



Monash City Council

2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey

April 2024

©Monash City Council, 2024

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

© Metropolis Research Pty Ltd, 2024

The survey form utilised in the commission of this project and the Governing Melbourne results are copyright. Apart from any use permitted under the Copyright Act 1968, no part may be reproduced by any process without written permission from the Managing Director Metropolis Research Pty Ltd.

Disclaimer

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

Contact details

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

Dale Hubner
Managing Director
Metropolis Research Pty Ltd

P O Box 1357
CARLTON VIC 3053

(03) 9272 4600
d.hubner@metropolis-research.com

Belinda Lim
Consultation and Research Coordinator
Monash City Council

293 Springvale Road
GLEN WAVERLEY VIC 3150

(03) 9518 3555
belinda.lim@monash.vic.gov.au



Table of contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	6
INTRODUCTION	13
RATIONALE	13
METHODOLOGY, RESPONSE RATE AND STATISTICAL STRENGTH	14
GOVERNING MELBOURNE	15
GLOSSARY OF TERMS	15
COUNCIL’S OVERALL PERFORMANCE	18
OVERALL PERFORMANCE BY PRECINCT	20
OVERALL PERFORMANCE BY RESPONDENT PROFILE	21
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ISSUES AND SATISFACTION WITH OVERALL PERFORMANCE	25
OVERALL SATISFACTION OF RESPONDENTS DISSATISFIED WITH SERVICES AND FACILITIES:	27
IMPROVEMENTS TO COUNCIL’S OVERALL PERFORMANCE	28
GOVERNANCE AND LEADERSHIP	32
COMMUNITY CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT	35
<i>Preferred consultation topics / issues</i>	37
REPRESENTATION, LOBBYING AND ADVOCACY:	41
RESPONSIVENESS OF COUNCIL TO LOCAL COMMUNITY NEEDS:	43
MAINTAINING TRUST AND CONFIDENCE OF LOCAL COMMUNITY	45
MAKING DECISIONS IN THE INTERESTS OF THE COMMUNITY	47
CONTACT WITH COUNCIL	49
CONTACT WITH COUNCIL IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS:	49
SATISFACTION WITH COUNCIL’S CUSTOMER SERVICE:	49
<i>General reception</i>	53
<i>Care and attention to your enquiry</i>	54
<i>Provision of information on the Council and its services</i>	55
<i>Speed of service</i>	56
<i>Courtesy of service</i>	57
<i>Access to relevant officer / area</i>	58
<i>Staff’s understanding of your language needs</i>	60
REASON FOR DISSATISFACTION WITH SELECTED ASPECTS OF CUSTOMER SERVICE	61
IMPORTANCE OF AND SATISFACTION WITH COUNCIL SERVICES	65
IMPORTANCE OF COUNCIL SERVICES AND FACILITIES	65
<i>Change in importance 2022 to 2023:</i>	65
<i>Variation in importance from the metropolitan Melbourne average:</i>	65
<i>Average importance by respondent profile</i>	67
SATISFACTION WITH COUNCIL SERVICES AND FACILITIES	68
<i>Comparative satisfaction:</i>	68
<i>Comparison to the metropolitan Melbourne average</i>	68
<i>Change in satisfaction between 2023 and 2024:</i>	70
<i>Percentage satisfaction results</i>	71
<i>Change in satisfaction over the last eight years:</i>	72
<i>Satisfaction by respondent profile:</i>	73
IMPORTANCE AND SATISFACTION CROSS TABULATION	75
CORRELATION BETWEEN SERVICE / FACILITIES SATISFACTION AND OVERALL SATISFACTION	76
SATISFACTION BY BROAD SERVICE AREAS	78
SATISFACTION BY COUNCIL DIVISION	81
INFRASTRUCTURE DIVISION	82



INFRASTRUCTURE DIVISION – WASTE AND RECYCLING.....	82
<i>Regular garbage collection</i>	83
<i>Regular green waste collection</i>	85
<i>Regular recycling service</i>	87
<i>Hard rubbish collection</i>	90
<i>Council’s Waste Transfer Station</i>	92
INFRASTRUCTURE DIVISION – OTHER.....	93
<i>Maintenance and repair of sealed local roads</i>	94
<i>Footpath maintenance and repairs</i>	96
<i>Street sweeping</i>	97
<i>Drains maintenance and repair</i>	99
<i>Provision and maintenance of street lighting</i>	100
<i>Provision of parking facilities</i>	102
<i>Local traffic management</i>	103
<i>Provision and maintenance of street trees</i>	105
<i>Public toilets</i>	109
<i>Provision and maintenance of local playgrounds</i>	114
<i>Provision and maintenance of parks, gardens, and reserves</i>	115
<i>Bike paths and shared pathways</i>	119
<i>Sport ovals and other outdoor sporting facilities</i>	120
<i>Council activities to encourage environmental sustainability</i>	122
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND SERVICES DIVISION	124
<i>Recreation and Aquatic Centres</i>	126
<i>Bike paths and shared pathways</i>	127
<i>Sport ovals and other outdoor sporting facilities</i>	129
<i>Provision and maintenance of local playgrounds</i>	130
<i>Council run services for children and their families</i>	132
<i>Council services for older residents and activities for seniors</i>	133
<i>Council run programs and activities for young people (10 – 25 years)</i>	135
<i>Local library and library services</i>	136
CITY DEVELOPMENT DIVISION.....	138
<i>Parking enforcement</i>	139
<i>Provision of parking facilities</i>	141
<i>Animal management</i>	142
EXECUTIVE DIVISION.....	144
<i>Council’s newsletter Monash Bulletin</i>	145
<i>Council’s website</i>	148
PLANNING AND HOUSING DEVELOPMENT	150
PLANNING FOR POPULATION GROWTH BY ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT	150
<i>Reasons for dissatisfaction with planning for population growth</i>	153
SATISFACTION WITH ASPECTS OF PLANNING AND HOUSING DEVELOPMENT.....	158
<i>Appearance and quality of new developments</i>	160
<i>Examples of and comments about specific developments</i>	162
<i>The design of public spaces</i>	164
<i>The protection of trees and vegetation on private property</i>	166
CURRENT ISSUES FOR THE CITY OF MONASH	168
ISSUES BY PRECINCT	172
ISSUES BY RESPONDENT PROFILE.....	175
<i>Provision and maintenance of street trees</i>	178
IMPORTANCE OF SELECTED COUNCIL INITIATIVES	180
PROMOTION OF GENDER EQUITY	181
PREVENTION OF FAMILY VIOLENCE AND ALL FORMS OF VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN.....	183
SUPPORT FOR LOCAL BUSINESSES TO GROW, TO INCREASE JOBS, AND INVESTMENT.....	184
REDUCING LONELINESS IN THE COMMUNITY	186



PERCEPTION OF SAFETY	187
PERCEPTION OF SAFETY IN PUBLIC AREAS DURING THE DAY	189
PERCEPTION OF SAFETY IN PUBLIC AREAS AT NIGHT	191
PERCEPTION OF SAFETY TRAVELLING ON / WAITING FOR PUBLIC TRANSPORT	193
PERCEPTION OF SAFETY IN AND AROUND YOUR LOCAL SHOPPING DISTRICT / CENTRE	194
<i>Reason for feeling unsafe in public areas:</i>	196
TRAFFIC AND PARKING	199
SATISFACTION WITH ASPECTS OF TRAFFIC AND PARKING:	199
VOLUME OF TRAFFIC.....	200
<i>Volume of traffic on residential streets</i>	200
<i>Volume of traffic on main roads</i>	202
SPEED OF TRAFFIC	203
<i>Speed of traffic on residential streets</i>	203
<i>Speed of traffic on main roads</i>	204
<i>Reasons for dissatisfaction with the speed of traffic</i>	205
AVAILABILITY OF PARKING	206
<i>Availability of parking on residential streets</i>	206
<i>Availability of parking on main roads</i>	207
RESPONDENT PROFILE	209
AGE STRUCTURE	209
GENDER	209
LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME:	210
ABORIGINAL OR TORRES STRAIT ISLANDER:	211
HOUSEHOLD MEMBER WITH DISABILITY:	211
HOUSEHOLD STRUCTURE	211
IDENTIFY AS DIVERSE POPULATION GROUPS:	212
GENERAL COMMENTS	213
APPENDIX ONE: SURVEY FORM	220



Executive summary

Survey aims and methodology:

Metropolis Research conducted this, Council's eighth *Annual Community Satisfaction Survey* as a door-to-door, 15-minute interview survey of 801 respondents conducted from the 10th of February to the 3rd of March 2024.

The survey was again this year conducted as a random sample, door-to-door, in-person interview style survey, after being conducted by telephone in 2020 through 2022 due to the pandemic. This in-person method provides a richer interaction with the community, includes a more representative sample of the community, and importantly, recorded a response rate of 45% (up from 44% last year), up significantly on the 18% recorded in 2022 using the telephone methodology.

The aim of the research was to measure community satisfaction with the broad range of Council provided services and facilities, aspects of governance and leadership, planning and development, customer service, and the performance of Council across all areas of responsibility.

The survey also measured the importance to the community of 28 individual services and facilities and explored the top issues the community feel needs to be addressed in the municipality 'at the moment'.

There were also a set of questions relating to Council's performance across four policy areas (gender equity, family violence, support for local business, and reducing loneliness in the community), which were included for the first-time last year.

Key findings:

The key finding from the survey this year was that satisfaction with the overall performance of Monash City Council continued to increase, up one percent to 7.3 out of 10.

Overall satisfaction has recovered from the lower-than-average results in 2022 and 2023 to be consistent with the long-term average since 2016 of 7.3.

Satisfaction with most aspects of Council performance remained relatively stable this year including satisfaction with 28 services and facilities (stable at 7.7), three planning and development outcomes (7.3, down 1%), five aspects of governance and leadership (stable at 7.1), and planning for population growth (6.9, down 2%).

There was an average four percent increase in satisfaction with three aspects of traffic and parking on residential streets and main roads. Whilst these issues remain significant in the City of Monash, the significant improvements in aspects of traffic and parking recorded over the last two years remain a stand-out positive result for the City of Monash.



There was, however, a five percent decline in average satisfaction with seven aspects of customer service this year (7.2 down from 7.6). Satisfaction with customer service remains notably below the long-term average since 2016 of 7.7 out of 10 or “very good”. Customer service remains an area under-performing the metropolitan Melbourne average.

The following table outlines the key satisfaction results, including the LGPRF reporting requirement scores.

Satisfaction with:	Metro. Melbourne 2024	City of Monash 2023	City of Monash 2024
Council’s Overall performance	7.0	7.2	7.3
Making decisions in the interests of community	6.9	7.2	7.1
Community consultation and engagement	7.2	7.2	7.1
Maintaining trust and confidence of the community	7.0	7.1	7.1
Representation, lobbying and advocacy	6.9	7.1	7.1
Responsiveness of Council to local community needs	7.0	7.0	7.0
<i>Customer service (average score across 7 indicators)</i>	7.4	7.6	7.2
Maintenance and repair of sealed local roads	7.0	7.5	7.4

There were increases in satisfaction with 16 individual Council services and facilities this year, with the largest increases recorded for Council services for older residents and activities for seniors (up 6% from 146 respondents), Council run services for children and their families (up 4% from 87 respondents), parking enforcement (up 3% following on from 8% increase last year), provision of parking facilities (up 3% following on from 4% increase last year), and animal management (up 3%).

The only service to record a statistically significant decline in satisfaction this year was the provision and maintenance of street trees (down 6%). Clearly the storm event that occurred during the survey fieldwork was a factor in this lower-than-average result this year.

The 2023 report noted an impact from the changes to the kerbside collection services on satisfaction with these services, as well as overall satisfaction with Council. Metropolis Research notes that this year, satisfaction with these services increased somewhat, and the proportion of respondents who nominated rubbish and waste issues (including kerbside collections declined notably (11% down from 17%).

Metropolis Research notes that satisfaction with the kerbside collection services were all at “excellent” levels this year.

These results reflect a decline in the impact of the kerbside collection service changes on satisfaction with Council, although it is noted that the 11% of respondents who nominated these issues remain four percent less satisfied with Council’s overall performance, which is the same as last year (17% were 4% less satisfied).

The three most nominated issues all continued to exert a negative influence on overall satisfaction for the respondents who nominate the issues, including parking issues (1% lower), traffic management (1% lower) and rubbish and waste issues (4% lower).



Other issues that appeared to exert a negative influence on satisfaction with Council’s overall performance for the respondents nominating them were street trees, parks and gardens, safety, policing, and crime issues, roads, drains, lighting, planning and development, and footpath related issues, although each of these issues were nominated by a smaller number.

Satisfaction with the performance of Council:

Satisfaction with the [overall performance](#) of Monash City Council increased marginally this year, up one percent to 7.3 out of a potential 10. This was not a statistically significant increase; however, satisfaction has recovered to be identical to the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 7.3.

This result was measurably higher than the metropolitan Melbourne average of 7.0 and marginally higher than the eastern region councils’ (7.1), both as recorded in the 2024 *Governing Melbourne* research.

It is clear that satisfaction with Monash City Council has recovered from the two lower-than-average results in 2022 and 2023. Metropolis Research notes that the influence on overall satisfaction from the changes to the kerbside collection services over those two years has diminished somewhat, although there remains a small proportion who were dissatisfied with these changes.

Overall satisfaction with the City of Monash in 2024 was at a “very good”, up from a “good” level of satisfaction.

A little less than half (49% up from 43%) of respondents were “very satisfied” with Council’s overall performance (rating satisfaction at eight or more out of 10), whilst five percent (up from 4%) were dissatisfied (rating zero to four).

There was some variation in satisfaction with Council’s overall performance observed this year, although most of this variation was not statistically significant, as follows:

- **Somewhat higher than average satisfaction** – included respondents from Notting Hill, young adults (aged 18 to 34 years), senior citizens (aged 75 years and over)^{sig}, respondents from two-parent families with youngest child 5 to 12 years), and sole person household respondents.
- **Somewhat lower than average satisfaction** – included respondents from Oakleigh East and Oakleigh South, middle-aged and older adults (aged 45 to 74 years), respondents from households with a member with disability, respondents who had contacted Council in the last 12 months, respondents with chronic illness, LGBTIQ+ respondents, and respondents experiencing financial hardship).

Satisfaction with the five included aspects of [governance and leadership](#) remained stable this year at 7.1 out of 10, which remains below the pre-pandemic average of 7.3.

The average satisfaction with all five aspects of governance and leadership remains marginally higher than the eastern region councils (7.0) and somewhat higher than the metropolitan Melbourne average (6.9).



Other than the range of issues discussed in the [relationship between issues and overall satisfaction](#), discussed above, there were no other significant underlying factors identified in this report that negatively impacted on satisfaction with Council’s overall performance or satisfaction with governance and leadership by a substantial number of respondents.

Governance and leadership issues did not appear as substantive issues to address in the municipality, nor were there significant issues raised by respondents who were dissatisfied with Council’s overall performance relating to governance and leadership performance.

As in previous years, there were comments received from several respondents dissatisfied with overall performance or aspects of governance and leadership that reflected a perception from these respondents that Council was not adequately listening to or communicating effectively with the community.

Satisfaction with all five aspects of governance and leadership remained at “good” levels, including satisfaction with Council’s community consultation and engagement (7.1), making decisions in the interests of the community (7.1), maintaining community trust and confidence (7.1), representation, lobbying and advocacy (7.1), and the responsiveness of Council to local community needs (7.0).

Satisfaction with Council’s [customer service](#) declined measurably this year, down by an average of five percent to 7.2, which was a “good”, down from a “very good” level.

These results do somewhat reverse the improvement recorded last year, with satisfaction with customer service lower than the long-term average this year, although it remains higher than the low point of 7.1 recorded in 2022.

Satisfaction with customer service remains somewhat below the metropolitan Melbourne result (7.4) and remains the only area of Council performance that appears to be underperforming the metropolitan Melbourne average.

The average satisfaction with the 28 Council provided [services and facilities](#) included in the survey remained this year at 7.7 out of 10, which remains a “very good” level.

The average satisfaction with these services and facilities in the City of Monash (7.7) was marginally (1%) higher than the metropolitan Melbourne average of 7.6.

There were notably increases in satisfaction with Council services for older residents and activities for seniors (up 6% from 85 respondents), Council run services for children and their families (up 4% from 146 respondents), parking enforcement (up 3% this year following on from the 9% increase last year), the provision of parking facilities (up 3% following on from the 4% increase last year), and animal management (up 3%).

The only service or facility to record a statistically significant decline this year was street trees, which declined six percent this year to 7.6, and was below the metropolitan average of 7.4. This unusual decline in satisfaction with street trees likely to reflect, at least in part, the impact of the storm event that occurred during the survey fieldwork.



Metropolis Research notes satisfaction with the regular garbage collection, regular recycling, and regular green waste collection services all improved two percent this year, although the garbage and recycling collections remain below the long-term average. These results show the diminishing impact of the changes to the kerbside collection services, with satisfaction now at “excellent” levels for each of the three services.

Despite this improvement, there remains a small proportion of respondents who were dissatisfied with these services and who raise the issue as one they feel needs to be addressed (11% of respondents who remain four percent less satisfied with Council overall).

The services with the highest satisfaction this year include the local library and library services (8.6), regular green waste collection (8.5), Council services for older residents and activities for seniors (8.5), Council run services for children and their families (8.2), sports ovals and other outdoor sporting facilities (8.2), regular recycling service (8.1), and recreation and aquatic centres (8.1). These services and facilities all recorded satisfaction scores measurably higher than the average of all 28.

Many of these services and facilities with the highest levels of satisfaction were also those with higher-than-average importance. This shows that many of the services and facilities of most importance to the community were those with which the community was most satisfied.

Satisfaction with all but three services and facilities recorded satisfaction scores higher than the overall satisfaction with Council this year, suggesting most services and facilities were a positive influence on satisfaction with Council’s overall performance.

The three services and facilities to record satisfaction scores lower than overall satisfaction include public toilets (6.5 down from 6.7), the provision and maintenance of street trees (7.2 down from 7.6), and parking enforcement (7.2 up from 7.0).

It is important to bear in mind that satisfaction with all of these services and facilities were categorised as “good”, despite recording satisfaction scores lower than the overall satisfaction. There were no services and facilities included in the survey this year that received “solid”, “poor”, “very poor”, or “extremely poor” categorised scores.

Satisfaction with [planning for population growth by all levels of government](#) declined marginally this year, down two percent to 6.9 out of 10. This result was marginally lower than the metropolitan Melbourne (7.0) and eastern region councils (7.0).

Satisfaction with the [planning and development outcomes](#), including the design of public spaces (7.6 down from 7.7), the protection of trees and vegetation on private property (7.2 down from 7.4) and the appearance and quality of new developments (7.2, stable) all remained essentially stable this year.

Satisfaction with the appearance and quality of new developments and the design of public spaces were higher than the metropolitan Melbourne results.

It is noted that planning issues remain significant issues for seven percent of respondents (up from unusually low 4% last year).



These results show that overall, the Monash community was relatively satisfied with planning and development outcomes and planning for population growth, although there remains a notable minority (7% this year) in the community with concerns around planning outcomes in the municipality.

Issues to address for the City of Monash:

The main [issues to address in the City of Monash 'at the moment'](#) included traffic management (13% down from 14%), parking both enforcement and availability (13% up from 12.0%), rubbish and waste issues including garbage collection (11% down from 17%), street trees (8% up from 5%), planning and development (7% up from 4%), roads (6%, stable), and parks, gardens, and open spaces (6% up from 5%).

All of these issues appear to exert a small negative influence on satisfaction with Council's overall performance for the respondents who raised each issue.

Particular attention is drawn to the still significant proportion of respondents who nominated rubbish and waste issues this year, which declined from the unusually high 17% recorded last year and the 13% recorded in 2022 in response to the changes to the kerbside collection services to 11% this year.

It appears that these issues have started to diminish for the Monash community, although it is noted that those who raised these issues remained four percent less satisfied with Council's overall performance than the average.

The other issues of note this year include street trees (8% up from 5%) and storm-related issues (3%, new), in response to the storm event that occurred during the survey fieldwork.

Those who raised street tree related issues were less satisfied with Council's overall performance than average, and satisfaction with the provision and maintenance of street trees declined six percent this year. The 25 respondents who directly raised issues arising from the storm were slightly more satisfied with Council's overall performance than the municipal average (7.5 compared to 7.3).

These results suggest that community concerns around Council responsibility in response to the storm event was focused, largely, but not exclusively on addressing issues with the street trees.

Importance of Council initiatives:

Respondents were again in 2024, asked to rate the [importance of Council initiatives](#) in relation to four policy areas.

Three of the four initiatives were again this year considered "extremely important", including the prevention of family violence and all forms of violence against women (8.5 down from 8.8), support for local business to grow, to increase jobs, and investment (8.3 down from 8.4), and reducing loneliness in the community (8.1 down from 8.3).



The importance of Council initiatives in relation to the promotion of gender equity (7.7 down from 7.9) remained at a “very important” level.

Two-thirds or more of respondents providing a score considered each of these four initiatives to be “very important”, whilst it is noted that eight percent considered Council initiatives in the promotion of gender equity to be “unimportant”.

Despite the small declines in the average importance, these results reaffirm a very strong level of community agreement with the importance of these Council initiatives.

Perception of safety:

Respondents were again in 2024, asked to rate their [perception of safety in the public areas of the municipality](#) during the day (8.6, stable), in and around the local shopping district / centre (8.3, stable), travelling on / waiting for public transport (8.0 up from 7.9), and at night (7.3 down from 7.3).

These results all remain consistent with the eastern region councils’ average, and somewhat higher than the metropolitan Melbourne averages, and continue to suggest a strong perception of safety in the public areas of the City of Monash.

It is noted that four percent (up from 3%) of respondents nominated safety, policing, and crime related issues as one of the top three issues to address, and it is noted that seven percent of respondents felt “unsafe” in the public areas of the City of Monash at night, which remains substantially lower than the metropolitan Melbourne average of 11%.

Traffic and parking:

Respondents were again in 2024, asked to rate their satisfaction with six aspects of [traffic and parking](#) on residential streets and main roads.

There were notable increases in satisfaction with the volume of traffic, the speed of traffic, and the availability of parking on both residential streets and main roads recorded this year.

Satisfaction with most of these aspects was “very good” this year, up from “good”, with the volume of traffic (6.9 up from 6.7) and availability of parking (6.9 up from 6.7) on main roads both remaining at “good” levels.

Despite these notable increases in satisfaction with aspects of traffic and parking, it is important to note that traffic management (13% down from 14%) and car parking including availability and enforcement (13% up from 12%) were the two most nominated issues to address for the City of Monash, and both continue to exert a somewhat negative influence on community satisfaction with the overall performance of Monash City Council.

Having said that, the continued increase in satisfaction with aspects of traffic and parking on residential streets and main roads a stand-out positive result from the survey in recent years.



Introduction

Metropolis Research Pty Ltd was commissioned by Monash City Council to undertake this, its eighth *Annual Community Satisfaction Survey*.

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

The *Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey* comprises the following:

- Satisfaction with Council's overall performance.
- Satisfaction with aspects of governance and leadership.
- Importance of and satisfaction with 28 Council services and facilities.
- Issues of importance for the City of Monash 'at the moment'.
- Satisfaction with aspects of Council's customer service.
- Satisfaction with planning for population growth by all levels of government.
- Importance of Council initiatives in four policy areas (gender equity, loneliness, economy, and family violence).
- Perception of safety in Monash.
- Satisfaction with traffic and parking.
- Respondent profile.

Rationale

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

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

The *Annual Community Satisfaction Survey* provides in-depth coverage of Council services and facilities as well as additional community issues and expectations. This information is critical to informing Council of the attitudes, levels of satisfaction and issues facing the community in the City of Monash.



A particular strength of this survey program is identifying the issues of importance to the community and how these issues may be impacting on community satisfaction with the performance of Council.

In addition, the *Annual Community Satisfaction Survey* includes a range of demographic and socio-economic variables against which the results can be analysed. For example, the *Annual Community Satisfaction Survey* includes data on age structure, gender, language spoken at home, disability, period of residence, household structure, and diverse population groups. By including these variables, satisfaction scores can be analysed against these variables and issues that sub-groups in the community have with Council's performance or services can be identified.

Methodology, response rate and statistical strength

The *Annual Community Survey* has traditionally been conducted as a door-to-door, interview style survey, and the 2023 survey returned fully to this traditional method.

The door-to-door, face-to-face interview style survey methodology was employed for this project, as it provides the richest interaction with residents, encourages their thoughtful participation in the research, records a substantially higher response rate, and provides a sample that is more representative of the underlying Monash community than can be obtained via other methods.

The surveying was completed from the 10th of February to the 3rd of March 2024.

Most surveys were completed on Saturdays and Sundays from 11am till 5pm, as this is the best time to ensure that the sample is most randomly selected and therefore representative of the underlying population, with no more than 15% completed daylight hours weekdays.

The sample was pre-weighted by precinct population, to ensure that each precinct contributed proportionally to the overall municipal results.

The final sample of surveys were then weighted by age and gender, to ensure that each age / gender group contributed proportionally to the overall municipal result.

A total of 3,523 residents were approached with a view to inviting them to participate in the research. Of these:

- No answer - 1,750
- Refused – 972
- Completed - 801



This provides a response rate of 45%, which is consistent with the 44% last year, and a significant improvement over the 18% recorded in 2022, using the less effective telephone methodology. This very strong response rate reflects well on the door-to-door methodology, as well as the level of engagement of the Monash community with their local council.

The 95% confidence interval (margin of error) of these results is plus or minus 3.4% at the 50% level. In other words, if a yes / no question obtains a result of 50% yes, it is 95% certain that the true value of this result is within the range of 46.6% and 53.4%.

This is based on a total sample size of 800 respondents, and an underlying population of the City of Monash of 202,847.

The 95% confidence level around the precinct level results is approximately plus or minus 12%, based on an average sample size of approximately 65 respondents. The 95% confidence level around the gender-based results is approximately plus or minus 5%, and for the age groups averages around plus or minus 7%.

Governing Melbourne

The sample is drawn in equal numbers from every municipality in metropolitan Melbourne, and then weighted by age and gender to reflect the profile of the metropolitan Melbourne community.

Governing Melbourne provides an objective, consistent and reliable basis on which to compare the results of the *Monash City Council – 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey*.

It is not intended to provide a “league table” for local councils, rather to provide a context within which to understand the results.

This report provides some comparisons against the 2024 metropolitan Melbourne average, which includes all municipalities located within the Melbourne Greater Capital City Statistical Area as well as the East region (Boroondara, Knox, Manningham, Maroondah, Monash, Whitehorse, Yarra Ranges).

Glossary of terms

Precinct

The results of this report are presented at both the municipal and precinct level. The term precinct is used by Metropolis Research to describe the sub-municipal areas for which results are presented, as agreed with officers of Council.

The precincts used for this report are the sub-municipal areas as presented in Council’s *Community Profile* as published by i.d Consulting.



Measurable and statistically significant

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

Significant result

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

Marginal / somewhat / notable

Metropolis Research will describe some results or changes in results as being marginally, somewhat, or notably higher or lower. These are not statistical terms, rather they are interpretive. They are used to draw attention to results that may be of interest or relevant to policy development and service delivery.

In order of significance, “marginal” is the least significant, followed by “somewhat”, and with “notable” the most significant of the subjective terms used to describe variations that were not statistically significant.

These terms are often used for results that may not be statistically significant due to sample size or other factors but may nonetheless provide some insight into the variation in community sentiment.

95% confidence interval

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

The margin of error around percentage results presented in this report at the municipal level is plus or minus 3.5%.

Satisfaction categories

Metropolis Research typically categorises satisfaction results to assist in the understanding and interpretation of the results.

Metropolis Research has worked primarily with local government and developed these categories as a guide to satisfaction with the performance of local government across a wide range of service delivery and policy related areas of Council responsibility.



The scores presented in the report are designed to give a general context about satisfaction with variables in this report, and are defined as follows:

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




Council’s overall performance

Respondents were asked:

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

Satisfaction with the performance of Monash City Council ‘across all areas of responsibility’, or “overall performance” increased marginally, but not measurably this year, up one percent to 7.3 out of 10.

This was a “very good”, up from a “good” level of satisfaction, and returns overall satisfaction with Monash City Council to the long-term average since 2016 of 7.3 out of 10.



Metropolis Research notes that satisfaction with Monash City Council was somewhat lower than the long-term average in both 2022 and 2023. A range of reasons underpinned that lower-than-average satisfaction, including a broader fatigue with government across metropolitan Melbourne in 2023, coming out of the last of the pandemic lockdowns, and then into both federal and state government election campaigns.

Specifically in relation to satisfaction with Monash City Council, in both 2022 and 2023, there appeared to be some impact on overall satisfaction from the changes to the kerbside collection services.

Metropolis Research notes that the kerbside collection issues remain evident in these 2024 results, although they have clearly diminished somewhat over time.



By way of comparison, this result was measurably higher than the metropolitan Melbourne average satisfaction (7.0), and marginally higher than the eastern region councils' (7.1), both as recorded in the 2024 *Governing Melbourne* research conducted independently by Metropolis Research in January 2024, using the same in-person, door-to-door methodology.


The following graph provides a breakdown of these results into the proportion of respondents (who provided a score) who were “very satisfied” (i.e., rated satisfaction at eight or more), those who were “neutral to somewhat satisfied” (i.e., rated satisfaction at between five and seven), and those who were “dissatisfied” (i.e., rated satisfaction at less than five out of 10).

Consistent with the results in most years of the survey program, approximately half (49%) of respondents who provided a score were “very satisfied” with Council’s overall performance, whilst five percent were “dissatisfied”.

Metropolis Research notes that over more than 20 years measuring community satisfaction with local government, it has never recorded less than three percent “dissatisfied” respondents. This reflects the fact that there will always be some in the community who, for a variety of reasons, will be dissatisfied with the performance of their local council.


Over the eight years of the survey program, these City of Monash results reflect widespread community satisfaction with the performance of Monash City Council.

It is noted, however, that the 2022 result included eight percent “dissatisfied” respondents, which, at the time, appeared to reflect initial community concern around changes to the kerbside collection services. This negative influence appears to have diminished since 2022.




Overall performance by precinct

There was no statistically significant variation in satisfaction with Council’s overall performance observed across the municipality, although it is noted that respondents from Oakleigh East and Oakleigh South rated satisfaction somewhat, but not measurably lower than the municipal average.



Metropolis Research notes that just 34% of respondents from Oakleigh South were “very satisfied”, and 11% of respondents from Hughesdale were “dissatisfied”.



Overall performance by respondent profile

The following section provides a comparison of satisfaction with Council's overall performance by respondent profile, including age structure, gender, language spoken at home, household disability status, contact with Council, household structure, and diverse population groups.


There was relatively little statistically significant variation in satisfaction observed (statistically significant variations noted with an *), although attention is drawn to the following variations:

- **Somewhat higher than average satisfaction** – included young adults (aged 18 to 34 years), senior citizens (aged 75 years and over)*, respondents from two-parent families with youngest child 5 to 12 years), and sole person household respondents.
- **Somewhat lower than average satisfaction** – included middle-aged and older adults (aged 45 to 74 years), respondents from households with a member with disability, respondents who had contacted Council in the last 12 months, respondents with chronic illness, LGBTIQ+ respondents, and respondents experiencing financial hardship).

Metropolis Research notes that some of these groups included only a small number of respondents, including just nine respondents identifying as LGBTIQ+ and 25 identifying as experiencing financial hardship.




Satisfaction with Council's overall performance by respondent profile
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
scale from 0 (very dissatisfied) to 10 (very satisfied)




Metropolis Research notes that almost two-thirds of the senior citizens (aged 75 years and over) were “very satisfied” with Council’s overall performance, whilst 12% of older adults (aged 60 to 74 years) were “dissatisfied”.

