supporting & valuing volunteers	2.70	Medium priority	
25	Provision of mains sewerage	2.67		
26	Bus services (school and public)	2.66		
27	Emergency service planning including flood and fire	2.52		
28	Train services	2.48		
29	Public toilets	2.44		
30	Protecting bushland, open space & natural habitats	2.28		
31	Disabled ramps & access	1.70		
32	Recycling services	1.68		
33	Garbage services	1.59		
34	On-site health inspections such as food and septic	1.47		
35	Access to services & facilities for people with a disability	1.20		
36	Supporting tourism facilities & industry	0.64		
37	Tree preservation	0.59		
38	Management of sewerage waste (pump-out)	0.54		
39	Youth centres and facilities	0.48		Lower priority
40	Parks and reserves	0.30		
41	Playgrounds	-0.01		
42	Companion animal shelter (pound) services	-0.09		
43	Senior's centre and programs	-0.10		
44	Programs for people from diverse cultures including Indigenous Australians	-0.20		
45	Sporting and recreational facilities	-0.33		
46	Public swimming pools	-0.33		
47	Community centres and community halls	-0.36		
48	Child care centres	-0.37		
49	Libraries	-0.57		
50	Gallery/Museum	-0.97		

Comparison of Hawkesbury City Council against other Local Government Areas

Satisfaction with key criteria

Comparisons with a Micromex Research developed Local Government Benchmark are able to be made with 16 specific key criteria that are common to all LGAs.

Sample

The sample includes 30 LGAs representing over 15,000 resident interviews.

Comment

Comparisons indicated that Hawkesbury City Council performed above average in 7 of the 16 criteria and was below average in 9 of the criteria.

Of significance, Hawkesbury City Council performed marginally below the Benchmark for the key criteria:

'Overall satisfaction with Council's performance'

	Criteria	Hawkesbury City Council	LGA Benchmark
Above the Benchmark			
	Libraries	4.3	4.1
	Recycling	3.9	3.7
	Child care services	3.9	3.6
	Ovals and sporting facilities	3.7	3.6
	Playgrounds	3.6	3.4
	Satisfaction with community consultation/communication	3.2	3.0
	Youth services and facilities	3.1	3.0
Below the Benchmark			
	Garbage services	3.9	4.1
	Satisfaction with the way contact with Council was handled	3.6	3.8
	Tourism facilities	3.4	3.6
	Protecting heritage values and buildings	3.4	3.6
	<i>Overall satisfaction with Council's performance</i>	3.4	3.5
	Services for people with disabilities	3.2	3.3
	Cycleways & walking paths	2.9	3.1
	Public toilets	2.7	2.9
	Maintaining road surfaces	2.3	2.8

Q1. What 3 things describe for you the character of the Hawkesbury Local Government area?

In this open ended question, residents were asked the three things that describe for them the character of the Hawkesbury Local Government Area.

The responses were analysed, with 53% of all respondents describing the character as 'rural lifestyle'.

	Count	Column %
Rural lifestyle	213	53.3%
Peace and quiet	70	17.5%
History	67	16.8%
Close-knit community	52	13.0%
Picturesque	44	11.0%
Open spaces	41	10.3%
Friendly	30	7.5%
River	26	6.5%
Relaxed	22	5.5%
People	21	5.3%
Other	247	61.8%
Total	400	100.0%

Other

Close to amenities	17	Small	4
Close proximity to Sydney	16	Acreage	3
Don't know	16	Affordable	3
Close to family/friends	14	Good distance from the city	3
Nice place to live	11	Parks	3
Shopping	10	Proximity to the mountains	3
Clean air	9	Waterways	3
Location	9	Well maintained	3
Low traffic volume	9	Area	2
Bushland area	6	Atmosphere	2
Clean and tidy	6	Environment	2
Safe	6	Not overpopulated	2
Agricultural	4	Tourism	2
Australian people	4	Always something to do	1
Close to work	4	Ambience	1
Good blend of urban and rural	4	Art Gallery	1
Schools	4	Born here	1

Continued on the following page

Q1. What 3 things describe for you the character of the Hawkesbury Local Government area?

Other (Cont'd)

Climate	1	New bridge alleviates traffic snarls	1
Convenient	1	No high-rises	1
Cool weather	1	No street lights	1
Declining in quality	1	Ordinary	1
Defence base	1	Overcrowded	1
Degrading infrastructure	1	Political intrigue	1
Dilapidated	1	Poor infrastructure	1
Dog friendly parks	1	Poor public transport	1
Enjoyable	1	Poor roads	1
Fair	1	Poor shopping	1
Festivals	1	Population	1
Fishing	1	Private	1
Flood level land	1	Quality of life	1
Flora and fauna	1	RAAF Base	1
Good amenities	1	Rainforest area	1
Good community for the elderly	1	Road network	1
Growth potential	1	Rundown	1
Has a village atmosphere	1	Self contained	1
Horses	1	Solitary	1
Idyllic	1	Spirit of the area	1
Interesting to watch it grow	1	Sports for children	1
Isolated	1	Terrible traffic	1
Lack of development	1	The availability of everyday needs	1
Lack of infrastructure	1	Town	1
Lacking in facilities	1	Unfriendly	1
Magnificent area covering townships and farmland	1	Untidy	1
Majestic	1	Vegetation	1
Multicultural	1	Wilderness	1
Natural environment	1	Wonderful	1
Nature	1		

Nb: Some respondents gave more than one answer

Services and Facilities

The following section details the community's perceptions with regards to the importance of, and their satisfaction with, each of 50 different services or facilities on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 = low importance or satisfaction and 5 = high importance or satisfaction.

The services and facilities rated are segmented into 5 specific groups:

- Looking After People and Places
- Supporting Businesses and Local Jobs
- Linking the Hawkesbury
- Caring for Our Environment
- Shaping Our Future Together

Q2. In this section, we list 50 services and facilities. Could you please indicate that which best describes your opinion of the importance of the individual services/facilities, and in the second part your level of satisfaction with the performance of that service/facility?

A. Looking After People and Places

Key findings – Looking After People and Places

Importance (overall)

- The 18 criteria ranged in importance from moderately low (Gallery/Museum) to very high (Road safety; Crime prevention; Emergency service planning including flood and fire)

Importance by age and gender

- Respondents aged 35-54 and 55+ rated 'access to services & facilities for people with a disability' as higher in importance than respondents aged 16-34
- Respondents aged 16-34 rated 'playgrounds' and 'child care centres' as higher in importance than respondents aged 35-54 and 55+
- Respondents aged 35-54 and 55+ rated 'senior's centre and programs' as higher in importance than respondents aged 16-34
- Respondents aged 16-34 and 35-54 rated 'sporting and recreational facilities' as higher in importance than respondents aged 55+
- Respondents aged 16-34 rated 'public swimming pools' as higher in importance than respondents aged 55+
- Respondents aged 55+ rated 'Gallery/Museum' as higher in importance than respondents aged 16-34 and 35-54
- Female respondents rated 6 of the 18 criteria as higher in importance than male respondents. These included:
 - Road safety
 - Crime prevention
 - Emergency service planning including flood and fire
 - On-site health inspections such as food and septic
 - Libraries
 - Child care centres

Importance compared to 2007

- Of the 8 criteria that could be compared with 2007, 1 of the criteria was rated significantly lower in importance in 2009 (Sporting and recreational facilities) and 1 was rated significantly higher (Gallery/Museum)

Satisfaction (overall)

- Satisfaction ranged from moderately low (Public toilets) to very high (Libraries)

Satisfaction by age and gender

- Respondents aged 16-34 expressed higher levels of satisfaction than respondents aged 35-54 for 'parks and reserves', 'crime prevention', 'youth centres and facilities', as well as 'public toilets'
- Respondents aged 55+ expressed higher levels of satisfaction than respondents aged 35-54 for 'parks and reserves', as well as 'senior's centre and programs'
- There was little statistical difference in the satisfaction ratings of males and females, with the exception of 'crime prevention' where female respondents expressed higher levels of satisfaction than males

Continued on the following page

A. Looking After People and Places (Cont'd)

Key findings – Looking After People and Places (Cont'd)

Satisfaction compared to 2007

- Of the 8 criteria that could be compared with 2007, 3 of the criteria were rated significantly higher in satisfaction in 2009. These included:
 - Gallery/Museum
 - Public swimming pools
 - Access to services & facilities for people with a disability

Performance gap analysis

- Performance gap analysis identified that the residents perceived the largest performance gaps were with:
 - Emergency service planning including flood and fire
 - Crime prevention


A. Looking After People and Places (Cont'd)

Importance	Importance rating %			Mean rating
	Low 1-2	Medium 3	High 4-5	
Road safety	3%	3%	95%	4.64
Crime prevention	2%	5%	93%	4.62
Emergency service planning including flood and fire	1%	7%	93%	4.61
On-site health inspections such as food and septic	10%	13%	77%	4.06
Parks and reserves	8%	22%	70%	3.91
Public toilets	16%	12%	72%	3.88
Companion animal shelter (pound) services	16%	22%	61%	3.76
Access to services & facilities for people with a disability	20%	16%	65%	3.75
Libraries	21%	15%	64%	3.70
Playgrounds	20%	21%	59%	3.58
Child care centres	27%	19%	55%	3.49
Senior's centre and programs	25%	23%	53%	3.46
Community centres and community halls	25%	24%	52%	3.39
Youth centres and facilities	29%	20%	51%	3.34
Sporting and recreational facilities	25%	27%	48%	3.33
Public swimming pools	32%	20%	47%	3.17
Programs for people from diverse cultures including Indigenous Australians	36%	20%	45%	3.08
Gallery/Museum	39%	25%	36%	2.94

