

Quality of Life and Asset Management Survey



*Results of a random 600-person telephone survey,
conducted in March 2020 for Urbis and Hornsby Shire
Council as input to CSP and Asset Management Plans*

Clients: Hornsby Shire Council and Urbis

FINAL REPORT

Dated: July 2nd 2020

Contact:

James Parker

e: James.Parker@jettyresearch.com.au

p: 02 6650 9175

Level 1, 30 Industrial Drive
Coffs Harbour NSW
PO Box 1555
Coffs Harbour NSW 2450

w: www.jettyresearch.com.au

e: info@jettyresearch.com.au

Coffs Harbour Sydney
ACN 121 037 429

Prepared by	James Parker
Reviewed by	Christine Denning
Date	July 2 nd 2020
Document Name	Hornsby Shire Council CSP Review
Version	FINAL (AMENDED)

Table of Contents

DISCLAIMER.....	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
INTRODUCTION	7
BACKGROUND	7
METHODOLOGY	7
SAMPLING ERROR.....	8
<i>Graph i: How sampling error varies with sample and population size.....</i>	<i>8</i>
DEMOGRAPHICS.....	9
<i>Graph ii: Sample by age (unweighted, 2020 vs. 2017).....</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>Graph iii: Sample by gender (unweighted, 2020 vs. 2017).....</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>Graph iv: Time lived in shire (weighted, 2020 only)</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Graph v: Type of residence (weighted, 2020 only).....</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Graph vi: Children at home (weighted, 2020 only)</i>	<i>11</i>
PART 1: SATISFACTION WITH COUNCIL.....	12
<i>Graph 1.1: Overall satisfaction with Council (2020 vs. 2017)</i>	<i>12</i>
PART 2: QUALITY OF LIFE	13
<i>Graph 2.1a: Agreement Statements – Liveable (Safety) (2020).....</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Graph 2.1b: Agreement Statements – Liveable (Other) (2020)</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Graph 2.2: Agreement Statements – Productive (2020)</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>Graph 2.3: Agreement Statements – Sustainable (2020).....</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>Graph 2.4: Agreement Statements – Collaborative (2020).....</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>Table 2.1: Mean scores broken down by age, gender, ward and children at home (2020 only)</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>Table 2.2: Agreement % and means (2020 vs. 2017).....</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>Graph 2.5: Overall quality of life (2020 vs. 2017).....</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Table 2.3: Driver analysis between QOL statements and overall satisfaction with Council.....</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Table 2.4: Driver analysis between QOL statements and overall quality of life</i>	<i>21</i>
PART 3: COUNCIL ASSETS.....	22
<i>Graph 3.1: Which Hornsby Council assets are you proudest of?.....</i>	<i>22</i>
<i>Graph 3.2: Can you think of any Council assets that need to be improved?</i>	<i>23</i>
<i>Graph 3.3: (If yes) Can you tell me which ones?</i>	<i>23</i>
<i>Graph 3.4: What should be the greatest priority among the following?</i>	<i>24</i>
APPENDIX 1: QUESTIONNAIRE.....	25
APPENDIX 2: WEIGHTING CALCULATION	29

All photos in this report from Hornsby Shire Council's Facebook page

Disclaimer

While all care and diligence has been exercised in the preparation of this report, Jetty Research Pty. Ltd. does not warrant the accuracy of the information contained within and accepts no liability for any loss or damage that may be suffered as a result of reliance on this information, whether or not there has been any error, omission or negligence on the part of Jetty Research Pty. Ltd. or its employees.



Executive summary

In early 2020, Hornsby Shire Council commissioned Urbis and Jetty Research to conduct a random telephone survey of Hornsby Shire residents (aged 18+). This survey, the initial component of a wider community engagement strategy, was designed to:

- (a) Measure progress with a range of Quality of Life statements against a 2017 baseline study; and
- (b) Understand community aspirations for future improvements in Council's assets and infrastructure.