Satisfaction with Council's overall performance by respondent profile
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
(Percent of respondents providing a response)




Satisfaction with Council's overall performance by household structure
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
scale from 0 (very dissatisfied) to 10 (very satisfied)




Metropolis Research notes that almost 60% of the respondents from one-parent families and sole person households were “very satisfied” with Council’s overall performance.

Satisfaction with Council's overall performance by household structure
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
(Percent of respondents providing a response)




Satisfaction with Council's overall performance by diverse population groups
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
scale from 0 (very dissatisfied) to 10 (very satisfied)



Metropolis Research notes that 30% of the nine LGBTIQA+ respondents and 16% of the 25 respondents experiencing financial hardship were “dissatisfied” with Council’s overall performance.

Satisfaction with Council's overall performance by disability
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
(Percent of respondents providing a response)



Relationship between issues and satisfaction with overall performance

The following graph displays the average overall satisfaction score for respondents nominating each of the top 12 issues to address for the City of Monash ‘at the moment’, with a comparison to the overall satisfaction score of all respondents (7.3), as well as a comparison to the 221 respondents who did not nominate any issues to address (7.5)

The detailed analysis of the top issues to address in the City of Monash “at the moment” is discussed in the [Current Issues for the City of Monash](#) section of this report.

The aim of this data is to explore the relationship between the issues nominated by respondents and their satisfaction with the Council’s overall performance.

The data does not prove a causal relationship between the issue and satisfaction with Council’s overall performance but does provide meaningful insight into whether these issues are likely to be exerting a positive or negative influence on these respondents’ satisfaction with Council’s overall performance.

Clearly the number of respondents nominating each of these 12 issues varied substantially, which is reflected in the size of the blue vertical bars (the 95% confidence interval).

Metropolis Research notes that 221 respondents (28% of the total sample) did not have any issues they felt needed to be addressed ‘at the moment’ for the City of Monash. Naturally, these respondents were significantly more satisfied than respondents who did nominate issues to address, and they rated satisfaction with Council’s overall performance four percent higher than the municipal average at 7.5 out of 10.

There were clearly three issues that dominated the results this year, those being traffic management (105 respondents), car parking (101 respondents), and rubbish and waste issues (91 respondents).

The respondents who nominated traffic management and car parking were somewhat (1.5%) less satisfied with Council’s overall performance than the municipal average, which again this year does suggest that these two major issues exerted a somewhat negative influence on satisfaction for the respondents who nominated them. The impact of these issues on overall satisfaction was mostly around the number of respondents nominating the issues, rather than the strength of the negative influence on their overall satisfaction with Council.

The 91 respondents who nominated rubbish and waste issues this year were, on average, four percent less satisfied with Council’s overall performance, similar to the result recorded last year (3.8% lower this year compared to 3.3% less satisfied last year).

This result shows that the size of the Monash community who have concerns around rubbish and waste issues (including mostly the kerbside collection services) has diminished somewhat, down from 17% last year to 11% this year. Whilst the size of this group in the community has diminished, those in the community who remain concerned about rubbish and waste issues continue to report lower satisfaction with Council’s overall performance than the municipal average.




Other issues that appeared to exert a negative influence on satisfaction with Council’s overall performance for the respondents nominating them included roads and roadworks, drains, lighting, planning and development, and most notably, footpaths.

It is noted that the 31 respondents who nominated footpath related issues this year were, on average, 12% less satisfied with Council’s overall performance than the municipal average. Metropolis Research suggests that this unusually strong influence on satisfaction may reflect, at least in part, the impact of the storms that occurred in parts of Monash City Council during the survey period.

Interestingly, however, it is noted that the 25 respondents who nominated storm damage related issues rated overall satisfaction at 7.5 out of 10, or somewhat higher than the municipal average. This was an unexpected result, and although caution should be exercised given the small sample size, it does suggest that relatively few in the community were dissatisfied with Council’s overall performance as a result of the storm.

Metropolis Research notes that these issues typically all exert a negative influence on satisfaction for the respondents who nominate them.



The following table provides an alternative method of exploring the relationship between the issues to address for the City of Monash and satisfaction with Council’s overall performance.

The table displays the proportion of respondents who were “dissatisfied” with Council’s overall performance who nominated each of the top 12 issues, compared to the proportion of all respondents who nominated each issue.

This table shows that respondents who were “dissatisfied” with Council’s overall performance were notably more likely to nominate traffic management (21% compared to 13%), road related issues (13% compared to 6%), footpath issues (13% compared to 4%), although it is important to bear in mind the small sample of just 39 respondents who were “dissatisfied”.



Top issues for Monash of respondents' dissatisfied with overall performance

Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey

(Number and percent of total respondents who dissatisfied with overall performance)

<i>Issue</i>	<i>Dissatisfied respondents</i>		<i>All respondents</i>
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	
Traffic management	8	21%	13%
Roads maintenance and repairs	5	13%	6%
Footpath repairs and maintenance	5	13%	4%
Parks, gardens and open space	3	8%	6%
Communication, consultation, provision of information	3	8%	2%
Building, planning, housing and development	3	8%	7%
Safety, policing and crime	3	8%	4%
Rubbish and waste issues inc. garbage	3	8%	11%
Parking	2	5%	13%
Cleanliness and maintenance of area	2	5%	1%
Lighting	2	5%	4%
Financial issues and priorities for Council	2	5%	1%
All other issues <i>(12 separately identified issues)</i>	27	69%	59%
Total responses	68		1,034
<i>Respondents identifying at least one issue (percent of total respondents)</i>	<i>30 (78%)</i>		<i>553 (69%)</i>

Overall satisfaction of respondents dissatisfied with services and facilities:

The following graph provides the average satisfaction with the Council’s overall performance of respondents dissatisfied with individual services and facilities.

Services and facilities with fewer than 10 dissatisfied respondents have been excluded.

It is important to bear in mind that for many of these services, there were relatively few dissatisfied respondents (an average of approximately 44 dissatisfied respondents), hence the relatively large 95% confidence interval around these results.

Attention is drawn to the fact that respondents who were dissatisfied with individual services and facilities were also, on average, measurably and significantly less satisfied with Council’s overall performance than the municipal average of all respondents (7.3).


It is also acknowledged that a relatively small sample of respondents were dissatisfied with most core services and facilities, with a significant degree of overlap between services. In other words, respondents who were dissatisfied with one service were likely to be dissatisfied with several, and they were also measurably less satisfied with Council’s overall performance.



The services and facilities that appear to be most strongly associated with lower overall satisfaction this year were the *Monash Bulletin*, environmental sustainability, and parks, gardens, and reserves. Respondents who were dissatisfied with any of these, on average, rated satisfaction with Council’s overall performance at “very poor” levels.

This reflects the fact that some (a small number) of respondents were dissatisfied with Council’s performance, and this tended to influence their satisfaction ratings for many, if not all, services and facilities included in the survey.

The opposite is also true for many respondents who tended to provide the same satisfaction rating for many, if not all, services, and facilities. This again reflects the fact that these respondents tended to see Council performance as being generally consistent across the full range of services and facilities provided by Council.



Improvements to Council’s overall performance

Respondents were asked:

“If overall satisfaction less than 6, what does Council most need to do to improve its performance?”

There were 85 comments received from respondents who were not satisfied with Council’s overall performance, outlining the improvements that they would like to see to improve their satisfaction with Council’s overall performance.



The most common responses provided by respondents related to improvements to Council’s management, governance, and responsiveness (19 comments), communication and consultation (15 comments), and generally negative comments (11 comments).

Desired Improvements to Council's overall performance
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
(Number of responses)

<i>Reason</i>	<i>Number</i>
<i>Council management, governance, and responsiveness</i>	
Act on stuff really quick such as trees falling on people houses	1
Be more responsive, take notice of problems	1
Because they are more worried about revenue and less worried about the access of facilities to public. Council should be people’s person. They should be working with humanity not greed	1
Council needs to be more representative of the community	1
Council needs to be more responsible	1
Focus only on business of roads and public facilities and don't interfere in other politics	1
Just solve things quicker	1
Let the State Government control and get rid of Council	1
No reason, I don't like their performance	1
Not responsible enough	1
Not satisfied with the transparency about programs for seniors	1
Proper representation from the Council side	1
Respond within timelines for requests	1
Stop getting involved in the political things	1
They are corrupt and only care about money	1
They have to listen to people on what they need e.g. cars parked in front of our driveway and we complained to Council, and they did nothing	1
They need to attend to essential community needs	1
They seem to be working for authoritarian agenda and not for the rate payer	1
We should not have to fight the Council to be able to have something done. There should be a easy way of doing things	1
Total	19

<i>Communication</i>	
Listen to the community more	2
Need to engage more with the people	2
Their communication with the community is not good	2
Advocate for an ambassador for certain issues	1
Council doesn't want to know what problems there are	1
Haven't heard anything from Council	1
Listen to people's complaints	1
Listen to the community more and provide frequent updates	1
Talk to the rate payers more about issues or local issues	1
They should improve their call centre people. They should give better base level training to them	1



They should speak more with people and more consulting with people. There is no engagement with the community	1
You don't hear from Council at all, you don't see them anywhere	1
Total	15

General negative

Could do more overall	1
Council is not doing anything; country is good but not carrying forward the legacy	1
Dealt with Council and they make everything hard, useless rules, don't fix things due to them being pedantic about their rules	1
Everything, Council just needs to actually do more things in general	1
I just don't like them	1
Improvement needed in areas which I gave low ratings	1
Not satisfied with the performance of the Council	1
The Council does not bother about the people	1
The Council does perform but not enough	1
They don't work hard enough to deserve our tax that we paid each year	1
Worst people useless	1
Total	11

Rates and financial management

Need proper regulation and management when fining residents	1
Need to look at the rates	1
Don't waste money on other stuff, focus on the basics	1
Not happy with Council all rates went up not getting services for which I pay, all they are doing is garden, rest is all garbage	1
The Council needs to improve its performance	1
There is no value for high rates	1
They need to revisit their strategies of waste and everything. Appropriation of hard funds need to be reviewed	1
Total	7

Waste management

Bin collection should be as before, by increasing size of red bin and collection should be weekly	1
Garbage collection	1
General waste collection needs to be done regularly	1
Needs to focus on rubbish	1
Take garbage bins every week	1
Waste collection mostly across Monash City	1
Total	6



<i>Council services and facilities</i>	
For young family the service isn't for us but for older generation mainly	1
Just do the basics, maintain the roads get the bins, stay out of our thoughts	1
Less money talk and more community help	1
Needs to focus on libraries	1
They need to focus on social needs of the community	1
Total	5
<i>Roads and traffic management</i>	
Could do more on road rules	1
Needs to focus on roads	1
Traffic and parking permits need improvement	1
We have been here for ten years and have seen a lot of changes like increase in traffic and we are not happy	1
Wellington Rd was falling apart and took a long time to address it	1
Total	5
<i>Cleanliness and maintenance of area</i>	
Cleaning streets needs improvement	1
Could do more cleaning	1
Need to be better at maintaining the area in Oakleigh	1
Total	3
<i>Parking</i>	
Could do more for parking	1
They should address people's concerns on parking near metros	1
Total	2
<i>Parks, gardens and playgrounds</i>	
Needs to focus on parks	1
Needs to focus on playgrounds	1
Total	2
<i>Planning, development, and housing</i>	
Stop the overdevelopment	1
A lot of changes like increase in population and we are not happy	1
Total	2



<i>Trees</i>	
Tree trimming in private property	1
Trees needs to be maintained regularly	1
Total	2
<i>Public transport</i>	
They need to lobby for public transport	1
Total	1
<i>Other</i>	
Basically, the vegetation overlay should be in place	1
Frequency	1
They don't look after Mulgrave. They haven't done anything here	1
They need to be more consistent with abandoned properties, especially the property in Police Rd, it's unsafe and unsightly, they should demolish it	1
They should have some facilities for international students	1
Total	5
Total	85

Governance and leadership

Respondents were asked:

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

Respondents were again in 2024, asked to rate their satisfaction with five core aspects of Council’s governance and leadership performance.


Satisfaction with four of these five measures of governance and leadership remained stable this year, with satisfaction with community consultation and engagement declining marginally (down 1%) to 7.1 out of 10.

Consistent with the results recorded last year, satisfaction with governance and leadership has recovered approximately half of the ground lost from the pre-pandemic average from 2016 through 2020 of 7.3, up from the average over 2021 and 2022 of 7.0, to an average of 7.1 this year.

By way of comparison, the average satisfaction with these five aspects of governance and leadership for the City of Monash was identical to the eastern region councils’ average of 7.1, and one percent higher than the metropolitan Melbourne average of 7.0 out of 10.




Satisfaction with selected aspects of governance and leadership
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
scale from 0 (very dissatisfied) to 10 (very satisfied)



The following graph provides a breakdown of these results into the proportion of respondents (who provided a score) who were “very satisfied” (i.e., rated satisfaction at eight or more), those who were “neutral to somewhat satisfied” (i.e., rated satisfaction at between five and seven), and those who were “dissatisfied” (i.e., rated satisfaction at less than five out of 10).

A little less than half of the respondents providing a score were “very satisfied” with each aspect, whilst no more than seven percent were “dissatisfied”.




The following graphs provide a comparison of satisfaction with these five aspects of governance and leadership against the eastern region councils and the metropolitan Melbourne average, both as recorded in the 2024 *Governing Melbourne* research.

Governing Melbourne was conducted independently by Metropolis Research in January 2024, using the same in-person, door-to-door methodology.

The average satisfaction with governance and leadership has remained consistent with both the eastern region councils’ and the metropolitan Melbourne results.

It is noted that the City of Monash did not experience the decline in satisfaction with governance and leadership in 2022 to the same extent as the metropolitan average.

Average satisfaction with governance and leadership
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
scale from 0 (very dissatisfied) to 10 (very satisfied)



Respondents in the City of Monash were marginally more satisfied than the metropolitan Melbourne average with maintaining community trust and confidence; representation, lobbying, and advocacy; and making decisions in the interests of the community. City of Monash respondents reported the same satisfaction with responsiveness to local community needs as the metropolitan Melbourne average.


Satisfaction with community consultation and engagement was marginally (1.5%) lower in the City of Monash than the metropolitan Melbourne average.

These results reflect a stable level of satisfaction with Council’s governance and leadership performance, in line with the metropolitan Melbourne average.

Metropolis Research notes that satisfaction with core aspects of governance and leadership can vary across metropolitan Melbourne, generally reflecting moments of lower-than-average performance in individual municipalities in individual years.



It is, in the experience of Metropolis Research, unusual for municipalities to significantly over-perform the metropolitan Melbourne average in terms of their governance and leadership performance. This was, however, the situation for the City of Monash from 2016 to 2018, although in recent years, satisfaction has been similar to the metropolitan average.




Community consultation and engagement

Satisfaction with Council’s community consultation and engagement declined marginally, but not measurably this year, down one percent to 7.1 out of 10, although it remains at a “good” level of satisfaction.

This result was marginally below the long-term average since 2016 of 7.2 out of 10, or “good”, and was marginally below the metropolitan Melbourne average of 7.2.


This result was comprised of 42% “very satisfied” and six percent “dissatisfied” respondents.






Whilst there was no statistically significant variation in satisfaction with community consultation and engagement observed across the municipality, it is noted that respondents from Chadstone were notably more satisfied than average and at a “very good” level.

By contrast, 10 respondents from Notting Hill were notably less satisfied than average, and at a “solid” rather than a “good” level of satisfaction.



There was notable and measurable variation in satisfaction with this aspect of performance observed by respondent profile. Young adults (aged 18 to 34 years) were notably, and senior citizens (aged 75 years and over) were measurably more satisfied than average, and both at “very good” levels, whilst older adults (aged 60 to 74 years) were measurably less satisfied.

Female respondents were notably more satisfied than male respondents.



Preferred consultation topics / issues

Respondents dissatisfied with community consultation and engagement were asked:

“What do you wish Council would ask you about?”

There were 68 comments received from respondents outlining the issues that respondents would like Council to ask them about.

Whilst there were a small number of respondents who nominated issues with planning and development (6 comments), waste management (6 comments), parks and gardens (3 comments), it is noted that the majority of comments were relatively general in nature and referred to a range of ways in which Council could better engage with the community.



Preferred consultation topics / issues
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
 (Number of responses)

Reason	Number
<i>General lack of communication, consultation, and responsiveness</i>	
Because I feel like there is lack of communication. I don't know where to get engaged. There is no orientation about local policies	5
They don't do anything / haven't done much	5
Haven't been engaged, the bulletin is not enough we need to be invited to engagement	4
The Council should interact more with residents	4
There are not any face-to-face meetings. They just want money	2
I don't take much consultation from them. You have to go find them	1
I don't think they listen	1
I had a bad experience with Council, we made numerous complaints, and nothing happened	1
I had contacted the Council multiple times over 5 years period before something happened. They haven't answered very often	1
Maybe mail people or something because I don't know anything that the Council is doing	1
Not many feedback opportunities, this survey is also just once per year	1
Their strategy and vision should be shared more	1
They blocked Clyde St many times without informing which is frustrating	1
They do consultation which you never know what the outcome is or how my contribution influenced it	1
They should have an open-door policy for people who are immigrants, and they should allow them to come inside and have information	1
Things that concern the residents and haven't really heard from the Council about them	1
Try to take action and listen to the community	1
We don't know what the facilities are	1
Total	28
<i>Council services and facilities</i>	
I want them to spend more money on doing things instead of on the asking, for instance on graffiti removal	1
Need more details about services	1
Ravenswood Ct isn't receiving the magazine from the Council	1
They got to improve the public transport as we get older	1
They haven't done anything with the hanging and falling branches in front of the house after contacting them	1
We don't get the gazette like before	1
Total	6



Planning and development

About building houses and development	3
I am not happy with the new development of the library in Glen Waverley	1
I think they should have consulted us about the new precinct. No heads up at all to us. They have a responsibility	1
We should give the building permits back to Council. It should be maintained by the Council. The standard of building has dropped massively	1
Total	6

Waste management

About the bins, general waste. Any changes that affect people	1
Any decision that affects my house like increase in our rates, annual hard rubbish, and garbage collection frequency	1
Neighbours are taking rubbish bins in front of our curb, where Council said rubbish needs to be picked up. So, in general rubbish collection	1
No consultation on the bin request	1
Sensible things, fix the rubbish collection	1
When we called for hard rubbish, they didn't care and asked for more money	1
Total	6

Parks, gardens, trees

Fix the trees in the nature strip	1
Too green	1
Trees, they can be more forward thinking with environmental things	1
Total	3

Parking

Parking should be asked from community. Parking around schools is awful	1
School parking	1
Total	2

Sports and Recreation

The Council has kicked out the tennis club members from the Monash Club for the football club. This is disheartening to us. No one responds in the Council. They don't care	1
They should engage more with the community about events for residents	1
Total	2

Roads

Major road works in the local area, especially digging up Stephenson Rd	1
Total	1



<i>Traffic management</i>	
Traffic management should be asked from community	1
Total	1
<i>Other</i>	
Council should work properly	1
Don't care	1
First time answering a survey	1
I think it is not putting revenue ahead of community needs. Thinking more about what the community's future needs are, need more thought on that	1
The attitude of Councillors is not great and needs check	1
There is nothing from them only confusion	1
They don't care about the people	1
They don't do anything they just say I hate them	1
They don't give any solution to my problem	1
They should be made more aware of demographics in an area. There should be more consulting for young kids	1
They should care more	1
They should engage more with major decisions	1
You go to the doctors, they are full. You got to have some doctors close to Wayne Ct	1
Total	13
Total responses	68




Representation, lobbying and advocacy:

Satisfaction with Council’s representation, lobbying, and advocacy performance remained stable this year at 7.1 out of 10, which was a “good” level of satisfaction.

This result was consistent with long-term average since 2016 of 7.1 out of 10, or “good”, and was somewhat higher than the metropolitan Melbourne average of 6.9.

This result was comprised of 48% “very satisfied” and six percent “dissatisfied” respondents.

Satisfaction with Council's representation, lobbying and advocacy
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
scale from 0 (very dissatisfied) to 10 (very satisfied)




There was some measurable and some notable variation in satisfaction with representation, lobbying, and advocacy observed across the municipality.


Respondents from Chadstone were measurably and respondents from Wheelers Hill were notably more satisfied than average, and both at “very good” levels of satisfaction.

The 30 respondents from Oakleigh East, however, were notably less satisfied than average and at a “solid” rather than “good” level of satisfaction.





There was no statistically significant variation in satisfaction with this aspect of performance observed by respondent profile, although it is noted that older adults (aged 60 to 74 years) were notably less satisfied than average, although still at a “good” level of satisfaction.




Responsiveness of Council to local community needs:

Satisfaction with the responsiveness of Council to local community needs remained stable this year at 7.0 out of 10, which was a “good” level of satisfaction.

This result was somewhat lower than the long-term average since 2016 of 7.2 out of 10, or “good”, and was identical to the metropolitan Melbourne and eastern region councils’ averages of 7.0.

This result was comprised of 49% “very satisfied” and seven percent “dissatisfied” respondents.


Satisfaction with the responsiveness of Council to local community needs
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
scale from 0 (very dissatisfied) to 10 (very satisfied)




There was measurable and notable variation in satisfaction with the responsiveness of Council to local community needs observed across the municipality.

Ther 32 respondents from Chadstone were measurably more satisfied than average and at a “very good” level of satisfaction, whilst the 26 respondents from Hughesdale and the 34 respondents from Oakleigh East were notably less satisfied than average, although still at “good” levels of satisfaction.





There was no statistically significant variation in this result observed by respondent profile, although it is noted that older adults (aged 60 to 74 years) were notably less satisfied than average, although still at a “good” level of satisfaction.




Maintaining trust and confidence of local community

Satisfaction with Council’s performance maintaining the trust and confidence of the local community remained stable this year at 7.1 out of 10, which was a “good” level of satisfaction.

This result was marginally lower than the long-term average since 2016 of 7.2 out of 10, or “good”, but was marginally higher than the metropolitan Melbourne and eastern region councils’ averages of 7.0.

This result was comprised of 49% “very satisfied” and seven percent “dissatisfied” respondents.

Satisfaction with Council maintaining community trust and confidence
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
scale from 0 (very dissatisfied) to 10 (very satisfied)




There was no statistically significant variation in satisfaction with Council’s performance maintaining the trust and confidence of the local community observed across the municipality.


It is noted, however, that 31 respondents from Chadstone and 11 respondents from Notting Hill were notably more satisfied than average, and at “very good” levels of satisfaction.

The 29 respondents from Oakleigh, the 26 respondents from Hughesdale, and 34 respondents from Oakleigh East were notably less satisfied than average. Respondents from Oakleigh rated satisfaction at a “solid” rather than a “good” level of satisfaction.





There was notable and measurable variation in satisfaction observed by respondent profile. Young adults (aged 18 to 34 years) and senior citizens (aged 75 years and over) were notably more satisfied than average and at “very good” levels, whilst older adults (aged 60 to 74 years) were measurably less satisfied, although still at a “good” level. Respondents from multilingual households were notably more satisfied than respondents from English speaking households, and at a “very good” rather than a “good” level of satisfaction.




Making decisions in the interests of the community

Satisfaction with Council’s performance making decisions in the interests of the community remained stable this year at 7.1 out of 10, which was a “good” level of satisfaction.

This result was marginally lower than the long-term average since 2016 of 7.2 out of 10, or “good”, but was somewhat higher than the metropolitan Melbourne and eastern region councils’ averages of 6.9.

This result was comprised of 45% “very satisfied” and seven percent “dissatisfied” respondents.




There was no statistically significant variation in satisfaction with Council’s performance making decisions in the interests of the community observed across the municipality.


It is noted, however, that 31 respondents from Chadstone were notably more satisfied than average, and at “very good” levels of satisfaction.

The 31 respondents from Oakleigh, the 26 respondents from Hughesdale, and 34 respondents from Oakleigh East were notably less satisfied than average, although still at “good” levels of satisfaction.





There was notable and measurable variation in satisfaction observed by respondent profile. Young adults (aged 18 to 34 years) were measurably, and senior citizens (aged 75 years and over) were notably more satisfied than average and at “very good” levels, whilst older adults (aged 60 to 74 years) were measurably less satisfied, although still at a “good” level.



Contact with Council

Contact with Council in the last 12 months:

Respondents were asked:

“Have you had any contact with Monash City Council in the last 12 months?”

Consistent with the historical results, one-quarter of respondents in 2024 reported that they had contacted Council in the last 12 months.

It is noted that through the pandemic years of 2021 and 2022, there were more respondents contacting Council than pre-pandemic. Metropolis Research notes that this was observed across several municipalities in Victoria through the pandemic, with many councils now showing a return to pre-pandemic levels of contact with Council.

Contacted Council in the last twelve months
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
(Number and percent of respondents providing a response)

Response	2024		2023	2022	2021	2020	2019
	Number	Percent					
Yes	203	25%	27%	38%	30%	26%	24%
No	596	75%	73%	62%	70%	74%	76%
Not stated	2		0	6	1	0	9
Total	801	100%	815	800	801	805	805

Satisfaction with Council’s customer service:

Respondents who had contacted Council were asked:

“On a scale of 0 (lowest) to 10 (highest), how satisfied were you with the following aspects of service when you last had contact with the Monash City Council?”

The 203 respondents who reported that they had contacted Council in the last 12 months were asked to rate their satisfaction with seven aspects of customer service, as outlined in the following graphs.

The average satisfaction with these seven aspects of customer service declined notably this year, down five percent to 7.2 out of 10.

Metropolis Research notes that customer service was the only area of Council performance that recorded a decline in average satisfaction this year. It is important to bear in mind, however, that satisfaction with customer service remains broadly consistent with overall satisfaction with Council.



This was a “good”, down from a “very good” level of satisfaction and was five percent below the long-term average satisfaction with customer service over the eight years of the survey program.

Metropolis Research notes that over the eight years of the survey program, satisfaction with customer service has trended lower over time. From an average of 7.9 out of 10 from 2016 to 2019, and 7.5 from 2020 to 2022, to an average of 7.4 for the last two years (2023 and 2024).


Whilst there was no additional insight into the reasons behind the decline in satisfaction with customer service observed elsewhere in the survey this year, Metropolis Research does note that a substantial minority of respondents raised issues around street trees, footpaths, and storm management / recovery related issues as one of the top three [issues to address](#) for the City of Monash this year.

It is, in the view of Metropolis Research, likely that some of those contacting Council this year were doing so in regard to issues resulting from the storm event that occurred during the fieldwork. It is possible that dissatisfaction with issues such as the speed of Council cleaning and recovery from storm damage, particularly street trees, may well have been a factor in lower satisfaction with aspects of customer service such as the speed of service.

By way of comparison, this result was two percent below the metropolitan Melbourne average satisfaction with the same seven aspects of customer service of 7.4 out of 10, as recorded in the 2024 *Governing Melbourne* research.

It is noted that satisfaction with customer service was notably lower in the City of Monash than the eastern region councils’ average of 7.9 out of 10 this year, although it is noted that the eastern region councils’ average has varied somewhat from year to year.


Average satisfaction with aspects of customer service
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
scale from 0 (very dissatisfied) to 10 (very satisfied)



There was a decline in satisfaction with each of the seven aspects of customer service, although none of these declines were statistically significant.

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

- **Excellent** – for staff understanding language needs (of respondents from multilingual households only).
- **Very Good** – for the courtesy of service (down from “excellent”).
- **Good** – for access to relevant officer / area (down from “very good”), general reception, the provision of information, care and attention to enquiry, and the speed of service.




The following graph provides a breakdown of these results into the proportion of respondents (who provided a score) who were “very satisfied” (i.e., rated satisfaction at eight or more), those who were “neutral to somewhat satisfied” (i.e., rated satisfaction at between five and seven), and those who were “dissatisfied” (i.e., rated satisfaction at less than five out of 10).

Metropolis Research notes that despite the five percent decline in average satisfaction with customer service recorded this year, more than half of the respondents providing a score were “very satisfied” with each of the seven aspects.

Of particular note is the 75% of the respondents from multilingual households who were “very satisfied” with Council staff understanding of their language needs.


It is, however, noted that there was a small increase in the proportion of respondents “dissatisfied” with each of the seven aspects of customer service, with 21% “dissatisfied” with the speed of service, and 20% “dissatisfied” with the care and attention to enquiry.






The following graph provides a comparison of satisfaction with each of these seven aspects of customer service against the metropolitan Melbourne results, as recorded in the 2024 *Governing Melbourne* research. *Governing Melbourne* was conducted independently by Metropolis Research in January 2024, using the same in-person, door-to-door methodology.

Metropolis Research notes that, with the exception of satisfaction with staff understanding of language needs, satisfaction with the six other aspects of customer service was marginally lower in the City of Monash than the metropolitan Melbourne average.




General reception

Satisfaction with general reception declined notably, but not measurably this year, down eight percent to 7.1 out of 10. This was a “good”, down from a “very good” level of satisfaction and was notably below the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 7.7 out of 10. This result was comprised of 60% “very satisfied” and 16% (up from 8%) “dissatisfied”.




Whilst there was no statistically significant variation in satisfaction with general reception observed by respondent profile, it is noted that adults aged 35 to 44 years were the most satisfied and at an “excellent” level.




Care and attention to your enquiry

Satisfaction with care and attention to enquiry declined notably this year, down six percent to 6.9, which was a “good”, down from a “very good” level. This result was notably below the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 7.4 out of 10, or “very good”. This result was comprised of 53% “very satisfied” (down from 61%) and 20% (up from 11%) “dissatisfied”.




Whilst there was no statistically significant variation in satisfaction observed by respondent profile, it is noted that adults (aged 35 to 44 years) rated satisfaction at a “very good” level, whilst senior citizens (aged 75 years and over) were the least satisfied and at a “solid” level.




Provision of information on the Council and its services

Satisfaction with the provision of information on the Council and its services declined notably this year, down six percent to 7.0 out of 10, or a “good”, down from a “very good” level. This result was notably below the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 7.4, or “very good”. This was comprised of 53% “very satisfied” (down from 64%) and 16% (up from 8%) “dissatisfied”.




Whilst there was no statistically significant variation in satisfaction observed by respondent profile, it is noted that adults (aged 35 to 44 years) rated satisfaction at an “excellent” level.



Speed of service

Satisfaction with the speed of service declined somewhat this year, down five percent to 6.7 out of 10, although it remains at a “good” level. This result was somewhat below the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 7.0.


This result was comprised of 55% “very satisfied” (up from 53%) and 21% (up from 14%) “dissatisfied” respondents.



Whilst there was no statistically significant variation in satisfaction with the speed of service observed by respondent profile, it is noted that adults (aged 35 to 44 years) were the most satisfied and at a “very good” level, whilst middle-aged adults (aged 45 to 59 years) and senior citizens (aged 75 years and over) rated satisfaction at “solid” levels.

It is also noted that female respondents were notably more satisfied than males, and respondents from multilingual households were notably more satisfied than respondents from English speaking households.







Courtesy of service

Satisfaction with courtesy of service declined notably this year, down six percent to 7.4 out of 10, which was a “very good”, down from an “excellent” level of satisfaction. This result was notably below the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 7.8 out of 10, or “excellent”.

This result was comprised of 63% “very satisfied” respondents and 12% (up from 8%) “dissatisfied” respondents.



Whilst there was no statistically significant variation in this result observed by respondent profile, it is noted that middle-aged adults (aged 45 to 59 years) were the least satisfied, and at a “good” level.




Access to relevant officer / area

Satisfaction with access to relevant officer / area declined somewhat this year, down three percent to 7.2 out of 10, which was a “good”, down from a “very good” level of satisfaction.


This result was somewhat below the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 7.5 out of 10, or “very good”.

This result was comprised of 61% “very satisfied” respondents and 17% (up from 8%) “dissatisfied” respondents.