Satisfaction	Satisfaction rating %			Mean rating
	Low 1-2	Medium 3	High 4-5	
Libraries	3%	12%	85%	4.27
Gallery/Museum	6%	15%	78%	3.91
Child care centres	8%	29%	63%	3.86
Companion animal shelter (pound) services	6%	22%	72%	3.85
Emergency service planning including flood and fire	10%	26%	64%	3.77
Community centres and community halls	8%	25%	66%	3.75
Sporting and recreational facilities	13%	26%	62%	3.66
Parks and reserves	12%	28%	60%	3.61
Playgrounds	14%	31%	55%	3.59
On-site health inspections such as food and septic	12%	36%	53%	3.57
Senior's centre and programs	13%	35%	53%	3.56
Public swimming pools	22%	25%	54%	3.50
Programs for people from diverse cultures including Indigenous Australians	18%	43%	38%	3.28
Crime prevention	22%	36%	41%	3.25
Access to services & facilities for people with a disability	25%	36%	39%	3.15
Youth centres and facilities	27%	38%	36%	3.10
Road safety	29%	40%	32%	3.03
Public toilets	45%	30%	25%	2.66

Continued on the following page

A. Looking After People and Places (Cont'd)



*Please see the table below for the full description


Mean ratings: 1 = not at all important and very dissatisfied
5 = very important and very satisfied

	Importance	Satisfaction	Gap analysis
Road safety	4.64	3.03	1.61
Crime prevention	4.62	3.25	1.37
Public toilets	3.88	2.66	1.22
Emergency service planning including flood and fire	4.61	3.77	0.84
Access to services & facilities for people with a disability	3.75	3.15	0.60
On-site health inspections such as food and septics	4.06	3.57	0.49
Parks and reserves	3.91	3.61	0.30
Youth centres and facilities	3.34	3.10	0.24
Playgrounds	3.58	3.59	-0.01
Companion animal shelter (pound) services	3.76	3.85	-0.09
Senior's centre and programs	3.46	3.56	-0.10
Programs for people from diverse cultures including Indigenous Australians	3.08	3.28	-0.20
Public swimming pools	3.17	3.50	-0.33
Sporting and recreational facilities	3.33	3.66	-0.33
Community centres and community halls	3.39	3.75	-0.36
Child care centres	3.49	3.86	-0.37
Libraries	3.70	4.27	-0.57
Gallery/Museum	2.94	3.91	-0.97

Continued on the following page

A. Looking After People and Places (Cont'd)

Importance – Cross correlations by year



*Please see the table below for the full description

Mean ratings: 1 = not at all important, 5 = very important

	2007	2009
Parks and reserves	4.08	3.91
Public toilets	3.85	3.88
Access to services & facilities for people with a disability	3.82	3.75
Libraries	3.83	3.70
Community centres and community halls	3.45	3.39
Sporting and recreational facilities	3.70	3.33
Public swimming pools	3.24	3.17
Gallery/Museum	2.71	2.94


 = A significantly higher level of importance

 = A significantly lower level of importance

Continued on the following page

A. Looking After People and Places (Cont'd)

Satisfaction – Cross correlations by year



*Please see the table below for the full description

Mean ratings: 1 = very dissatisfied, 5 = very satisfied

	2007	2009
Libraries	4.20	4.27
Gallery/Museum	3.60	3.91
Community centres and community halls	3.66	3.75
Sporting and recreational facilities	3.47	3.66
Parks and reserves	3.54	3.61
Public swimming pools	2.96	3.50
Access to services & facilities for people with a disability	2.97	3.15
Public toilets	2.43	2.66

 = A significantly higher level of satisfaction

 = A significantly lower level of satisfaction

Continued on the following page

A. Looking After People and Places (Cont'd)

Importance – Cross correlations by age and gender

	16-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
Road safety	4.59	4.69	4.63	4.45	4.79
Crime prevention	4.57	4.66	4.62	4.52	4.69
Emergency service planning including flood and fire	4.59	4.62	4.62	4.52	4.68
On-site health inspections such as food and septic	4.14	4.06	3.97	3.90	4.18
Parks and reserves	3.82	3.92	4.02	3.82	3.99
Public toilets	3.86	3.87	3.90	3.81	3.93
Companion animal shelter (pound) services	3.66	3.85	3.74	3.63	3.86
Access to services & facilities for people with a disability	3.34	3.86	4.06	3.73	3.76
Libraries	3.50	3.73	3.88	3.46	3.89
Playgrounds	3.93	3.52	3.25	3.51	3.63
Child care centres	3.95	3.41	3.07	3.25	3.67
Senior's centre and programs	2.93	3.54	3.95	3.45	3.47
Community centres and community halls	3.23	3.41	3.55	3.36	3.42
Youth centres and facilities	3.30	3.48	3.23	3.30	3.38
Sporting and recreational facilities	3.41	3.57	2.91	3.26	3.38
Public swimming pools	3.48	3.13	2.88	3.15	3.19
Programs for people from diverse cultures including Indigenous Australians	2.93	3.08	3.24	3.01	3.13
Gallery/Museum	2.61	2.92	3.31	2.96	2.92

Mean ratings: 1 = not at all important, 5 = very important

 = A significantly higher level of importance

 = A significantly lower level of importance

	Not at all important		Not important		Neither		Important		Very important		Total	
	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %
Sporting and recreational facilities	54	13.6%	44	11.1%	108	27.1%	102	25.5%	91	22.6%	400	100.0%
Parks and reserves	15	3.7%	18	4.5%	86	21.5%	148	37.1%	133	33.2%	400	100.0%
Public swimming pools	73	18.2%	57	14.2%	81	20.4%	105	26.3%	83	20.9%	400	100.0%
Community centres and community halls	36	9.1%	62	15.4%	95	23.9%	123	30.7%	84	20.9%	400	100.0%
Libraries	28	7.1%	56	14.1%	61	15.3%	116	29.0%	138	34.6%	400	100.0%
Gallery/Museum	71	17.6%	84	20.9%	102	25.4%	89	22.2%	55	13.8%	400	100.0%
Public toilets	33	8.2%	30	7.4%	48	12.0%	132	33.1%	157	39.2%	400	100.0%
On-site health inspections such as food and septic	17	4.3%	23	5.7%	54	13.4%	132	33.0%	174	43.6%	400	100.0%
Child care centres	76	19.0%	30	7.6%	75	18.8%	59	14.6%	160	39.9%	400	100.0%
Playgrounds	55	13.8%	25	6.3%	85	21.2%	104	26.0%	131	32.7%	400	100.0%
Youth centres and facilities	55	13.8%	61	15.4%	81	20.3%	95	23.7%	107	26.9%	400	100.0%
Senior's centre and programs	55	13.9%	44	10.9%	90	22.5%	83	20.8%	128	31.9%	400	100.0%
Access to services & facilities for people with a disability	46	11.6%	32	8.0%	62	15.5%	96	24.0%	164	40.9%	400	100.0%
Programs for people from diverse cultures including Indigenous Australians	76	18.9%	67	16.7%	78	19.5%	108	27.1%	71	17.7%	400	100.0%
Crime prevention	2	.6%	6	1.5%	20	5.0%	86	21.6%	285	71.4%	400	100.0%
Road safety	2	.6%	8	1.9%	11	2.7%	90	22.5%	289	72.3%	400	100.0%
Emergency service planning including flood and fire	2	.4%	2	.4%	27	6.8%	90	22.6%	279	69.9%	400	100.0%
Companion animal shelter (pound) services	27	6.8%	38	9.6%	89	22.3%	96	24.0%	149	37.4%	400	100.0%

Continued on the following page

A. Looking After People and Places (Cont'd)

Satisfaction – Cross correlations by age and gender

	16-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
Libraries	4.35	4.14	4.34	4.21	4.30
Gallery/Museum	3.91	3.92	3.90	3.79	4.00
Child care centres	3.79	3.81	4.10	3.90	3.84
Companion animal shelter (pound) services	3.96	3.83	3.76	3.89	3.82
Emergency service planning including flood and fire	3.87	3.60	3.88	3.81	3.73
Community centres and community halls	3.83	3.59	3.89	3.79	3.72
Sporting and recreational facilities	3.83	3.47	3.76	3.62	3.68
Parks and reserves	3.79	3.38	3.73	3.57	3.65
Playgrounds	3.66	3.43	3.74	3.50	3.65
On-site health inspections such as food and septic	3.68	3.46	3.56	3.51	3.62
Senior's centre and programs	3.55	3.29	3.80	3.55	3.57
Public swimming pools	3.48	3.51	3.55	3.47	3.54
Programs for people from diverse cultures including Indigenous Australians	3.42	3.19	3.29	3.33	3.24
Crime prevention	3.49	3.13	3.14	3.08	3.39
Access to services & facilities for people with a disability	3.25	3.05	3.21	3.16	3.15
Youth centres and facilities	3.42	2.84	3.13	2.91	3.23
Road safety	3.17	2.85	3.11	2.96	3.08
Public toilets	2.94	2.44	2.61	2.79	2.56

Mean ratings: 1 = very dissatisfied, 5 = very satisfied

 = A significantly higher level of satisfaction
 = A significantly lower level of satisfaction