The engagement is ultimately designed both to provide quantitative benchmarks for Council's Community Strategic Plan, and provide input into the Shire's Asset Management Plan.

The research was conducted as a random and representative telephone survey of 600 adults – and approximately 200 per ward - living within the Hornsby Shire. Fieldwork was conducted between March 18th and 30th inclusive.

A sample size of 600 implies a margin for error of +/- 4.0% at the 95% confidence level. (This means in effect that if we conducted a similar poll 20 times, results should reflect the views and behaviour of the overall survey population to within a +/- 4.0% margin in 19 of those 20 surveys.)

See Pages 7-8 for further information on methodology and sampling error, and pages 9-11 for a demographic breakdown of survey participants.

Among the survey's major conclusions:

1. Satisfaction with Council is high. Some 92% expressed satisfaction, and mean satisfaction (of 3.60 out of a possible 5) was up 8% on 2017.
2. More than two-thirds of quality of life measures showed improvements on 2017, with parking, leisure and recreation opportunities and affordable housing all showing gains (albeit sometimes from low bases).
3. Highest ranking quality of life results included "feel safe walking around your local area" (mean score 4.60 out of a possible 5), "have access to bushland areas, parks and green spaces" (4.59), "feel safe using public transport during the day" (4.47) and "able to access a range of community facilities and services" (4.09).
4. Lowest ranking scores related to "the road network provides for efficient traffic flows" (2.74 out of 5), "adequate parking facilities" (2.98), "the community is encouraged to participate in Council's decision-making" (3.07) and "Council plans well to help secure the community's long-term future" (3.10)
5. Overall quality of life (QOL) remained high and stable survey-to-survey. Four out of five residents classed their QOL as very good or excellent, the same as in 2017.

6. Specific sporting facilities were the most admired assets, led by (in rough order of priority) the Hornsby Aquatic Centre, the Thornleigh Brickpit Stadium, and Greenway Park. Specific parks, gardens and playgrounds were also popular choices, with Fagan Park the most often mentioned among a wide range of other facilities. Among other, more general assets, a range of specific bushland reserves and green spaces were also admired. These included Galston Gorge, Crosslands Reserve, Kuring-gai Chase and Lane Cove National Parks, and Pennant Hills Park. Meanwhile Hornsby and Pennant Hills Libraries were the most frequently mentioned in this category.
7. Three-quarters of respondents cited community infrastructure they would like to see improved. Roads and parking dominated the residents' "wish lists", with a wide variety of specific suggestions (see separate spreadsheet), and others just taking the chance to comment about these more generally. Upgrades to leisure and sporting facilities were also frequently cited, with Hornsby Aquatic Centre and Dence Park prominently mentioned.

James D. Parker

James Parker, QPR, B. Ec, Grad Cert Applied Science (Statistics), AMSRS
July 2nd 2020



Introduction

Background

In early 2020, Hornsby Shire Council (HSC) commissioned Urbis and Jetty Research to conduct a random telephone survey of Hornsby Shire adult residents. This survey, the initial component of a wider community engagement strategy, was designed to:

- (a) Measure progress with a range of Quality of Life statements against a 2017 baseline study; and
- (b) Understand community aspirations for future improvements in Council's assets and infrastructure.

The engagement was ultimately designed both to provide quantitative benchmarks for Council's Community Strategic Plan, and provide input into the Shire's next Asset Management Plan.

Methodology

The survey instrument (i.e. questionnaire) was created collaboratively between Jetty Research, HSC and Urbis based on meeting the Stage 1 project objectives, and ensuring comparability against the 2017 survey.

Numbers for the residential (fixed line + mobile) telephone survey were sourced from SamplePages, a respected supplier of random valid residential and mobile phone numbers to the market and social research industry.