There was no statistically significant variation in satisfaction with access to relevant officer or area observed by respondent profile.




Staff’s understanding of your language needs

Satisfaction with staff understanding language needs (of respondents from multilingual households only) declined notably this year, down five percent to 8.2 out of 10, which remains an “excellent” level of satisfaction.


This result was somewhat below the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 8.5 out of 10, or “excellent”.

This result was comprised of 75% “very satisfied” respondents and seven percent (up from 4%) “dissatisfied” respondents.



There was no statistically significant variation in satisfaction with staff understanding language needs observed by respondent profile.





Reason for dissatisfaction with selected aspects of customer service

The following table outlines the 61 comments received from respondents dissatisfied with aspects of customer service this year.

The majority of these comments related to the perception that requests and complaints were poorly actioned or remained unresolved (17 comments), the perception of slow or no response (17 comments), and the perception of poor communication or a lack of information (8 comments).

Reasons for dissatisfaction with selected aspects of customer service
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
(Number of responses)

Reason	Number
<i>Requests / complaints poorly actioned / unresolved</i>	
Because I specifically asked about the trees in front of my house. There are overhanging power lines inside my property, they did not understand my issues. They just checked along the road and said everything is fine. So, the issue was not addressed	1
I asked two things, but none of them have been into action yet. Streetlights and to fit speed bumps to reduce traffic	1
I fall because of uneven footpath which the Council did, and they refused to compensate me for it and kept on wasting my time with their procedure	1
I have informed regarding the streetlight at the park near waterfall close to my house. I requested them to repair the public property and make it useful for people at night for the safety. They haven't responded	1



Just unsatisfactory service	1
Still waiting for a new bin, as mine was stolen	1
The Council does not respond adequately for service needs, I've been waiting 15 months to replace tree in the nature strip, there is barely any communication	1
The request for speed bump has not been done	1
There are lot of cars parked on Winbourne Rd during weekdays, I complained but no action was taken	1
They didn't resolve the issue and didn't provide me proper information	1
They didn't understand the issue and didn't bother to investigate it	1
They do nothing with the query	1
They don't care about the situation and no solution to the problem	1
They have not done anything with the issue I rang up about, the house was very dirty and not well kept and could encourage rats near a children's park	1
They haven't cleared the tree branch from the road that I had complained about	1
We had to wait, and we don't know the outcome and what happened	1
We were told that a pathway through a local park would be built over a year ago and this is yet to be done. Unfortunately, there have been more troublesome gum trees planted but there is a lack of care with the grass cutting and still no path. This is a safety issue when walking through	1
Total	17

Slow / no response

It was too slow	2
They haven't responded to my issues	2
Because they took 2.5 months to reply to the email	1
Council don't want to be incorrect and are vague in their answers. We want straight forward answers, but they go around, and we spend a lot of time. Takes a while to come to planning decisions. Takes months to give an answer. Not a lot of information online. Lot of delegation. Lot of grey areas	1
It hasn't happened yet	1
The gas company came here they did their work but didn't fix the property properly, so I contacted them, but they didn't respond	1
The response wasn't great	1
They are not speedy to fix the issues, parking officers and policing regulation don't come here often, they don't bother near this street and Wellington Secondary School	1
They are slow to respond and struggle to understand exactly what I'm inquiring about - I asked the Council to fetch some documents to sell a property and they said they can only access the documents if they are in the office. They were just overall very vague and didn't give me a valid reason as to why they couldn't access the documents in the office	1
They haven't done anything about my issue with low quality soil	1
They haven't proactively responded to my enquires on development approvals	1
They took a long time to do a lot of things like pruning trees near Browning Dr, I had to call them 5 times	1
They were slow in providing information	1
Took them 5 days to complete the task of collecting bin	1
We had to wait a lot for our issues to be resolved	1
Total	17



Poor communication, information, and consultation

Hard to get information in general, being passed around and never giving me a solid answer	1
Holiday time, they were off hand, not interested	1
I don't think they took my complaint that seriously	1
It was about town planning and my neighbours do not have frosted windows, but I have frosted windows. So, they did not answer me properly	1
My call was not received on time	1
The Council never listens to my complaints	1
They didn't let me talk to the right person and they didn't listen very well	1
We contacted them for some enquiry regarding regulations and they didn't tell us properly what to do	1
Total	8

Difficulty accessing relevant officer / department

Council were not aware of relevant officer to deal with specific issue and recommended us to wrong department. We had to wait a lot during our visit to Council office	1
Hard to find the right person to talk to. I had called about the building permit in the area	1
It was hard to get hold of the person to explain the situation. It was about the bin not emptied. They could not provide the relevant officer to solve the issue	1
Wasn't given a relevant officer to follow up	1
You don't get past the receptionist with any enquiries	1
Total	5

Difficulty in contacting / accessing Council

Hard to get to	1
It is very hard to contact them	1
Nobody picked up the bins and nobody answered after calling several times	1
Total	3

Lack of support / help from Council

They are unhelpful. They didn't listen to the problem. They are very dismissive	1
They weren't helpful, the bins are full, and they skip the house sometimes and the bin doesn't get emptied, two weeks for emptying the red bin is not ideal	1
We asked them to come and remove the branches, the attitude was 'can't you just do it yourself'. We got a different response to our neighbour for the same request, ours didn't get through	1
Total	3



<i>General negative</i>	
They are not customer focused. They are more focused on their policies	1
They are useless and c**p	1
Total	2
<i>Rude staff</i>	
I had someone on the phone that was making comments which were not good and should not have been made	1
Total	1
<i>Other</i>	
Because the issue was from contractors' fault so there was a delay	1
I have a business complex in Monash leased to other business. I have a hoarding Board from 70 years. They asked me to pay 1200 dollars to renew. But later they asked me to pull it down because they said it was detrimental	1
The building development in the neighbourhood house is bad and very close without any boundaries in between	1
Their parking permit policy, not the person	1
Wrongfully fined when there wasn't any specific issue	1
Total	5
Total	61



Importance of and satisfaction with Council services

Respondents were asked:

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

The annual community survey in 2024, included importance of and satisfaction scores for 28 Council provides services and facilities.

Importance of Council services and facilities

The average importance of the 28 included services and facilities increased somewhat this year, up 3.5% to 8.8 out of 10.

Of these 28 services and facilities, 27 were included in the *Governing Melbourne* research conducted independently by Metropolis Research in January 2024, using the same door-to-door methodology.

The average importance of services and facilities was marginally higher in the City of Monash than the metropolitan Melbourne average (8.8 compared to 8.7).

These results confirm that the community considers all the wide range of Council services and facilities to be important, with importance varying from a “very high” 7.8 for the *Monash Bulletin* to an “extremely high” 9.3 for the regular garbage collection.

Change in importance 2022 to 2023:

Of the 28 included services and facilities, the importance of eight increased somewhat this year, and the importance of 20 declined somewhat, with attention drawn to the following:

- ***Notably more important in 2024 than in 2023*** – included animal management (up 5%), provision of parking facilities (up 4%), recreation and aquatic centres (up 4%), provision and maintenance of street trees (up 4%), public toilets (up 4%), and Council run activities for young people (up 4%).
- ***Notably less important in 2024 than in 2023*** – included there were no services or facilities to record a decline in importance this year.

Variation in importance from the metropolitan Melbourne average:

Of the 27 services and facilities included in both the City of Monash survey and *Governing Melbourne*, 14 were somewhat more important in the City of Monash, five reported identical importance, and eight were somewhat less important, as follows:



- **Notably more important in the City of Monash than metro. average** – included the regular green waste collection (4% more important in Monash).
- **Notably less important in the City of Monash than metro. average** – included parking enforcement (4% less important in Monash), and the *Monash Bulletin* (4% less important).

Importance of selected Council services and facilities
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
 (Number and index score scale 0 - 10)

	Service/facility	Number	2024			2023	2022	2024 Metro.*
			Lower	Mean	Upper			
Higher than average	Regular garbage collection	793	9.3	9.3	9.4	9.1	9.2	9.1
	Regular green waste collection	793	9.1	9.2	9.3	8.9	9.0	8.9
	Regular recycling service	788	9.1	9.1	9.2	8.9	9.0	9.1
	Hard rubbish collection	782	9.0	9.1	9.1	8.8	9.0	8.9
Average importance	Public toilets	761	8.9	9.0	9.1	8.7	8.9	8.7
	Council services: older residents, activities: seniors	729	8.9	9.0	9.1	8.7	9.0	8.9
	Local library and library services	757	8.9	9.0	9.0	8.7	8.9	8.8
	Drains maintenance and repairs	780	8.8	8.9	9.0	8.6	8.5	8.8
	Provision and maintenance of street lighting	792	8.8	8.9	9.0	8.6	8.8	8.8
	Provision and maintenance of parks, gardens, reserves	781	8.8	8.9	9.0	8.7	8.9	8.9
	Council run services for children and their families	728	8.8	8.9	9.0	8.6	8.8	8.9
	The maintenance and repair of sealed local roads	796	8.8	8.9	9.0	8.8	8.6	9.0
	Footpath maintenance and repairs	792	8.8	8.9	9.0	8.7	8.5	8.8
	Sports ovals and other outdoor sporting facilities	760	8.8	8.8	8.9	8.6	8.8	8.7
	Provision and maintenance of local playgrounds	770	8.8	8.8	8.9	8.6	8.8	8.7
	Local traffic management	789	8.7	8.8	8.9	8.5	8.4	8.8
	Recreation and Aquatic Centres	747	8.7	8.8	8.9	8.5	8.8	8.6
	Provision and maintenance of street trees	788	8.7	8.8	8.9	8.5	8.6	8.7
	Provision of parking facilities	785	8.7	8.8	8.9	8.4	8.4	n.a.
	Council run programs and activities for young people	723	8.7	8.8	8.9	8.4	8.5	8.8
	Council's Waste Transfer Station	685	8.7	8.8	8.9	8.5	8.8	8.8
	Bike paths and shared pathways	757	8.6	8.7	8.8	8.4	8.7	8.6
Lower than average	Street sweeping	783	8.4	8.5	8.6	8.3	8.2	8.6
	Council's website	732	8.4	8.5	8.6	8.3	8.2	8.6
	Animal management	757	8.3	8.4	8.6	8.0	8.2	8.7
	Council activities encourage envir'm'tal sustainability	757	8.3	8.4	8.5	8.3	8.4	8.5
	Parking enforcement	775	8.0	8.2	8.3	8.0	7.6	8.5
	Council's newsletter <i>Monash Bulletin</i>	733	7.6	7.8	7.9	7.8	7.6	8.1
<i>Average importance of Council services</i>			8.7	8.8	8.9	8.5	8.6	8.7

(*) 2024 metropolitan Melbourne average from Governing Melbourne



Average importance by respondent profile

The following table provides a breakdown of the average importance of each of these services and facilities by respondent profile, including age structure, gender, and language spoken at home.

There was no statistically significant variation in the average importance of services and facilities observed by respondent profile, although some variation was observed for individual services and facilities.

Average importance of selected Council services and facilities
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
 (Number and index score scale 0 - 10)

Service/facility	Young adults	Adults	Middle-aged adults	Older adults	Senior citizens	Male	Female	English speaking	Multi-lingual
Maint. & repair of sealed local roads	8.7	9.0	9.0	8.9	8.9	8.8	8.9	8.9	8.8
Footpath maintenance and repairs	8.7	8.9	8.9	8.9	9.0	8.7	9.0	8.9	8.8
Drains maintenance and repairs	8.7	9.0	9.0	8.9	9.1	8.9	8.9	8.9	8.9
Regular garbage collection	9.2	9.4	9.4	9.4	9.4	9.3	9.4	9.3	9.3
Regular recycling service	9.0	9.3	9.2	9.1	9.2	9.1	9.2	9.2	9.1
Regular green waste collection	8.9	9.3	9.3	9.3	9.4	9.1	9.3	9.2	9.2
Street sweeping	8.4	8.7	8.5	8.6	8.6	8.4	8.6	8.5	8.5
Provision & maintenance of street lighting	8.7	9.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	8.8	8.9	8.8	9.0
Parking enforcement	8.1	8.1	8.2	8.0	8.6	8.0	8.3	8.1	8.2
Provision of parking facilities	8.7	8.8	8.7	8.9	8.9	8.7	8.9	8.7	8.8
Local traffic management	8.8	8.9	8.8	8.8	9.0	8.8	8.9	8.8	8.9
Prov. / maint. of parks, gardens, reserves	8.8	9.1	8.9	9.0	8.8	8.9	8.9	8.9	8.9
Provision and maintenance of street trees	8.7	8.9	8.8	8.8	8.9	8.7	8.9	8.8	8.8
Animal management	8.3	8.6	8.4	8.6	8.7	8.4	8.5	8.4	8.5
Activities encourage env'mental sustain.	8.3	8.7	8.3	8.3	8.3	8.3	8.4	8.3	8.5
Council's newsletter <i>Monash Bulletin</i>	7.3	8.1	7.7	8.0	8.5	7.7	7.9	7.8	7.8
Council's website	8.3	8.8	8.6	8.5	8.6	8.4	8.6	8.5	8.5
Hard rubbish collection	9.0	9.1	9.0	9.2	9.2	9.0	9.1	9.0	9.1
Council's Waste Transfer Station	8.4	9.0	8.7	9.0	9.1	8.8	8.8	8.8	8.7
Recreation and Aquatic Centres	8.7	9.0	8.7	9.0	8.9	8.8	8.8	8.8	8.8
Bike paths and shared pathways	8.5	8.9	8.6	8.9	8.8	8.7	8.7	8.8	8.7
Sports ovals / outdoor sporting facilities	8.7	9.0	8.9	8.8	9.1	8.8	8.9	8.9	8.8
Provision & maint. of local playgrounds	8.6	9.1	8.9	8.9	9.0	8.8	8.9	8.9	8.8
Public toilets	8.9	9.2	9.0	9.1	9.1	9.0	9.0	9.0	9.0
Services for children and their families	8.7	9.1	8.9	9.0	9.0	8.8	8.9	8.9	8.9
Services: older residents, activities: seniors	8.7	9.1	9.0	9.2	9.2	8.9	9.0	9.0	8.9
Local library and library services	8.7	9.1	9.0	9.0	9.1	8.9	9.0	9.0	8.9
Programs and activities for young people	8.5	9.1	8.7	8.9	8.8	8.8	8.8	8.8	8.7
<i>Average importance</i>	8.6	8.9	8.8	8.9	8.9	8.7	8.8	8.8	8.8
Total respondents	279	129	176	128	87	386	410	374	418



Satisfaction with Council services and facilities

The average satisfaction with the 28 included services and facilities remained stable this year at 7.7 out of 10, or a “very good” level of satisfaction.

This result was consistent with the long-term average satisfaction with Council services and facilities since 2016 of 7.7.

It is noted, however, that there have been a small number of changes to the list of services included in the survey from year to year, although the general level of satisfaction with Council services and facilities remains comparable over time.

This average satisfaction of 7.7 out of 10 remains marginally above the metropolitan Melbourne average, and with all services recording a “good” (3 services), “very good” (11 services), or “excellent” (14 services) scores, these results represent a strong level of satisfaction with the performance of Monash City Council providing services and facilities to the community.

Comparative satisfaction:

As outlined at the right-hand side of the main satisfaction table following, there were six services that recorded a satisfaction score measurably higher than the average of all 28 (7.7), and six that recorded a satisfaction score measurably lower than the average, as follows:

- **Measurably higher-than-average satisfaction** – included the local library and library services (12% higher), regular green waste collection (10% higher), Council services for older residents, and activities for seniors (7% higher), Council run services for children and their families (7% higher), sports ovals and other outdoor sporting facilities (6% higher), and the regular recycling service (5% higher).
- **Measurably lower-than-average satisfaction** – included public toilets (15% lower), provision and maintenance of street trees (7% lower), parking enforcement (6% lower), provision of parking facilities (5% lower), Council activities encouraging environmental sustainability (4% lower), and local traffic management (4% lower).

Comparison to the metropolitan Melbourne average

Of the 28 services and facilities included in the survey this year, 27 were also included in *Governing Melbourne* in a comparable format.

Of these 27 services and facilities, 16 recorded a higher satisfaction score in the City of Monash, three recorded identical satisfaction, and eight recorded a somewhat lower score.

Whilst most of these variations were not statistically significant, attention is drawn to the following notable variations:



- **Notably higher satisfaction in the City of Monash than metro. average** – included Council run services for children and their families (8% higher in Monash), bike paths and shared pathways (7% higher), Council services for older residents and activities for seniors (6% higher), the maintenance and repair of sealed local roads (6% higher), local library and library services (6% higher), recreation and aquatic centres (5% higher), and Council run programs and activities for young people (5% higher).
- **Notably lower satisfaction in the City of Monash than metro. average** – included public toilets (6% lower in Monash) and the provision and maintenance of street trees (4% lower).

Satisfaction with selected Council services and facilities
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
 (Number and index score scale 0 - 10)

	Service/facility	Number	2024			2023	2022	2024 Metro.*
			Lower	Mean	Upper			
Higher than average satisfaction	Local library and library services	362	8.5	8.6	8.8	8.5	8.4	8.2
	Regular green waste collection	786	8.3	8.5	8.6	8.3	8.2	8.1
	Council services: older residents, activities: seniors	85	7.9	8.2	8.5	7.7	7.8	7.7
	Council run services for children and their families	146	8.0	8.2	8.4	7.9	8.0	7.6
	Sports ovals and other outdoor sporting facilities	332	8.0	8.2	8.3	8.1	8.1	7.9
	Regular recycling service	783	8.0	8.1	8.2	7.9	7.9	8.2
Average satisfaction	Recreation and Aquatic Centres	257	7.9	8.1	8.3	8.2	8.1	7.7
	Council's Waste Transfer Station	231	7.9	8.1	8.3	8.1	7.9	7.7
	Regular garbage collection	790	7.9	8.0	8.2	7.8	8.1	8.2
	Hard rubbish collection	522	7.8	8.0	8.1	7.9	7.9	8.0
	Provision and maintenance of local playgrounds	364	7.8	8.0	8.1	8.0	8.0	7.8
	Bike paths and shared pathways	338	7.7	7.9	8.0	7.9	7.7	7.4
	Council run programs and activities for young people	83	7.4	7.9	8.3	7.7	7.6	7.5
	Provision and maintenance of parks, gardens, reserves	762	7.7	7.8	7.9	7.9	7.9	7.9
	Animal management	700	7.6	7.7	7.8	7.5	7.5	7.7
	Provision and maintenance of street lighting	782	7.5	7.7	7.8	7.5	7.5	7.5
	Council's website	300	7.5	7.7	7.8	7.8	7.4	7.6
	Drains maintenance and repairs	759	7.3	7.5	7.6	7.6	7.3	7.4
	Street sweeping	760	7.3	7.5	7.6	7.4	7.4	7.6
	Council's newsletter <i>Monash Bulletin</i>	657	7.3	7.5	7.6	7.6	7.3	7.5
	Footpath maintenance and repairs	785	7.3	7.4	7.6	7.4	7.0	7.3
	The maintenance and repair of sealed local roads	794	7.3	7.4	7.6	7.5	7.2	7.0
Lower than average satisfaction	Local traffic management	777	7.3	7.4	7.5	7.3	6.9	7.2
	Council activities encourage env'r'm'tal sustainability	684	7.2	7.4	7.5	7.4	7.1	7.6
	Provision of parking facilities	770	7.2	7.3	7.5	7.1	6.8	n.a.
	Parking enforcement	753	7.1	7.2	7.4	7.0	6.4	7.2
	Provision and maintenance of street trees	780	7.0	7.2	7.3	7.6	7.3	7.4
	Public toilets	297	6.3	6.5	6.8	6.7	6.6	6.9
<i>Average satisfaction with Council services</i>			7.6	7.7	7.9	7.7	7.5	7.57

(*) 2024 metropolitan Melbourne average from Governing Melbourne




Change in satisfaction between 2023 and 2024:

Of the 28 services and facilities included in the survey in 2024, the average satisfaction with 16 increased somewhat, remained the same for two, and declined somewhat for 10 services and facilities, with attention drawn to the following:

- **Notably higher satisfaction in 2024 than in 2023** – included Council services for older residents and activities for seniors (up 6% by 85 respondents) and Council run services for children and their families (up 4% by 146 respondents).
- **Notably lower satisfaction in 2024 than in 2023** – included the provision and maintenance of street trees (down 6%).

Metropolis Research draws particular attention to the measurable decline in satisfaction with street trees this year. This measurable decline in satisfaction with this service this year appears to have been influenced by the impact of the storm during the fieldwork period.

Percentage change in satisfaction 2023 to 2024
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
 (Percentage increase / decrease)



Percentage satisfaction results

The following table provides a breakdown of these results into the proportion of respondents who were “very satisfied” (i.e., rated satisfaction at eight or more), those who were “neutral to somewhat satisfied” (i.e., rated satisfaction at between five and seven), and those who were “dissatisfied” (i.e., rated satisfaction at less than five).

Of the 28 services and facilities, more than half of the respondents providing a score were “very satisfied” with 27, whilst more than 10% were “dissatisfied” with public toilets (14%) and the provision and maintenance of street trees (11%).

Satisfaction with selected Council services and facilities
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
(Number and percent of respondents providing a response)

<i>Service/facility</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>Neutral to somewhat satisfied</i>	<i>Very satisfied</i>	<i>Can't say</i>	Total
Local library and library services	1%	16%	84%	4	365
Regular green waste collection	3%	16%	81%	15	801
Council services: older residents, activities: seniors	2%	19%	79%	3	88
Council run services for children and their families	1%	21%	78%	1	148
Sports ovals and other outdoor sporting facilities	1%	23%	76%	2	334
Regular recycling service	4%	23%	74%	18	801
Council run programs and activities for young people	6%	21%	73%	4	87
Regular garbage collection	7%	20%	73%	11	801
Hard rubbish collection	5%	23%	72%	5	527
Recreation and Aquatic Centres	3%	26%	72%	6	264
Provision and maintenance of local playgrounds	3%	27%	70%	8	373
Council's Waste Transfer Station	4%	28%	68%	4	234
Provision and maintenance of parks, gardens, reserves	3%	31%	66%	39	801
Bike paths and shared pathways	2%	32%	66%	3	342
Animal management	5%	30%	65%	101	801
Provision and maintenance of street lighting	5%	32%	63%	19	801
Street sweeping	8%	30%	61%	41	801
Council's website	3%	37%	61%	2	302
Drains maintenance and repairs	8%	32%	60%	42	801
Footpath maintenance and repairs	7%	35%	59%	16	801
The maintenance and repair of sealed local roads	7%	35%	59%	7	801
Local traffic management	7%	35%	58%	24	801
Council's newsletter Monash Bulletin	5%	39%	56%	144	801
Provision of parking facilities	7%	37%	56%	31	801
Parking enforcement	9%	36%	56%	48	801
Council activities encourage environmental sustainability	6%	40%	55%	117	801
Provision and maintenance of street trees	11%	37%	52%	21	801
Public toilets	14%	53%	33%	6	302



Change in satisfaction over the last eight years:

The following graph provides the percentage change in satisfaction with each of the services and facilities over the last eight years.

This is based on the average satisfaction from 2016 to 2018 compared to the 2024 result. The aim of the graph is to provide a longer-term look at community satisfaction with Council services and facilities.

The following graph displays the percentage change in satisfaction with included services and facilities over the course of the satisfaction survey program from 2016.

The graph displays the change in satisfaction from the three-year moving average (2016 through 2018) compared to 2024.


It is noted that satisfaction with 12 services and facilities increased over this timeframe, whilst satisfaction with 15 declined.

Metropolis Research draws attention to the following when interpreting these results.

1. **Higher-than-average satisfaction with services and facilities in the City of Monash** – over the course of the City of Monash survey, the average satisfaction with services and facilities was four percent higher than the metropolitan Melbourne average. This higher-than-average satisfaction varied from a low of two percent this and last year, to a high of six percent in 2017.
2. **Stable satisfaction over time** – satisfaction with more than half (18 of the 28) services and facilities remained essentially stable over time, either increasing or decreasing in satisfaction by less than four percent.
3. **Parking facilities and enforcement** – satisfaction with parking related services and facilities has improved over time, with satisfaction with parking facilities up seven percent and satisfaction with parking enforcement up five percent.
4. **Kerbside collection services** – it is noted that satisfaction with the three kerbside collection services all declined substantially over the previous two years. Of these, satisfaction with the regular garbage and regular recycling services remains measurably below the average from 2016 to 2018. Community concerns around the changes to the kerbside collection services have diminished somewhat this year, as discussed in both the [Issues to Address](#) section, the [Relationship between Issues and Overall Satisfaction](#), and other results. This is reflected in an increase in satisfaction with these services this year, although they remain below the levels recorded back in 2016 to 2018. It is anticipated that satisfaction with these services will likely continue to trend higher in coming years, as the community becomes more comfortable with the new system.
5. **Public toilets** – satisfaction with public toilets declined significantly over time, from around 7.3 out of 10 in 2016 to 2018 to 6.5 out of 10 this year.



Percentage change in satisfaction 2016-2018 to 2024
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
 (Percentage increase / decrease)



Satisfaction by respondent profile:

The following table displays the average satisfaction with each of these 28 services and facilities by respondent profile, including age structure, gender, and language spoken at home.

Whilst the total number of respondents in each of these profile groups was included at the bottom of the table, it is important to bear in mind that not all respondents will have been asked to or provided a satisfaction score with each service and facility.

Some services and facilities were used by only a sub-set of the community, and therefore the number of respondents varies for each service and facility.



Looking at the average satisfaction with all 28 services and facilities by respondent profile, it was noted that older adults (aged 60 to 74 years) were somewhat less satisfied with Council services and facilities than the municipal average.

It is also noted that female respondents were marginally more satisfied than males, and respondents from multilingual households were marginally more satisfied than respondents from English speaking households.

A more detailed discussion of satisfaction with Council services and facilities is provided in the following section outlining the results for each individual service and facility.

Average satisfaction with selected Council services and facilities
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
(Number and index score scale 0 - 10)

Service/facility	Young adults	Adults	Middle-aged adults	Older adults	Senior citizens	Male	Female	English speaking	Multi-lingual
Maint. & repair of sealed local roads	7.7	7.7	7.2	6.8	7.5	7.4	7.5	7.3	7.6
Footpath maintenance and repairs	7.8	7.5	7.3	6.9	7.2	7.5	7.4	7.2	7.6
Drains maintenance and repairs	7.8	7.7	7.2	6.9	7.6	7.6	7.4	7.3	7.6
Regular garbage collection	7.9	7.9	8.1	7.9	8.6	8.0	8.0	8.1	8.0
Regular recycling service	8.1	8.1	8.0	7.7	8.5	8.1	8.1	8.1	8.1
Regular green waste collection	8.3	8.5	8.5	8.4	8.8	8.4	8.5	8.5	8.5
Street sweeping	7.8	7.7	7.3	6.7	7.6	7.5	7.5	7.4	7.5
Provision & maintenance of street lighting	7.7	7.7	7.6	7.5	8.0	7.6	7.7	7.8	7.6
Parking enforcement	7.5	7.2	7.1	6.8	7.4	7.2	7.3	7.3	7.2
Provision of parking facilities	7.3	7.5	7.3	7.1	7.5	7.3	7.4	7.4	7.4
Local traffic management	7.6	7.4	7.3	7.1	7.5	7.4	7.4	7.4	7.5
Prov. / maint. of parks, gardens, reserves	7.8	7.8	7.8	7.8	7.9	7.9	7.8	7.7	7.9
Provision and maintenance of street trees	7.5	7.3	7.0	6.6	6.8	7.2	7.1	7.0	7.3
Animal management	7.9	8.0	7.6	7.1	7.5	7.6	7.7	7.5	7.9
Activities encourage env'mental sustain.	7.5	7.7	7.2	7.1	7.3	7.3	7.4	7.3	7.5
Council's newsletter <i>Monash Bulletin</i>	7.4	7.4	7.5	7.2	7.9	7.5	7.5	7.4	7.5
Council's website	7.5	7.8	7.8	7.5	7.5	7.6	7.7	7.6	7.7
Hard rubbish collection	7.7	8.2	7.8	8.0	8.5	8.0	8.0	8.2	7.7
Council's Waste Transfer Station	7.6	8.2	8.2	8.4	8.1	8.1	8.1	8.3	7.9
Recreation and Aquatic Centres	8.2	7.8	8.2	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.1	8.2	8.0
Bike paths and shared pathways	8.0	7.7	7.7	7.8	8.3	7.7	8.0	7.9	7.8
Sports ovals / outdoor sporting facilities	8.4	8.1	7.9	8.1	8.3	8.2	8.1	8.1	8.2
Provision & maint. of local playgrounds	8.1	7.7	8.0	7.9	8.1	8.1	7.9	8.1	7.8
Public toilets	6.5	6.6	6.6	6.3	7.0	6.6	6.5	6.7	6.4
Services for children and their families	8.2	8.3	8.2	7.8	9.1	8.1	8.3	8.1	8.3
Services: older residents, activities: seniors	8.5	8.1	7.5	8.5	8.4	8.1	8.3	8.3	8.2
Local library and library services	8.6	8.6	8.5	9.0	8.8	8.5	8.8	8.8	8.6
Programs and activities for young people	8.2	7.4	8.0	7.1	8.4	7.5	8.2	7.7	8.0
<i>Average satisfaction</i>	7.8	7.8	7.7	7.5	7.9	7.7	7.8	7.7	7.8
Total respondents	279	129	176	128	87	386	410	374	418



Importance and satisfaction cross tabulation

The following graph provides a cross-tabulation of the average importance of each of the 28 included Council services and facilities against the average satisfaction with each service.

The grey crosshairs represent the metropolitan Melbourne average importance (8.7) and satisfaction (7.6) with Council services and facilities as recorded in the 2024 *Governing Melbourne* research conducted independently by Metropolis Research.

Services and facilities located in the top right-hand quadrant were therefore more important than average and received higher-than-average satisfaction. Conversely services in the bottom right-hand quadrant were those of most concern as they were of higher-than-average importance but received lower than average satisfaction scores.

Metropolis Research notes that most of the services of higher-than-average importance also obtained higher than average satisfaction scores. This suggests that Council was overall effectively meeting community expectations of quality service delivery in relation to the most important services. This general pattern was commonly observed by Metropolis Research and was not unique to Monash.

It is noted that the average satisfaction with services and facilities was marginally higher in the City of Monash than the metropolitan Melbourne average (7.7 to 7.6).


The services and facilities in the lower right-hand quadrant are those that were more important than average, but with which respondents were less satisfied than average. This quadrant represents the services and facilities of most concern.

Some points to note from these results:

- **Kerbside collection services** – despite the decline in satisfaction last year, these services were all higher-than-average importance and continued to record higher than average satisfaction.
- **Community services** – these were mostly of average importance, somewhat lower than typically observed, but they all received higher than average satisfaction scores.
- **Sports and recreation** – these were all of approximately average importance, and all received higher than average satisfaction scores. It is typically, but not universally found, that sports and recreation services tend to be of a lower importance than average.
- **Communication** – both services were of somewhat lower-than-average importance, but approximately average or slightly higher-than-average satisfaction.
- **Parking** – both parking enforcement and the provision of parking facilities were of lower-than-average importance and received notably lower than average satisfaction, particularly enforcement which received the third lowest satisfaction score this year.
- **Services and facilities of most concern** – included public toilets, street trees, parking enforcement and facilities, traffic management, footpaths, roads, and environmental sustainability. It is important to note, however, that all of these services received at least “good” satisfaction scores.



Importance of and satisfaction with Council services
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
 (Index score scale 0 - 10)



Correlation between service / facilities satisfaction and overall satisfaction

The following table provides the Pearson correlation coefficient for each of the 28 services and facilities when analysed individually against satisfaction with Council’s overall performance.