	Very dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Neither		Satisfied		Very satisfied		Total	
	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %
Sporting and recreational facilities	2	.8%	23	12.1%	49	25.6%	84	43.5%	35	18.0%	193	100.0%
Parks and reserves	9	3.3%	25	8.8%	77	27.5%	124	44.1%	46	16.2%	280	100.0%
Public swimming pools	10	5.4%	30	16.2%	46	24.9%	55	29.6%	44	23.9%	186	100.0%
Community centres and community halls	5	2.4%	12	5.9%	50	25.4%	93	46.7%	39	19.6%	198	100.0%
Libraries	2	.7%	6	2.3%	30	12.1%	97	39.5%	112	45.4%	246	100.0%
Gallery/Museum	5	4.0%	3	2.4%	21	15.3%	76	55.4%	31	22.9%	137	100.0%
Public toilets	57	19.9%	70	24.6%	86	30.3%	57	20.0%	15	5.2%	285	100.0%
On-site health inspections such as food and septic	7	2.7%	22	8.8%	88	35.6%	86	34.6%	45	18.3%	248	100.0%
Child care centres	5	2.3%	11	5.8%	57	29.3%	56	28.5%	67	34.0%	196	100.0%
Playgrounds	6	2.8%	25	11.1%	71	30.9%	79	34.5%	47	20.7%	228	100.0%
Youth centres and facilities	13	7.4%	33	19.5%	64	37.6%	45	26.3%	16	9.2%	170	100.0%
Senior's centre and programs	5	3.2%	16	9.7%	57	34.5%	55	33.1%	32	19.4%	166	100.0%
Access to services & facilities for people with a disability	18	8.9%	34	16.4%	73	35.7%	58	28.4%	22	10.6%	206	100.0%
Programs for people from diverse cultures including Indigenous Australians	4	2.8%	22	15.5%	61	43.4%	38	27.1%	16	11.2%	140	100.0%
Crime prevention	25	6.9%	56	15.5%	132	36.4%	103	28.4%	47	12.9%	362	100.0%
Road safety	35	9.2%	74	19.5%	150	39.7%	83	22.0%	36	9.6%	377	100.0%
Emergency service planning including flood and fire	7	2.0%	27	7.5%	93	26.1%	144	40.4%	85	23.9%	356	100.0%
Companion animal shelter (pound) services	5	2.3%	10	4.1%	51	21.7%	117	49.9%	51	22.0%	234	100.0%

Note: Satisfaction with the objectives was only asked of those respondents who rated that objective as 'important' or 'very important'

B. Supporting Businesses and Local Jobs

Key findings – Supporting Businesses and Local Jobs

Importance (overall)

- Overall, the 6 criteria were all rated high or very high in importance

Importance by age and gender

- Respondents aged 16-34 generally rated each criteria to be of lower importance than respondents aged 35-54 and 55+
- Female respondents rated 2 of the 6 criteria as higher in importance than male respondents. These included:
 - Promoting local employment opportunities
 - Supporting business development

Importance compared to 2007

- Of the 3 criteria that could be compared with 2007, 'supporting business development' and 'supporting tourism facilities & industry' were rated significantly higher in importance in 2009

Satisfaction (overall)

- Overall, satisfaction was moderate for all 6 criteria

Satisfaction by age and gender

- Respondents aged 16-34 expressed higher levels of satisfaction than respondents aged 35-54 for 'supporting tourism facilities & industry' and 'supporting training and career opportunities' and higher levels of satisfaction than respondents aged 35-54 and 55+ for 'helping to create thriving town centres'
- There was little statistical difference in the satisfaction ratings of males and females, with the exception of 'helping to create thriving town centres' where female respondents expressed higher levels of satisfaction than males

Satisfaction compared to 2007

- Of the 3 criteria that could be compared with 2007, there was no statistical difference in the ratings from 2009

Performance gap analysis

- Performance gap analysis identified that the residents perceived there to be opportunities for improvement with all 6 criteria. The largest performance gaps were identified with:
 - Promoting local employment opportunities
 - Supporting training and career opportunities
 - Supporting business development

B. Supporting Businesses and Local Jobs (Cont'd)


Importance	Importance rating %			Mean rating
	Low 1-2	Medium 3	High 4-5	
Promoting local employment opportunities	8%	12%	80%	4.24
Supporting training and career opportunities	7%	13%	79%	4.16
Supporting business development	7%	14%	79%	4.12
Helping to create thriving town centres	6%	16%	78%	4.09
Supporting rural based activities	7%	19%	74%	4.05
Supporting tourism facilities & industry	9%	17%	74%	4.01

Satisfaction	Satisfaction rating %			Mean rating
	Low 1-2	Medium 3	High 4-5	
Supporting tourism facilities & industry	16%	39%	44%	3.37
Helping to create thriving town centres	20%	44%	36%	3.19
Supporting rural based activities	21%	43%	36%	3.18
Supporting business development	19%	53%	28%	3.10
Promoting local employment opportunities	25%	45%	30%	3.08
Supporting training and career opportunities	22%	52%	26%	3.07

**Mean ratings: 1 = not at all important and very dissatisfied
5 = very important and very satisfied**

Continued on the following page

B. Supporting Businesses and Local Jobs (Cont'd)




Mean ratings: 1 = not at all important and very dissatisfied
5 = very important and very satisfied

	Importance	Satisfaction	Gap analysis
Promoting local employment opportunities	4.24	3.08	1.16
Supporting training and career opportunities	4.16	3.07	1.09
Supporting business development	4.12	3.10	1.02
Helping to create thriving town centres	4.09	3.19	0.90
Supporting rural based activities	4.05	3.18	0.87
Supporting tourism facilities & industry	4.01	3.37	0.64

Continued on the following page

B. Supporting Businesses and Local Jobs (Cont'd)

Importance – Cross correlation by year



Mean ratings: 1 = not at all important, 5 = very important

	2007	2009
Promoting local employment opportunities	4.23	4.24
Supporting business development	3.81	4.12
Supporting tourism facilities & industry	3.87	4.01


 = A significantly higher level of importance

 = A significantly lower level of importance

Continued on the following page

B. Supporting Businesses and Local Jobs (Cont'd)

Satisfaction – Cross correlations by year



Mean ratings: 1 = very dissatisfied, 5 = very satisfied

	2007	2009
Supporting tourism facilities & industry	3.27	3.37
Supporting business development	3.05	3.10
Promoting local employment opportunities	2.95	3.08

Continued on the following page

B. Supporting Businesses and Local Jobs (Cont'd)

Importance – Cross correlations by age and gender

	16-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
Promoting local employment opportunities	4.05	4.41	4.24	4.11	4.34
Supporting training and career opportunities	3.93	4.34	4.17	4.05	4.24
Supporting business development	3.77	4.32	4.26	4.01	4.21
Helping to create thriving town centres	3.84	4.28	4.13	4.05	4.12
Supporting rural based activities	3.82	4.13	4.19	4.03	4.06
Supporting tourism facilities & industry	3.61	4.20	4.20	3.92	4.08

Mean ratings: 1 = not at all important, 5 = very important

 = A significantly higher level of importance
 = A significantly lower level of importance

	Not at all important		Not important		Neither		Important		Very important		Total	
	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %
Promoting local employment opportunities	9	2.4%	20	5.1%	49	12.2%	108	27.0%	213	53.4%	400	100.0%
Supporting business development	14	3.6%	13	3.2%	55	13.8%	145	36.2%	173	43.2%	400	100.0%
Supporting rural based activities	11	2.7%	16	4.1%	77	19.4%	133	33.3%	162	40.5%	400	100.0%
Supporting tourism facilities & industry	17	4.3%	19	4.9%	68	17.0%	132	33.1%	163	40.7%	400	100.0%
Helping to create thriving town centres	9	2.3%	16	4.1%	65	16.3%	148	37.0%	162	40.5%	400	100.0%
Supporting training and career opportunities	14	3.6%	15	3.7%	53	13.4%	128	32.1%	189	47.3%	400	100.0%

Continued on the following page

B. Supporting Businesses and Local Jobs (Cont'd)

Satisfaction – Cross correlations by age and gender

	16-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
Supporting tourism facilities & industry	3.60	3.23	3.36	3.34	3.39
Helping to create thriving town centres	3.57	3.05	3.02	3.05	3.30
Supporting rural based activities	3.29	3.08	3.20	3.30	3.09
Supporting business development	3.04	3.02	3.29	3.11	3.10
Promoting local employment opportunities	3.13	3.04	3.07	2.98	3.15
Supporting training and career opportunities	3.30	2.95	2.98	3.04	3.09

Mean ratings: 1 = very dissatisfied, 5 = very satisfied

= A significantly higher level of satisfaction
 = A significantly lower level of satisfaction

	Very dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Neither		Satisfied		Very satisfied		Total	
	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %
Promoting local employment opportunities	18	6.0%	54	18.6%	132	45.4%	63	21.7%	24	8.3%	291	100.0%
Supporting business development	20	7.0%	34	11.8%	155	53.3%	58	19.8%	23	8.1%	290	100.0%
Supporting rural based activities	16	5.7%	42	15.2%	120	42.7%	79	28.2%	23	8.2%	280	100.0%
Supporting tourism facilities & industry	10	3.5%	36	12.7%	112	39.4%	92	32.3%	34	12.1%	284	100.0%
Helping to create thriving town centres	20	6.4%	41	13.4%	133	43.7%	84	27.5%	27	8.9%	304	100.0%
Supporting training and career opportunities	18	6.0%	47	16.0%	153	51.9%	53	17.9%	24	8.3%	295	100.0%

Note: Satisfaction with the objectives was only asked of those respondents who rated that objective as 'important' or 'very important'

C. Linking the Hawkesbury

Key findings – Linking the Hawkesbury

Importance (overall)

- The 7 criteria ranged in importance from moderately high (Bus services - school and public) to very high (Car parks; Road maintenance)

Importance by age and gender

- With the exception of 'footpaths and cycleways', respondents aged 16-34 rated all criteria to be of lower importance than older respondents
- Female respondents rated 3 of the 7 criteria as higher in importance than male respondents. These included:
 - Road maintenance
 - Car parks
 - Footpaths and cycleways

Importance compared to 2007

- Of the 3 criteria that could be compared with 2007, 1 of the criteria (Car parks) was rated significantly higher in importance in 2009

Satisfaction (overall)

- Satisfaction ranged from low (Road maintenance) to moderate (Car parks; Disabled ramps & access)