Fieldwork was conducted between March 18th and 30th inclusive. Calls were made from 4-8.30pm weekdays, and midday to 5pm on Saturday. Respondents were rung up to five times at different times of the afternoon and evening. Respondents were screened to ensure they were aged 18 or over, lived within the HSC LGA, and were not councillors or permanent Council employees.

There were no age and gender quotas applied, other than seeking a robust mix of ages and genders across the LGA. We also aimed for quotas of +/- 200 in each of the LGA's three wards.

A final sample of n=600 was achieved. Average interview time was 15 minutes.

Results from the random telephone survey have been post-weighted to reflect the age and gender breakdown of the Hornsby Shire, based on 2016 ABS Census data. See Appendix 2 for details of the weighting process.

Please note that due to the nature of the survey, not all respondents answered every question. The number of respondents answering each question is marked as "n = XXX" in the graph accompanying that question. Caution should be taken in analysing some questions due to the small sample size.

Cleaned data was entered into statistical database SPSS for analysis. Where differences in this report are classed as significant, this implies they are statistically significant based on independent sample t-scores or other analysis of variation (or ANOVA) calculations. In statistical terms, significant differences are unlikely to have been caused by chance alone.

Cross analysis was undertaken by a number of demographic and attitudinal characteristics. Only where differences by groups were statistically significant they are mentioned in the report commentary. Unless indicated otherwise, significant differences are typically highlighted in blue (above mean) and pink (below mean).


Percentages for single response questions may not always add up to 100% due to rounding.

Sampling error

According to the 2016 ABS Census (Usual Resident profile) total population of the Hornsby Shire was 142,667, of which 108,829 (76%) were aged 18 and over. A sample size of 600 implies a margin for error of $\pm 4.0\%$ at the 95% confidence level. (This means in effect that if we conducted a similar poll 20 times, results should reflect the views and behaviour of the overall survey population to within a $\pm 4.0\%$ margin in 19 of those 20 surveys.)

As graph i below shows, margin for error falls as sample size rises. Hence sub-groups within the overall sample will typically create much higher margins for error.


Graph i: How sampling error varies with sample and population size



In addition to the random sampling error, above, there may also be some forms of non-random sampling error which may have affected results. These include respondents without fixed line phones, the proportion of non-respondents (refusals, no answers etc.) and/or imperfections in the survey database. However, steps have been taken at each step of the research process to minimise non-random error wherever possible.


Demographics

Graph ii: Sample by age (unweighted, 2020 vs. 2017)




While the survey sample skewed slightly older than the overall Hornsby Shire adult population, we were able to achieve a substantially younger “mix” than in 2017. In each survey, results were post-weighted to match ABS Census 2016 data by age and gender.

Graph iii: Sample by gender (unweighted, 2020 vs. 2017)




The gender sample was almost identical to 2017, and closely matched the LGA’s overall adult gender profile.

Graph iv: Time lived in shire (weighted, 2020 only)




Nine out of ten respondents has lived in the shire for six years or more, and over 40% had lived locally for over 20 years.

Graph v: Type of residence (weighted, 2020 only)



Four out of five residents owned or part-owned their homes.

Graph vi: Children at home (weighted, 2020 only)




Almost half of our respondents had children living in their home.



Part 1: Satisfaction with Council

The survey proper commenced with a question asking residents to rate their overall satisfaction with Council's performance. Graph 1.1 shows results for both 2020 and the equivalent survey conducted in 2017:

Graph 1.1: Overall satisfaction with Council (2020 vs. 2017)



Happily both the mean and Net Satisfaction Rating¹ (or NSR) satisfaction ratings have risen survey-to-survey. Mean satisfaction now sits at 3.60 out of a possible five, up 8% on 2017.

Those in Ward C were happiest with Council (60% very satisfied or satisfied, against 50% for wards A and B). There were no significant differences by age, gender or whether or not respondents had children living in their home.