The correlation coefficient provides a measure of the relationship between satisfaction with each of the 28 services and facilities and satisfaction with Council’s overall performance. The correlation coefficient is a number between minus one and positive one, with scores of more than zero representing a positive correlation, and scores of less than one a negative correlation.

In other words, these results show how closely related satisfaction with the individual services and facilities are to satisfaction with Council’s overall performance. It does not show a causal relationship between satisfaction with services and facilities and overall performance but does highlight how closely they are related (correlated).

It is important to bear in mind when interpreting the correlation coefficients, that many of the services that are most important, and which have consistently recorded high levels of satisfaction tend to have a low correlation coefficient.



This is because almost all the respondents were very satisfied with these services (such as the library and recreation and aquatic centres), regardless of whether they were satisfied or dissatisfied with Council’s overall performance.

If the performance of Council delivering these critical services and facilities was to fall unexpectedly, such a fall would likely have a significant impact on overall satisfaction with Council.

Correlation between satisfaction with services and facilities and overall satisfaction
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
(Number and index score scale 0 - 10)

Service / facility	2024		Correlation*
	Number	Mean	
Footpath maintenance and repairs	785	7.4	0.50
Council run programs and activities for young people	83	7.9	0.49
The maintenance and repair of sealed local roads	794	7.4	0.49
Council's newsletter Monash Bulletin	657	7.5	0.47
Public toilets	297	6.5	0.45
Street sweeping	760	7.5	0.44
Council activities to encourage environmental sustainability	684	7.4	0.44
Drains maintenance and repairs	759	7.5	0.44
Provision and maintenance of parks, gardens and reserves	762	7.8	0.43
Provision of parking facilities	770	7.3	0.43
Council services for older residents & activities for seniors	85	8.2	0.42
Regular garbage collection	790	8.0	0.39
Parking enforcement	753	7.2	0.39
Council run services for children and their families	146	8.2	0.39
Provision and maintenance of street trees	780	7.2	0.38
Local traffic management	777	7.4	0.38
Regular recycling service	783	8.1	0.37
Council's website	300	7.7	0.35
Animal management	700	7.7	0.33
Provision and maintenance of street lighting	782	7.7	0.32
Bike paths and shared pathways	338	7.9	0.31
Local library and library services	362	8.6	0.31
Hard rubbish collection	522	8.0	0.30
Regular green waste collection	786	8.5	0.30
Sports ovals and other outdoor sporting facilities	332	8.2	0.26
Recreation and Aquatic Centres	257	8.1	0.24
Provision and maintenance of local playgrounds	364	8.0	0.21
Council's Waste Transfer Station	231	8.1	0.19

Average satisfaction with selected services **7.7**

(*) Pearson coefficient



Satisfaction by broad service areas

Metropolis Research has created a standard set of broad service areas for use in comparing average satisfaction with results from *Governing Melbourne*. The following graph provides the average satisfaction with the 10 broad service areas for the City of Monash, with a comparison to the metropolitan Melbourne 2024 averages.

The breakdown of services and facilities into these broad service areas is as follows:


- **Infrastructure** – includes drains maintenance and repairs, provision and maintenance of street lighting, provision and maintenance of street trees, and public toilets.
- **Waste and recycling** – include the regular garbage collection, regular recycling service, regular green waste collection, hard rubbish collection, and Council’s Waste Transfer Station.
- **Recreation and culture** – include recreation and aquatic centres, sports ovals and other outdoor sporting facilities, provision and maintenance of local playgrounds, and local library and library services.
- **Community services** – includes Council run services for children and their families, Council services for older residents and activities for seniors, and Council run programs and activities for young people (10 – 25 years).
- **Enforcement** – includes parking enforcement, and animal management.
- **Communication** – includes the Council’s newsletter *Monash Bulletin*, and Council’s website.
- **Cleaning** – includes street sweeping.
- **Transport infrastructure** – includes the maintenance and repair of sealed local roads, footpath maintenance and repairs, local traffic management, bike paths and shared pathways.
- **Parks and gardens** – include the provision and maintenance of parks, gardens, and reserves.
- **Environmental sustainability** – includes Council activities to encourage environmental sustainability.

Of the 10 broad service areas, the average satisfaction with four increased marginally this year, average satisfaction with three remained the same, and the average satisfaction with three declined marginally. None of these variations were statistically significant.

Satisfaction with the 10 broad service areas can best be summarised as follows:

- **Excellent** – for recreation and culture, waste and recycling, community services, and parks and gardens.
- **Very Good** – for communications, transport, cleaning, enforcement, and environmental sustainability.
- **Good** – for infrastructure (down from “very good”).







The following graph provides a comparison of satisfaction with these 10 broad service areas against the metropolitan Melbourne average satisfaction as recorded in the 2024 *Governing Melbourne* research.

The following variations are noted:

- **Higher satisfaction in the City of Monash** – included community services (7% higher in Monash), recreation and culture (5% higher), transport infrastructure (4% higher), waste and recycling (1% higher), and communication (<1% higher).
- **Lower satisfaction in the City of Monash** – included environmental sustainability (3% lower), infrastructure (2% lower in Monash), enforcement (1% lower), cleaning (1% lower), and parks and gardens (1% lower).






Satisfaction by Council division

The following section of the report provides details on the average importance and average satisfaction with each of the 28 services and facilities included in the survey, broken down by the four Council divisions.

Satisfaction with the community development and services division group of services remained essentially stable this year at 8.1 out of 10 or “excellent”.

Satisfaction with infrastructure division (7.7, stable), executive division (7.5, down 3%), and city development division (7.4, up 3%) were all at “very good” levels of satisfaction.




Infrastructure Division

There were 19 services and facilities from the Infrastructure Division of Council included in the survey again this year.

The average satisfaction with this group of 19 services and facilities increased marginally this year, up one percent to 8.1 out of 10, which remains an “excellent” level of satisfaction.

This is the equal highest average satisfaction with Infrastructure Division services and facilities and was marginally higher than the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 8.0 out of 10 or “excellent”.



The 19 Infrastructure Division services and facilities have been broken into two groups, the five waste and recycling services and the 14 other services and facilities.

Infrastructure Division – waste and recycling

The five waste and recycling services and facilities were all of higher-than-average importance again in 2024 and remain among the most important services and facilities provided by Monash City Council.

Four of the five waste and recycling services and facilities were notably more important than the average of all services and facilities, whilst the waste transfer station was of approximately average importance. This is consistent with historical results both in the City of Monash as well as elsewhere across metropolitan Melbourne.




It is noted that the regular garbage collection and regular recycling collection services both recorded somewhat lower satisfaction in the City of Monash than the metropolitan Melbourne average.

This clearly reflects the changes to the kerbside collection services last year. Metropolis Research notes that the difference between the metropolitan Melbourne and City of Monash satisfaction for these two services has diminished as satisfaction with these two services has increased for the City of Monash this year.

Satisfaction with the waste transfer station was notably higher in the City of Monash, whilst satisfaction with the hard rubbish collection was almost identical to the metropolitan Melbourne average.

Importance of and satisfaction with infrastructure (waste and recycling)
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
 (Index score scale 0 - 10)



Regular garbage collection

The regular garbage collection service was the most important of the 28 included services and facilities, with an average importance of 9.3 out of 10, and one of four that were measurably more important than the average of all 28 services and facilities (8.8).



Satisfaction with the kerbside garbage collection increased somewhat this year, up two percent to eight out of 10, which remains an “excellent” level of satisfaction.

This result ranks the regular garbage collection 9th in terms of satisfaction this year.


This result remains, however, measurably below the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 8.5 out of 10, or “excellent”.

This result clearly reflects the beginning of a recovery in satisfaction following the decline over 2022 and 2023 through the changes to the kerbside collection services.

This result was comprised of 73% (up from 69%) “very satisfied” and seven percent (down from 8%) dissatisfied respondents, based on a total sample of 790 of the 801 respondents who provided a satisfaction score.


There was some variation in satisfaction observed by respondent profile, with senior citizens (aged 75 years and over) notably more satisfied than average.

By way of comparison, satisfaction with the regular garbage collection remains somewhat lower than the metropolitan Melbourne average satisfaction with the “regular garbage collection” of 8.2 out of 10, as recorded in the 2024 *Governing Melbourne*.



Whilst there was no statistically significant variation in this result observed across the municipality, it is noted that respondents from Clayton were notably less satisfied than average, and at a “very good” rather than an “excellent” level of satisfaction.





Regular green waste collection

The regular green waste collection service was the 2nd most important of the 28 included services and facilities, with an average importance of 9.2 out of 10, and one of four that were measurably more important than the average of all 28 services and facilities (8.8).

Satisfaction with the regular green waste collection increased somewhat this year, up two percent to 8.5 out of 10, which remains an “excellent” level of satisfaction.

This result ranks the regular garbage collection 2nd in terms of satisfaction this year, and one of six that received a satisfaction score measurably higher than the average of all 28 (7.7).


This result was identical to the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 8.5 out of 10, or “excellent”.

This result was comprised of 81% “very satisfied” and three percent dissatisfied respondents, based on a total sample of 785 of the 801 respondents who provided a satisfaction score.


There was some variation in satisfaction observed by respondent profile, with senior citizens (aged 75 years and over) notably more satisfied than average.

By way of comparison, satisfaction with the regular green waste collection was measurably higher than the metropolitan Melbourne average satisfaction with the “green waste collection” of 8.1 out of 10, as recorded in the 2024 *Governing Melbourne*.





There was no statistically significant variation in this result observed across the municipality, with respondents from all precincts rating satisfaction at “excellent” levels of satisfaction.



Regular recycling service

The regular recycling collection service was the 3rd most important of the 28 included services and facilities, with an average importance of 9.1 out of 10, and one of four that were measurably more important than the average of all 28 services and facilities (8.8).

Satisfaction with the regular recycling service increased somewhat this year, up two percent to 8.1 out of 10, which remains an “excellent” level of satisfaction.

This result ranks the regular garbage collection 6th in terms of satisfaction this year, and one of six that received a satisfaction score measurably higher than the average of all 28 (7.7).


This result was somewhat lower than the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 8.3 out of 10, or “excellent”.

This result was comprised of 74% “very satisfied” and four percent dissatisfied respondents, based on a total sample of 783 of the 801 respondents who provided a satisfaction score.


There was some variation in satisfaction observed by respondent profile, with older adults (aged 60 to 74 years) notably less satisfied, and senior citizens (aged 75 years and over) notably more satisfied than average.

By way of comparison, satisfaction with the regular recycling service was marginally lower than the metropolitan Melbourne average satisfaction with the “regular recycling” of 8.2 out of 10, as recorded in the 2024 *Governing Melbourne*.

Importance of and satisfaction with regular recycling service
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
 (Index score 0 - 10)



There was some variation in this result observed across the municipality, with respondents from Chadstone measurably more satisfied than average. By contrast, respondents from Hughesdale, Oakleigh East, and Oakleigh were somewhat less satisfied than average and at “very good” rather than “excellent” levels of satisfaction.



The following table outlines the 40 comments received from respondents dissatisfied with the regular recycling service.

The most common reasons outlined by respondents related to the frequency of the collection, with a preference for a weekly pickup.

There were also some comments around the quality of the collection (6 comments) and the bin size (3 comments).

Reasons for dissatisfaction with regular recycling service
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
(Number of responses)

Reason	Number
<i>Frequency</i>	
Frequency should be higher	5
It should be done weekly	5
Fortnightly pickup is not enough	4
Getting infrequent lately	1
Go back to red bins weekly. Green bins fortnightly	1
I don't like how they do garbage collection in only two weeks. It should be weekly	1



Not enough collection they are only collected once every fortnight they should be more on Gwingana Cres	1
People do a lot of recycling and recycling fortnightly isn't enough	1
Red bins frequency is bad	1
Should be collected weekly or should have large bins or rate should be low	1
Yellow bin every second week, should go weekly	1
Total	22

Bin collection

All of the garbage is very sloppy. The drivers are sloppy, and they don't care whether our bins are thrown on roads or anywhere	1
Could be better	1
Not regular	1
Recycle bin left in driveway lately in Kingston Rd	1
The garbage truck should take care while taking garbage as the bin are always open	1
The reason is we need to pay for recycling if I am taking all the things to the tip, then why should I pay	1
These people are in such a hurry that they leave half of my bin most of the times and it stays for a week again which creates lot of smell	1
They come and collect late	1
They sometimes don't pick up everything or things fall on the ground	1
Total	6

Bin size

Our bins get filled up easily and they stink	1
Red bin should be made bigger fi collected every two weeks	1
The red bin should be increased	1
Total	3

Recycling collection

Because I reckon, they could have more personal recycling for each house	1
It is not convenient. I must drive all the way to Monash recycling. Maybe they could do it locally or add more location such as local libraries	1
The whole recycling service is poor that they are done at once	1
Total	3

Soft plastic recycling

No soft plastic recycling	2
There is no soft plastic, impact is low	1
Total	3



<i>Bin contents</i>	
Large items I can throw them in bin	1
Total	1
<i>Other</i>	
Drains not maintained drains	1
Road roundabout is disaster	1
Total	2
Total	40

Hard rubbish collection

The hard rubbish collection service was the 4th most important of the 28 included services and facilities, with an average importance of 9.1 out of 10, and one of four that were measurably more important than the average of all 28 services and facilities (8.8).

Satisfaction with the hard rubbish collection increased marginally this year, up one percent to 8.0 out of 10, which remains an “excellent” level of satisfaction.

This result ranks the hard rubbish collection 10th in terms of satisfaction this year.


This result was identical to the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 8.0 out of 10, or “excellent”.

This result was comprised of 72% “very satisfied” and five percent dissatisfied respondents, based on a total sample of 522 of the 527 respondents (66%) from households who had used these services in the last 12 months.


There was some variation in satisfaction observed by respondent profile, with young adults (aged 18 to 34 years) somewhat less satisfied, and senior citizens (aged 75 years and over) notably more satisfied than average.

By way of comparison, satisfaction with the hard rubbish collection was identical to the metropolitan Melbourne average satisfaction with the “hard rubbish collection” of 8.0 out of 10, as recorded in the 2024 *Governing Melbourne*.





There was some variation in this result observed across the municipality, with respondents from Oakleigh measurably more satisfied than average. By contrast, respondents from Oakleigh East, Ashwood-Burwood, Oakleigh South, and Hughesdale were somewhat less satisfied than average and at “very good” rather than “excellent” levels of satisfaction.



Council’s Waste Transfer Station

Council’s waste transfer station was the 21st most important of the 28 included services and facilities, with an average importance of 8.8 out of 10.

Satisfaction with the waste transfer station remained stable this year at 8.1 out of 10, which remains an “excellent” level of satisfaction.


This result ranks the waste transfer station 8th in terms of satisfaction this year.

This result was identical to the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 8.1 out of 10, or “excellent”.

This result was comprised of 68% “very satisfied” and four percent dissatisfied respondents, based on a total sample of 230 of the 234 respondents (29%) from households who had used these services in the last 12 months.


There was some variation in satisfaction observed by respondent profile, with young adults (aged 18 to 34 years) somewhat less satisfied than average and at a “very good” rather than “excellent” level of satisfaction.

By way of comparison, satisfaction with the waste transfer station was notably higher than the metropolitan Melbourne average satisfaction with the “waste transfer station / tip” of 7.7 out of 10, as recorded in the 2024 *Governing Melbourne*.



Whilst there was no statistically significant variation in satisfaction observed across the municipality, it is noted that eight respondents from Oakleigh South rated satisfaction at a “good” rather than an “excellent” level of satisfaction.





Infrastructure Division – other

There were 14 other services and facilities from the Infrastructure Division included in the survey again this year, as outlined in the following graph.

The graph displays the average importance of and satisfaction with each of these 14 services and facilities, with a comparison against the metropolitan Melbourne average results from the 2024 *Governing Melbourne* research conducted independently by Metropolis Research in January 2024 using the same methodology.

As is clear in the graph, most of the infrastructure services and facilities were clustered around the average importance and satisfaction scores.


That said, it is noted that public toilets were of concern, and the only service to record a satisfaction score of less than seven out of 10.

Metropolis Research also draws attention this year to the lower-than-average satisfaction with street trees. Clearly the storm event that occurred during the survey fieldwork had an impact on community satisfaction with street trees in parts of the municipality.

The most important point to note from this graph was that most, but not all, of these services and facilities recorded a higher satisfaction score in the City of Monash than the metropolitan Melbourne average.

The three services and facilities that received higher-than-average satisfaction scores were sports ovals, playgrounds, bike paths, and parks, gardens, and open spaces.





Maintenance and repair of sealed local roads

The maintenance and repair of sealed local roads was the 12th most important of the 28 included services and facilities, with an average importance of 8.9 out of 10.

Satisfaction with sealed local roads declined marginally this year, down one percent to 7.4 out of 10, which remains a “very good” level of satisfaction.

This result ranks sealed local roads 22nd in terms of satisfaction this year.


This result was marginally lower than the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 7.5 out of 10, or “very good”.

This result was comprised of 59% “very satisfied” and seven percent dissatisfied respondents, based on a total sample of 794 of the 801 respondents who provided a score this year.


There was some variation in satisfaction observed by respondent profile, with young adults and adults (aged 18 to 44 years) somewhat more satisfied than average and older adults (aged 60 to 74 years) measurably less satisfied and at a “good” rather than a “very good level of satisfaction.



By way of comparison, satisfaction with sealed local roads was measurably higher than the metropolitan Melbourne average satisfaction with the “the maintenance and repair of sealed local roads” of 7.0 out of 10, as recorded in the 2024 *Governing Melbourne*.



There was no statistically significant variation in satisfaction with sealed local roads observed across the municipality, although it is noted that respondents from Oakleigh were somewhat less satisfied than average and at a “good” rather than a “very good” level.



Footpath maintenance and repairs

Footpath maintenance and repair was the 13th most important of the 28 included services and facilities, with an average importance of 8.9 out of 10.

Satisfaction with footpaths remained stable this year, up one percent to 7.4 out of 10, or a “very good” level of satisfaction.


This result ranks footpaths 22nd in terms of satisfaction this year.

This result was marginally higher than the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 7.3 out of 10, or “very good”.


This result was comprised of 59% “very satisfied” and seven percent dissatisfied respondents, based on a total sample of 785 of the 801 respondents who provided a score this year.

There was some variation in satisfaction observed by respondent profile, with young adults and adults (aged 18 to 44 years) somewhat more satisfied than average and older adults (aged 60 to 74 years) measurably less satisfied and at a “good” rather than a “very good level of satisfaction. Respondents from multilingual households were somewhat more satisfied than respondents from English speaking households.

By way of comparison, satisfaction with footpaths was marginally higher than the metropolitan Melbourne average satisfaction with the “footpath maintenance and repair” of 7.3 out of 10, as recorded in the 2024 *Governing Melbourne*.



There was no statistically significant variation in satisfaction with sealed local roads observed across the municipality, although it is noted that respondents from Oakleigh South and Ashwood-Burwood were somewhat more satisfied than average and at “excellent” levels, whilst respondents from Oakleigh East were somewhat less satisfied than average and at a “good” rather than a “very good” level.



Street sweeping

Street sweeping was the 23rd most important of the 28 included services and facilities, with an average importance of 8.5 out of 10, and one of six that were measurably less important than the average of all 28 services and facilities (8.8).

Satisfaction with street sweeping increased marginally this year, up one percent to 7.5 out of 10, which remains a “very good” level of satisfaction.

This result ranks street sweeping 19th in terms of satisfaction this year.


This result was identical to the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 7.5 out of 10, or “very good”.

This result was comprised of 61% “very satisfied” and eight percent dissatisfied respondents, based on a total sample of 760 of the 801 respondents who provided a score this year.


There was some variation in satisfaction observed by respondent profile, with young adults and adults (aged 18 to 44 years) somewhat more satisfied than average and older adults (aged 60 to 74 years) measurably less satisfied and at a “good” rather than a “very good level of satisfaction.



By way of comparison, satisfaction with street sweeping was marginally lower than the metropolitan Melbourne average satisfaction with the “street sweeping” of 7.6 out of 10, as recorded in the 2024 *Governing Melbourne*.



There was no statistically significant variation in satisfaction with street sweeping observed across the municipality, although it is noted that respondents from Chadstone and Ashwood-Burwood were somewhat more satisfied than average and at “excellent” levels, whilst respondents from Hughesdale, Oakleigh, and Oakleigh East were somewhat less satisfied than average and at “good” rather than “very good” levels.



Drains maintenance and repair

Drains maintenance and repair was the 8th most important of the 28 included services and facilities, with an average importance of 8.9 out of 10.

Satisfaction with drains declined somewhat, but not measurably this year, down two percent to 7.6 out of 10, which remains a “very good” level of satisfaction.

This result ranks drains maintenance and repair 18th in terms of satisfaction this year.


This result was marginally lower than the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 7.6 out of 10, or “very good”.

This result was comprised of 60% “very satisfied” and eight percent dissatisfied respondents, based on a total sample of 759 of the 801 respondents who provided a score this year.


There was some variation in satisfaction observed by respondent profile, with young adults and adults (aged 18 to 44 years) somewhat more satisfied than average and middle-aged and older adults (aged 60 to 74 years) notably and measurably less satisfied and at a “good” rather than a “very good levels of satisfaction. Respondents from multilingual households were notably more satisfied than respondents from English speaking households.

By way of comparison, satisfaction with drains was marginally higher than the metropolitan Melbourne average satisfaction with the “drains maintenance and repair” of 7.4 out of 10, as recorded in the 2024 *Governing Melbourne*.

Importance of and satisfaction with drains maintenance and repairs
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
 (Index score 0 - 10)



There was measurable and notable variation in satisfaction with drains observed across the municipality, with respondents from Chadstone measurably, and respondents from Notting Hill and Oakleigh South somewhat more satisfied than average and at “excellent” levels. Respondents from Mulgrave and Hughesdale were somewhat less satisfied than average and at “good” rather than “very good” levels.



Provision and maintenance of street lighting

The provision and maintenance of street lighting was the 9th most important of the 28 included services and facilities, with an average importance of 8.9 out of 10.

Satisfaction with street lighting increased somewhat, but not measurably this year, up two percent to 7.7 out of 10, although it remains at a “very good” level of satisfaction.

This result ranks street lighting 16th in terms of satisfaction this year.


This result was somewhat higher than the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 7.5 out of 10, or “very good”.

This result was comprised of 63% “very satisfied” and five percent dissatisfied respondents, based on a total sample of 782 of the 801 respondents who provided a score this year.


There was some variation in satisfaction observed by respondent profile, with senior citizens (aged 75 years and over) notably more satisfied than average and at an “excellent” level of satisfaction.



By way of comparison, satisfaction with street lighting was somewhat higher than the metropolitan Melbourne average satisfaction with the “provision and maintenance of street lighting” of 7.5 out of 10, as recorded in the 2024 *Governing Melbourne*.



Whilst there was no statistically significant variation in satisfaction with street lighting observed across the municipality, it is noted that respondents from Notting Hill and Ashwood-Burwood were somewhat less satisfied than average and at “good” levels of satisfaction.



Provision of parking facilities

The provision of parking facilities was the 19th most important of the 28 included services and facilities, with an average importance of 8.8 out of 10.

Satisfaction with parking facilities increased notably this year, up three percent to 7.3 out of 10, which was a very good”, up from a “good” level of satisfaction, and up nine percent since 2016.

This was the highest score recorded over the eight years of the survey program.


This result ranks parking facilities 25th in terms of satisfaction this year, and one of six that received a satisfaction score measurably lower than the average of all 28 (7.7).

This result was notably higher than the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 7.0 out of 10, or “good”.


This result was comprised of 56% “very satisfied” and seven percent dissatisfied respondents, based on a total sample of 770 of the 801 respondents who provided a score this year.

There was no substantial variation in satisfaction with the provision of parking facilities observed by respondent profile.

By way of comparison, these facilities were not included in the 2024 *Governing Melbourne* research and therefore no comparison result was available.



There was some measurable and some notable variation in satisfaction with parking facilities observed across the municipality. Respondents from Chadstone were measurably and respondents from Oakleigh South were notably more satisfied than average and at “excellent” levels, whilst respondents from Oakleigh East were notably less satisfied and at a “good” level of satisfaction.



Local traffic management

Local traffic management was the 16th most important of the 28 included services and facilities, with an average importance of 8.8 out of 10.

Satisfaction with local traffic management increased somewhat this year, up two percent to 7.4 out of 10, which remains a “very good” level of satisfaction.

This result ranks local traffic management 23rd in terms of satisfaction this year, and one of six that received a satisfaction score measurably lower than the average of all 28 (7.7).


This result was somewhat higher than the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 7.2 out of 10, or “good”.

This result was comprised of 58% “very satisfied” and seven percent dissatisfied respondents, based on a total sample of 777 of the 801 respondents who provided a score this year.


There was some variation in satisfaction with the local traffic management observed by respondent profile, with older adults (aged 60 to 74 years) somewhat less satisfied than average and at a “good” rather than a “very good” level of satisfaction.



By way of comparison, satisfaction with local traffic management was somewhat higher than the metropolitan Melbourne average satisfaction with the “local traffic management” of 7.2 out of 10, as recorded in the 2024 *Governing Melbourne*.



Whilst there was no measurable variation in satisfaction with local traffic management observed across the municipality it is noted that respondents from Chadstone and Clayton were notably more satisfied than average and at “excellent” levels. Respondents from Wheelers Hill and Ashwood-Burwood were notably less satisfied and at “good” levels.



Provision and maintenance of street trees

The provision and maintenance of street trees was the 18th most important of the 28 included services and facilities, with an average importance of 8.8 out of 10.

Satisfaction with street trees declined measurably this year, down six percent to 7.2 out of 10, which was a “good”, down from a “very good” level of satisfaction.

Clearly, the decline in satisfaction with street trees this year was at least partly due to the impact of the storm event that occurred during the fieldwork for the survey. This was also observed in the fact that eight percent (up from 5%) of respondents nominated street trees and a further three percent nominated storm management / cleanup related issues as one of the top three [issues to address](#) at the moment.

This result ranks street trees 27th (down from 17th last year) in terms of satisfaction this year, and one of six that received a score measurably lower than the average of all 28 (7.7).


This result was somewhat lower than the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 7.2 out of 10, or “good”.

This result was comprised of 52% “very satisfied” and 11% (up from 5%) dissatisfied respondents, based on a total sample of 777 of the 801 respondents who provided a score.


There was some variation in satisfaction observed by respondent profile, with older adults and senior citizens (aged 60 years and over) notably less satisfied than average.

By way of comparison, satisfaction with street trees was somewhat lower than the metropolitan Melbourne average satisfaction with the “provision and maintenance of street trees” of 7.4 out of 10, as recorded in the 2024 *Governing Melbourne*.

Importance of and satisfaction with provision and maintenance of street trees
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
 (Index score 0 - 10)



There was measurable and notable variation in satisfaction with street trees observed across the municipality. Respondents from Chadstone were measurably and respondents from Oakleigh South and Notting Hill were notably more satisfied than average and at “excellent” levels. By contrast, respondents from Oakleigh East were notably less satisfied and at a “solid” rather than a “good” level of satisfaction.



There were 107 comments received from respondents who were not satisfied with the provision and maintenance of street trees.

The majority of these comments related to the maintenance of trees and particularly branches (49 comments) and the removal of dead trees or branches (15 comments).

Reasons for dissatisfaction with provision and maintenance of street trees
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
(Number of responses)

Reason	Number
<i>Tree / branch maintenance</i>	
Need more trimming / maintenance	21
Due to storms, trees come down and not well maintained	3
A lot of gum trees need to be taken for safety	2
A big branch fell into the yard near Highbury Rd and bothered recycling waste	1
Avonhurst Dr has trees that should be taken care of, gum trees mainly	1
Bass Ct has a lot of trees to be taken care of	1
Big tree not cut down and fallen on Eileen St	1
Dead tree leaves are not cleaned often	1



Debbie St has many old trees which need maintenance	1
Feels like trees were trimmed in a way that they split from the middle and collapsed all around it	1
Hedge needs to be trimmed	1
I asked them to get a tree cut in Beverley Grv, but it's not done yet	1
I have made an appointment for removing the tree branches (Tasmanian Paper Tree). They have not come and done their service	1
My tree is coming inside my house, but they do not come to cut it frequently	1
Old trees not well maintained at Barlyn Rd	1
Overgrown weeds and garbage on nature strip	1
Poor management of trees	1
Pruning is poorly done of the fir trees	1
The reluctance to take actions on established trees is concerning	1
They haven't done any maintenance on Gwingana Cres	1
They should take care of trees falling on side of homes and not burden it on residents	1
Trees in View St aren't maintained	1
Trees on nature strips need to be cut down	1
Total	46

Choice of trees

Not good choice of trees, not thoughtful	10
Dislike the trees in the street, they do not provide any shade	1
I just think they chose very poorly the species and size for residential areas	1
I think there are some trees which are not suitable for nature strips in areas which affects traffic.	1
I wanted to plant other species of trees in front of the yard on side of the street, but the city Council refused	1
Paperbark trees are falling apart, its root bound, and nothing grows underneath it, they should remove it in Hatter St	1
Some people don't have trees in front of their house. More attractive species needed	1
The selection of trees is wrong, they drop leaves and block the drainage, this is across this whole local area	1
They don't have a good variety of trees, eucalyptus is dry, fragile and has broken everywhere after the storms. It's not beautiful as well	1
Total	18

Removal of tree debris / damaged / dead trees

In last storm, damaged trees were lying across my driveway	2
The tree in front of the house needs to be cut down but the Council hasn't cut	2
After storm it took a long time to clean up the trees in Atheldene Dr	1
After the storm there are trees lying on footpath on Gallagher Rd	1
Especially for my tree it always leaves debris on footpath on Excalibur Ave	1
It takes Council ages to do things like removing fallen trees, and the trees look stupid after trim under powerline	1
The speed of cutting trees after the storm	1
The trees fell during the storm, because the trees weren't well maintained, and were knowingly left dying	1
The trees on Ormond Rd are too big and sometimes when the Council comes to cut them, they leave it on the street for a long time	1
The trees that fell on Harlington St since the storm have been left there and Council has been notified but nothing has been done	1



There are many trees leaning towards the road they fall during storm Highbury Rd	1
They have removed the mature trees in the street. Almost more than 15 mature trees older than 60 years were removed. That was horrible	1
Tree branches fall in the roads and make a traffic jam after the storm in Kionga St in Clayton. Falling trees in playgrounds too	1
Total	15

Trees and powerlines

Street trees are tangled with the wires	2
Currently, they are touching electric wires and hazard can take place. We have written letters to the Council. However, the issue has not been resolved	1
I don't like seeing the V shaped trees under the power lines, I think it's dangerous	1
Street trees are high enough to touch electric wires and are not cut on a regular basis	1
The trees that are shaped like V are very dangerous along Police Rd, all through Monash too, they put giant trees under power lines	1
There are still hanging branches on the electricity wire	1
Trees are touching the cables; they need to come frequently but they come only once in year on Wattletree Ct	1
Total	8

Overgrown / dangerous trees

Recent wind has been a great danger in terms of street trees	2
Street trees are not well maintained. There are trees that are fallen on the houses of people	1
The branches swing towards the house with wind, still nothing done after calling council	1
The tree branches in front of my house, Garrison Dr, might fall from the thunderstorm	1
The tree falls between Whitehaven Cres and Aintree Rd	1
The tree in front of my house is overgrown and fence is full of bird poo, and they need to be maintained, the storm has shown that they are not maintaining it	1
Total	7

Tree roots uprooting footpaths / drains

Some trees are very big and blocking us and leaves are blocking drains. We asked Council to cut it, but it was non-negotiable, but they were too stiff and refused	2
Roots of trees are grown and uplifting footpath and making it dangerous in Winbourne Rd	1
The nature strip is cr*p. It is lifting the gutter, and the tree is too big for these areas on Tiverton Dr	1
They don't care if the tree falls, it's dangerous, wrecking the footpaths, prone to cracking, gutters get full	1
Total	5

Not enough trees

I want more trees, there aren't enough	2
Need trees but needs to be maintained	1
Total	3



<i>Trees overhanging roads / footpaths / property</i>	
The big tree branch fell on my car, Council didn't claim responsibility	1
Total	1
<i>Other</i>	
If it is my tree, then don't destroy it	1
They should do a thorough assessment of survival of trees	1
They should take into consideration of what people want	1
Tree berries flood the whole area	1
Total	4
Total	107

Public toilets

Public toilets were the 5th most important of the 28 included services and facilities, with an average importance of 9.0 out of 10.