Satisfaction by age and gender

- There was no statistical difference in the satisfaction ratings by age demographic
- There was little statistical difference in the satisfaction ratings of males and females, with the exception of 'footpaths and cycleways' where male respondents expressed higher levels of satisfaction than females

Satisfaction compared to 2007

- Of the 3 criteria that could be compared with 2007, there was no statistical difference in the ratings from 2009

Performance gap analysis

- Performance gap analysis identified that the residents perceived there to be significant opportunities for improvement with all 7 criteria

C. Linking the Hawkesbury (Cont'd)


Importance	Importance rating %			Mean rating
	Low 1-2	Medium 3	High 4-5	
Road maintenance	3%	4%	94%	4.56
Car parks	4%	13%	83%	4.25
Supporting a wider communications network	7%	16%	76%	4.09
Footpaths and cycleways	10%	13%	77%	4.08
Train services	13%	13%	74%	3.98
Disabled ramps & access	14%	15%	70%	3.93
Bus services (school and public)	20%	13%	67%	3.78

Satisfaction	Satisfaction rating %			Mean rating
	Low 1-2	Medium 3	High 4-5	
Disabled ramps & access	23%	48%	30%	3.08
Car parks	29%	35%	36%	3.04
Supporting a wider communications network	36%	36%	28%	2.90
Footpaths and cycleways	36%	37%	27%	2.86
Train services	43%	29%	28%	2.74
Bus services (school and public)	50%	30%	20%	2.45
Road maintenance	58%	27%	14%	2.32

**Mean ratings: 1 = not at all important and very dissatisfied
5 = very important and very satisfied**

Continued on the following page

C. Linking the Hawkesbury (Cont'd)




**Mean ratings: 1 = not very important and very dissatisfied
5 = very important and very satisfied**

	Importance	Satisfaction	Gap analysis
Road maintenance	4.56	2.32	2.24
Bus services (school and public)	3.78	2.45	1.33
Train services	3.98	2.74	1.24
Footpaths and cycleways	4.08	2.86	1.22
Car parks	4.25	3.04	1.21
Supporting a wider communications network	4.09	2.90	1.19
Disabled ramps & access	3.93	3.08	0.85

Continued on the following page

C. Linking the Hawkesbury (Cont'd)

Importance – Cross correlations by year



Mean ratings: 1 = not at all important, 5 = very important


	2007	2009
Car parks	3.84	4.25
Footpaths and cycleways	4.03	4.08
Disabled ramps & access	3.90	3.93

= A significantly higher level of importance
 = A significantly lower level of importance

Continued on the following page

C. Linking the Hawkesbury (Cont'd)

Satisfaction – Cross correlations by year



Mean ratings: 1 = very dissatisfied, 5 = very satisfied

	2007	2009
Disabled ramps & access	3.11	3.08
Car parks	2.96	3.04
Footpaths and cycleways	2.81	2.86

Continued on the following page

C. Linking the Hawkesbury (Cont'd)

Importance – Cross correlations by age and gender

	16-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
Road maintenance	4.41	4.62	4.64	4.41	4.68
Car parks	4.09	4.28	4.39	4.06	4.40
Supporting a wider communications network	3.84	4.24	4.18	4.07	4.11
Footpaths and cycleways	4.14	4.04	4.08	3.90	4.23
Train services	3.50	4.20	4.25	3.92	4.04
Disabled ramps & access	3.55	3.94	4.34	3.90	3.94
Bus services (school and public)	3.34	4.04	3.94	3.75	3.81

Mean ratings: 1 = not at all important, 5 = very important

= A significantly higher level of importance
 = A significantly lower level of importance

	Not at all important		Not important		Neither		Important		Very important		Total	
	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %
Footpaths and cycleways	19	4.7%	22	5.6%	52	13.0%	120	30.1%	186	46.7%	400	100.0%
Car parks	3	.8%	14	3.5%	52	13.1%	140	35.0%	190	47.6%	400	100.0%
Road maintenance	7	1.6%	4	.9%	16	3.9%	108	27.0%	266	66.6%	400	100.0%
Bus services (school and public)	50	12.6%	29	7.2%	53	13.2%	94	23.6%	174	43.4%	400	100.0%
Train services	38	9.5%	16	3.9%	52	13.1%	102	25.5%	192	48.0%	400	100.0%
Supporting a wider communications network	17	4.1%	13	3.3%	65	16.4%	128	32.0%	177	44.2%	400	100.0%
Disabled ramps & access	39	9.6%	18	4.5%	62	15.4%	99	24.6%	183	45.8%	400	100.0%

Continued on the following page

C. Linking the Hawkesbury (Cont'd)

Satisfaction – Cross correlations by age and gender

	16-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
Disabled ramps & access	3.17	2.97	3.12	3.06	3.09
Car parks	3.14	3.03	2.95	3.12	2.98
Supporting a wider communications network	2.93	2.81	2.99	2.80	2.97
Footpaths and cycleways	2.92	2.90	2.75	3.03	2.74
Train services	2.85	2.56	2.88	2.83	2.68
Bus services (school and public)	2.54	2.42	2.41	2.58	2.35
Road maintenance	2.41	2.24	2.32	2.33	2.30

Mean ratings: 1 = very dissatisfied, 5 = very satisfied

= A significantly higher level of satisfaction
 = A significantly lower level of satisfaction

	Very dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Neither		Satisfied		Very satisfied		Total	
	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %
Footpaths and cycleways	40	13.1%	71	23.3%	111	36.5%	56	18.5%	26	8.6%	303	100.0%
Car parks	39	11.8%	58	17.6%	115	34.8%	87	26.3%	31	9.5%	330	100.0%
Road maintenance	107	28.7%	111	29.6%	102	27.4%	37	9.9%	16	4.4%	373	100.0%
Bus services (school and public)	77	30.4%	50	19.8%	77	30.3%	34	13.4%	15	6.1%	254	100.0%
Train services	55	19.4%	67	23.7%	81	28.6%	56	19.7%	24	8.6%	284	100.0%
Supporting a wider communications network	31	10.4%	76	25.5%	107	36.1%	59	20.0%	24	8.1%	297	100.0%
Disabled ramps & access	19	7.5%	38	15.2%	119	47.5%	55	21.7%	20	8.1%	251	100.0%

Note: Satisfaction with the objectives was only asked of those respondents who rated that objective as 'important' or 'very important'

D. Caring for Our Environment

Key findings – Caring for Our Environment

Importance (overall)

- The 11 criteria all ranged in importance from high to very high

Importance by age and gender

- Respondents aged 16-34 generally rated 'garbage services', 'recycling services', 'protecting bushland, open space & natural habitats' and 'reducing energy consumption' as lower in importance than older respondents
- Female respondents rated 6 of the 11 criteria as higher in importance than male respondents. These included:
 - Healthy & sustainable Hawkesbury River & waterways
 - Garbage services
 - Recycling services
 - Reducing water consumption
 - Reducing energy consumption
 - Tree preservation

Importance compared to 2007

- Of the 8 criteria that could be compared with 2007, 4 were rated significantly higher in importance in 2009. These included:
 - Reducing water consumption
 - Reducing energy consumption
 - Improving air quality
 - Stormwater management & re-use

Satisfaction (overall)

- Satisfaction ranged from moderately low (Healthy & sustainable Hawkesbury River & waterways; Stormwater management & re-use) to high (Recycling services; Garbage services)

Satisfaction by age and gender

- Respondents aged 16-34 expressed higher levels of satisfaction than older respondents for 8 of the 11 criteria
- There was no statistical difference in the satisfaction ratings of males and females

Satisfaction compared to 2007

- Of the 8 criteria that could be compared with 2007, 2 of the criteria were rated significantly higher in satisfaction in 2009. These included:
 - Provision of mains sewerage
 - Stormwater management & re-use

Performance gap analysis

- Performance gap analysis identified that the residents perceived there to be significant opportunities for improvement with all 11 criteria. The largest performance gaps were attributed to:
 - Healthy & sustainable Hawkesbury River & waterways
 - Stormwater management & re-use
 - Reducing energy consumption
 - Improving air quality
 - Reducing water consumption

D. Caring for Our Environment (Cont'd)


Importance	Importance rating %			Mean rating
	Low 1-2	Medium 3	High 4-5	
Healthy & sustainable Hawkesbury River & waterways	1%	5%	94%	4.61
Garbage services	2%	8%	90%	4.45
Recycling services	4%	8%	89%	4.43
Reducing water consumption	4%	7%	89%	4.38
Protecting bushland, open space & natural habitats	5%	10%	85%	4.33
Reducing energy consumption	4%	10%	85%	4.32
Improving air quality	7%	10%	84%	4.30
Stormwater management & re-use	5%	12%	83%	4.29
Provision of mains sewerage	9%	9%	82%	4.20
Tree preservation	6%	23%	71%	4.02
Management of sewerage waste (pump-out)	17%	14%	69%	3.88

Satisfaction	Satisfaction rating %			Mean rating
	Low 1-2	Medium 3	High 4-5	
Garbage services	12%	15%	73%	3.92
Recycling services	13%	16%	71%	3.87
Protecting bushland, open space & natural habitats	12%	33%	56%	3.57
Tree preservation	15%	39%	47%	3.43
Management of sewerage waste (pump-out)	15%	41%	44%	3.34
Provision of mains sewerage	24%	32%	45%	3.31
Reducing water consumption	20%	43%	37%	3.21
Improving air quality	25%	40%	36%	3.08
Reducing energy consumption	27%	46%	28%	3.00
Stormwater management & re-use	37%	37%	27%	2.84
Healthy & sustainable Hawkesbury River & waterways	34%	45%	22%	2.80

**Mean ratings: 1 = not at all important and very dissatisfied
5 = very important and very satisfied**

Continued on the following page

D. Caring for Our Environment (Cont'd)



*Please see the table below for the full description


Mean ratings: 1 = not at all important and very dissatisfied
5 = very important and very satisfied