¹ Total percentage satisfied less total percentage dissatisfied


Part 2: Quality of Life

The bulk of the survey comprised quality of life statements (using a five point disagree/agree scale) across five different categories. The 2020 results are shown in Graphs 2.1 to 2.5, while Table 2.1 shows mean scores for all statements broken down by age, gender, ward etc.

Table 2.2 shows how results have changed since 2017, colour-coded by category and ranked from biggest improvement to biggest decline.


(Note, not all statements add to 100% due to rounding.)

Graph 2.1a: Agreement Statements – Liveable (Safety) (2020)



As in 2017, residents feel extremely safe walking and using public transport in the local area. Even at night, less than 15% of respondents were concerned.

Graph 2.1b: Agreement Statements – Liveable (Other) (2020)




In all cases, agreement outweighed disagreement – in most instances, dramatically so. However a number of areas exhibited high levels of uncertainty, especially aged care services (60% neutral or unsure) and youth services and facilities (48%). This suggest some additional publicity of existing services may be warranted.

Results for infrastructure were mixed, with positive sentiment around community facilities and services (77% agree, 5% disagree) and sporting facilities (55%/8%).

(Continued next page...)


Graph 2.2: Agreement Statements – Productive (2020)



Results for “productive life” were mixed, with positive sentiment around public transport (63% agree, 17% disagree) and the road network (47%/23%). However as in 2017, the community remains dissatisfied with parking facilities (37% agreeing they were adequate vs. 37% disagreeing) and the efficiency of traffic flow on the road network (27% vs. 44%).


(Continued next page...)

Graph 2.3: Agreement Statements – Sustainable (2020)



Environmental scores were (as in 2017) extremely high. Some 78% agreed that the community is supportive of recycling and sustainability (up by 6% on 2017), while 90% agreed that residents had access to bushland, parks and green spaces (up by 3% on 2017).

Graph 2.4: Agreement Statements – Collaborative (2020)



Results were mixed in relation to My Council, with a high proportion of “neutral/don’t know” across all three measures. However happily all results showed slight improvements on 2017, suggesting opinion is heading in the right direction.

Table 2.1: Mean scores broken down by age, gender, ward and children at home (2020 only)