Satisfaction with public toilets declined somewhat this year, down two percent to 6.5 out of 10, which remains a “good” level of satisfaction.


This result ranks public toilets 28th (last) in terms of satisfaction this year, and one of six that received a satisfaction score measurably lower than the average of all 28 (7.7).

This result was measurably lower than the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 6.9 out of 10, or “good”, and 12% below the historical high of 7.4 recorded back in 2018.


This result was comprised of 33% “very satisfied” and 14% dissatisfied respondents, based on a total sample of 296 of the 320 respondents (38%) from households who had used these facilities in the last 12 months.

There was some variation in satisfaction with the public toilets observed by respondent profile, with senior citizens (aged 75 years and over) somewhat more satisfied than average. By way of comparison, satisfaction with public toilets was measurably lower than the metropolitan Melbourne average satisfaction with the “public toilets” of 6.9 out of 10, as recorded in the 2024 *Governing Melbourne*.





Noting the small sample size at the precinct level for public toilets, there was no measurable variation in satisfaction observed across the municipality. It is noted, however, that 14 respondents from Oakleigh East and six from Hughesdale rated satisfaction at “poor” and “very poor” levels of satisfaction respectively.



There were 145 comments received from respondents who were not satisfied with public toilets, including 66 comments and 79 locations of concern. Consistent with previous years, the majority of these comments related to perceived lack of toilets (26 comments) and perceived insufficient cleaning and hygiene (18 comments).



Reasons for dissatisfaction with public toilets
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
 (Number of responses)

Reason	Number
<i>More toilets needed / not enough / hard to find / locked</i>	
Could be more	6
Not enough public toilets	3
Council should put toilets in all parks	2
Not available in the community	2
Public toilets are locked	2
Very few public toilets	2
I have not found any public toilet in my suburb	1
I have not found any public toilets except in Glen Waverley Shopping Centre	1
No public toilets near playgrounds	1
Not easy to find public toilet. There should be more	1
Not enough public toilets provided, if so no one knows where it is	1
Not enough toilets and many are out of service	1
Very hard to find	1
Inconvenient to access public toilet at the public park	1
It is hard to navigate	1
Total	26
<i>Dirty / smelly / terrible / wet</i>	
Dirty / smelly / terrible	9
It is not convenient to use the toilet in the public areas because of its smell and dirtiness	1
It was terrible, really disgusting, no one ever cleaned it	1
Male toilet doesn't smell good and not clean	1
Public toilets especially near library are very unhygienic	1
The washroom stinks and the bin outside is very stinky	1
They are always very dirty	1
Unsanitary like in parks and shopping centres in general	1
Wasn't clean, it was at a park, a tin shed one. The wall had an opening	1
It's flooded / wet	1
They all are super wet	1
Total	19
<i>Toilet cleaning / maintenance</i>	
Not clean	5
Better serviced	2
Old and not cleaned enough	2
Poor maintenance	2
Clean more often because toilets are being used by many	1
Cleanliness	1



Not enough cleaning	1
Not well maintained, not clean	1
The toilets were broken for a couple days and need to be cleaned more often	1
They are not cleaned regularly. Especially after COVID, you need to maintain hygiene	1
Toilet seats broken, toilet papers on the floor	1
Total	18

Other

Frequency of red bin collection	1
No drinking water near playgrounds	1
Putting a big individual one is ridiculous, there used to be three small but one big is limiting: the one near Waverley Shopping Centre	1
Total	3

Total responses **66**

Specific locations

Pinewood	3
Kings Way Shopping Centre	2
Holmesglen station	2
Huntingdale station	2
In front of Glen Waverley station, it's nasty, they don't ever clean it	2
Near shopping centre, The Glen	2
Public toilet at the Clayton train station usually has a bad smell and dirty floor and sometimes toilet tissues weren't available at all	2
There should be public toilets at the playground on England Rd or at Monash Toy Library	2
Warrabee Park	2
Awful at the crematorium	1
Batesford Rd Reserve	1
Brandon Park Shopping Centre	1
Chester St	1
Clayton area toilets are dirty, not enough parent rooms	1
Davies Reserve Playground	1
Dirty in Talbot Park	1
Dirty toilets like in Mount Waverley Village	1
Dirty, Jells Park	1
Everywhere	1
Few that are dirty, at Glen Waverley train station at night	1
Glen Waverley Central Reserve Playground	1
Glen Waverley Secondary College	1
Glen Waverley station	1
I used one close to the Clayton station near Coles and it was dirty. That needs cleaning	1
In buildings like libraries and the aquatic centre it's good but general outdoor ones aren't.	1
Like the one at the Mount Waverley shops (Hamilton Place)	1
In Glen Waverley	1
It should be all side of main roads and public parks like Jells Park	1
It's a bit dirty like piss on the floor nearby Glenferrie Rd	1
It's very dirty and it needs maintenance. At Clayton shopping centre next to Coles	1
Malvern station cleanliness was not proper	1



Most parks and gardens	1
Mount Waverley railway station	1
Near park, a couple in Glen Waverley should have more	1
Near the Coles in Clayton	1
Near the Mount Waverley shopping mall there is one which is not even proper	1
Near Warrigal Rd	1
Need more toilets in Clayton	1
Need one on Samada St playground	1
No clean toilet available at the Batesford Rd Reserve	1
No public toilet at the Wilson St Reserve Playground so I had to bring my kids back home when they needed to use it	1
No toilet at the F E Hunt Reserve	1
No toilet in the neighbourhood near Jordanville station and even if it's there, there is no one to clean it	1
Not clean on time or frequently cleaned in Centre Rd	1
Not many public toilets seen around Excalibur Ave	1
Nothing specific comes to mind but in general	1
Oakleigh South Child and Family Hub	1
Opposite Chapel St Glen Waverley	1
Public toilet around Cook St not regularly cleaned	1
Public toilet near Coles sometimes does not work	1
Public toilet not maintained in Clayton area, most of them are okay but a few need improvement	1
Public toilets are not accessible because they are locked and not available at the Batesford Rd Reserve	1
Public toilets in public car park in Kings Way Shopping Centre	1
Restroom at Huntingdale station is currently locked, what are passengers supposed to do with that?	1
Smelly, dirty toilet in Springvale	1
The cleanliness, broken doors at Jells Park, they are still building the toilets, taking a very long time	1
The Electra Reserve and Markham Reserve have no public toilets. I have not encountered public toilets in that area	1
The public toilet located at the car park near Coles and another one in Dunstan St. They need to be cleaned up regularly. Many homeless people use it	1
The public toilet near the gardens and golf course	1
The toilet near Mount Waverley shopping centre was blocked and my husband had to take action and call people from the city to fix it	1
The toilets at the Clayton library are acceptable except the Huntingdale station which is not possible to use because they're locked now	1
There are no public toilets in Glen Waverley	1
There are no toilets on Chesterville Rd along Glen Waverley North Reserve playground	1
There are not enough public toilets mainly in and around Davies Reserve	1
There is no public toilet at the Central Oval Glen Waverley. People have to use the football club public toilet	1
There is no toilet available at the Huntingdale station	1
There should be a clean toilet nearby F. E. Hunt Reserve so that children and parents can use when they need to	1
They are extremely dirty precisely at the Springvale station. They stink a lot	1
This community is lacking public toilets (England Rd and Herriotts Blvd)	1
Unclean and messy like near the park in Clayton	1

Total 79

Total responses 145



Provision and maintenance of local playgrounds

The provision and maintenance of local playgrounds was the 15th most important of the 28 included services and facilities, with an average importance of 8.8 out of 10.

Satisfaction with playgrounds remained essentially stable this year, down by one percent to 8.0 out of 10, which remains an “excellent” level of satisfaction.


This result ranks playgrounds 11th in terms of satisfaction this year.

This result was identical to the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 8.0 out of 10, or “excellent”.


This result was comprised of 70% “very satisfied” and three percent dissatisfied respondents, based on a total sample of 365 of the 373 respondents (47%) from households who had used these facilities in the last 12 months.

There was some variation in satisfaction with the playgrounds observed by respondent profile, with adults (aged 35 to 44 years) somewhat less satisfied than average, and at a “very good” rather than an “excellent” level of satisfaction.

By way of comparison, satisfaction with playgrounds was somewhat higher than the metropolitan Melbourne average satisfaction with the “the provision and maintenance of playgrounds” of 7.8 out of 10, as recorded in the 2024 *Governing Melbourne*.



Whilst there was no statistically significant variation in this result observed across the municipality, it is noted that the small sample of 17 respondents from Ashwood-Burwood, 15 from Hughesdale, 16 from Chadstone, and 12 from Oakleigh East rated satisfaction at “very good” rather than “excellent” levels of satisfaction.



Provision and maintenance of parks, gardens, and reserves

The provision and maintenance of parks, gardens, and reserves was the 10th most important of the 28 included services and facilities, with an average importance of 8.8 out of 10.

Satisfaction with parks, gardens, and reserves declined marginally this year, down by one percent to 7.8 out of 10, which remains an “excellent” level of satisfaction.

This result ranks parks, gardens, and reserves 14th in terms of satisfaction this year.


This result was marginally lower than the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 8.0 out of 10, or “excellent”.

This result was comprised of 66% “very satisfied” and three percent dissatisfied respondents, based on a total sample of 762 of the 801 respondents who provide a score this year.


There was no substantial variation in satisfaction with the parks, gardens, and reserves observed by respondent profile, with respondents from all age groups, gender, and language spoken at home rating satisfaction at “excellent” levels of satisfaction.



By way of comparison, satisfaction with parks, gardens, and reserves was marginally lower than the metropolitan Melbourne average satisfaction with the “the provision and maintenance of parks, gardens, and open spaces” of 7.9 out of 10, as recorded in the 2024 *Governing Melbourne*.



Whilst there was no statistically significant variation in this result observed across the municipality, it is noted that respondents from Oakleigh East rated satisfaction notably lower than average, and at a “very good” rather than an “excellent” levels of satisfaction.



The following table outlines the 64 comments received from respondents who were not satisfied with the provision and maintenance of parks, gardens, and reserves.

A range of issues were outlined by a handful of respondents.

Reasons for dissatisfaction with provision and maintenance of parks, gardens ad reserves

Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey

(Number of responses)

<i>Reason</i>	<i>Number</i>
All parks everywhere	3
Add barbeque area in smaller area as well so it can disburse crowd	1
Add general exercise equipment to encourage local community	1
Average	1
Better walkway in the area	1
Garbage disposable bin with liners hold garbage and empty regularly	1
Grass is long, broken glasses on parks in general	1
Has only 3 items for the kids in the whole community to enjoy and	1
I didn't see any parks around my area	1
I feel they should regulate pets on leash in parks. They should have better rules for that	1
I find syringe in parks and paint cans and all kinds of s**t everywhere in general in this area	1
It can be better	1
Lack of upgrading and grass cutting and pathways	1
Less green space and no creative parks in the community in this area	1
Lights are not bright enough	1
Little parks around here in the general area	1
Local reserve has too much overgrowth	1
Mainly walking paths and cleanliness around interns of trees overhang and weeds, mainly all of them specially Creek Walk	1
Not more often enough during summer in general	1
Not much attention, just roughly done, rough and ready	1
Overgrown weeds and garbage on the parks	1
Park next to the Monash hospital is required mourning to cut the grass	1
Parks should be livelier and more attractive	1
Put tap water for people and animals	1
Take care of parks more	1
Tends to get overgrown in some places. Hard to use facilities as there isn't enough parking facilities	1
The bench is broken	1
There should be more equipment including kids for playing and exercise	1
There should be more mowing and cleaning up, like the storm was 2 weeks ago, and no one is cleaning up	1
They don't maintain properly and let them over grow. They still haven't cleaned up the storm mess	1
Weeds and overgrown trees	1
Total	33



<i>Specific locations of concern</i>	
Park on Clayton Rd goes into the footpath and onto bikers, it's dangerous for little kids	1
Most parks are poorly maintained in Federal Reserve	1
Border all the parks seating in the Damper Creek Mt Waverley Shopping Centre Hamilton Pl	1
Many falling branches and not maintained properly in Hinkler Reserve	1
A lot of parked cars on either side of Oakern Rd and Waverley Rd	1
Mulgrave Reserve is bad, grass is overgrown	1
Not maintained very well on a regular basis. A few around Wheelers Hill	1
Overgrown bushes in the general Waverley area	1
The parks have no bins on Arthur St and Vannam Dr	1
The grass not cut well named Argyle Reserve, rubbish everywhere	1
The local park at Elmwood has no shade and people are at risk of skin cancer	1
The local parks around Vannam Dr and Arthur St are not cleaned and has dangerous screw which can hurt the children	1
The park on the corner of Elmwood and Ballara Cres has been left without fence for a long time which is dangerous for people like me with pets	1
The parks and the cricket ground at Clayton are filled with beer bottles after football match	1
Some facilities near playgrounds need to be cleaned in Evelyn St	1
All of them in the Waverley area	1
Atheldene Dr park	1
Bike paths not wide enough and no bins in this area and in Huntingdale Rd	1
Glen Waverley North reserve playground does not have bright lights	1
Grass is not often mowed on Canola Dr Park	1
Gumtree Gully roads and Eileen St damaged trees due to storm not fixed	1
Highview park should be renewed fast	1
Jells Park	1
Jells Park needs to upgrade its facilities to be a top-rated park	1
Leeds Rd playground has very less facilities. Needs more upgrades	1
Local playgrounds of Arthur Street	1
No parking at Whitehaven Cres Reserve	1
Park on Clayton Rd, Oakleigh East	1
Scotchman Creek needs improvement	1
The reserve on Canova Dr needs to be made livelier and more attractive	1
Wilson St Reserve playground	1
Total	31
Total	64



Bike paths and shared pathways

Bike paths and shared pathways were the 22nd most important of the 28 included services and facilities, with an average importance of 8.7 out of 10.

Satisfaction with bike paths and shared pathways remained essentially stable this year, down one percent to 7.9 out of 10, which remains an “excellent” level of satisfaction.

This result ranks bike paths and shared pathways 12th in terms of satisfaction this year.


This result was marginally higher than the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 7.8 out of 10, or “excellent”.

This result was comprised of 66% “very satisfied” and two percent dissatisfied respondents, based on a total sample of 339 of the 342 respondents (43%) from households who had used these facilities in the last 12 months.

There was no substantial variation in satisfaction with bike paths and shared pathways observed by respondent profile, with respondents from all age groups, gender, and language spoken at home rating satisfaction at “very good” to “excellent” levels of satisfaction.


By way of comparison, satisfaction with bike paths and shared pathways was measurably higher than the metropolitan Melbourne average satisfaction with the “bike paths and shared pathways” of 7.4 out of 10, as recorded in the 2024 *Governing Melbourne*.

Importance of and satisfaction with bike paths and shared pathways
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
 (Index score 0 - 10)



Whilst there was no statistically significant variation in this result observed across the municipality, it is noted that 11 respondents from Oakleigh South rated satisfaction notably lower than average, and at a “good” rather than an “excellent” levels of satisfaction.





Sport ovals and other outdoor sporting facilities

Sports ovals and other outdoor sporting facilities were the 14th most important of the 28 included services and facilities, with an average importance of 8.7 out of 10.

Satisfaction with these facilities increased marginally this year, up one percent to 8.2 out of 10, which remains an “excellent” level of satisfaction.

This result ranks sports ovals and other outdoor sporting facilities 5th in terms of satisfaction this year, and one of six that received a satisfaction score measurably higher than the average of all 28 services and facilities (7.7).

This result was marginally higher than the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 8.1 out of 10, or “excellent”.


This result was comprised of 76% “very satisfied” and just one percent dissatisfied respondents, based on a total sample of 332 of the 334 respondents (42%) from households who had used these facilities in the last 12 months.

There was no substantial variation in satisfaction with bike paths and shared pathways observed by respondent profile, with respondents from all age groups, gender, and language spoken at home rating satisfaction at “excellent” levels of satisfaction.

By way of comparison, satisfaction with these facilities was notably higher than the metropolitan Melbourne average satisfaction with the “sports ovals and other outdoor sporting facilities” of 7.9 out of 10, as recorded in the 2024 *Governing Melbourne*.




Importance of and satisfaction with sport ovals and other outdoor sporting facilities
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
 (Index score 0 - 10)



Whilst there was no statistically significant variation in this result observed across the municipality, it is noted that 10 respondents from Hughesdale rated satisfaction somewhat lower than average, and at a “very good” rather than an “excellent” levels of satisfaction.

Sports ovals and other outdoor sporting facilities by precinct
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
 scale from 0 (very dissatisfied) to 10 (very satisfied)



Council activities to encourage environmental sustainability

Council activities to encourage environmental sustainability were the 26th most important of the 28 included services and facilities, with an average importance of 8.4 out of 10, and one of six that were measurably less important than the average of all 28 (8.8).

Satisfaction with these services remained stable this year at 7.4 out of 10, which remains a “very good” level of satisfaction.


This result ranks these services 24th in terms of satisfaction this year, and one of six that received a satisfaction score measurably lower than the average of all 28 services and facilities (7.7).

This result was marginally lower than the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 7.5 out of 10, or “excellent”.

This result was comprised of 55% “very satisfied” and six percent dissatisfied respondents, based on a total sample of 684 of the 801 respondents who provided a score this year.


There was no substantial variation in satisfaction with these services observed by respondent profile.

By way of comparison, satisfaction with these services was somewhat lower than the metropolitan Melbourne average satisfaction with the “Council meeting its responsibilities towards the environment” of 7.6 out of 10, as recorded in the 2024 *Governing Melbourne*.



Whilst there was no statistically significant variation in this result observed across the municipality, it is noted that respondents were notably more satisfied than average and at an “excellent” level. Respondents from Oakleigh East, Ashwood-Burwood, and Notting Hill were somewhat less satisfied than average and at “good” rather than “very good” levels of satisfaction.

Council activities encourage environmental sustainability by precinct
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
 scale from 0 (very dissatisfied) to 10 (very satisfied)



There were 43 comments received from respondents in relation to Council activities to encourage environmental sustainability. The majority of these comments related to a perceived lack of activity by Council in this area, although there were several comments related to the kerbside green waste collection service.

Reasons for dissatisfaction with Council activities to encourage environmental sustainability
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
 (Number of responses)

Reason	Number
Don't know about any environmental activity	7
I do not see any activities	6
Overrated	2
The Council is not doing anything to protect the environment	2
Because they do not do anything that I know. Replacing pollen and broken trees should be the priority	1
Bins not taken regularly	1
Clearing of native trees on private property	1
Community building in the reserved area would be crowded near Jordanville Station	1



Encouraging community to solve sustainability environment problems. Start at root levels add in education sectors about environment	1
Glass recycling bins separated	1
Green bins should be taken once in fortnight and other rubbish and recycle waste should be taken once a week	1
I don't see anything done; the only thing done is burden on us green bins. We need to separate 3 bins; maintenance is too much. In developed countries they separate by themselves, facilities are a generation behind	1
I don't think Monash Council implement anything with energy saving options	1
Need more green spaces. A lot of the trees are old and there is a lack of action regarding replanting trees	1
No communication	1
No reason to do with Council	1
No regular provision of sustainability	1
Only do green waste collection - could do more about renewable energy and other stuff	1
Streetlights could be solar powered by now and approval of houses could be improved	1
The green coverage is reducing day by day	1
They act on a whim and just do things randomly	1
They are focused too much on it and it's a waste of time and money	1
They don't care about our problems	1
They don't do what they need to do, just do stupid things to satisfy the minority	1
They fenced off an entire park area because of some local grass they are trying to protect	1
They just don't do much apart from waste collection	1
They need to do better. I don't see any. Need more initiatives	1
They talk a lot and promise but don't deliver	1
We are penalized for solar panels. Invest in community battery to store power. Current tariff is 4 cents they will be charge 32 cents for tariff and the store cost is huge	1
We don't have environmental issues	1
Total	43

Community Development and Services division

There were eight services from the Community Development and Services Division of Council included in the survey again this year.

The average satisfaction with these services and facilities increased marginally again this year, up one percent to 8.1, which remains an “excellent” level of satisfaction.


Satisfaction with the Community Development and Services Division has remained very stable around a long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of eight out of 10, or “excellent”.

Metropolis Research notes that seven of these eight services and facilities were of higher-than-average importance, with services for youth only marginally lower than average.


Satisfaction with all eight of these services and facilities was higher-than-average, and of most interest, it is noted that all recorded satisfaction scores somewhat higher than the metropolitan Melbourne results, as sourced from the 2024 *Governing Melbourne* research.



Satisfaction with community development and services division
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
scale from 0 (very dissatisfied) to 10 (very satisfied)



Importance of and satisfaction with community development and services
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
(Index score scale 0 - 10)



Recreation and Aquatic Centres

Recreation and aquatic centres were the 17th most important of the 28 included services and facilities, with an average importance of 8.8 out of 10.

Satisfaction with these facilities declined somewhat this year, down two percent to 8.1 out of 10, although it remains at an “excellent” level of satisfaction.


This result ranks these recreation and aquatic centres 7th in terms of satisfaction this year.

This result was identical to the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 8.1 out of 10, or “excellent”.

This result was comprised of 72% “very satisfied” and three percent dissatisfied respondents, based on a total sample of 258 of the 264 respondents (33%) from households who had used these facilities in the last 12 months.


There was no substantial variation in satisfaction with these services observed by respondent profile, with respondents from all age groups, gender, and language spoken at home rating satisfaction at “excellent” levels.

By way of comparison, satisfaction with these facilities was notably higher than the metropolitan Melbourne average satisfaction with the “recreation and / or aquatic centres” of 7.7 out of 10, as recorded in the 2024 *Governing Melbourne*.



There was measurable variation in this result observed across the municipality, with 16 respondents from Chadstone measurably more satisfied than average, and five respondents from Oakleigh East notably less satisfied and at a “very good” rather than “excellent” level.





Bike paths and shared pathways

Bike paths and shared pathways were the 22nd most important of the 28 included services and facilities, with an average importance of 8.7 out of 10.

Satisfaction with bike paths and shared pathways remained essentially stable this year, down one percent to 7.9 out of 10, which remains an “excellent” level of satisfaction.

This result ranks bike paths and shared pathways 12th in terms of satisfaction this year.

This result was marginally higher than the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 7.8 out of 10, or “excellent”.


This result was comprised of 66% “very satisfied” and two percent dissatisfied respondents, based on a total sample of 339 of the 342 respondents (43%) from households who had used these facilities in the last 12 months.

There was no substantial variation in satisfaction with bike paths and shared pathways observed by respondent profile, with respondents from all age groups, gender, and language spoken at home rating satisfaction at “very good” to “excellent” levels of satisfaction.

By way of comparison, satisfaction with bike paths and shared pathways was measurably higher than the metropolitan Melbourne average satisfaction with the “bike paths and shared pathways” of 7.4 out of 10, as recorded in the 2024 *Governing Melbourne*.




Importance of and satisfaction with bike paths and shared pathways
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
 (Index score 0 - 10)



Whilst there was no statistically significant variation in this result observed across the municipality, it is noted that 11 respondents from Oakleigh South rated satisfaction notably lower than average, and at a “good” rather than an “excellent” levels of satisfaction.

Bike paths and shared pathways by precinct
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
 scale from 0 (very dissatisfied) to 10 (very satisfied)



Sport ovals and other outdoor sporting facilities

Sports ovals and other outdoor sporting facilities were the 14th most important of the 28 included services and facilities, with an average importance of 8.7 out of 10.

Satisfaction with these facilities increased marginally this year, up one percent to 8.2 out of 10, which remains an “excellent” level of satisfaction.

This result ranks sports ovals and other outdoor sporting facilities 5th in terms of satisfaction this year, and one of six that received a satisfaction score measurably higher than the average of all 28 services and facilities (7.7).

This result was marginally higher than the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 8.1 out of 10, or “excellent”.


This result was comprised of 76% “very satisfied” and just one percent dissatisfied respondents, based on a total sample of 332 of the 334 respondents (42%) from households who had used these facilities in the last 12 months.

There was no substantial variation in satisfaction with sports ovals and other outdoor sporting facilities observed by respondent profile, with respondents from all age groups, gender, and language spoken at home rating satisfaction at “excellent” levels of satisfaction.


By way of comparison, satisfaction with these facilities was notably higher than the metropolitan Melbourne average satisfaction with the “sports ovals and other outdoor sporting facilities” of 7.9 out of 10, as recorded in the 2024 *Governing Melbourne*.

Importance of and satisfaction with sport ovals and other outdoor sporting facilities
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey

(Index score 0 - 10)



Whilst there was no statistically significant variation in this result observed across the municipality, it is noted that 10 respondents from Hughesdale rated satisfaction somewhat lower than average, and at a “very good” rather than an “excellent” levels of satisfaction.



Provision and maintenance of local playgrounds

The provision and maintenance of local playgrounds was the 15th most important of the 28 included services and facilities, with an average importance of 8.8 out of 10.

Satisfaction with playgrounds remained essentially stable this year, down one percent to 8.0 out of 10, which remains an “excellent” level of satisfaction.

This result ranks playgrounds 11th in terms of satisfaction this year.


This result was identical to the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 8.0 out of 10, or “excellent”.

This result was comprised of 70% “very satisfied” and three percent dissatisfied respondents, based on a total sample of 365 of the 373 respondents (47%) from households who had used these facilities in the last 12 months.


There was some variation in satisfaction with playgrounds observed by respondent profile, with adults (aged 35 to 44 years) somewhat less satisfied than average, and at a “very good” rather than an “excellent” level of satisfaction.



By way of comparison, satisfaction with playgrounds was somewhat higher than the metropolitan Melbourne average satisfaction with the “the provision and maintenance of playgrounds” of 7.8 out of 10, as recorded in the 2024 *Governing Melbourne*.



Whilst there was no statistically significant variation in this result observed across the municipality, it is noted that the small sample of 17 respondents from Ashwood-Burwood, 15 from Hughesdale, 16 from Chadstone, and 12 from Oakleigh East rated satisfaction at “very good” rather than “excellent” levels of satisfaction.



Council run services for children and their families

Council run services for children and their families were the 11th most important of the 28 included services and facilities, with an average importance of 8.9 out of 10.

Satisfaction with these services increased notably this year, up four percent to 8.2 out of 10, which remains an “excellent” level of satisfaction.

This result ranks these services 4th in terms of satisfaction this year, and one of six that received a satisfaction score measurably higher than the average of all 28 (7.7).


This result was somewhat higher than the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 8.0 out of 10, or “excellent”.

This result was comprised of 78% “very satisfied” and just one percent dissatisfied respondents, based on a total sample of 147 of the 148 respondents (18%) from households who had used these facilities in the last 12 months.


There was no substantive variation in satisfaction with these services observed by respondent profile, with respondents from all age groups, gender, and language spoken at home rating satisfaction at “excellent” levels. The 35 respondents from two-parent families (with youngest child aged 0 to 4 years) rated satisfaction at 8.4 out of 10, the 39 respondents from two-parent families (with youngest child aged 5 to 12 years) rated it at 8.2. The four one parent families with children under 18 years rated satisfaction at 7.4 out of 10.

By way of comparison, satisfaction with these services was notably higher than the metropolitan Melbourne average satisfaction with the “services for children from birth to five years of age” of 7.6 out of 10, as recorded in the 2024 *Governing Melbourne*.

Importance of and satisfaction with Council run services for children and their families
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
 (Index score 0 - 10)



As a result of the small sample of 147 respondents, there was no statistically significant variation in this result observed across the municipality.



Council services for older residents and activities for seniors

Council run services for older residents and activities for seniors were the 6th most important of the 28 included services and facilities, with an average importance of 9.0 out of 10.

Satisfaction with these services increased notably this year, up six percent to 8.2 out of 10, which was an “excellent”, up from a “very good” level of satisfaction.

This result ranks these services 3rd in terms of satisfaction this year, and one of six that received a satisfaction score measurably higher than the average of all 28 (7.7).


This result was somewhat higher than the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 7.9 out of 10, or “excellent”.

This result was comprised of 79% “very satisfied” and two percent dissatisfied respondents, based on a total sample of 85 of the 88 respondents (11%) from households who had used these facilities in the last 12 months.


Cognisant of the small sample size, there was no substantive variation in satisfaction with these services observed by respondent profile, although middle-aged adults (aged 45 to 59 years) were somewhat less satisfied than average. The 14 respondents from older sole person households rated satisfaction at 8.3 out of 10, and the 12 older couple-household respondents rated satisfaction at 8.1 out of 10.



By way of comparison, satisfaction with these services was notably higher than the metropolitan Melbourne average satisfaction with the “services for seniors” of 7.7 out of 10, as recorded in the 2024 *Governing Melbourne*.



As a result of the small sample of 88 respondents, there was no statistically significant variation in this result observed across the municipality.



Council run programs and activities for young people (10 – 25 years)

Council run programs and activities for young people (aged 10 to 25 years) were the 20th most important of the 28 included services and facilities, with an average importance of 8.8 out of 10.

Satisfaction with these services increased marginally this year, up one percent to 7.9 out of 10, which was an “excellent”, up from a “very good” level of satisfaction.

This result ranks these services 13th in terms of satisfaction this year.

This result was somewhat higher than the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 7.7 out of 10, or “excellent”.

This result was comprised of 73% “very satisfied” and six percent dissatisfied respondents, based on a total sample of 83 of the 87 respondents (11%) from households who had used these facilities in the last 12 months.


Cognisant of the small sample size, there was no substantive variation in satisfaction with these services observed by respondent profile, although adults (aged 35 to 44 years) were somewhat less satisfied than average, and female respondents were somewhat more satisfied than male respondents.

By way of comparison, satisfaction with these services was somewhat higher than the metropolitan Melbourne average satisfaction with the “services for youth” of 7.5 out of 10, as recorded in the 2024 *Governing Melbourne*.

Importance of and satisfaction with Council run programs and activities for young people (10 - 25 years)


Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey

(Index score 0 - 10)



As a result of the small sample of 87 respondents, there was no statistically significant variation in this result observed across the municipality.





Local library and library services

Local library and library services were the 7th most important of the 28 included services and facilities, with an average importance of 9.0 out of 10.

Satisfaction with library services increased somewhat this year, up two percent to 8.6 out of 10, which remains an “excellent” level of satisfaction.

This result ranks these services 1st in terms of satisfaction this year, and one of six that received a satisfaction score measurably higher than the average of all 28 (7.7).

This result was marginally higher than the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 8.5 out of 10, or “excellent”.


This result was comprised of 84% “very satisfied” and just one percent dissatisfied respondents, based on a total sample of 361 of the 365 respondents (46%) from households who had used these facilities in the last 12 months.

There was some variation in satisfaction with library services observed by respondent profile, with older adults (aged 60 to 74 years) somewhat more less satisfied than average, and female respondents somewhat more satisfied than male respondents.

By way of comparison, satisfaction with local library and library services was notably higher than the metropolitan Melbourne average satisfaction with the “local library” of 8.2 out of 10, as recorded in the 2024 *Governing Melbourne*.




Importance of and satisfaction with local library and library services
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
 (Index score 0 - 10)



There was no statistically significant variation in satisfaction with local libraries and library services observed across the municipality, with respondents from all precincts rating satisfaction at “excellent” levels.