	Importance	Satisfaction	Gap analysis
Healthy & sustainable Hawkesbury River & waterways	4.61	2.80	1.81
Stormwater management & re-use	4.29	2.84	1.45
Reducing energy consumption	4.32	3.00	1.32
Improving air quality	4.30	3.08	1.22
Reducing water consumption	4.38	3.21	1.17
Provision of mains sewerage	4.20	3.31	0.89
Protecting bushland, open space & natural habitats	4.33	3.57	0.76
Tree preservation	4.02	3.43	0.59
Recycling services	4.43	3.87	0.56
Management of sewerage waste (pump-out)	3.88	3.34	0.54
Garbage services	4.45	3.92	0.53

Continued on the following page

D. Caring for Our Environment (Cont'd)

Importance – Cross correlations by year



Mean ratings: 1 = not at all important, 5 = very important


	2007	2009
Garbage services	4.52	4.45
Recycling services	4.54	4.43
Reducing water consumption	4.17	4.38
Reducing energy consumption	4.17	4.32
Improving air quality	4.14	4.30
Stormwater management & re-use	4.13	4.29
Provision of mains sewerage	4.00	4.20
Tree preservation	3.88	4.02

 = A significantly higher level of importance
 = A significantly lower level of importance

Continued on the following page

D. Caring for Our Environment (Cont'd)

Satisfaction – Cross correlations by year



Mean ratings: 1 = very dissatisfied, 5 = very satisfied

	2007	2009
Garbage services	3.97	3.92
Recycling services	3.93	3.87
Tree preservation	3.32	3.43
Provision of mains sewerage	2.95	3.31
Reducing water consumption	3.24	3.21
Improving air quality	3.04	3.08
Reducing energy consumption	2.83	3.00
Stormwater management & re-use	2.49	2.84

= A significantly higher level of satisfaction
 = A significantly lower level of satisfaction

Continued on the following page

D. Caring for Our Environment (Cont'd)

Importance – Cross correlations by age and gender

	16-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
Healthy & sustainable Hawkesbury River & waterways	4.50	4.67	4.66	4.52	4.69
Garbage services	4.23	4.48	4.64	4.33	4.53
Recycling services	4.27	4.46	4.56	4.33	4.51
Reducing water consumption	4.36	4.41	4.34	4.17	4.54
Protecting bushland, open space & natural habitats	4.09	4.44	4.45	4.27	4.37
Reducing energy consumption	4.14	4.41	4.43	4.15	4.46
Improving air quality	4.14	4.36	4.40	4.23	4.35
Stormwater management & re-use	4.23	4.31	4.35	4.31	4.28
Provision of mains sewerage	4.27	4.18	4.15	4.09	4.29
Tree preservation	3.91	4.04	4.11	3.84	4.15
Management of sewerage waste (pump-out)	3.68	3.96	3.98	3.89	3.87

Mean ratings: 1 = not at all important, 5 = very important

= A significantly higher level of importance
 = A significantly lower level of importance

	Not at all important		Not important		Neither		Important		Very important		Total	
	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %
Healthy & sustainable Hawkesbury River & waterways	1	.1%	5	1.1%	20	5.0%	100	24.9%	275	68.9%	400	100.0%
Reducing water consumption	11	2.8%	5	1.3%	26	6.5%	137	34.2%	221	55.2%	400	100.0%
Tree preservation	10	2.5%	16	3.9%	91	22.8%	123	30.9%	159	39.8%	400	100.0%
Provision of mains sewerage	23	5.8%	14	3.6%	34	8.5%	116	29.0%	212	53.1%	400	100.0%
Stormwater management & re-use	7	1.9%	12	2.9%	48	11.9%	123	30.8%	210	52.5%	400	100.0%
Reducing energy consumption	10	2.4%	8	1.9%	41	10.3%	126	31.5%	215	53.8%	400	100.0%
Improving air quality	12	2.9%	15	3.7%	39	9.8%	111	27.7%	223	55.9%	400	100.0%
Garbage services	4	.9%	6	1.5%	32	8.0%	126	31.5%	232	58.1%	400	100.0%
Recycling services	4	1.0%	10	2.6%	30	7.6%	119	29.8%	236	59.0%	400	100.0%
Management of sewerage waste (pump-out)	42	10.5%	25	6.4%	58	14.4%	89	22.3%	185	46.4%	400	100.0%
Protecting bushland, open space & natural habitats	10	2.5%	9	2.3%	40	10.0%	122	30.6%	219	54.7%	400	100.0%

Continued on the following page

D. Caring for Our Environment (Cont'd)

Satisfaction – Cross correlations by age and gender

	16-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
Garbage services	4.03	3.79	3.95	3.81	4.00
Recycling services	4.05	3.71	3.89	3.84	3.90
Protecting bushland, open space & natural habitats	3.83	3.43	3.48	3.51	3.61
Tree preservation	3.83	3.23	3.30	3.42	3.44
Management of sewerage waste (pump-out)	3.36	3.36	3.30	3.38	3.32
Provision of mains sewerage	3.64	3.12	3.12	3.31	3.31
Reducing water consumption	3.42	3.05	3.17	3.23	3.20
Improving air quality	3.38	2.89	3.04	3.10	3.07
Reducing energy consumption	3.21	2.88	2.94	3.02	2.98
Stormwater management & re-use	3.15	2.68	2.71	2.87	2.82
Healthy & sustainable Hawkesbury River & waterways	3.14	2.63	2.68	2.89	2.72

Mean ratings: 1 = very dissatisfied, 5 = very satisfied

 = A significantly higher level of satisfaction
 = A significantly lower level of satisfaction

	Very dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Neither		Satisfied		Very satisfied		Total	
	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %
Healthy & sustainable Hawkesbury River & waterways	44	12.3%	77	21.3%	162	44.8%	63	17.5%	15	4.1%	362	100.0%
Reducing water consumption	17	5.2%	48	14.4%	142	43.0%	96	28.9%	28	8.5%	331	100.0%
Tree preservation	9	3.4%	31	11.1%	107	38.5%	91	32.7%	40	14.3%	277	100.0%
Provision of mains sewerage	33	10.4%	42	13.4%	99	31.6%	75	24.0%	65	20.6%	313	100.0%
Stormwater management & re-use	50	16.1%	63	20.5%	113	36.7%	51	16.5%	31	10.2%	309	100.0%
Reducing energy consumption	27	8.4%	58	18.2%	146	45.7%	65	20.2%	24	7.4%	320	100.0%
Improving air quality	28	8.9%	48	15.6%	124	40.0%	91	29.2%	19	6.3%	310	100.0%
Garbage services	18	5.0%	24	6.7%	55	15.4%	135	37.6%	126	35.3%	358	100.0%
Recycling services	21	5.9%	25	7.2%	57	16.1%	126	35.6%	125	35.3%	354	100.0%
Management of sewerage waste (pump-out)	18	7.2%	20	8.1%	101	41.3%	74	30.2%	33	13.3%	245	100.0%
Protecting bushland, open space & natural habitats	13	3.9%	26	7.6%	109	32.5%	134	39.9%	54	16.1%	335	100.0%

Note: Satisfaction with the objectives was only asked of those respondents who rated that objective as 'important' or 'very important'

E. Shaping Our Future Together

Key findings – Shaping Our Future Together

Importance (overall)

- The 8 criteria all ranged in importance from high to very high

Importance by age and gender

- Respondents aged 16-34 generally rated 'improving services & infrastructure (generally)', 'supporting & valuing volunteers', 'engaging the community in making decisions', 'providing transparent, accountable and respected leadership' and 'building partnerships with residents, community groups & institutions' as lower in importance than older respondents
- There was little statistical difference in the importance ratings of males and females, with the exception of 'improving services & infrastructure (generally)', which female respondents rated of higher importance than males

Importance compared to 2007

- Only 1 of the criteria could be compared with 2007 (Value and protect the Hawkesbury's heritage areas), with this rated to be of higher importance in 2009

Satisfaction (overall)

- Satisfaction ranged from moderately low (Lobbying State & Federal government for funding and improved service levels; Engaging the community in making decisions; Providing transparent, Accountable and respected leadership; Improving services & infrastructure - generally) to moderate (Building partnerships with residents, community groups & institutions; Supporting & valuing community organisations; Value and protect the Hawkesbury's heritage areas; Supporting & valuing volunteers)

Satisfaction by age and gender

- There was little statistical difference in the satisfaction ratings by age or gender with the exception of 'supporting & valuing volunteers' and 'value and protect the Hawkesbury's heritage areas', where respondents aged 16-34 expressed higher levels of satisfaction than respondents aged 35-54

Satisfaction compared to 2007

- Only 1 of the criteria could be compared with 2007 (Value and protect the Hawkesbury's heritage areas), which was rated lower in satisfaction in 2009

Performance gap analysis

- Performance gap analysis identified that the residents perceived there to be significant opportunities for improvement with all 8 criteria. The largest performance gaps were attributed to:
 - Improving services & infrastructure (generally)
 - Lobbying State & Federal government for funding and improved service levels
 - Engaging the community in making decisions
 - Providing transparent, accountable and respected leadership

E. Shaping Our Future Together (Cont'd)


Importance	Importance rating %			Mean rating
	Low 1-2	Medium 3	High 4-5	
Value and protect the Hawkesbury's heritage areas	2%	7%	91%	4.50
Improving services & infrastructure (generally)	3%	6%	91%	4.49
Supporting & valuing volunteers	3%	10%	87%	4.41
Lobbying State & Federal government for funding and improved service levels	4%	8%	88%	4.40
Engaging the community in making decisions	4%	10%	86%	4.34
Providing transparent, accountable and respected leadership	5%	10%	85%	4.32
Supporting & valuing community organisations	3%	15%	82%	4.28
Building partnerships with residents, community groups & institutions	6%	19%	75%	4.11