Statement	Total	Ward			Age			Gender		Children at home?	
		Ward A	Ward B	Ward C	18-45	46-65	66+	Male	Female	Yes	No
During the day you feel safe walking around your local area	4.60	4.66	4.51	4.63	4.57	4.60	4.65	4.61	4.59	4.55	4.63
You have access to bushland areas, parks and green spaces	4.59	4.69	4.52	4.56	4.60	4.61	4.52	4.56	4.61	4.60	4.58
During the day you feel safe using public transport in your local area	4.47	4.36	4.51	4.54	4.53	4.47	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.50	4.46
You are able to access a range of community facilities and services...	4.09	4.03	4.21	4.01	4.21	3.91	4.13	4.11	4.07	4.08	4.10
The community is generally supportive of recycling and sustainability	3.99	4.03	3.92	4.01	3.89	4.04	4.11	3.99	3.98	3.94	4.02
The natural environment within the Hornsby Shire is well cared for and protected	3.92	3.88	3.87	4.03	3.95	3.90	3.91	3.99	3.86	3.99	3.87
At night you feel safe walking around your local area	3.89	3.87	3.85	3.96	3.99	3.90	3.65	4.19	3.61	3.97	3.83
There is a good range of leisure and recreation opportunities	3.86	3.86	3.80	3.93	3.83	3.87	3.91	3.91	3.82	3.79	3.92
Sporting facilities in the area meet your needs	3.83	3.78	3.83	3.88	3.94	3.80	3.65	3.86	3.81	3.89	3.79
At night you feel safe using public transport in your local area	3.70	3.55	3.76	3.78	3.85	3.69	3.37	4.04	3.38	3.78	3.64
Public transport is adequate for your needs	3.67	3.51	3.89	3.60	3.73	3.50	3.85	3.72	3.63	3.66	3.69
There is a good range of opportunities for cultural and artistic activities and expression	3.60	3.63	3.60	3.57	3.58	3.58	3.67	3.50	3.69	3.54	3.64
There is a good range of opportunities for cultural and artistic activities and expression	3.46	3.52	3.40	3.46	3.42	3.40	3.65	3.46	3.46	3.42	3.49
Youth services and facilities within the Hornsby Shire are adequate	3.46	3.48	3.50	3.38	3.52	3.37	3.47	3.45	3.47	3.41	3.50
Travel time to and from work is acceptable	3.40	3.33	3.55	3.28	3.45	3.37	3.32	3.40	3.39	3.39	3.40
You feel able to afford a reasonable standard of housing in the area	3.36	3.38	3.34	3.37	3.04	3.36	4.12	3.37	3.35	3.25	3.44
Aged care and disability services and facilities within the Hornsby Shire are adequate	3.36	3.34	3.36	3.39	3.43	3.24	3.42	3.37	3.35	3.36	3.37
Information about Council and its decisions are clear and accessible...	3.32	3.35	3.34	3.26	3.33	3.22	3.46	3.27	3.37	3.27	3.36
The road network is well maintained	3.29	3.27	3.29	3.29	3.26	3.25	3.42	3.28	3.29	3.16	3.38
Council plans well to help secure the community's long-term future	3.10	3.02	3.15	3.13	3.11	3.07	3.15	3.11	3.09	3.00	3.18
The community is encouraged to participate in Council's decision-making	3.07	3.13	3.13	2.95	3.04	3.06	3.17	3.03	3.12	3.02	3.12
There are adequate parking facilities in public areas...	2.98	2.99	3.10	2.83	3.09	2.86	2.94	3.10	2.87	2.89	3.06
The road network provides for efficient traffic flows	2.74	2.72	2.91	2.56	2.73	2.68	2.86	2.71	2.76	2.73	2.74

Legend:

Liveable
Sustainable
Productive
Collaborative

There were relatively few demographic differences in QOL statement means. As one would expect males and younger residents feel safer walking the streets and catching public transport, and Ward B residents are happiest with their public transport. Meanwhile older residents are most likely to agree that they can afford reasonable housing.

Table 2.2: Agreement % and means (2020 vs. 2017)

Quality Of Life Statement	% Agree 2017	1-5 Mean 2017	% Agree 2020	1-5 Mean 2020	Change in % Agree	Change in Mean (as a %)
There are adequate parking facilities in public areas, such as schools, shopping centres and hospitals	22%	2.70	37%	2.98	14.4%	10.5%
There is a good range of leisure and recreation opportunities	60%	3.72	72%	3.86	11.8%	3.8%
You feel able to afford a reasonable standard of housing in the area	41%	3.09	50%	3.36	9.8%	8.7%
The road network is well maintained	40%	3.06	47%	3.29	7.8%	7.3%
Information about Council and its decisions are clear and accessible via a variety of channels	36%	3.14	43%	3.32	7.2%	5.8%
The road network provides for efficient traffic flows	21%	2.56	27%	2.74	6.7%	6.9%
Youth services and facilities within the Hornsby Shire are adequate	38%	3.27	43%	3.46	5.7%	5.8%
Council plans well to help secure the community's long-term future	28%	2.92	34%	3.10	5.7%	6.1%
The community is encouraged to participate in Council's decision-making	26%	2.92	31%	3.07	5.7%	5.4%
The Hornsby Shire community is generally supportive of recycling and sustainability	72%	3.92	78%	3.99	5.3%	1.6%
You are able to access a range of community facilities and services to meet your needs,	74%	4.03	78%	4.09	3.6%	1.5%
You have access to bushland areas, parks and green spaces	87%	4.45	91%	4.59	3.2%	3.0%
During the day you feel safe walking around your local area	93%	4.51	95%	4.60	2.4%	1.9%
A range of community events and activities take place that help bring people together	52%	3.54	54%	3.60	2.1%	1.6%
Travel time to and from work is acceptable	44%	3.23	46%	3.40	2.0%	5.0%
At night you feel safe walking around your local area	70%	3.88	70%	3.89	-0.6%	0.3%
The natural environment within the Hornsby Shire is well cared for and protected	76%	3.96	75%	3.92	-1.0%	-1.0%
There is a good range of opportunities for cultural and artistic activities and expression	47%	3.46	46%	3.46	-1.1%	-0.2%
Public transport is adequate for your needs	65%	3.78	62%	3.67	-2.3%	-2.7%
During the day you feel safe using public transport in your local area	91%	4.54	88%	4.47	-3.3%	-1.4%
Sporting facilities in the area meet your needs	69%	3.88	65%	3.83	-4.1%	-1.2%
At night you feel safe using public transport in your local area	67%	3.77	61%	3.70	-6.4%	-2.0%
Aged care and disability services and facilities within the Hornsby Shire are adequate	44%	3.41	33%	3.36	-11.6%	-1.5%