Local library and library services by precinct
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
 scale from 0 (very dissatisfied) to 10 (very satisfied)




City Development division

There were three services and facilities from the City Development Division of Council included in the survey again this year.

The average satisfaction with this group of services increased somewhat this year, up three percent to 7.4 out of 10, which was the equal highest result for this group of services and facilities.


This was a “very good”, up from a “good” level of satisfaction.



It is noted that all three of these services and facilities were of somewhat lower-than-average importance, and parking enforcement and provision of parking facilities received lower than average satisfaction scores.



Importance of and satisfaction with city development
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
 (Index score scale 0 - 10)



Parking enforcement

Parking enforcement was the 27th most important of the 28 included services and facilities, with an average importance of 8.2 out of 10, and one of six that was measurably less important than the average of all 28 (8.8).

Satisfaction with parking enforcement increased notably this year, up three percent to 7.2 out of 10, although it remains at a “good” level of satisfaction.

This result ranks these services 26th in terms of satisfaction this year, and one of six that received a satisfaction score measurably lower than the average of all 28 (7.7).


This result was notably higher than the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 6.9 out of 10, or “good”.

This result was comprised of 56% “very satisfied” and nine percent dissatisfied respondents, based on a total sample of 753 of the 801 respondents who provided a satisfaction score.


There was some variation in satisfaction with parking enforcement observed by respondent profile, with young adults (aged 18 to 34 years) somewhat more satisfied than average, and older adults (aged 60 to 74 years) somewhat less satisfied than average.



By way of comparison, satisfaction with parking enforcement was identical to the metropolitan Melbourne average satisfaction with the “parking enforcement” of 7.2 out of 10, as recorded in the 2024 *Governing Melbourne*.



There was statistically significant variation in this result observed across the municipality, with 36 respondents from Chadstone measurably more satisfied than average and at an “excellent” level, whilst 14 respondents from Notting Hill were notably less satisfied and at a “poor” level of satisfaction.



Provision of parking facilities

The provision of parking facilities was the 19th most important of the 28 included services and facilities, with an average importance of 8.8 out of 10.

Satisfaction with parking facilities increased notably this year, up three percent to 7.3 out of 10, which was a “very good”, up from a “good” level of satisfaction, and up nine percent since 2016.

This was the highest score recorded over the eight years of the survey program.


This result ranks parking facilities 25th in terms of satisfaction this year, and one of six that received a satisfaction score measurably lower than the average of all 28 (7.7).

This result was notably higher than the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 7.0 out of 10, or “good”.

This result was comprised of 56% “very satisfied” and seven percent dissatisfied respondents, based on a total sample of 770 of the 801 respondents who provided a score this year.

There was no substantial variation in satisfaction with the provision of parking facilities observed by respondent profile.


By way of comparison, these facilities were not included in the 2024 *Governing Melbourne* research and therefore no comparison result was available.



There was some measurable and some notable variation in satisfaction with parking facilities observed across the municipality.



Respondents from Chadstone were measurably and respondents from Oakleigh South were notably more satisfied than average and at “excellent” levels, whilst respondents from Oakleigh East were notably less satisfied and at a “good” level of satisfaction.



Animal management

Animal management was the 25th most important of the 28 included services and facilities, with an average importance of 8.4 out of 10.

Satisfaction with animal management increased notably this year, up three percent to 7.7 out of 10, which remains a “very good” level of satisfaction.

This result ranks animal management 15th in terms of satisfaction this year.

This result was identical to the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 7.7 out of 10, or “good”.


This result was comprised of 65% “very satisfied” and five percent dissatisfied respondents, based on a total sample of 700 of the 801 respondents who provided a score this year.

There was some variation in satisfaction with animal management observed by respondent profile, with older adults (aged 60 to 74 years) measurably less satisfied than average and at a “good” rather than a “very good” level of satisfaction. Respondents from multilingual households were notably more satisfied than respondents from English speaking households.

By way of comparison, satisfaction with animal management was identical to the metropolitan Melbourne average satisfaction with the “animal management” of 7.7 out of 10, as recorded in the 2024 *Governing Melbourne*.




Importance of and satisfaction with animal management
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
 (Index score 0 - 10)



There was measurable variation in satisfaction with animal management observed across the municipality. Respondents from Chadstone and Clayton were measurably more satisfied than average and at “excellent” levels, whilst 12 respondents from Notting Hill were measurably less satisfied and at “good” level of satisfaction.


Animal management by precinct
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
 scale from 0 (very dissatisfied) to 10 (very satisfied)



Executive Division

There were two services from the Executive Division included in the survey again this year, relating to the website and the *Monash Bulletin*.

The average satisfaction with these two communication-related services and facilities has remained stable around a long-term average of 7.6 out of 10, despite a small, three percent decline this year.




Both of these services remain of lower-than-average importance this year, and both received somewhat lower than average satisfaction scores.

This is consistent with historical results.

It is noted that satisfaction with both these services was similar to the metropolitan Melbourne results, as sourced from the 2024 *Governing Melbourne* research.



Importance of and satisfaction with executive division
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
 (Index score scale 0 - 10)



Council’s newsletter *Monash Bulletin*

The *Monash Bulletin* was the least important (28th) of the 28 included services and facilities, with an average importance of 7.8 out of 10.

Satisfaction with the *Monash Bulletin* declined marginally this year, down one percent to 7.5 out of 10, although it remains a “very good” level of satisfaction.

This result ranks the publication 20th in terms of satisfaction this year.

This result was marginally lower than the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 7.7 out of 10, or “very good”.


This result was comprised of 56% “very satisfied” and five percent dissatisfied respondents, based on a total sample of 657 of the 801 respondents who provided a score this year.

There was some variation in satisfaction with the *Monash Bulletin* observed by respondent profile, with older adults (aged 60 to 74 years) somewhat less satisfied and senior citizens (aged 75 years and over) measurably more satisfied than average and at an “excellent” level.




By way of comparison, satisfaction with the *Monash Bulletin* was identical to the metropolitan Melbourne average satisfaction with the “Council’s regular printed newsletter” of 7.5 out of 10, as recorded in the 2024 *Governing Melbourne*.

Importance of and satisfaction with Council's newsletter *Monash Bulletin*
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
 (Index score 0 - 10)



Whilst there was no measurable variation in satisfaction with the *Monash Bulletin* observed across the municipality it is noted that 12 respondents from Notting Hill and 27 respondents from Oakleigh East were notably less satisfied than average and at “good” rather than “very good” levels of satisfaction.

Council's newsletter *Monash Bulletin* by precinct
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
 scale from 0 (very dissatisfied) to 10 (very satisfied)



The following table outlines the 51 comments received from respondents in relation to the Council newsletter.

These comments include a mix of those who report that they do not receive the newsletter, some preference for email, some comments about a lack of relevance of the information contained in the publication, and a range of other issues in small numbers.

Reasons for dissatisfaction with Council's newsletter *Monash Bulletin*
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
(Number of responses)

<i>Reason</i>	<i>Number</i>
Because I don't get any newsletter	7
Better to email	6
Not relevant and important	6
Because I don't read it	5
I don't find Council activity interesting	4
I don't think people spend time reading	4
It is a waste of paper	3
It's of no use	2
Could add more information	1
Doesn't affect us	1
Doesn't come frequently	1
It should be translated in Chinese language	1
It's all about the environmental agenda too much, but people want different things	1
It's not an important service	1
It's not good anymore, no information for activities for youth and toddlers, not many free events	1
It's self-promotional	1
Newsletters are not my type of thing	1
The news does not actually represent community activity	1
They don't tell you enough of what they're doing	1
They keep saying how good they are and do nothing	1
They mainly talk about Council but the topics they pick are not important to the people of the community	1
Waste of time	1
Total	51



Council’s website

Council’s website was the 24th most important of the 28 included services and facilities, with an average importance of 8.5 out of 10.

Satisfaction with the website declined marginally this year, down one percent to 7.7 out of 10, although it remains at a “very good” level of satisfaction.


This result ranks the website 17th in terms of satisfaction this year.

This result was identical to the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 7.7 out of 10, or “very good”.

This result was comprised of 61% “very satisfied” and three percent dissatisfied respondents, based on a total sample of 300 of the 302 respondents (38%) from households who had used these facilities in the last 12 months.


There was no substantive variation in satisfaction with the website observed by respondent profile.

By way of comparison, satisfaction with the website was marginally higher than the metropolitan Melbourne average satisfaction with the “Council’s website” of 7.6 out of 10, as recorded in the 2024 *Governing Melbourne*.



Whilst there was no measurable variation in satisfaction with the website observed across the municipality it is noted that eight respondents from Notting Hill and two respondents from Hughesdale were notably less satisfied than average.





Planning and housing development

Planning for population growth by all levels of government

Respondents were read the following preamble, and then asked:

The population of Monash is expected to grow by approximately 22,000 over the next 20 years. The responsibility for providing services, transport infrastructure, and facilities rests with both Council and the State Government.


“On a scale of 0 (lowest) to 10 (highest), please rate your satisfaction with planning for population growth (by all levels of government). If rated less than 6, why do you say that?”

Satisfaction with planning for population growth by all levels of government declined marginally, but not measurably this year, down two percent to 6.9 out of 10, which remains a “good” level of satisfaction.

Despite the marginal decline from a record high last year, this result remains above the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 6.8 out of 10.


By way of comparison, this result was marginally lower than both the metropolitan Melbourne (7.0) and eastern region councils’ (7.0) averages, as recorded in the *Governing Melbourne* research conducted independently by Metropolis Research in January 2024, using the same in-person, door-to-door methodology.

Metropolis Research notes that this decline in satisfaction with planning for population growth was consistent with the increase (7% up from 4%) in the proportion of respondents who nominated “building, housing, planning, and development” related issues as one of the top three issues to address for the City of Monash ‘at the moment’. This is discussed in more detail in the [Issues To Address](#) section of this report.



The following graph provides a breakdown of these results into the proportion of respondents (who provided a score) who were “very satisfied” (i.e., rated satisfaction at eight or more), those who were “neutral to somewhat satisfied” (i.e., rated satisfaction at between five and seven), and those who were “dissatisfied” (i.e., rated satisfaction at less than five out of 10).



Consistent with the marginal decline in satisfaction, there were slightly fewer “very satisfied” respondents this year, and a small increase in the proportion of “dissatisfied” respondents (10% up from 8%).



Whilst there was not statistically significant variation in satisfaction with planning for population growth by all levels of government observed across the municipality, or by respondent profile, attention is drawn to the following variations of note:

- **Oakleigh South and Chadstone** – respondents were somewhat more satisfied than average and at “very good” rather than “good” levels of satisfaction.
- **Wheelers Hill** – respondents were notably less satisfied than average, and at a “solid” rather than a “good” level of satisfaction.
- **Young adults (aged 18 to 34 years)** – respondents were somewhat more satisfied than average.
- **Older adults (aged 60 to 74 years)** – respondents were notably less satisfied than average and at a “solid” level.
- **Household disability status** – respondents from households with a member with disability were notably less satisfied than average and at a “solid” level of satisfaction.
- **Group household** – respondents were notably more satisfied than average and at a “very good” level of satisfaction.






Metropolis Research does note that satisfaction with planning for population growth by all levels of government was rated at 6.6 out of 10 for respondents from two-parent families with youngest child aged under five years.

This was a somewhat unusual result, as it is typically observed that young families tend to be more satisfied with planning for population growth than more established families.



It may be the case that concerns around the impact of population growth on access to services and facilities (e.g., MCH, childcare, etc.) may be negatively impacting on satisfaction for these respondents.



Reasons for dissatisfaction with planning for population growth

The following table outlines the 136 comments received from respondents who were not satisfied with planning for population growth by all levels of government.

The most common responses were related to the impact of population growth on parking, roads, traffic, and public transport related issues (43 comments), followed by planning related concerns including around the impact of population growth on local neighbourhood character.

There were also some concerns around impacts on infrastructure (13 comments), impact on specific services and facilities (11 comments), and concerns around over-population (10 comments).

Metropolis Research notes that it is commonly observed in the growth areas of metropolitan Melbourne that concerns around population growth tend to be focused on the impact on availability of services and facilities (including services like childcare), as well as impacts on transport.

In the middle-ring areas of metropolitan Melbourne, the tends to be a greater emphasis of population growth on the local neighbourhood character, as well as transport related impacts.



Reasons for dissatisfaction with planning for population growth
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
(Number of responses)

<i>Reason</i>	<i>Number</i>
<i>Parking, traffic, roads, and public transport</i>	
Roads and amount of traffic / congestion	7
Not enough parking spaces	4
Public transport infrastructure will not support population growth	4
The streets are not big enough / are too narrow for the growth	2
They are not planning any new roads to accommodate people	2
They are not planning well for the growth in terms of public transport	2
All traffic is bottlenecked into the city causing major delays	1
Because the train and bus stops are not connected	1
Cars parked on roads as there are no parking arrangement	1
Children can't play in the streets, there is no space. Street parking is an issue	1
Doing nothing about the roads, no planning	1
Infrastructure is not adequate to cater to population growth like trains	1
Lot of traffic around The Glen	1
More transport for elderly to move around. The bus stops are too far for us to go	1
Need more tram lines here	1
No parking for new developments. Must park in the street	1
Not enough road facilities	1
Parking issues on peak times	1
Parking minimums are cartoonishly excessive	1
People park in the streets and ambulance can't go through	1
Public transport has to be better	1
Road speeds are too slow and is slowing everyone	1
The burden of the increased population on the narrow roads of Clayton causing parking and traffic issues	1
There is underground railway in progress so I am concerned about how it will go	1
They should not do new railway lines without consulting and knowledge; it almost feels like a betrayal	1
Traffic infrastructure will not support population growth	1
Traffic jams increase	1
We need high density living in areas having good public transportation	1
Total	43
<i>Planning and development / neighbourhood character</i>	
I don't see a plan, or any planning discussed	5
High density / buildings too clustered	2
Against building property over two storeys high in Mt Waverley due to new suburban rail project which does not blend in with the existing housing demographic	1
Big builders are good as it is employing people but they should make long term plans for it	1



Cause they're more focused on building more commercial areas rather focusing on building better area for living	1
High density is good but it needs better planning	1
Huge failure in all areas for the last 20 years, they should make planning easier for starters, so much paperwork and cost to get anything built these days it's not worth the hassle	1
I think there is not sufficient connection and future planning amongst different levels of government	1
McMonsters are taking over the municipality. They should not allow big buildings to be built in this area and look after the green character of the area	1
Not much preparation been done for population growth	1
Not sure what their plans are	1
Takes too long for planning decisions. They should make it easier for people who are trying to build more to accommodate the population growth	1
The decisions being made are inappropriate for places like Monash, they're making places into slums and ghettos, an example is the high-rise structure at Glen Waverley Station, now they have multiple properties built on it although it was originally a single property, this also creates parking issues	1
The nature of the area is changing because of Council policy	1
There are lot of housing going on. Across the road there is 1 block and 4 houses and one driveway. So, it is quite compact	1
They are just building units with no parking for the cars	1
They need to look at how they approve high rise buildings	1
They should improve their planning and alignment with the Federal and State government	1
Too many high-rises	1
When they allocate lands for trains and stuff, there should be a body outside the government who continuously do all these things so that there is a continuity and uniformity in the developments	1
Zoning laws are complicated and very bureaucratic	1
Total	26

Infrastructure

Inadequate infrastructure	3
Inner city infrastructure is overpopulated	1
Not enough infrastructure to handle the population growth	2
More infrastructure on outer city suburbs to create jobs in them and make good pathways for employees and employers	1
Not good enough. Structure couldn't cope	1
Poor infrastructure management	1
The infrastructure is not enough for elderly	1
They are not planning any infrastructure to accommodate people	1
They should have better infrastructure and planning for all the high rate of increments in population	1
We don't have infrastructure to begin with	1
Total	13



<i>Services and facilities</i>	
Services are not enough	2
Greater consideration on impact on the amenities should be given	1
Increasing population needs facilities for new and existing residents	1
Need more space and not just high-rise buildings	1
Needs more facilities for more population	1
Provision of adequate services	1
Schools, hospitals etc. needed by State Government	1
They're increasing growth without providing enough services	1
Too much pressure in schools and facilities	1
You need to increase services according to the population growth / size	1
Total	11
<i>Population growth / over population</i>	
Getting overpopulated / over saturated	4
I think population growth is expanding rapidly and housing is a big issue and there is no proper idea by the government	1
Overpopulated already, not enough roads to handle it	1
Overpopulated suburb	1
The population growth is unsustainable	1
They're all stupid, overpopulation is badly affecting the housing	1
We haven't got the levels of spending into population growth	1
Total	10
<i>Need more housing / housing supply issues</i>	
Housing availability	1
Infrastructure is not adequate to cater to population growth like housing	1
Less housing in area	1
More homes for homeless people	1
More houses and rental properties	1
The housing here is not keeping up, the housing here are getting worse because of it	1
There's so much obsession with garden city thinking and not enough housing. Glen Waverley, Clayton, and anywhere with major public transport needs more housing	1
They should focus on medium density houses near stations like Oakleigh and Mount Waverley. They should have multi-level development	1
We don't have the accommodation	1
Total	9
<i>Communication / consultation / information / engagement</i>	
Don't know what they have got planned growth	1
I haven't been informed	1
I just think we are not having a say in it. They are talking about changing zones which is weird	1
I think planning is done in a way that various organisations are involved it's not done with consultation with the community, and it's not well coordinated	1



No consultation with the community and Council is making decisions against expert advice in some cases like Talbot tip development, the Council disapproved even if experts said something else	1
People have engaged but are they being listened to	1
Total	6

Too many houses / high density

They shouldn't permit multi dwellings	1
Too many high-rise buildings	1
Too many houses	1
Too many multi dwellings development being built	1
We live in a neighbourhood with houses and units and with time they make it denser housing and it detracts from quality of life that we chose to live in	1
Total	5

Overcrowding

It's getting very crowded	2
Already crowded and we don't need more people here	1
I don't like crowded area or city	1
Too much crowded around Glen Waverley station and shopping centre area	1
Total	5

Affordable housing

Affordable housing is an issue	1
Total	1

Other

It's not a first homeowner area, I don't want it to expand anymore	1
It's the pace, it is too fast	1
It's too intense	1
Main issue is there are too many people who use public spaces, bins for their own personal use	1
More noise	1
Nothing happens	1
Shops having only Chinese text and no English	1
Total	7

Total	136
--------------	------------



Satisfaction with aspects of planning and housing development

Respondents were asked:

“On a scale of 0 (lowest) to 10 (highest), please rate your satisfaction with the following aspects of planning and housing development in your local area?”

Respondents were again in 2024, asked to rate their satisfaction with three key planning and development outcomes in the municipality.


Satisfaction with two of these three of these planning and development outcomes declined marginally this year, whilst satisfaction with the appearance and quality of new developments remained stable.

Despite the marginal decline this year, Metropolis Research notes that these remain positive results for Council, that reinforce the view that most in the community were relatively satisfied with key planning outcomes.

Particularly informative was the “good” satisfaction with the appearance and quality of new developments, which is the key measure of community satisfaction with development outcomes, which is often the critical aspect that impacts on how satisfied the community is with how well Council is managing development in the municipality.


Satisfaction with these aspects can best be summarised as follows:

- **Very Good** – for the design of public spaces.
- **Good** – for the appearance and quality of new developments and the protection of trees and vegetation on private property.



The following graph provides a breakdown of these results into the proportion of respondents (who provided a score) who were “very satisfied” (i.e., rated satisfaction at eight or more), those who were “neutral to somewhat satisfied” (i.e., rated satisfaction at between five and seven), and those who were “dissatisfied” (i.e., rated satisfaction at less than five out of 10).

Consistent with historical results, at least half of the respondents were “very satisfied” with each of the three planning and development outcomes, whilst six percent were “dissatisfied” with the appearance and quality of new developments, and nine percent this year were “dissatisfied” with the protection of trees and vegetation on private property.




The following graph provides a comparison against the eastern region councils and metropolitan Melbourne, as recorded in the *Governing Melbourne* research conducted independently by Metropolis Research in January 2024, using the same methodology.

Satisfaction with the design of public spaces was measurably higher than both the eastern region council’s and metropolitan Melbourne results.

Satisfaction with the appearance and quality of new developments was identical to the eastern region councils’ average and just marginally above the metropolitan Melbourne average.


Metropolis Research that these results were consistent with those recorded last year, which reinforce that satisfaction with planning and development outcomes in the City of Monash remains above the metropolitan Melbourne average.






Appearance and quality of new developments


Satisfaction with the appearance and quality of new developments remained stable this year at 7.2 out of 10, or a “good” level of satisfaction. Satisfaction with new developments has remained relatively stable in the City of Monash over the eight years of the survey program, except for the two pandemic years of 2021 and 2022, around the long-term average satisfaction of 7.0 out of 10, or “good”.



Whilst there was no statistically significant variation in satisfaction with the appearance and quality of new developments observed across the municipality, it is noted that respondents from Clayton and Chadstone were somewhat more satisfied than average, and at “very good” levels.



There was measurable variation in satisfaction observed by respondent profile, with young adults (aged 18 to 34 years) measurably more satisfied than average and at a “very good” level, whilst older adults (aged 60 to 74 years) were measurably less satisfied.



Examples of and comments about specific developments

The following table outlines the 62 comments received from respondents who were not satisfied with the appearance and quality of new developments.

The most common reasons for dissatisfaction related to perceived overdevelopment (22 comments) and specific locations of concern (12 comments).

There were also some comments around concerns the appearance and quality of developments (9 comments).

These results were consistent with the issues raised in previous years and reflect those in the community who were concerned about perceived over-development and excessive population growth.

Reasons for dissatisfaction with the appearance and quality of new development

Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey

(Number of responses)

<i>Reason</i>	<i>Number</i>
<i>Overdevelopment / high density development</i>	
The high-rise building developments	4
Apartment buildings	1
Because Council wants more people living in small spaces and facilities have not been extended	1
Blocks of land are overly developed, there's insufficient parking. One of many examples is on Briar Gr and Wanda Str	1
I find it to be a monstrosity to see big houses	1
It's multiple dwelling on average blocks. They don't seem to be doing anything for affordable housing	1
Lots of town houses so it becomes too crowded and too small. Sometimes it is only 180 square meters	1
Sub-divisions, you get different mix of properties	1
There are very unnecessarily builds like estate type buildings	1
They are too big, bigger than necessary and unsustainable	1
Trying to put too many houses and boxes. People need spaces	1
We don't like high density apartments	1
Haven't seen any	2
I couldn't see any development. There is no change in this area	1
Limited new developments	1
No developments are being done in this area; we need more development to take place as we pay the rates too	1
Not developed anything they should start something	1
Not enough housing	1
Total	22



Specific locations

Development in Calista Ave had underground parking but has a poor finish. Not an asset to the community	1
Gallaghers Rd	1
Jells Rd and Ferntree Gully Rd development was abandoned, and it looks garbage	1
Near The Glen, in Kingsway area it is bad	1
Oakleigh Mall	1
Ones near Monash are embarrassing, it's got too many granny flats rented to students	1
The apartments on the corner of Springvale Rd and Police Rd	1
The building sites are very messy and maintained on the Huxley Ave	1
The Glen shopping centre	1
There are too many town houses, and they look cheap. There are many such developments in Scotsburn Ave	1
There is no room for open spaces since the buildings are too close especially on the Kingsway and new development on Ferntree Gully Rd and Springvale Rd	1
There are some apartments that's been started on Ferntree Gully Rd and Jells Rd, it is unfinished for years and I think that's poor	1
Total	12

Appearance and quality

They don't look very nice	2
In general, all look the same, boring	1
No beauty around the Garrison Drv area because they are not maintaining gardens and trees, it is all concrete everywhere	1
Some new houses look terrible, not my taste, prefer conventional houses	1
The appearance doesn't suit with neighbourhood	1
There is very unnecessarily poor-quality builds like estate type buildings	1
They are not so appealing as too many people	1
Too many ugly houses	1
Total	9

Trees / greenery

Not happy with them cutting the trees	2
No garden area, need more	1
Talbot Park is being redone	1
They have cut down so many trees to build houses	1
We have lost the greenery	1
Total	6




<i>Heritage protection / character of neighbourhood</i>	
New private buildings look ugly and out of character (vintage one)	1
Not enough consolidation of period housing	1
The mixture of old and new houses and don't go anywhere and houses are not kept properly	1
There are big houses that don't fit in this area, they need planning permission	1
Total	4
<i>Planning and development process / regulations</i>	
Should be strict to planning controls, very congested	1
There are plenty of construction which are not regulated	1
Won't listen to people. They have their own rules	1
Total	3
<i>Traffic / parking</i>	
Parking facilities Albert Ave car parked both ways can't get through	1
Total	1
<i>Other / general comments</i>	
I have not found recreation activities. I must drive far	1
Infrastructure is not upgraded according to the rate of population growth	1
Neighbour put yard into my yard at Kingston, but Council came and did nothing	1
No more management of housing developments	1
Too many houses taking the sunlight and blocking the views	1
Total	5
Total	62


The design of public spaces

Satisfaction with the design of public spaces declined marginally this year, down one percent to 7.6 out of 10, although it remains at a “very good” level, and consistent with the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 7.6 out of 10.






There was measurable variation in satisfaction observed across the municipality, with respondents from Oakleigh measurably less satisfied than average, and at a “good” level.



Whilst there was no measurable variation in satisfaction observed by respondent profile, older adults (aged 60 to 74 years) were the least satisfied, although still at a “very good” level.




The design of public spaces by respondent profile
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
scale from 0 (very dissatisfied) to 10 (very satisfied)



The protection of trees and vegetation on private property


Satisfaction with the protection of trees and vegetation on private property declined somewhat, but not measurably this year, down three percent to 7.2 out of 10, which was a “good”, down from a “very good” level, although it remains consistent with the long-term average satisfaction since 2016 of 7.2 out of 10.

The protection of trees and vegetation on private property
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
scale from 0 (very dissatisfied) to 10 (very satisfied)




There was measurable and notable variation in satisfaction observed across the municipality. Respondents from Clayton were measurably and 11 respondents from Notting Hill were notably more satisfied than average and at “very good” levels, whilst respondents from Oakleigh were measurably and significantly less satisfied and at a “solid” level of satisfaction.

The protection of trees and vegetation on private property by precinct
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
scale from 0 (very dissatisfied) to 10 (very satisfied)



There was measurable variation in satisfaction observed by respondent profile. Younger respondents (aged 18 to 44 years) were notably more satisfied than average and at “very good” levels, whilst older respondents (aged 45 years and over) were notably less satisfied. Respondents from multilingual households were measurably more satisfied than respondents from English speaking households.

The protection of trees and vegetation on private property by respondent profile
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
scale from 0 (very dissatisfied) to 10 (very satisfied)



Current issues for the City of Monash

Respondents were asked:

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

Respondents were again in 2024 asked to identify what they considered to be the top three issues for the City of Monash to address ‘at the moment’.

Approximately two-thirds (69% up from 68%) of respondents provided a total of 1,034 responses, at an average approximately two issues per respondent.

This is a critical component of the *Annual Community Survey* program, as it provides meaningful insight into the range of issues currently of importance to the community and insight into how these issues may be impacting on community satisfaction with Council.

These can include a wide range of issues, some relating to the activities of Council, and some relating to other areas. They all, however, have the capacity to impact on the local community’s satisfaction with, and expectations of their local council.

It is important to bear in mind that these responses were not necessarily all complaints about the performance of Council, nor do they only reflect services, facilities, and issues within the specific remit of the Monash City Council. Many of the issues that respondents nominate as significant are generally within the remit of other levels of government.

The open-ended responses received from respondents have been broadly categorised into a set of approximately 70 categories to facilitate analysis and examination of change over time.

The storm event:

It is noted that 25 respondents (3%) nominated issues around the storm, including power outages, and the cleanup of damage such as fallen trees, etc. There was also an increase in the related issue of street trees (8% up from 5%). It is noted, however, that the 25 respondents who nominated storm related events were no less satisfied with Council’s overall performance than the municipal average (7.5 compared to 7.3).

Rubbish and waste issues:

The proportion of respondents nominating rubbish and waste issues (including mostly kerbside collection) related issues declined notably this year, down from the very high 17% recorded last and the 13% recorded in 2022, to 11% this year.

Over the last three years, these results clearly reflect community engagement with kerbside collection issues through firstly the communication stage (2022), then the implementation stage (2023) of the changes to the kerbside collection services, and now as the new system settles into the new normal.



As discussed in the [Relationship between issues and overall satisfaction](#) section, the 91 (down from 139 last year) respondents who nominated rubbish and waste issues, were notably (4%) less satisfied with Council's overall performance than the municipal average (7.0 compared to 7.3).

This result clearly indicates the degree to which the changes in the kerbside collection services continue to negatively impact on satisfaction with Council's overall performance for those in the community who continue to raise concerns around the new system.

The size of the group in the community who have concerns around the kerbside collection service changes has declined, although the impact on overall satisfaction with Council for those with concerns around the new system has remained stable at four percent.

Metropolis Research does note, however, that satisfaction with Monash City Council's overall performance has increased by three percent since 2022, despite this negative influence from the changes to the kerbside collection services.

It remains the experience of Metropolis Research, that the impact on overall satisfaction of changes to the kerbside collection services tends to dissipate over time, as the community becomes more comfortable with the new service provision. This trend is clearly evident in these results.

Metropolis Research notes that this diminishing of the impact of kerbside collection service changes was also evident with the three percent improvement in satisfaction with the regular garbage collection to 8.1 out of 10. It does, however, still remain five percent below the long-term average since 2016 of 8.5. This is discussed in the [Regular garbage collection](#) section.

Traffic and parking issues:

There have traditional been two issues that have dominated the issues to address section of the survey since it commenced in 2016, those being traffic management (e.g., commuting times, congestion) and parking issues (both availability and enforcement).

It is noted that traffic management returned to around the pre-pandemic average in 2022, although car parking issues have yet to fully return to the pre-pandemic average of around 21%.

Parking issues continue to be notably more nominated in the City of Monash than the metropolitan Melbourne average (13% compared to 7%).

Both traffic and parking issues appear to exert a somewhat negative influence on satisfaction with Council's overall performance for the respondents' nominating them.

The consistently negative impact on overall satisfaction of these issues has been observed over a long period of time and typically observed across metropolitan Melbourne, although the strength of the impact on satisfaction does vary somewhat from municipality to municipality.



Respondents who nominated either traffic management or car parking issues rated overall satisfaction at 7.2 out of 10, or around 1.1% below the municipal average. The impact of these issues on overall satisfaction is reflected in the relatively large proportion of respondents nominating these issues.

Other notable issues:

Other issues commonly nominated by a smaller proportion of respondents (typically between approximately five and ten percent) in recent years in the City of Monash include street trees, planning, and development issues, road maintenance and repairs including roadworks, and parks, gardens, and open spaces issues.

These issues were all evident in these results again in 2024, with more than five percent of respondents nominating each of these issues.

Importantly, all these issues appear to consistently exert a somewhat negative influence on satisfaction with Council's overall performance, for the respondents who raised the issues, although the proportion of respondents nominating each issue remains relatively small.

Further discussion of the relationship between the issues nominated in this section and the respondents' overall satisfaction with the performance of Council is included in the [Relationship between issues and overall satisfaction](#) section of this report.

Change in results from 2023 to 2024:

There was some variation observed in the top issues to address this year, as follows:

- **Somewhat more commonly nominated in 2023 than in 2022** – included street trees (8% up from 5%), planning and development (7% up from 4%), and storm management / cleanup (3%).
- **Somewhat less commonly nominated in 2023 than in 2022** – included rubbish and waste issues (11% down from 17%), and cleanliness and maintenance (1% down from 5%).