Satisfaction	Satisfaction rating %			Mean rating
	Low 1-2	Medium 3	High 4-5	
Supporting & valuing volunteers	13%	38%	49%	3.51
Value and protect the Hawkesbury's heritage areas	16%	36%	48%	3.36
Supporting & valuing community organisations	14%	47%	39%	3.27
Building partnerships with residents, community groups & institutions	20%	51%	29%	3.09
Improving services & infrastructure (generally)	33%	44%	24%	2.83
Providing transparent, accountable and respected leadership	35%	39%	26%	2.81
Engaging the community in making decisions	37%	39%	24%	2.79
Lobbying State & Federal government for funding and improved service levels	36%	43%	22%	2.78

**Mean ratings: 1 = not very important and very dissatisfied
5 = very important and very satisfied**

Continued on the following page

E. Shaping Our Future Together (Cont'd)



*Please see the table below for the full description

Mean ratings: 1 = not at all important and very dissatisfied
5 = very important and very satisfied

	Importance	Satisfaction	Gap analysis
Improving services & infrastructure (generally)	4.49	2.83	1.66
Lobbying State & Federal government for funding and improved service levels	4.40	2.78	1.62
Engaging the community in making decisions	4.34	2.79	1.55
Providing transparent, accountable and respected leadership	4.32	2.81	1.51
Value and protect the Hawkesbury's heritage areas	4.50	3.36	1.14
Building partnerships with residents, community groups & institutions	4.11	3.09	1.02
Supporting & valuing community organisations	4.28	3.27	1.01
Supporting & valuing volunteers	4.41	3.51	0.90

Continued on the following page

E. Shaping Our Future Together (Cont'd)

Importance – Cross correlations by year

	2007	2009
Value and protect the Hawkesbury's heritage areas	4.12	4.50

	16-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
Value and protect the Hawkesbury's heritage areas	4.41	4.51	4.59	4.47	4.53
Improving services & infrastructure (generally)	4.30	4.59	4.58	4.40	4.56
Supporting & valuing volunteers	4.27	4.41	4.54	4.36	4.44
Lobbying State & Federal government for funding and improved service levels	4.34	4.39	4.46	4.35	4.43
Engaging the community in making decisions	4.11	4.43	4.47	4.27	4.39
Providing transparent, accountable and respected leadership	3.95	4.45	4.58	4.31	4.33
Supporting & valuing community organisations	4.16	4.32	4.34	4.19	4.34
Building partnerships with residents, community groups & institutions	3.95	4.11	4.28	4.06	4.15

Mean ratings: 1 = not at all important, 5 = very important

= A significantly higher level of importance
 = A significantly lower level of importance

	Not at all important		Not important		Neither		Important		Very important		Total	
	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %
Providing transparent, accountable and respected leadership	12	2.9%	8	2.0%	41	10.2%	118	29.5%	221	55.4%	400	100.0%
Supporting & valuing community organisations	6	1.5%	4	1.0%	61	15.1%	133	33.2%	197	49.2%	400	100.0%
Supporting & valuing volunteers	3	.8%	10	2.5%	40	9.9%	116	29.1%	231	57.8%	400	100.0%
Engaging the community in making decisions	7	1.7%	11	2.7%	40	9.9%	126	31.5%	217	54.2%	400	100.0%
Improving services & infrastructure (generally)	1	.3%	10	2.6%	23	5.8%	121	30.4%	244	61.0%	400	100.0%
Lobbying State & Federal government for funding and improved service levels	7	1.7%	9	2.3%	34	8.4%	121	30.2%	230	57.5%	400	100.0%
Value and protect the Hawkesbury's heritage areas	3	.9%	5	1.3%	27	6.7%	116	29.0%	248	62.1%	400	100.0%
Building partnerships with residents, community groups & institutions	11	2.7%	12	3.0%	76	19.1%	123	30.9%	177	44.3%	400	100.0%

Continued on the following page

E. Shaping Our Future Together (Cont'd)

Satisfaction – Cross correlations by year

	2007	2009
Value and protect the Hawkesbury's heritage areas	3.69	3.36

	16-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
Supporting & valuing volunteers	3.70	3.33	3.55	3.46	3.55
Value and protect the Hawkesbury's heritage areas	3.51	3.16	3.43	3.36	3.35
Supporting & valuing community organisations	3.23	3.21	3.39	3.38	3.20
Building partnerships with residents, community groups & institutions	3.18	3.01	3.09	3.10	3.08
Improving services & infrastructure (generally)	2.97	2.70	2.86	2.93	2.75
Providing transparent, accountable and respected leadership	2.86	2.73	2.85	2.74	2.86
Engaging the community in making decisions	2.71	2.76	2.91	2.85	2.74
Lobbying State & Federal government for funding and improved service levels	2.88	2.67	2.81	2.87	2.71

Mean ratings: 1 = very dissatisfied, 5 = very satisfied

= A significantly higher level of satisfaction
 = A significantly lower level of satisfaction

	Very dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Neither		Satisfied		Very satisfied		Total	
	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %
Providing transparent, accountable and respected leadership	49	15.3%	63	19.6%	126	39.4%	67	20.9%	16	4.9%	320	100.0%
Supporting & valuing community organisations	11	3.6%	32	10.5%	145	47.3%	98	32.1%	20	6.4%	306	100.0%
Supporting & valuing volunteers	10	3.0%	33	10.2%	123	37.8%	100	30.7%	59	18.3%	325	100.0%
Engaging the community in making decisions	48	14.2%	76	22.7%	130	38.9%	62	18.6%	19	5.7%	336	100.0%
Improving services & infrastructure (generally)	48	13.3%	69	19.2%	159	43.9%	67	18.5%	18	5.0%	361	100.0%
Lobbying State & Federal government for funding and improved service levels	42	12.8%	74	22.7%	140	43.0%	55	16.9%	15	4.6%	326	100.0%
Value and protect the Hawkesbury's heritage areas	25	7.0%	34	9.4%	128	35.6%	134	37.2%	39	10.9%	360	100.0%
Building partnerships with residents, community groups & institutions	19	6.6%	37	13.2%	143	51.1%	65	23.2%	17	5.9%	281	100.0%

Note: Satisfaction with the objectives was only asked of those respondents who rated that objective as 'important' or 'very important'

Customer Service

Customer service

Q3a. Overall, for the last 12 months, how satisfied are you with the performance of Council, not just on one or two issues, but across all responsibility areas?

Overall satisfaction with the performance of Council

- 49% of the respondents were 'satisfied' and 5% 'very satisfied' with Council's performance overall, whilst 29% were neutral and 18% expressed dissatisfaction
- Respondents in 2009 expressed higher levels of satisfaction than in 2007
- There was no statistically significant difference in satisfaction by age or gender


Satisfaction – Cross correlations by age, gender and year

	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female	2007	2009
Satisfaction mean ratings	3.45	3.27	3.33	3.35	3.35	3.21	3.35

Mean ratings: 1 = very dissatisfied, 5 = very satisfied

- = A significantly higher level of satisfaction
- = A significantly lower level of satisfaction

In a follow up question those respondents who were dissatisfied were asked the reason for their dissatisfaction. The predominant response related to 'roads/transport'.



	2007		2009	
	Count	Column %	Count	Column %
Very satisfied	15	3.7%	18	4.6%
Satisfied	190	47.5%	194	48.6%
Neither	93	23.3%	117	29.2%
Dissatisfied	68	17.0%	50	12.5%
Very dissatisfied	34	8.5%	21	5.1%
Total	400	100.0%	400	100.0%

Continued on the following page

Q3a. Overall, for the last 12 months, how satisfied are you with the performance of Council, not just on one or two issues, but across all responsibility areas? (Cont'd)

Q3b. (If dissatisfied or very dissatisfied), what is your main reason for feeling that way?

Roads/Transport	27
• Roads are poorly maintained	15
• The transport system in the LGA is appalling, especially buses and trains	5
• Dispute regarding my access road	1
• Kurrajong traffic lights	1
• Lack of kerbs and gutters	1
• Lack of street signs	1
• New roads are not well thought out and there are serious traffic management issues around them	1
• North Richmond bridge traffic is terrible	1
• Safety of our roads is poor	1
Communication	18
• Poor communication with local residents	5
• Council does not listen to the ratepayers	4
• Lack of response from enquiries	2
• Too much infighting	2
• Council is insular and won't communicate with the community	1
• Don't receive responses to enquiries	1
• Have made requests of Council, but have not received a satisfactory response	1
• They don't listen to residents enough and make their own decisions	1
• Things are done behind people's backs	1
Council (general)	18
• Council is not spending enough time or money on what the community actually needs	5
• Council has made too many mistakes, i.e. the museum building not being in character with the local area, misuse of the old hospital	2
• Lack of good leadership	2
• Council has forgotten the northern side of the river at Wisemans Ferry	1
• Council is selling Australiana Village and I'm not happy about it	1
• Council should take a stance on the future direction of the district	1
• I don't think the Council has a properly co-ordinated plan and there is too much fragmentation in the Council	1
• Inconsistencies in Council's decision making	1
• Lack of or inability to sort out disputes and non-compliance orders	1
• Takes too long for anything to get done	1
• They don't seem to do anything for Kurrajong residents	1
• Totally inefficient and have no idea what the local community needs	1

Continued on the following page

Q3a. Overall, for the last 12 months, how satisfied are you with the performance of Council, not just on one or two issues, but across all responsibility areas?