Legend:


Liveable
Sustainable
Productive
Collaborative

Although parking obviously remains an issue, scores were significantly better than three years ago. And there was also a large jump in agreement that there is a good range of leisure and recreation opportunities.

Other measures were all broadly in line with 2017, although there was less agreement regarding the adequacy of aged care and disability services. (This may be due to the younger respondent profile this time around – as previously noted, some 60% were neutral or unsure this time around.)

Interestingly the percentage of residents feeling able to afford a reasonable standard of housing rose from 41% in 2017 to 50% in 2020.

Graph 2.5: Overall quality of life (2020 vs. 2017)



Overall quality of life (QOL) remained high and stable survey-to-survey. Four out of five residents classed their QOL as very good or excellent, the same as in 2017.

Residents from Wards A and C were the most satisfied with their QOL, with 85% saying it was very good or excellent (vs. 74% for Ward B). There were no significant QOL differences by age, gender or whether respondents had children living at home.

Finally in this section, we can conduct a driver analysis² to understand the degree of correlations between individual statements and (in this case) overall satisfaction with Council and overall quality of life. Table 2.3 (next page) shows the co-efficients for overall satisfaction with Council, ranked from highest correlation to lowest:

² Based on a Pearson Correlation co-efficient, or Pearson's r.

Table 2.3: Driver analysis between QOL statements and overall satisfaction with Council

Statement	Relationship to Overall Satisfaction
Council plans well to help secure the community's long-term future	.518
A range of community events and activities take place that help bring people together	.363
The road network is well maintained	.358
Youth services and facilities within the Hornsby Shire are adequate	.356
There is a good range of leisure and recreation opportunities	.343
The natural environment within the Hornsby Shire is well cared for and protected	.328
Information about Council and its decisions are clear and accessible via a variety of channels	.324
The Hornsby Shire community is generally supportive of recycling and sustainability	.316
The community is encouraged to participate in Council's decision-making	.315
There are adequate parking facilities in public areas, such as schools, shopping centres and hospitals	.312
You are able to access a range of community facilities and services to meet your needs	.306
The road network provides for efficient traffic flows	.303
Sporting facilities in the area meet your needs	.285
Travel time to and from work is acceptable	.275
There is a good range of opportunities for cultural and artistic activities and expression	.267
Public transport is adequate for your needs	.244
You feel able to afford a reasonable standard of housing in the area	.237
Aged care and disability services and facilities within the Hornsby Shire are adequate	.169
You have access to bushland areas, parks and green spaces	.162
During the day you feel safe walking around your local area	.160
At night you feel safe using public transport in your local area	.150
During the day you feel safe using public transport in your local area	.141
At night you feel safe walking around your local area	.131

Legend:

Liveable
 Sustainable
 Productive
 Collaborative

This suggests that the biggest contributors to overall satisfaction are (not surprisingly) "Council plans well to secure the community's long-term future" and "a range of community events and activities are planned that bring people together". A well-maintained road network is also an important satisfaction indicator.