Variation between the City of Monash and metropolitan Melbourne:

There was some variation observed in the top issues to address this year between the City of Monash and metropolitan Melbourne, as recorded in *Governing Melbourne*, as follows:

- **Somewhat more commonly nominated in the City of Monash** – included parking issues both enforcement and availability (13% compared to 7%), rubbish and waste issues (11% compared to 6%), planning and development (7% compared to 2%), hard rubbish (4% compared to 1%), drains (4% compared to 1%), and storm issues (3% compared to 0%).
- **Somewhat less commonly nominated in the City of Monash** – included Council rates, fees, and charges (3% compared to 6%), and nature strip issues (1% compared to 6%).



Top three issues for the City of Monash at the moment
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
 (Number and percent of total respondents)

Response	2024		2023	2022	2021	2024 Metro.*
	Number	Percent				
Traffic management	105	13%	14%	13%	8%	14%
Parking	101	13%	12%	11%	7%	7%
Rubbish and waste issues inc. garbage collection	91	11%	17%	13%	5%	6%
Provision and maintenance of street trees	64	8%	5%	4%	3%	6%
Building, planning, housing and development	54	7%	4%	9%	10%	2%
Roads maintenance and repairs	51	6%	6%	6%	6%	7%
Parks, gardens and open spaces	47	6%	5%	8%	9%	6%
Safety, policing and crime	36	4%	3%	4%	4%	2%
Hard rubbish collection	32	4%	3%	5%	4%	1%
Footpath maintenance and repairs	31	4%	4%	3%	4%	4%
Lighting	31	4%	7%	5%	3%	2%
Drains maintenance and repairs	29	4%	2%	2%	2%	1%
Rates	27	3%	2%	2%	2%	6%
Prov. and maint. of sports and recreation facilities	25	3%	1%	3%	2%	1%
Storm management / clean-up	25	3%	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Communication, consultation, provision of info.	19	2%	4%	4%	3%	2%
Street cleaning and maintenance	19	2%	3%	2%	2%	3%
Activities and facilities for children	16	2%	1%	2%	2%	1%
Animal / pest management	15	2%	1%	1%	1%	2%
Provision and maint. of cycling / walking paths	15	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%
Public toilets	15	2%	3%	2%	3%	0%
Housing availability / affordability	13	2%	1%	0%	0%	1%
Environment, conservation and climate change	12	1%	3%	3%	2%	0%
Nature strip issues	10	1%	1%	0%	1%	6%
Cleanliness and maintenance of area	9	1%	5%	2%	1%	3%
Council management, governance, accountability	9	1%	1%	2%	2%	2%
Provision and maintenance of infrastructure	9	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%
Public transport	9	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%
Financial issues and priorities for Council	7	1%	0%	1%	0%	1%
Library services	7	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Services and facilities for the elderly	7	1%	1%	2%	1%	2%
Council customer service / responsiveness	6	1%	1%	2%	1%	0%
Multicultural issues / cultural diversity	6	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%
Recycling collection	6	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Dog off leash parks / bins / facilities	5	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%
Population and growth	5	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%
All other issues (32 separately identified issues)	66	8%	11%	7%	8%	7%
Total responses	1,034		1,089	1,016	857	765
<i>Respondents identifying at least one issue</i>	553 (69%)		553 (68%)	511 (64%)	454 (57%)	391 (50%)

(*) 2024 metropolitan Melbourne average from Governing Melbourne



Issues by precinct

There was some variation in the top issues to address for the City of Monash at the moment observed across the municipality, as follows:

- **Ashwood – Burwood** – the 27 respondents were somewhat more likely than average to nominate parking, street trees, and traffic management related issues.
- **Chadstone** – the 31 respondents were somewhat more likely than average to nominate rubbish and waste issues, and storm management / cleanup related issues.
- **Clayton** – the 61 respondents were somewhat more likely than average to nominate rubbish and waste issues.
- **Notting Hill** – the 12 respondents were somewhat more likely than average to nominate planning and development and road related issues.
- **Wheelers Hill** – the 56 respondents were somewhat more likely than average to nominate traffic management, roads, and parks, gardens, and open space related issues.
- **Mt Waverley** – the 109 respondents were somewhat more likely than average to nominate traffic management, car parking, planning and development, and road related issues.
- **Mulgrave** – the 60 respondents were somewhat more likely than average to nominate traffic management, parks, gardens, and open space, and storm management related issues.
- **Oakleigh** – the 27 respondents were somewhat more likely than average to nominate roads, parks, gardens, and open spaces, the provision of sports and recreation facilities, and activities and facilities for children.
- **Oakleigh East** – the 26 respondents were somewhat more likely than average to nominate car parking, street trees, rubbish and waste, storm management, and provision and maintenance of sports and recreation facilities.
- **Oakleigh South** – the 14 respondents were somewhat more likely than average to nominate rubbish and waste, parks, gardens, and open spaces, and planning and development issues.
- **Hughesdale** – the 17 respondents were somewhat more likely than average to nominate drains related issues.



Top three issues for the City of Monash at the moment by precinct

Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey

(Number and percent of total respondents)

Ashwood - Burwood	
Parking	19%
Provision and maintenance of street trees	17%
Traffic management	17%
Rubbish and waste issues inc. garbage	14%
Drains maintenance and repairs	7%
Prov. and maint. of cycling / walking path	7%
Building, planning, housing, development	5%
Lighting	5%
Safety, policing and crime	5%
Provision / maintenance of infrastructure	5%
All other issues	31%
<i>Respondents identifying an issue</i>	27 (65%)

Chadstone	
Rubbish and waste issues inc. garbage	21%
Traffic management	13%
Parking	11%
Lighting	8%
Public toilets	8%
Storm management / clean-up	8%
Rates	5%
Building, planning, housing, development	5%
Road repairs and maintenance	5%
Footpath repairs and maintenance	5%
All other issues	45%
<i>Respondents identifying an issue</i>	31 (83%)

Clayton	
Rubbish and waste issues inc. garbage	17%
Parking	16%
Provision and maintenance of street trees	9%
Footpath repairs and maintenance	6%
Safety, policing and crime	6%
Traffic management	6%
Hard rubbish collection	5%
Drains maintenance and repairs	4%
Street cleaning and maintenance	4%
Building, planning, housing, development	3%
All other issues	23%
<i>Respondents identifying an issue</i>	61 (59%)

Notting Hill	
Building, planning, housing, development	20%
Road repairs and maintenance	20%
Rates	13%
Rubbish and waste issues inc. garbage	13%
Traffic management	13%
Provision / maintenance of infrastructure	13%
Hard rubbish collection	13%
Parks, gardens and open space	13%
Environment, conservation, climate change	13%
Public transport	13%
All other issues	53%
<i>Respondents identifying an issue</i>	12 (75%)

Glen Waverley	
Parking	13%
Traffic management	10%
Rubbish and waste issues inc. garbage	9%
Building, planning, housing, development	8%
Drains maintenance and repairs	6%
Provision and maintenance of street trees	5%
Lighting	5%
Safety, policing and crime	5%
Parks, gardens and open space	4%
Animal / pest management	4%
All other issues	51%
<i>Respondents identifying an issue</i>	113 (68%)

Wheelers Hill	
Traffic management	19%
Rubbish and waste issues inc. garbage	13%
Road repairs and maintenance	12%
Provision and maintenance of street trees	10%
Parks, gardens and open space	10%
Rates	7%
Building, planning, housing, development	7%
Safety, policing and crime	5%
Prov./maint. of sports/recreation facilities	5%
Lighting	4%
All other issues	39%
<i>Respondents identifying an issue</i>	56 (66%)



Top three issues for the City of Monash at the moment by precinct
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
 (Number and percent of total respondents)

Mt Waverley	
Traffic management	19%
Parking	18%
Building, planning, housing, development	12%
Road repairs and maintenance	10%
Provision and maintenance of street trees	8%
Footpath repairs and maintenance	7%
Rubbish and waste issues inc. garbage	6%
Communication, consultation, prov. of info.	5%
Safety, policing and crime	5%
Housing availability / affordability	5%
All other issues	51%
<i>Respondents identifying an issue</i>	<i>109 (74%)</i>

Mulgrave	
Traffic management	20%
Parks, gardens and open space	14%
Rubbish and waste issues inc. garbage	9%
Provision and maintenance of street trees	9%
Parking	7%
Safety, policing and crime	7%
Storm management / clean-up	7%
Road repairs and maintenance	6%
Public transport	5%
Services and facilities for the elderly	4%
All other issues	58%
<i>Respondents identifying an issue</i>	<i>60 (75%)</i>

Oakleigh	
Road repairs and maintenance	21%
Parks, gardens and open space	15%
Parking	12%
Prov./maint. of sports/recreation facilities	12%
Rubbish and waste issues inc. garbage	9%
Activities and facilities for children	9%
Rates	6%
Building, planning, housing, development	6%
Traffic management	6%
Prov. & maint. of cycling / walking path	6%
All other issues	59%
<i>Respondents identifying an issue</i>	<i>27 (79%)</i>

Oakleigh East	
Parking	17%
Provision and maintenance of street trees	15%
Rubbish and waste issues inc. garbage	12%
Storm management / clean-up	10%
Prov./maint. of sports/recreation facilities	10%
Traffic management	7%
Noise	7%
Road repairs and maintenance	5%
Footpath repairs and maintenance	5%
Hard rubbish collection	5%
All other issues	37%
<i>Respondents identifying an issue</i>	<i>26 (64%)</i>

Oakleigh South	
Rubbish and waste issues inc. garbage	21%
Parks, gardens and open space	21%
Building, planning, housing, development	16%
Hard rubbish collection	16%
Prov./maint. of sports/recreation facilities	16%
Parking	11%
Library services	11%
Traffic management	11%
Activities and facilities for children	11%
Drains maintenance and repairs	5%
All other issues	32%
<i>Respondents identifying an issue</i>	<i>14 (72%)</i>

Hughesdale	
Hard rubbish collection	14%
Parking	10%
Drains maintenance and repairs	10%
Rubbish and waste issues inc. garbage	10%
Provision and maintenance of street trees	10%
Traffic management	7%
Footpath repairs and maintenance	3%
Lighting	3%
Library services	3%
Council management and governance	3%
All other issues	21%
<i>Respondents identifying an issue</i>	<i>17 (57%)</i>



Issues by respondent profile

There was some variation in the top issues to address for the City of Monash at the moment observed by respondent profile, as follows:

- **Adults (aged 35 to 44 years)** – respondents were somewhat more likely than average to nominate traffic management.
- **Older adults (aged 60 to 74 years)** – respondents were somewhat more likely than average to nominate roads, planning and development, and street trees related issues.
- **Male** – respondents were somewhat more likely than female respondents to nominate planning and development related issues.
- **Female** – respondents were somewhat more likely than male respondents to nominate parking, safety, policing, and crime, and lighting related issues.
- **Household with member with disability** – the 50 respondents were somewhat more likely than respondents from other households to nominate parking, traffic management, footpaths, roads, drains, hard rubbish collection, and communication and consultation related issues.



Top three issues for the City of Monash at the moment by respondent profile

Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey

(Number and percent of total respondents)

Young adults (18 to 34 years)	
Parking	13%
Rubbish and waste issues inc. garbage	13%
Traffic management	10%
Safety, policing and crime	5%
Provision and maintenance of street trees	5%
Parks, gardens and open space	5%
Hard rubbish collection	5%
Road repairs and maintenance	4%
Prov./maint. of sports/recreation facilities	4%
Storm management / clean-up	4%
All other issues	38%
<i>Respondents identifying an issue</i>	<i>167 (60%)</i>

Adults (35 to 44 years)	
Traffic management	19%
Parking	11%
Rubbish and waste issues inc. garbage	10%
Lighting	8%
Provision and maintenance of street trees	7%
Rates	5%
Activities and facilities for children	5%
Safety, policing and crime	5%
Building, planning, housing, development	4%
Footpath repairs and maintenance	4%
All other issues	58%
<i>Respondents identifying an issue</i>	<i>93 (72%)</i>

Middle aged adults (45 to 59 years)	
Traffic management	16%
Parking	14%
Rubbish and waste issues inc. garbage	12%
Provision and maintenance of street trees	10%
Building, planning, housing, development	9%
Parks, gardens and open space	7%
Road repairs and maintenance	6%
Footpath repairs and maintenance	6%
Lighting	6%
Safety, policing and crime	5%
All other issues	58%
<i>Respondents identifying an issue</i>	<i>137 (77%)</i>

Older adults (60 to 74 years)	
Parking	14%
Road repairs and maintenance	14%
Traffic management	14%
Building, planning, housing, development	13%
Provision and maintenance of street trees	12%
Rubbish and waste issues inc. garbage	12%
Parks, gardens and open space	7%
Hard rubbish collection	7%
Rates	5%
Communication, consultation, prov. of info.	5%
All other issues	53%
<i>Respondents identifying an issue</i>	<i>98 (76%)</i>

Senior citizens (75 years and over)	
Provision and maintenance of street tree	9%
Parks, gardens and open space	9%
Parking	9%
Building, planning, housing, development	9%
Traffic management	9%
Drains maintenance and repairs	7%
Road repairs and maintenance	7%
Rubbish and waste issues inc. garbage	7%
Footpath repairs and maintenance	6%
Street cleaning and maintenance	6%
All other issues	39%
<i>Respondents identifying an issue</i>	<i>57 (66%)</i>

City of Monash	
Traffic management	13%
Parking	13%
Rubbish and waste issues inc. garbage	11%
Provision and maintenance of street trees	8%
Building, planning, housing, development	7%
Roads maintenance and repairs	6%
Parks, gardens and open spaces	6%
Safety, policing and crime	4%
Hard rubbish collection	4%
Footpath maintenance and repairs	4%
All other issues	53%
<i>Respondents identifying an issue</i>	<i>553 (69%)</i>



Top three issues for the City of Monash at the moment by respondent profile

Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey

(Number and percent of total respondents)

Male	
Traffic management	16%
Parking	11%
Rubbish and waste issues inc. garbage	11%
Road repairs and maintenance	8%
Provision and maintenance of street trees	8%
Building, planning, housing, development	6%
Safety, policing and crime	5%
Parks, gardens and open space	5%
Lighting	4%
Footpath repairs and maintenance	4%
All other issues	49%
<i>Respondents identifying an issue</i>	<i>260 (67%)</i>

Female	
Parking	14%
Rubbish and waste issues inc. garbage	11%
Traffic management	11%
Provision and maintenance of street trees	9%
Building, planning, housing, development	7%
Parks, gardens and open space	7%
Hard rubbish collection	5%
Road repairs and maintenance	5%
Rates	5%
Drains maintenance and repairs	4%
All other issues	53%
<i>Respondents identifying an issue</i>	<i>289 (71%)</i>

English speaking	
Traffic management	14%
Rubbish and waste issues inc. garbage	10%
Parking	10%
Provision and maintenance of street trees	9%
Building, planning, housing, development	9%
Road repairs and maintenance	8%
Parks, gardens and open space	8%
Footpath repairs and maintenance	5%
Drains maintenance and repairs	4%
Rates	3%
All other issues	53%
<i>Respondents identifying an issue</i>	<i>267 (72%)</i>

Multi-lingual	
Parking	15%
Rubbish and waste issues inc. garbage	13%
Traffic management	12%
Provision and maintenance of street trees	7%
Safety, policing and crime	7%
Lighting	5%
Building, planning, housing, development	5%
Hard rubbish collection	5%
Road repairs and maintenance	5%
Prov./maint. of sports/recreation facilities	5%
All other issues	47%
<i>Respondents identifying an issue</i>	<i>280 (67%)</i>

Household members with disability	
Parking	16%
Traffic management	15%
Footpath repairs and maintenance	13%
Road repairs and maintenance	10%
Provision and maintenance of street trees	10%
Parks, gardens and open space	8%
Rubbish and waste issues inc. garbage	8%
Drains maintenance and repairs	8%
Hard rubbish collection	8%
Communication, consultation, prov. of info.	7%
All other issues	74%
<i>Respondents identifying an issue</i>	<i>50 (82%)</i>

Household members without disability	
Traffic management	13%
Parking	12%
Rubbish and waste issues inc. garbage	12%
Provision and maintenance of street trees	8%
Building, planning, housing, development	7%
Road repairs and maintenance	6%
Parks, gardens and open space	6%
Safety, policing and crime	5%
Lighting	4%
Hard rubbish collection	4%
All other issues	48%
<i>Respondents identifying an issue</i>	<i>489 (68%)</i>



Provision and maintenance of street trees

The following table outlines the 68 verbatim comments that were classified as “street trees” in the issues to address results.

Most of these comments related to a perceived lack of maintenance of street trees, including issues with trimming and pruning.

It is likely that the increase in the proportion of respondents nominating street trees as an issue this year (8% up from 5%) may well have resulted, at least in part, to the impact of the storm event that occurred during the survey fieldwork.

Issues that specifically mentioned the storm were separately classified.

Issues regarding "provision and maintenance of street trees"
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
(Number of responses)

<i>Issue</i>	<i>Number</i>
Maintenance of street trees	9
Tree trimming not good / need regularly	6
Trees pruning / maintenance on Strada Cres. Lots need to be replaced and managed	3
Better tree species selection	2
Aging trees	1
Consider the safety regarding trees on High St Road blocking vision	1
Council is trying but it's not up to the mark on trees	1
Council management of street trees is not good	1
Green coverage, trees need to be planted in this area where there are less gardens. We don't have many gardens and places to walk	1
Gum trees causing problems that needs to be solved. Once a month isn't enough for cleaning in this area	1
I feel like the trees are not aligned to the trees another side. They do not look good	1
I think choice of species of trees on nature strips should be looked at on main roads	1
I want to replant trees	1
Keeping trees trimmed and hedged	1
Leaves falling from the trees around the community made a mess especially on the pathways at Lawson and Baynton St	1
Maintaining of big trees in new build and private housing	1
Maintenance of oak tree at the end of McKenzie Ct which is over 100 years old	1
Maintenance of street trees in McKenzie Ct	1
More maintenance of the street trees. Hanging cables can be seen somewhere. It can be trimmed	1
More work should be done on tree maintenance on Grenfell St	1
Need to clean up those loose branches ASAP	1
Packing of felled trees of the street as soon as possible	1
Proper street trees management should be prioritised	1
Prune street trees every year	1



Some of the big trees on road on Gwingana Cres spill lot of dust	1
Some of trees on Winmalee Rd block the view of the drivers, especially when driving from Woodlea Drv to intersect Winmalee Rd	1
Street tree maintenance in front of my house, it can be dangerous with hanging branches	1
Street trees maintenance should be timely	1
The choice of trees on nature strips should be better in residential areas	1
The street trees in front of my house are not properly maintained and intruding my house	1
The tree in front of me has lots of branches. It can hurt passersby	1
The tree is split into half and damaged the neighbour's house. The remaining half of the tree might be danger in the future as well	1
The tree species selection should be improved and made less dangerous	1
The trees in front of my house have not been well maintained	1
The trees on Crewe Rd dim the streetlights and it is always very dark at night	1
There should be a policy to protect the trees being planted by tenant to protect them from noise	1
Tree canopy is disappearing because of monstrosity houses being built	1
Tree maintenance needs to be improved not the wrong trees like bush but other trees	1
Tree maintenance should be done more after the thunderstorms	1
Tree management should be done more regularly	1
Tree trimming on main roads	1
Tree trimming on Springvale Rd	1
Trees	1
Trees are being poisoned by bad people	1
Trees are not planted well	1
Trees down by storm	1
Trees fall across my house; owner complain but they have not done anything on (Grove Rd)	1
Trees in my property is damaging the power lines	1
Trees maintenance and trimming. Hazardous due to strong winds around the Avenue	1
Trees management at Clayton SC because the trees there block the view when driving	1
Trees need to be maintained and cut down if dead or rotting	1
Trees on nature strip to be cut down and removed	1
Total	68



Importance of selected Council initiatives

Respondents were asked:


“On a scale from 0 (very unimportant), to 10 (very important), how important are the following Council initiatives to you?”

Respondents were again in 2024, asked to rate how important they considered each of three Council initiatives were to them.

Consistent with the results recorded last year, respondents considered three of the four initiatives to be extremely important, with average importance scores of more than eight out of 10, whilst the importance of the promotion of gender equity was considered “very important” with an average score of 7.7 out of 10.

Metropolis Research notes that the average importance of each of these four Council initiatives declined somewhat this year, from the scores recorded last year. These declines were statistically significant for the prevention of family violence and all forms of violence against women (down 4%) and reducing loneliness in the community (down 3%).

Metropolis Research suggests that these declines in average importance, whilst notable, do not suggest a significant decline in the importance that the community places on these four areas, as the average importance remains at “very” to “extremely” high levels.




The following graph provides a breakdown of these results into the proportion of respondents who provided a score who considered each initiative to be “very important” (i.e., rated importance at eight or more), those who considered them to be “neutral to somewhat important” (i.e., rated five to seven), and those who considered each to be “unimportant” (i.e., rated importance at less than five out of 10).



Consistent with the decline in average importance scores, the proportion of respondents who considered three of the four initiatives to be “very important” declined marginally this year.

It is noted that there was no significant increase in the proportion of respondents who considered each initiative to be “unimportant”, with attention again this year to the eight percent of respondents who considered the promotion of gender equity to be “unimportant”.



Promotion of gender equity


The importance of the promotion of gender equity declined somewhat this year, down three percent to 7.7 out of 10, although it remains “very important”.

There was some notable and some measurable variation in this result observed across the municipality.

The 27 respondents from Chadstone rated the promotion of gender equity measurably higher than the municipal average, whilst 18 respondents from Oakleigh South and 89 respondents from Clayton rated it notably more important than the municipal average.


By contrast, 30 respondents from Oakleigh and 14 respondents from Notting Hill rated the importance of this initiative notably, but not measurably lower than the municipal average at 7.0 out of 10.





There was significant variation in the importance of the promotion of gender equity observed by respondent profile, as follows:


- **Notably more important than average** – young adults and adults (aged 18 to 44 years), female respondents, respondents from multilingual households, and the 25 LGBTIQ+ respondents.
- **Notably less important than average** – older adults (aged 60 to 74 years), male respondents and respondents from English speaking households.



Prevention of family violence and all forms of violence against women

The importance of the prevention of family violence and all forms of violence against women declined measurably, but not significantly this year, down four percent to 8.5 out of 10, which remains an “extremely high” level of agreement. Just one percent of respondents considered this “unimportant”.

There was measurable variation in this result observed across the municipality, with respondents from 15 respondents from Notting Hill, 17 from Oakleigh South, and 91 from Clayton rating this measurably more important than average. Respondents from Mt Waverley rated this measurably less important than average, although still “extremely important” nonetheless.




There was relatively little significant variation in the importance of this Council initiative observed by respondent profile, with respondents from most age groups, gender, and language spoken at home considering this initiative to be “extremely important” with average scores of more than eight out of 10.

It is noted, however, that older adults (aged 60 to 74 years) rated the importance of this Council initiative measurably, but not significantly lower than average at 7.9 out of 10.

It is also noted that female respondents rated the importance of this Council initiative notably higher than male respondents, although male respondents rated it “extremely important”.






Support for local businesses to grow, to increase jobs, and investment

The average importance of Council initiatives to support local businesses to grow, to increase jobs, and investment declined marginally this year, down one percent to 8.3 out of 10, although it remains “extremely important”.

There was some measurable and notable variation in the average importance of this Council initiative observed across the municipality.


The 16 respondents from Oakleigh South and 14 respondents from Notting Hill rated this initiative measurably more important than the municipal average, whilst 22 respondents from Hughesdale rated it measurably less important, although still at a “very important” score of 7.3 out of 10.





There was relatively little significant variation in the average importance of this Council initiative observed by respondent profile, with respondents from most age groups, gender, and language spoken at home rating this initiative as “extremely important”.

It is noted, however, that older adults (aged 60 to 74 years) rated this initiative somewhat less important than the municipal average, although still at a “very important” level of 7.9 out of 10.




Reducing loneliness in the community

The importance of the Council initiative of reducing loneliness in the community declined measurably this year, down three percent to 8.1 out of 10, although it remains “extremely important” with a score of more than eight out of 10.

There was some measurable variation in this result observed across the municipality, with 15 respondents from Notting Hill rating this measurably more important than average at 9.0 out of 10.

It is noted, however, that 23 respondents from Hughesdale rated the importance of this initiative notably lower than average, but still at a “very important” score of 7.4 out of 10.




There was measurable variation in the importance of reducing loneliness in the community observed by respondent profile.

- **Senior citizens (aged 75 years and over)** – respondents considered this initiative measurably and significantly more important than other respondents at 8.6 out of 10.
- **Gender** – female respondents rated this initiative notably, but not measurably more important than male respondents.
- **Language spoken at home** – respondents from multilingual households considered this initiative notably but not measurably more important than respondents from English speaking households.

Metropolis Research notes that the 91 respondents from sole person households rated the importance of reducing loneliness in the community at the municipal average of 8.1 out of 10.





Perception of safety

Respondents were then asked:

“On a scale of 0 (lowest) to 10 (highest), how safe do you feel in public areas in the City of Monash? If rated less than 5, why do you say that?”

Respondents were again in 2024, asked to rate their perception of safety in the public areas of the City of Monash during the day, at night, in and around their local shopping district / centre, and travelling on / waiting for public transport.


The perception of safety in the public areas of the City of Monash during the day, in and around the local shopping area remained stable this year, whilst the perception of safety travelling on / waiting for public transport increased marginally (1%), although all three remained at very high levels of more than eight out of 10.

There was, however, a marginal (1%) but not statistically significant decline in the perception of safety in the public areas of Monash at night, with seven percent (up from 6%) of respondents reporting that they felt unsafe in the public areas at night.

These results clearly indicate that overall, the Monash community feels very to extremely safe in and around the City of Monash.


Metropolis Research notes that four percent of respondents (up from 3%) nominated safety, policing, and crime related issues as one of the top three [issues to address](#) this year. Whilst this is a little higher than the metropolitan Melbourne average of two percent, it still suggests that safety related issues were not significant in the municipality again this year.





The following graph provides the breakdown of these results into the proportion of respondents who felt “very safe” (i.e., rated safety at eight or more), those who felt “neutral to somewhat safe” (i.e., rated safety at between five and seven), and those who felt “unsafe” (i.e., rated safety at less than five).

Approximately three-quarters or more of respondents felt safe around shopping centres, during the day, and around public transport, a little more than half (55%) felt safe in the public areas at night, with seven percent (up from 6%) reporting that they felt “unsafe” at night.




The following graph provides a comparison of these results against the metropolitan Melbourne and eastern region councils’ results, as sourced from the 2024 *Governing Melbourne* research conducted independently by Metropolis Research in January 2024, using the same in-person, door-to-door methodology.

It is noted that the perception of safety in three of four of these circumstances and times was measurably higher than the metropolitan Melbourne average, whilst the perception of safety in the public areas of the municipality at night was notably but not measurably higher.

The perception of safety in the City of Monash was also measurably higher than the eastern region councils’ average for public transport and in and around shopping areas.


These results again reinforce the view that the Monash community, on the whole, feels quite safe in public areas, and at levels consistently higher than the metropolitan Melbourne average.




Perception of safety in public areas during the day

The perception of safety in the public areas of the City of Monash during the day remained stable this year at 8.6 out of 10, which is an “extremely high” perception of safety score. This result has remained very stable around the long-term average since 2018 of 8.6 out of 10.






There was no statistically significant variation in this result observed across the municipality, with respondents from all precincts rating their perception of safety in the public areas of the municipality during the day at “extremely safe” levels of more than eight out of 10.



There was also no statistically significant variation in this result observed by respondent profile, with respondents from all age groups, gender, and language spoken at home rating their perception of safety at more than eight out of 10. It is, however, noted that older adults (aged 60 to 74 years) felt the least safe, although “extremely safe” nonetheless.




Perception of safety in public areas during the day by respondent profile
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
scale from 0 (very unsafe) to 10 (very safe)




Perception of safety in public areas at night

The perception of safety in the public areas of the City of Monash at night declined somewhat, but not measurably this year, down three percent to 7.3 out of 10, although it remains at a “very safe” average of more than seven out of 10. This result has remained relatively stable around the long-term average result since 2018 of 7.3 out of 10.


Perception of safety in public areas at night
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
scale from 0 (very unsafe) to 10 (very safe)



There was no statistically significant variation in the perception of safety in the public areas of the City of Monash at night observed across the municipality, with respondents from all precincts rating their perception of safety at “very safe” levels of more than seven out of 10.




There was, however, some measurable variation in this result observed by respondent profile. Older adults (aged 60 to 74 years) felt measurably less safe than average, and female respondents felt measurably (7%) less safe than male respondents.




Perception of safety travelling on / waiting for public transport


The perception of safety travelling on / waiting for public transport remained essentially stable this year, up less than one percent to 8.0 out of 10, which is an “extremely safe” level, and relatively stable around the long-term average score since 2018 of 7.9 out of 10.



There was some measurable variation in this result observed across the municipality, with respondents from Ashwood-Burwood and Glen Waverley feeling measurably safer.




There was no statistically significant variation in the perception of safety travelling on / waiting for public transport observed by respondent profile.




Perception of safety in and around your local shopping district / centre


The perception of safety in and around the local shopping district / centre remained stable this year at 8.3 out of 10, which is an “extremely safe” level, and remarkably stable around the long-term average score since 2018 of 8.3 out of 10.



There was no statistically significant variation in this result observed across the municipality, although it is noted that 15 respondents from Notting Hill rated their safety at nine out of 10.



There was no meaningful variation in the perception of safety in and around the local shopping district / centre observed by respondent profile.



Reason for feeling unsafe in public areas:

There were 47 comments received this year from respondents who felt unsafe in the public areas of the City of Monash.

The majority of these comments again this year related to concerns around crime and policing (16 comments), and the perception of safety at night and lighting related issues (12 comments).

Reason for feeling unsafe in public areas in the City of Monash
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
(Number and percent of total responses)

Reason	2024		2023	2022
	Number	Percent		
Crime and policing	16	34%	18%	21%
Perception of safety at night	12	26%	48%	40%
General perception of safety	6	13%	10%	14%
Issues with people - gangs, youths, "louts" etc	6	13%	20%	16%
Image / feel of place and news reports	2	4%	3%	4%
Other	5	11%	3%	3%
Total	47	100%	40	73

The following table outlines the verbatim comments as broadly categorised in the above table.

Reason for feeling unsafe in public areas in the City of Monash
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
(Number of responses)

Reason	Number
<i>Crime and policing</i>	
Also increased robbery and stealing issues	1
Because there are robberies in the area, it's too far from police stations in our local Mulgrave area	1
Crime rates	1
Due to increased robbery and burglary at Fraser St	1
More police around the roads, highly visible, a lot of reckless people would stop making a mess	1
Murders and lots of cars stolen nearby Railway Pde South	1
My daughter was attacked on train so not feeling safe at all	1
My home was almost burgled some months ago and I had to get extra security	1
Need better policing	1
Recently there was a burglary in the neighbourhood around 8:30 am. I don't feel safe. We were also robbed at night	1



So many break-ins everywhere	1
Somebody broke in and stole something in my neighbourhood recently (Plume Ct). Stole mobile and cash	1
The local attendant at a petrol station, the one at the corner of Stephensons Rd and Ferntree Gully Rd, he was attacked by knife	1
They have reported many incidents, and our house was broken into many years ago and there have always been concerns	1
Train stations and Woolworths need more policing and safety	1
Violence on public transport, we should have security on trains	1
Total	16

Perception of safety at night

Not safe during night because no street lighting	3
Need better lighting	2
There are no streetlights in my street	1
Bus stops are not well lit, for example the bus station on Scotsburn Ave	1
Feel very scared especially at night. They need to do something about it	1
Glen Waverley is dangerous at night and no good lights to feel safe	1
Groups of people at night wandering around yelling and screaming	1
I am a woman, and I would never feel safe at night	1
The streetlights on my street are not bright	1
Total	12

General perception of safety

Don't know what is going on. We just don't go out. We grew up with that	1
In general, everywhere is unsafe	1
In general, I am a woman	1
Lots of people not following rules and being loud	1
My wife feels scared to live in Garrison Dr, we have CCTV camera due to that	1
People make trouble in public transport acting inappropriately in public spaces	1
Total	6

Issues with people - gangs, youths, "louts" etc

Bad area, bad people	1
Gangs causing intimidation	1
People drinking on street and other aggressive people present	1
Recently, an unknown person knocked at my door and asked for mobile charger. I was terrified	1
So many thefts and young kids with machetes	1
There are a lot of unknown people roaming in the area	1
Total	6



Image / feel of place and news reports

Because of all the burglaries in the area, read in newspaper in whole Glen Waverley	1
Concerned about so many incidents you keep hearing about	1
Total	2

Other

Accessibility of public transport is poor, and we need more buses coming in more frequently	1
Familiarity is not much	1
Not frequent public transport as it doesn't make all stops	1
Nothing happened but more aware	1
Too far to reach public transport	1
Total	5
Total	47



Traffic and parking

Satisfaction with aspects of traffic and parking:

Respondents were asked:

“On a scale of 0 (lowest) to 10 (highest), can you please rate your satisfaction with the following aspects of traffic and parking in the City of Monash?”