Q3b. (If dissatisfied or very dissatisfied), what is your main reason for feeling that way? (Cont'd)

Councillors	17
• Councillors have their own agendas	7
• Most of our councillors have poor attitudes	5
• Too much politics within the Council. The focus is on the political careers of councillors with a disregard for community services they are supposed to be providing	2
• Councillors don't support local shopkeepers. I have a business and no councillor has ever set foot in the door to say hello. You only ever see them around election time	1
• We need some new blood in Council to bring in new ideas	1
• Weak mayoral leadership	1
Development	17
• Council does not value the heritage of the area, too much development is approved	6
• Decisions on DAs are not always for the best	2
• No consistency with development	2
• Clarendon Hotel, Land and Environment court case	1
• Extremely poor planning decisions, e.g. developments approved at Pitt Town and Peels Dairy without any infrastructure put in first	1
• Handling of certain issues, e.g. Heritage Village at Wilberforce	1
• New North Richmond shops have no character	1
• Shopping complexes don't have any good stores in them	1
• The bridge will not be going ahead	1
• Too much development is being allowed	1
Rate issues	13
• Council doesn't prioritise the spending of funds, rates are being wasted	7
• Their consistency in lifting rates and giving nothing in return	3
• Rising rates	2
• Council overcharges ratepayers, then does not deliver on basic community needs in rural areas e.g. street lights, stormwater drains, sewerage drains, town water, parks	1
Lack of services/facilities	12
• Not provided with adequate waste collection	3
• Council doesn't support enough of the local businesses	2
• ADSL services are very limited and need upgrading	1
• Bus services are poor	1
• Entertainment facilities are very limited	1
• Lack of funding for public toilets	1
• More services and facilities are needed for the youth in the Glossodia area, also policing of the same age group	1
• Problem with the sewerage system in Wilberforce	1
• Untreated sewerage plant, lack of investigation	1

Continued on the following page

Q3a. Overall, for the last 12 months, how satisfied are you with the performance of Council, not just on one or two issues, but across all responsibility areas?

Q3b. (If dissatisfied or very dissatisfied), what is your main reason for feeling that way? (Cont'd)

Other	11
• Lack of funding for cultural groups	2
• Dissatisfaction with the fire hazard reduction burning	1
• Grassed areas are not looked after	1
• Kurmond fruit stall was ordered to shut down, but is still trading and Council hasn't taken action	1
• Not much maintenance happens out my way, if we ever had a flood we could not get out. I have not heard of any flood routes and the river is always filthy	1
• River water quality is not good	1
• Sale of public properties	1
• There is not much happening around Bligh Park	1
• Too many trees are being pulled down	1
• Unnecessary funding of the museum	1

Q4a. Have you contacted Hawkesbury City Council in the last 12 months?

Key findings – Contact with Council

- 43% of the respondents had contact with Council in the last 12 months
- Respondents aged 35-54 were the most likely to have contacted Council

Of those that had contact, the predominant means of contact were:

- Phone 77%
- In person 33%
- Email 16%
- Mail 8%

Overall, satisfaction with the way the contact was handled by phone or in person was moderately high, however, significant levels of dissatisfaction were recorded.

Satisfaction with Council contact	Dissatisfied	Neither	Satisfied	Mean
Phone	19%	16%	65%	3.7
In person	17%	18%	65%	3.7

Note: The samples of respondents for email and mail were too low to gather statistically valid responses on satisfaction.

	Count	Column %
Yes	173	43.2%
No	227	56.8%
Total	400	100.0%

Cross correlations by age and gender

	18-34		35-54		55+		Male		Female	
	Count	Column %	Count	Column %	Count	Column %	Count	Column %	Count	Column %
Yes	42	31.8%	81	53.5%	50	42.7%	75	42.9%	98	43.5%
No	89	68.2%	71	46.5%	67	57.3%	100	57.1%	127	56.5%
Total	131	100.0%	152	100.0%	117	100.0%	175	100.0%	225	100.0%

Continued on the following page

Q4b. When you made contact with Council was it by:

	Count	Column %
Phone	134	77.3%
In person	57	32.7%
Email	27	15.7%
Mail	13	7.6%
Total	173	100.0%


Cross correlations by age and gender

	18-34		35-54		55+		Male		Female	
	Count	Column %	Count	Column %	Count	Column %	Count	Column %	Count	Column %
Phone	36	85.7%	64	78.6%	34	68.2%	54	72.4%	79	81.1%
Mail	3	7.1%	8	9.5%	2	4.7%	7	8.8%	6	6.6%
Email	6	14.3%	16	20.2%	5	9.4%	13	17.7%	14	14.1%
In person	9	21.4%	30	36.9%	18	35.3%	27	35.4%	30	30.6%
Total	42	100.0%	81	100.0%	50	100.0%	75	100.0%	98	100.0%

Continued on the following page

**Q4a. Have you contacted Hawkesbury City Council in the last 12 months?
(Cont'd)**

Q4c. How satisfied were you with the way your contact was handled?



Mean ratings: 1 = very dissatisfied, 5 = very satisfied

Satisfaction – Cross correlations by age, gender and overall

	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female	2009
Phone	3.83	3.66	3.75	3.74	3.72	3.73
In person	4.00	3.47	3.93	3.69	3.69	3.69
Email	2.50	3.21	3.45	2.79	3.46	3.11
Mail	3.00	3.33	2.67	3.28	2.88	3.06

Note: Due to the low number of responses for mail and email, these results should be viewed from a point of interest only.

	Very dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Neither		Satisfied		Very satisfied		Total	
	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %
Phone	7	5.3%	19	14.1%	21	15.6%	43	32.5%	43	32.6%	133	100.0%
Mail	1	9.6%	2	12.6%	6	52.5%	2	12.6%	2	12.6%	12	100.0%
Email	8	30.9%	1	2.3%	3	12.0%	9	34.6%	5	20.2%	26	100.0%
In person	6	9.9%	4	7.2%	10	18.1%	19	33.6%	18	31.2%	57	100.0%

Continued on the following page

Q4a. Have you contacted Hawkesbury City Council in the last 12 months?

Q4c. How satisfied were you with the way your contact was handled? (Cont'd)


Q4d. (If dissatisfied or very dissatisfied), how could the way this contact was handled be improved?

Phone	
• Be more helpful and informative	6
• Be courteous, listen and understand	5
• Council needs to take action on requests made	3
• Return calls more promptly	2
• Actually understand that they are supposed to be working on my behalf	1
• Attend to the issues more thoroughly	1
• Be more flexible	1
• Follow up on the issues raised	1
• Have the correct person respond to the call	1
• Improve the training standards of employees	1
• More compassion needed from staff	1
• Quicker responses to queries. It has been 12 months since I made mine, but there has still been no outcome after I've made 4 or 5 phone calls	1
• Suggest a meeting if the issue can't be resolved over the phone	1
• Use common sense and at least understand the difference between town and rural areas	1
Mail	
• Council tried to postpone the decision to close Australiana Village and nothing has been done	1
• More following up of the issues raised in letters	1
• Quicker response time	1
Email	
• Responding to emails, I am still waiting	5
• More prompt responses	1
In person	
• Handle enquiries/complaints in a professional manner, I was treated rudely by a staff member	4
• Better training of development application staff, both in knowledge and customer service	2
• Be more helpful, the staff member suggested sending an email would be better	1
• Be more involved in the issues of the Hawkesbury area	1
• Be more knowledgeable	1
• Respond to requests and take action	1

Q5. Please indicate from the following list how you source information about Council.

Respondents indicated that they sourced information about Council from a variety of sources with the most predominant being:

- Local newspaper 81%
- Word of mouth 66%
- Letters 50%
- Community newsletters 47%



	2007		2009	
	Count	Column %	Count	Column %
Local newspaper	293	73.3%	324	81.0%
Word of mouth	251	62.8%	262	65.6%
Letters			201	50.3%
Community newsletters			188	46.9%
Council's website	103	25.9%	156	39.1%
Council offices	148	37.2%	124	30.9%
Libraries	109	27.4%	107	26.8%
Other	43	10.8%	12	3.0%
Total	400	100.0%	400	100.0%

Note: In 2007, respondents were prompted with 'letterbox drops', which received 202 (51%) responses.

Other

Radio	2	Phone book local area government section	1
Attending meetings	1	Rate notices	1
Don't source information	1	Speaking directly with elected councillors	1
Find it very difficult to get information	1	Telephone Council	1
North Richmond Action Group	1	Television news	1
Observation	1		

Continued on the following page

Q5. Please indicate from the following list how you source information about Council. (Cont'd)

Cross correlations by age and gender

	18-34		35-54		55+		Male		Female	
	Count	Column %	Count	Column %	Count	Column %	Count	Column %	Count	Column %
Local newspaper	98	75.0%	129	84.7%	97	82.9%	145	82.9%	179	79.5%
Word of mouth	86	65.9%	98	64.3%	78	66.8%	107	61.3%	155	68.9%
Letters	56	43.2%	94	61.8%	51	43.2%	77	44.0%	124	55.2%
Community newsletters	45	34.1%	78	51.6%	65	55.3%	86	49.0%	102	45.3%
Council's website	62	47.7%	70	45.9%	24	20.6%	71	40.3%	86	38.1%
Council offices	39	29.5%	45	29.9%	39	33.7%	57	32.6%	67	29.6%
Libraries	24	18.2%	46	30.6%	37	31.7%	41	23.4%	66	29.5%
Other	6	4.5%	2	1.3%	4	3.5%	7	3.9%	5	2.3%
Total	131	100.0%	152	100.0%	117	100.0%	175	100.0%	225	100.0%

Q6. How satisfied are you with the way Council consults with the community?