Respondents were again in 2024, asked to rate their satisfaction with the volume and speed of traffic and the availability of parking on both residential streets and main roads.

Consistent with the increase in satisfaction with [local traffic management](#) (up 2%), [parking enforcement](#) (up 3%), and [the provision of parking facilities](#) (up 3%), the average satisfaction with these six aspects of traffic and parking increased four percent again this year.

Metropolis Research notes that this four percent increase in satisfaction with aspects of traffic and parking builds on the four percent increase recorded last year.

Satisfaction with the volume and speed of traffic on both residential streets and main roads and the availability of parking on residential streets improved from “good” to “very good” levels of satisfaction, whilst satisfaction with the availability of parking on main roads remained at a “good” level.


These results reinforce the view of a strong improvement in community satisfaction with aspects of traffic and parking, which have been reflected in the significant improvements in satisfaction with Council’s performance in this area.



The following graph provides a breakdown of these results into the proportion of respondents (who provided a score) who were “very satisfied” (i.e., rated satisfaction at eight or more), those who were “neutral to somewhat satisfied” (i.e., rated satisfaction at between five and seven), and those who were “dissatisfied” (i.e., rated satisfaction at less than five out of 10).

Consistent with the measurable increase in average satisfaction, there was a significant increase in the proportion of respondents “very satisfied” with the volume and speed of traffic and availability of parking on residential streets and the speed of traffic on main roads.

Particular attention is drawn to the approximate halving in the proportion of respondents “dissatisfied” with the volume of traffic on residential streets and main roads, the speed of traffic on residential streets, and the availability of parking on residential streets and main roads.




Volume of traffic

Volume of traffic on residential streets

Whilst there was no statistically significant variation in satisfaction with the volume of traffic on residential streets, it is noted that 15 respondents from Notting Hill rated satisfaction at an “excellent” level, whilst respondents from Mt Waverly, Mulgrave, and Hughesdale rated it at “good” rather than “very good” levels.




Volume of traffic on residential streets in your local area by precinct
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
scale from 0 (very dissatisfied) to 10 (very satisfied)




There was measurable variation in satisfaction with the volume of traffic on residential streets observed by respondent profile. Young adults (aged 18 to 34 years) were measurably more satisfied and at an “excellent” level, whilst older adults (aged 60 to 74 years) were measurably less satisfied, and at a “good” rather than a “very good” level.

Volume of traffic on residential streets in your local area by respondent profile
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
scale from 0 (very dissatisfied) to 10 (very satisfied)




Volume of traffic on main roads

Whilst there was no statistically significant variation in satisfaction with the volume of traffic on main roads observed across the municipality, it is noted that 28 respondents from Hughesdale were notably less satisfied, and at a “solid” rather than a “good” level.




There was no statistically significant variation in satisfaction observed by respondent profile, with all age groups, gender, and language rating satisfaction at “good” levels.



Speed of traffic

Speed of traffic on residential streets

Whilst there was no statistically significant variation in satisfaction with the speed of traffic on residential streets, it is noted that 14 respondents from Notting Hill rated satisfaction at an “excellent” level, whilst respondents from Hughesdale, Oakleigh South, and Oakleigh rated it at “good” rather than “very good” levels.



There was measurable variation in satisfaction with the speed of traffic on residential streets observed by respondent profile. Young adults (aged 18 to 34 years) were measurably more satisfied, whilst older adults (aged 60 to 74 years) were measurably less satisfied, and at a “good” rather than a “very good” level.




Speed of traffic on residential streets in your local area by respondent profile
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
 scale from 0 (very dissatisfied) to 10 (very satisfied)




Speed of traffic on main roads

Whilst there was no statistically significant variation in satisfaction with the speed of traffic on main roads observed across the municipality, it is noted that respondents from Wheelers Hill rated satisfaction at an “excellent” level.

Speed of traffic on main roads by precinct
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
 scale from 0 (very dissatisfied) to 10 (very satisfied)



There was no statistically significant variation in satisfaction with the speed of traffic on main roads observed by respondent profile, although it is noted that older adults (aged 60 to 74 years) were notably less satisfied than average, and at a “good” rather than a “very good” level.



Reasons for dissatisfaction with the speed of traffic

Consistent with the results observed by Metropolis Research across metropolitan Melbourne, the majority of respondents who were dissatisfied with the speed of traffic on residential streets felt that the speed was “too fast”, whilst views were more mixed in relation to the speed of traffic on main roads.

Reasons for dissatisfaction with the speed of traffic by gender
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
(Number and percent of respondents dissatisfied with the speed of traffic)

Response	Residential streets				Main roads			
	Male		Female		Male		Female	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Too fast	25	75.8%	16	88.9%	14	58.3%	8	34.8%
Too slow	7	21.2%	2	11.1%	8	33.3%	13	56.5%
Both	1	3.0%	0	0.0%	2	8.3%	2	8.7%
Not stated								
Total	33	100%	18	100%	24	100%	23	100%




Availability of parking

Availability of parking on residential streets

There was measurable and notable variation in satisfaction with the availability of parking on residential street observed across the municipality.

Respondents from Wheelers Hill were measurably, whilst 15 respondents from Notting Hill and 19 respondents from Oakleigh South were notably more satisfied than average and at “excellent” levels of satisfaction.


Respondents from Hughesdale, Ashwood-Burwood, and Clayton were somewhat less satisfied than average and at “good” rather than “very good” levels of satisfaction.



There was no statistically significant variation in satisfaction with the availability of parking on residential streets observed by respondent profile, with respondents from all age groups, gender, and language spoken at home rating satisfaction at “very good” levels.




Availability of parking on residential streets in your local area by respondent profile
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
scale from 0 (very dissatisfied) to 10 (very satisfied)




Availability of parking on main roads

Whilst there was no statistically significant variation in satisfaction with the availability of parking on main roads observed across the municipality, it is noted that 13 respondents from Notting Hill were somewhat more satisfied than average and at a “very good” rather than a “good” level of satisfaction.

Availability of parking on main roads by precinct
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
scale from 0 (very dissatisfied) to 10 (very satisfied)



There was no statistically significant variation in satisfaction with the availability of parking on main roads observed by respondent profile, with respondents from all age groups, gender, and language spoken at home rating satisfaction at “good” levels of satisfaction.



Respondent profile

The following section provides the demographic profile of respondents to the *Monash City Council – 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey*.

Age structure

The results have continued to be weighted by age and gender to maintain consistency with the previous three years, although Metropolis Research notes that the return to the door-to-door methodology last year provided an underlying sample that was more in line with the *Census* results than had been achieved via the telephone methodology.

Age structure
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
(Number and percent of respondents providing a response)

Age	2024 (unweighted)		2024 (weighted)	2023	2022	2021	2020
	Number	Percent					
Young adults (18 - 34 years)	192	24%	35%	35%	35%	35%	35%
Adults (35 - 44 years)	177	22%	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%
Middle-aged adults (45 - 59 yrs)	204	26%	22%	22%	22%	22%	22%
Older adults (60 - 74 years)	136	17%	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%
Senior citizens (75 yrs and over)	91	11%	11%	11%	11%	11%	11%
Not stated	1		1	6	0	0	0
Total	801	100%	801	815	801	801	805

Gender

As discussed above, the sample was weighted by age and gender to reflect the *Census*, although the strength of the underlying sample is noted.

Gender
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
(Number and percent of respondents providing a response)

Gender	2024 (unweighted)		2024 (weighted)	2023	2022	2021	2020
	Number	Percent					
Man / Male	454	57%	48%	48%	49%	49%	49%
Women / Female	342	43%	51%	51%	52%	51%	51%
Non-binary	2	0%	0%	1%	0%		
Prefer to self describe	2	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Prefer not to say / not stated	1		1	12	0	0	0
Total	801	100%	801	815	800	801	805



Language spoken at home:

Consistent with the results recorded in previous years, half (50%) of the respondents who provided a response to the question were from households that spoke a language other than English.

The most common other languages included Mandarin (13%), Hindi (6%), Chinese not further defined (5%), Sinhalese (4%), and Cantonese (3%).

Language spoken at home
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
(Number and percent of respondents providing a response)

Language	2024		2023	2022	2021	2020	2019
	Number	Percent					
English	374	50%	55%	57%	54%	52%	51%
Mandarin	95	13%	12%	10%	9%	6%	12%
Hindi	48	6%	4%	3%	4%	4%	3%
Chinese, n.f.d	35	5%	2%	2%	2%	2%	6%
Sinhalese	28	4%	3%	4%	3%	3%	3%
Cantonese	26	3%	3%	3%	2%	3%	0%
Vietnamese	13	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%
Tamil	12	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	3%
Telugu	12	2%	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%
Indonesian	8	1%	0%	0%	1%	2%	1%
Spanish	7	1%	0%	0%	1%	1%	0%
French	6	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Persian	5	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Punjabi	5	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%	0%
Tagalog (Filipino)	5	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%
Urdu	4	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%
Thai	4	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%
Polish	4	1%	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%
Malayalam	4	1%	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%
German	4	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%
Bengali	4	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%
Croatian	3	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Gujarati	3	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Japanese	3	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	0%
Korean	3	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%
Malay	3	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Nepali	3	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%
Turkish	3	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
All languages (29 separately identified)	31	4%	10%	14%	6%	13%	13%
Not stated	9		7	25	6	13	8
Total	764	100%	815	800	801	805	805



Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander:

Consistent with the results recorded in previous years, and the Census results, approximately one percent of respondents identified as Aboriginal and / or Torres Strait Islander.

Aboriginal Australian or Torres Strait Islander
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
 (Number and percent of respondents providing a response)

Response	2024		2023	2023	2022	2021	2020
	Number	Percent					
Yes	9	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%
No	785	99%	99%	99%	99%	100%	99%
Not stated	7		14	14	18	8	12
Total	801	100%	815	815	800	801	805

Household member with disability:

In 2024, eight percent (down from 14%) of respondents were from households with a member with disability.

This was one of the smaller proportions recorded for this question in recent years.

Household member with disability
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
 (Number and percent of respondents providing a response)

Response	2024		2023	2022	2021	2020	2019
	Number	Percent					
Yes	61	8%	14%	13%	10%	12%	8%
No	723	92%	86%	87%	90%	88%	92%
Not stated	17		33	35	25	36	25
Total	801	100%	815	800	801	805	805

Household structure

Consistent with historical results, the survey sample continues to include a good cross-section of households.

This included a little less than half from two-parent families, one-quarter couple households without children, approximately 10% group households, 10% sole person households, and approximately five percent from one-parent families.



Household structure
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
 (Number and percent of respondents providing a response)

Structure	2024		2023	2022	2021	2020	2019
	Number	Percent					
Two parent family total	326	41%	46%	45%	42%	44%	51%
youngest child 0 - 5 years	64	8%	11%	10%	11%	8%	10%
youngest child 6 - 12 years	94	12%	12%	12%	10%	11%	17%
youngest child 13 - 18 years	68	9%	11%	8%	6%	10%	8%
adult children only	100	13%	12%	15%	14%	16%	16%
One parent family	44	6%	6%	10%	5%	6%	5%
youngest child 0 - 5 years	6	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%
youngest child 6 - 12 years	3	0%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%
youngest child 13 - 18 years	11	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%
adult children only	24	3%	2%	6%	4%	4%	3%
Couple only household	212	27%	25%	24%	30%	28%	20%
Group household	103	13%	11%	8%	11%	10%	15%
Sole person household	91	12%	11%	10%	11%	11%	8%
Extended or multiple families	10	1%	1%	3%	1%	1%	1%
Not stated	15		7	30	18	27	22
Total	801	100%	815	800	801	805	805

Identify as diverse population groups:

It is noted that 26% (up from 20%) of respondents identified as culturally or linguistically diverse. It is noted that this is a less reliable method of asking this question than the language spoken at home question discussed above. A small number of respondents identified as a person with chronic illness (46 respondents), LGBTIQ+ (28 respondents), and dealing with financial hardship (26 respondents).

Diverse population groups
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
 (Number and percent of total respondents)

Response	2024		2023
	Number	Percent	
Culturally or linguistically diverse	212	26%	20%
Person with chronic illness	46	6%	6%
LGBTIQ+	28	3%	3%
Financial hardship	26	3%	3%
Other	3	0%	3%
Total responses	315		284
<i>Respondents identifying at least one response</i>	271 (34%)		253 (31%)



General comments

The following tables outline the general comments received from respondents at the conclusion of the survey this year.

There were 170 general comments received this year, up on the unusually low 84 received last year.

These comments have been broadly categorised, as outlined in the following table, with the most common issues relating to community facilities, services, and activities (20 comments), parks, gardens, and open spaces (17 comments), and safety, policing, and crime related issues (15 comments).

The issues raised in the general comments have been discussed in detail in the main body of this report.

General comments
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
(Number and percent of total responses)

Comment	2024		2023	2022
	Number	Percent		
Community facilities / services / activities	20	12%	11%	11%
Parks, gardens, open spaces, tree maintenances	17	10%	5%	12%
Safety, policing and crime	15	9%	5%	6%
General positive comments	13	8%	13%	8%
Parking	13	8%	6%	10%
Planning and development issues	13	8%	1%	6%
Communication, consultation, Council management	11	6%	14%	7%
Traffic and public transport management	11	6%	6%	7%
Rates / financial management	10	6%	2%	5%
Waste management and cleanliness	10	6%	11%	24%
Comments relating to this survey	9	5%	5%	2%
Roads	6	4%	7%	5%
Environment and sustainability	5	3%	1%	1%
Footpaths	5	3%	0%	0%
Animal management	2	1%	0%	5%
Street lighting	2	1%	6%	3%
Other	8	5%	2%	3%
Total	170	100%	84	173

The following table outlines the verbatim comments received from respondents this year.



General comments
Monash City Council - 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey
(Number of responses)

<i>Reason</i>	<i>Number</i>
<i>Community facilities / services / activities</i>	
Community feel is not here, we need Council to have things to improve connectivity in the community	1
Council should be the first place to ask for help rather than Federal government	1
Don't see street sweepers often	1
For small businesses post COVID, more assistance is required, mentorship etc. could be provided	1
Give proper facilities	1
Just fix roads and rubbish, concentrate on that, I know it's hard as we have mixture of Council and government roads	1
Little initiatives like local markets or events can help the community	1
More recreational activities in Ashwood	1
More tables in Glen Waverley library	1
My neighbour's fence is falling apart, they are not cooperating to fix it, I want you to send a letter to them asking them to cooperate. I will be writing a letter to you very soon about this	1
Provide more entertainment like function rooms	1
Public toilets need to be cleaned regularly	1
Put more public toilets in the area	1
The Council should ask volunteers to look after the elderly as they feel lonely	1
They could have helped with house due to my recent disability, but they refused	1
They need to address the needs of the community rather than Canberra	1
They need to make The Oakleigh all year around usable for lap swimming	1
They should outreach more to elderly people. A lot of these elderly people are not educated enough to know about what they are doing	1
Water clogging on Wayne Ct	1
When will they follow up on contractors to make sure the grass is mowed, and street trees aren't blocking the drainage. Tell us about this in the newsletter. Come here to Merrill St where I live, come talk to me	1
Total	20
<i>Parks, gardens, open spaces, and tree maintenances</i>	
Again, cut back the trees on nature strip	1
Assistance to residents who are keeping treescapes	1
Covered playgrounds	1
Duck pawn in front of Wheelers Hill library hasn't been maintained for years	1
If we are not allowed to cut trees on our own property, there needs to be rules and provisions for trimming and maintenance as it's dangerous especially during storms	1
Maintenance of overgrown lawns in the middle of the road, under the bridge in Ferntree Gully Rd	1
More big playgrounds for kids in Mount Waverley	1
More BMX / pump tracks needed and maintained for kids	1
Nature reserve adjacent to Nellie Melba incomplete	1
Nature strips are not being looked after properly	1



Natures calamities should be taken care of like broken tree branches after storms	1
Over policing of trees on private property	1
Playground on Clayton Rd goes into the pathway onto bikers which is dangerous, it should be fenced off	1
The big issue I have is the issue with trees, both with public and private properties, as the recent storm support my views	1
The cutting of trees in some areas, there are dangerous trees caused by the cutting of branches for powerlines. Tree safety in Waverley Rd	1
Viewer ramp is deteriorating	1
When they have the services with cutting grass, the timing is poor. They come early in the morning	1
Total	17

Safety, policing, and crime

Druggies live in most of the houses in Clayton which makes it unsafe to live in	1
Family violence against women is very important but there is no protection for men who are the victims of family violence or where the family violence system is used against men	1
Huntingdale station feels unsafe at night, not much activity there, not enough people, it feels creepy there, the underpass especially	1
Improve safety issues during the night	1
Patch near Chesterfield Farm Ferntree Gully Rd, is very dark and needs streetlights	1
Put more CCTV in the area	1
Robbery at my house in Dunstan St	1
Safety during holiday season, more policing required more staffing for police to go around	1
Safety is most important	1
Safety is our biggest concern right now	1
Security has been determined over the years. Especially increase in frequency of robbery	1
Teenagers are not behaving properly in public area	1
The place is getting less safe due to robbery and stealing happening	1
Use local existing community groups, for example churches, sports or other, to identify prevailing violence in family, to do outreach and solve and provide funds to then to do it	1
We need more security in the area	1
Total	15

General positive comments

All is good in general, happy with Council / they are doing a good job	6
City of Monash is good, is safe	1
I like our Council and very satisfied with how they work	1
In the 54 years of living here, we have been very happy, lovely atmosphere and very friendly	1
Love living in Monash	1
Thank you for the support given to the SES	1
The bottle depot that you get 10c per bottle is a good initiative	1
The place is kept well, overall good	1
Total	13



<i>Parking</i>	
Lack of parking near the stations	2
Clayton market near Schnitz should have more parking spots and options	1
More free parking in our area to support local businesses	1
More parking on main roads and in Clayton and it should be for longer time	1
Need more parking around Renver Rd	1
Not enough parking near the station. We have to do ten or twenty rounds before we can get parking	1
One side parking on the roads will be better	1
Parking around shopping centres is difficult during dinner time	1
Parking enforcement is poor	1
Parking issue near Monash aquatic centre	1
Parking near the station and hospitals is limited and expensive for people	1
Residents should have parking permits on their own street. Should have longer time limit on Calista Ave or no time limit at all	1
Total	13

<i>Planning and development issues</i>	
Development in The Glen has high rises coming up which is not normal for that area and should not have been allowed and is out of character of those areas	1
Future designing should be like where traffic is more so that houses are safe	1
In general, there needs to be more affordable housing, don't crack under pressure	1
Infrastructure and services will not keep up with the increase of population	1
Lack of power planning in the past	1
New property	1
Overall, the Council does not know what they want for planning and vision and plans for the community. So, they are not very convicted in what they put forward	1
The Council should do something about the increasing population	1
The numbers of Council staff have reduced in areas of building inspection and other services. We need more of them as we can't depend on builders doing the right thing	1
There needs to be more medium density housing	1
They need to redevelop Mount Waverley shopping centre	1
They should compensate for the inconvenience caused by monstrosity of new houses and the inconvenience they cause	1
We need the right infrastructure to support the population growth	1
Total	13

<i>Traffic and public transport management</i>	
Continuity in the traffic. They should give way to continuing in moment rather stopping at every station	1
Entire Clayton is full of Uber drivers' cars parked on the streets which gets congested	1
Face recognition at public transport as a deterrent	1
Intersection of Arthur St and Huntingdale Rd should have a traffic light	1
Need more speed bumps on the residential streets	1
Railway changes should have been consulted before being done	1
Speed limit signages needed for residential streets	1
Speed on local streets is too fast, should have traffic calming or reduce speed to 40KM/hr	1



The 40KM/hr zones through shopping zones is dangerous because motorists spend more time looking at their speeders to prevent them being fined instead of watching the road for pedestrians safety	1
Too much traffic on road so we can't drop kids to school	1
Tram line in Wellington Rd due to traffic	1
Total	11

Communication, consultation, Council management

Asked Council to see the light pole that was knocked down in Delamere CI, waiting for Council to come and repair it	1
Council should be more available for elderly people to access help, support. They should not expect us to call, they should call. We pay rates and they should make it easier for us	1
Disenfranchise of the political and ministerial system	1
More transparent in providing information and they should be reminded that they are working for the people of Monash	1
Stick to the basics, what you are supposed to be doing and not the woke agenda. Do your job	2
They should listen to people's advice and don't make us feel like it is useless to protest anything they do	1
To be an elected official, you have to be prepared to stand there and be accountable for whatever consequences are about to come	1
Too much red tape in Council	1
We don't know who to call to ask for help, when we call, we are put through to different people it's frustrating	1
When we complain to Council, they don't do anything. I needed consultation related to some things and I went to the city they had young people who were not good in giving advice related to the consulting I wanted (related to new houses being built)	1
Total	11

Waste management and cleanliness

Garbage collection should be once a week	2
Compost bags should have better quality	1
Hard rubbish should be twice a year	1
Intersection on Arthur St has rubbish everyday	1
McKenna Rd playground should be cleaned more often	1
Rubbish collection should be taken regularly	1
Rubbish dumped on the streets of Clayton	1
There is a rubbish bin in David Crawford playground, it should be emptied more regularly	1
We don't like people going around picking apart the hard rubbish that is kept on the kerbside	1
Total	10

Rates / financial management

Lower the rates	4
Council proposal for library is too expensive, they should reduce that cost. The local central carpark money gets put to the library, and it's too expensive	1
Do they have any more money to do things around here, or is Mulgrave still the deep south?	1
If they have additional funding, will they publish recurrent funding for graffiti removal, streets, or footpaths?	1
Selling of public property and assets is completely wrong	1
Sometimes my rates are higher than my neighbours'	1



The rates are high, but the services need to be better	1
Total	10

Comments relating to this survey

Council should conduct more surveys like this	1
Council would be great to setup something in The Glen or busy shopping centre to collect survey	1
Food vouchers should be given after doing these surveys	1
Get rid of all this stuff at the end of the surveys with the diverse population groups	1
I hope they pay you survey collectors more	1
Please listen to the feedback given by the community	1
They need to tell us what they're doing after the results of the surveys are released and when they're doing it	1
This is my first hearing about this Council survey for performance despite living here for more than 30 years	1
This survey guy gets 100%	1
Total	9

Roads and footpaths

Build better roads	1
Kangaroo Rd needs to be widened as before	1
Less potholes	1
Stapley Cres roads are cracked and not good	1
The road should be broader	1
Widen the street so that people can park in the street	1
Total	6

Environment and sustainability

Cat curfews are irrelevant when trees are being cut. No wildlife to protect	1
Keep the leafy nature in Glen Waverley	1
More green space in the community	1
Should have more solar powered streetlights	1
The development has caused birds to disappear, we don't see many birds these days because of this	1
Total	5

Footpaths

Footpath maintenance is a major issue in the area	1
Footpaths around school areas should be prioritised	1
Footpaths can be narrow	1
I'd maintain footpaths, makes it difficult to walk on as a person with disability or old people specifically tree roots through the ground make it uneven	1
Tree roots damage footpaths, need better variety	1
Total	5



<i>Street lighting</i>	
Streetlight does not work at Dunstan St	1
Street lighting has to be improved in Calista Ave and surrounding areas. It's very dark around here	1
Total	2
<i>Animal management</i>	
Council could be a bit better in regard to the barking dogs complaints and should act better	1
In the last six months, we notice people are not picking up dog poo, it needs to be enforced more strongly	1
Total	2
<i>Other</i>	
Cost of living is very high, for young people to be able to move out is a challenge	1
Don't push the LGBTIQA agenda on school kids. They can decide for themselves when they are older	1
Have a look at the abandoned project on the corner of Ferntree Gully Rd and Jells Rd	1
It's okay to say, "Merry Christmas" and not "season's greetings", we shouldn't just bow down to minority groups, we should just be able to respect each culture and accepting, not worry about it too much	1
Just act in the interest of people not political agenda	1
Just moved here, it would be better if the Council had sent us like a welcome booklet providing all the important information	1
Not happy with the drag queen shows for children. These are adult shows not for children	1
The Oakleigh only caters for businesses and not the wider community. It is a disgrace that the Council has sold out 2 businesses at the expense of the broader community	1
Total	8
Total	170



Appendix One: survey form



Monash City Council 2024 Annual Community Satisfaction Survey



Hello my name is _____ from Metropolis Research and I am calling on behalf of Monash City Council.

Council is required, under government regulations to conduct a community satisfaction survey every year, and we would welcome your feedback on the performance of Council, including ways in which Council may improve its performance.

The survey also includes a few questions about what the community values most about Monash and what the issues are that affect Monash both now and into the future.

The survey will take approximately 15 mins to complete, is completely confidential and voluntary.

1

Have you had any contact with Monash City Council in the last 12 months?

Yes (*continue*) 1 No (*go to Q. 3*) 2

2

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

1. General reception	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
2. Care and attention to your enquiry	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
3. Provision of information on the Council and its services	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
4. Speed of service	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
5. Courtesy of service	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
6. Access to relevant officer / area	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
7. Staff's understanding of your language needs	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99

If any aspect rated less than 6, why do you say that?

3

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

1. The maintenance and repair of sealed local roads	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
<i>This includes local streets and roads managed by Monash but excludes highways and main roads that are managed by VicRoads</i>													
2. Footpath maintenance and repairs	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
3. Drains maintenance and repairs	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
4. Regular garbage collection	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
5. Regular recycling service	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99

If less than 6, why do you say that?

6. Regular green waste collection	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99

3

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

7. Street sweeping	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
8. Provision and maintenance of street lighting	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
9. Parking enforcement	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
10. Provision of parking facilities	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
11. Local traffic management	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
12. Provision and maintenance of parks, gardens and reserves	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99

If less than 6, why do you say that?

Is there a specific park, garden or reserve of concern?

13. Provision and maintenance of street trees	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99

If less than 6, why do you say that?

14. Animal management (control and regulation of pets and domestic animals)	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99

15. Council activities to encourage environmental sustainability	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99

If less than 6, why do you say that?

16. Council's newsletter Monash Bulletin (delivered by Australia Post to every household in Monash)	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99

If less than 6, why do you say that?

4

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

(note: Ask importance, then use, then satisfaction only if service has been used in last 12 months)

1. Council's website	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
	Used	Yes						No					
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99

2. Hard rubbish collection	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	
	Used	Yes					No							
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	
3. Council's Waste Transfer Station <i>(located in Ferntree Gully Road, Notting Hill)</i>	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	
	Used	Yes					No							
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	
4. Recreation and Aquatic Centres	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	
	Used	Yes					No							
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	
5. Bike paths and shared pathways	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	
	Used	Yes					No							
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	
6. Sports ovals and other outdoor sporting facilities	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	
	Used	Yes					No							
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	
7. Provision and maintenance of local playgrounds	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	
	Used	Yes					No							
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	
8. Public toilets	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	
	Used	Yes					No							
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	
<i>If rated less than 6, why do you say that, and please name any specific locations of concern?</i>														
9. Council run services for children and their families	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	
	Used	Yes					No							
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	
10. Council services for older residents and activities for seniors	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	
	Used	Yes					No							
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	
11. Local library and library services	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	
	Used	Yes					No							
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	
12. Council run programs and activities for young people (10 to 25 years of age)	Importance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	
	Used	Yes					No							
	Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	

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

1. Council's performance in community consultation and engagement	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
<i>If less than 6, what do you wish Council would ask you about?</i>												
2. Council's representation, lobbying and advocacy on behalf of the community with other levels of government or organisations on key issues	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
3. The responsiveness of Council to local community needs	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
4. Council's performance in maintaining the trust and confidence of the local community	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
5. Council making decisions in the interests of the community	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
6. Performance of Council across all areas of responsibility	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
If overall satisfaction less than 6, what does Council most need to do to improve its performance?												

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

Issue One:	
Issue Two:	
Issue Three:	

The population of Monash is expected to grow by approximately 46,000 over the next 20 years. The responsibility for providing services, transport infrastructure, and facilities rests with both Council and the State Government.

7 On a scale of 0 (lowest) to 10 (highest), please rate your satisfaction with planning for population growth (by all levels of government).

Planning for population growth	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
<i>If rated less than 6, why do you say that?</i>												

8

On a scale of 0 (lowest) to 10 (highest), please rate your satisfaction with the following aspects of planning and housing development in your local area.

1. The appearance and quality of new developments in your area	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
<i>If rated less than 6, please identify the developments:</i>												
2. The design of public spaces	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
3. The protection of trees and vegetation on private property	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99

Thank you. I would now like to ask you a few questions about what you value about living in Monash.

9

On a scale from 0 (very unimportant) to 10 (very important), how important are the following Council initiatives to you?

1. Promotion of gender equity	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
2. Prevention of family violence and all forms of violence against women	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
3. Support for local businesses to grow, to increase jobs, and investment	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
4. Reducing loneliness in the community	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99

10

On a scale of 0 (lowest) to 10 (highest) can you please rate your satisfaction with the following aspects of traffic and parking in the City of Monash?

1. Volume of traffic on residential streets	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
2. Volume of traffic on main roads	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
3. Speed of traffic on residential streets	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
<i>If < 5, is speed too fast or too slow</i>	Too fast						Too slow					
4. Speed of traffic on main roads	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
<i>If < 5, is speed too fast or too slow</i>	Too fast						Too slow					
5. Availability of parking on residential sts.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
6. Availability of parking on main roads	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99

11

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

1. During the day	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
2. At night	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
3. Travelling on / waiting for public transport	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99
4. In and around your local shopping district / centre	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99

If any rated less than 5, why do you say that?

Thank you. Finally, just a few questions about you.

12

Please indicate which of the following best describes you.

15 - 19 years	1	45 - 59 years	4
20 - 34 years	2	60 - 74 years	5
35 - 44 years	3	75 years or over	6

13

With which gender do you most identify?

Man / Male	1	Prefer to self describe:	4
Women / Female	2	_____	
Non-binary	3	Prefer not to say	5

14

Are any members of this household of Aboriginal and / or Torres Strait Islander origin?

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

15

What are all the languages spoken in this household?

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

16

Do any members of this household identify as having a disability?

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

17

What is the structure of this household?

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

18

Do you identify with any of the following diverse population groups?

Person with chronic illness	1	Financial hardship	4
Culturally or linguistically diverse	2	Other (<i>please describe:</i>)	9
LGBTIQ+A+	3	_____	

19

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

**Thank you for your time
Your feedback is most appreciated**

Council will publish the full results of this survey on its website by end June 2022, following detailed analysis and discussion with Councillors and senior officers.