- 41% of the respondents were 'satisfied' and 3% 'very satisfied' with the way Council consults with the community. 32% were 'neutral' and 24% expressed 'dissatisfaction'
- Respondents in 2009 expressed higher levels of satisfaction than in 2007
- There was no statistically significant difference in satisfaction by age or gender

Satisfaction – Cross correlations by age, gender and year

	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female	2007	2009
Satisfaction mean ratings	3.23	3.15	3.16	3.16	3.19	2.99	3.18

Mean ratings: 1 = very dissatisfied, 5 = very satisfied

- = A significantly higher level of satisfaction
- = A significantly lower level of satisfaction



	2007		2009	
	Count	Column %	Count	Column %
Very satisfied	6	1.4%	11	2.8%
Satisfied	149	37.3%	165	41.2%
Neither	111	27.8%	129	32.2%
Dissatisfied	104	26.1%	74	18.6%
Very dissatisfied	30	7.4%	21	5.2%
Total	400	100.0%	400	100.0%

Q7a. Have you heard about the Hawkesbury Community Strategic Plan "Shaping Our Future" (it is a 20 year plan for the Hawkesbury)?

- 38% of respondents had heard about the Hawkesbury Community Strategic Plan "Shaping Our Future"
- Of the respondents who had not heard about the plan, 56% indicated that they would like information on the plan

	Count	Column %
Yes	153	38.4%
No	246	61.6%
Total	400	100.0%

Cross correlations by age and gender

	18-34		35-54		55+		Male		Female	
	Count	Column %	Count	Column %	Count	Column %	Count	Column %	Count	Column %
Yes	36	27.3%	73	47.8%	45	38.7%	86	49.1%	68	30.1%
No	95	72.7%	79	52.2%	72	61.3%	89	50.9%	157	69.9%
Total	131	100.0%	152	100.0%	117	100.0%	175	100.0%	225	100.0%

Q7b. If no - would you like some information about the Hawkesbury Community Strategic Plan?

	Count	Column %
Yes	137	55.5%
No	110	44.5%
Total	246	100.0%

Cross correlations by age and gender

	18-34		35-54		55+		Male		Female	
	Count	Column %	Count	Column %	Count	Column %	Count	Column %	Count	Column %
Yes	45	46.9%	45	57.3%	46	64.8%	44	49.2%	93	59.0%
No	51	53.1%	34	42.7%	25	35.2%	45	50.8%	64	41.0%
Total	95	100.0%	79	100.0%	72	100.0%	89	100.0%	157	100.0%

Q7c. (If yes), what are your contact details?

Note: Respondents' details were supplied directly to Council.

Q8a. After we analyse the results from this research we will be forming a Resident's Panel to investigate areas more closely and obtain resident feedback on the outcomes of this research (The Resident's Panel would meet for a workshop once or twice a year and may also be contacted for a mail or email survey). Would you be interested in participating in the Resident's Panel?

- 35% of respondents indicated that they would be interested in participating in the Resident's Panel

	Count	Column %
Yes	140	35.0%
No	260	65.0%
Total	400	100.0%

Cross correlations by age and gender

	18-34		35-54		55+		Male		Female	
	Count	Column %	Count	Column %	Count	Column %	Count	Column %	Count	Column %
Yes	42	31.8%	60	39.5%	38	32.2%	62	35.7%	77	34.2%
No	89	68.2%	92	60.5%	79	67.8%	113	64.3%	148	65.8%
Total	131	100.0%	152	100.0%	117	100.0%	175	100.0%	225	100.0%

Q8b. (If yes), what are your contact details?

Note: Respondents' details were supplied directly to Council.

Demographic information

Q9. Please stop me when I read out your age group.

	Count	Column %
18-34	131	32.7%
35-54	152	38.0%
55+	117	29.3%
Total	400	100.0%

Q10. In which suburb/town do you live?

	Count	Column %
Bligh Park	46	11.5%
North Richmond	31	7.8%
Richmond	31	7.8%
South Windsor	24	6.0%
Kurrajong	23	5.8%
Kurrajong East	20	5.0%
Glossodia	18	4.5%
Wilberforce	18	4.5%
Hobartville	17	4.3%
Windsor	16	4.0%
Mcgraths Hill	14	3.5%
Freemans Reach	12	3.0%
Pitt Town	12	3.0%
Vineyard	11	2.8%
Windsor Downs	11	2.8%
Oakville	10	2.5%
Bowen Mountain	9	2.3%
Kurmond	9	2.3%
Kurrajong Heights	8	2.0%
Lower Macdonald	6	1.5%
Blaxlands Ridge	4	1.0%
Ebenezer	4	1.0%
Kurrajong Hills	4	1.0%

	Count	Column %
Maraylya	4	1.0%
Grose Vale	3	0.8%
Grose Wold	3	0.8%
Richmond East	3	0.8%
St Albans	3	0.8%
Wisemans Ferry	3	0.8%
Yarramundi	3	0.8%
Agnes Banks	2	0.5%
Cattai	2	0.5%
Clarendon	2	0.5%
Colo Heights	2	0.5%
Lower Portland	2	0.5%
Sackville	2	0.5%
Bilpin	1	0.3%
Colo Upper	1	0.3%
Higher Macdonald	1	0.3%
Mountain Lagoon	1	0.3%
Scheyville	1	0.3%
Tennyson	1	0.3%
The Slopes	1	0.3%
Webbs Creek	1	0.3%
Total	400	100.0%

Q11. Gender.

	Count	Column %
Male	175	43.8%
Female	225	56.2%
Total	400	100.0%

Appendix

Hawkesbury Community Survey 2009

Q1. What 3 things best describe for you the character of the Hawkesbury Local Government area?

- 1.....
- 2.....
- 3.....

Q2. In this section, we list 50 services and facilities. Could you please indicate that which best describes your opinion of the importance of the individual services/facilities, and in the second part your level of satisfaction with the performance of that service/facility?

The scale is from 1 to 5 where 1 = low importance and 5 = high importance and where 1 = low satisfaction and 5 = high satisfaction.

A. Looking after People and places

	Importance					Satisfaction				
	Low		High			Low		High		
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
1. Sporting and recreational facilities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Parks and reserves	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Public swimming pools	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Community centres and community halls	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Libraries	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Gallery/Museum	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Public toilets	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. On-site health inspections such as food and septic	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Child care centres	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. Playgrounds	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11. Youth centres and facilities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12. Senior's centre and programs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
13. Access to services & facilities for people with a disability	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
14. Programs for people from diverse cultures including Indigenous Australians	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
15. Crime prevention	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
16. Road safety	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
17. Emergency service planning including flood and fire	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
18. Companion animal shelter (pound) services	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

B. Supporting Businesses and Local Jobs

	Importance					Satisfaction				
	Low					Low		High		
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
1. Promoting local employment opportunities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Supporting business development	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Supporting rural based activities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Supporting tourism facilities & industry	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Helping to create thriving town centres	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Supporting training and career opportunities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

C. Linking the Hawkesbury

	Importance					Satisfaction				
	Low					Low		High		
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
1. Footpaths and cycleways	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Car parks	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Road maintenance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Bus services (school and public)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Train services	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Supporting a wider communications network (mobile coverage, broad-band, TV reception)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Disabled ramps & access	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

D. Caring for our Environment

	Importance					Satisfaction				
	Low					Low		High		
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
1. Healthy & sustainable Hawkesbury River and waterways	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Reducing water consumption	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Tree preservation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Provision of mains sewerage	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Storm water management & re-use	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Reducing energy consumption	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Improving air quality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Garbage services	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Recycling services	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. Management of sewerage waste (pump-out)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11. Protecting bushland, open space and natural habitats	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

E. Shaping Our Future Together

	Importance					Satisfaction				
	Low					High				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
1. Providing transparent, accountable and respected leadership	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Supporting & valuing community organisations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Supporting & valuing volunteers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Engaging the community in making decisions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Improving services & infrastructure (generally)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Lobbying State & Federal government for funding and improved service levels	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Value and protect the Hawkesbury's heritage areas	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Building partnerships with residents, community groups & institutions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Customer service

Q3a. Overall, for the last 12 months, how satisfied are you with the performance of Council, not just on one or two issues, but across all responsibility areas? *Prompt*

Very satisfied Satisfied Neither Dissatisfied Very dissatisfied

Q3b. (If dissatisfied or very dissatisfied), what is your main reason for feeling that way?

.....

Q4a. Have you contacted Hawkesbury City Council in the last 12 months?

Yes No (If no, go to Q5)

Q4b. When you made contact with Council was it by:

Phone Mail Email In person

Note: Satisfaction is asked for each of the means in which contact was made.

Q4c. How satisfied were you with the way your contact was handled? *Prompt*

Very satisfied Satisfied Neither Dissatisfied Very dissatisfied

Q4d. (If dissatisfied or very dissatisfied), how could the way this contact was handled be improved?

.....

Q5. Please indicate from the following list how you source information about Council.

- Local newspaper
- Council's website
- Council offices
- Community newsletters
- Libraries
- Letters
- Word of mouth

Other (please specify)

Q6. How satisfied are you with the way Council consults with the community? *Prompt*

- Very satisfied
- Satisfied
- Neither
- Dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

Q7a. Have you heard about the Hawkesbury Community Strategic Plan "Shaping Our Future" (it is a 20 year plan for the Hawkesbury)?

- Yes
- No (If yes, go to Q8a)

Q7b. If no - would you like some information about the Hawkesbury Community Strategic Plan?

- Yes
- No (If no, go to Q8a)

Q7c. (If yes), what are your contact details?

Name Telephone

Email

Q8a. After we analyse the results from this research we will be forming a Resident's Panel to investigate areas more closely and obtain resident feedback on the outcomes of this research. (The Resident's Panel would meet for a workshop once or twice a year and may also be contacted for a mail or email survey)

Would you be interested in participating in the Resident's Panel?

- Yes
- No (If no go to Q9)

Q8b. (If yes), what are your contact details?

Name Telephone

Email

Thank you. We will be randomly selecting participants to ensure we get a good cross-section of the community. If you are selected you will be contacted early next year.

Demographic information

Could you please assist with the following information?

Q9. Please stop me when I read out your age group.

- 18-34
- 35-54
- 55+

Q10. In which suburb/town do you live?

Q11. Gender by voice. Male Female

Thank you very much for your assistance with this research.