Table 2.4: Driver analysis between QOL statements and overall quality of life

Statement	Relationship to Overall Quality of life
There is a good range of leisure and recreation opportunities	.341
Council plans well to help secure the community's long-term future	.326
Sporting facilities in the area meet your needs	.317
You are able to access a range of community facilities and services to meet your needs,	.303
During the day you feel safe walking around your local area	.284
A range of community events and activities take place that help bring people together	.278
The natural environment within the Hornsby Shire is well cared for and protected	.277
The road network is well maintained	.271
You feel able to afford a reasonable standard of housing in the area	.263
Information about Council and its decisions are clear and accessible via a variety of channels	.261
There is a good range of opportunities for cultural and artistic activities and expression	.260
The Hornsby Shire community is generally supportive of recycling and sustainability	.246
Travel time to and from work is acceptable	.238
You have access to bushland areas, parks and green spaces	.238
Public transport is adequate for your needs	.221
At night you feel safe walking around your local area	.219
During the day you feel safe using public transport in your local area	.205
The community is encouraged to participate in Council's decision-making	.200
Aged care and disability services and facilities within the Hornsby Shire are adequate	.188
There are adequate parking facilities in public areas, such as schools, shopping centres and hospitals	.187
The road network provides for efficient traffic flows	.183
At night you feel safe using public transport in your local area	.183
Youth services and facilities within the Hornsby Shire are adequate	.179

Legend:

Liveable
 Sustainable
 Productive
 Collaborative

Interestingly none of the individual statements correlated closely³ with overall quality of life. This suggests that it is a wide combination of factors, rather than any one or two, which dictates QOL.


³ i.e. Pearson's $r > 0.5$

Part 3: Council assets

The final section of the survey was more qualitative in nature - firstly inviting residents to suggest specific local assets of which they were proud, and secondly asking them to suggest where improvements could be made. *The full lists of comments will be supplied separately, as input to the next phase of CSP engagement.*

However the open-ended responses were also coded, to see what key themes emerged. Firstly, residents were invited to describe which Council assets or infrastructure they were proudest of, and why.

Graph 3.1: Which Hornsby Council assets are you proudest of?




Specific sporting facilities were the most admired assets, led by (in rough order of priority) the Hornsby Aquatic Centre, the Thornleigh Brickpit Stadium, and Greenway Park.

Specific parks, gardens and playgrounds were also popular choices, with Fagan Park the most often mentioned among a wide range of other facilities.

Among other, more general assets, a range of specific bushland reserves and green spaces were also admired. These included Galston Gorge, Crosslands Reserve, Ku-ring-gai Chase and Lane Cove National Parks, and Pennant Hills Park.


Meanwhile Hornsby and Pennant Hills Libraries were the most frequently mentioned in this category.

Graph 3.2: Can you think of any Council assets that need to be improved?



Around three-quarters of those surveyed were able to think of Council assets that needed improvements.


Graph 3.3: (If yes) Can you tell me which ones?



Roads and parking dominated the residents' "wish lists", with a wide variety of specific suggestions (see separate spreadsheet), and others just taking the chance to comment about these more generally.

Upgrades to leisure and sporting facilities were also frequently mentioned, with Hornsby Aquatic Centre and Dence Park prominently mentioned.

Graph 3.4: What should be the greatest priority among the following?



Finally, residents were asked in a trade-off questions which should be Council's highest priority when it came to future infrastructure. In this regard opinion was evenly split between the need to build more infrastructure, and improve existing Council assets. Opinion was relatively consistent between different age groups, genders and wards, and whether or not the respondent had children at home.



Appendix 1: Questionnaire

S1 Good afternoon/evening, my name is (name) and I'm calling from Jetty Research on behalf of Hornsby Shire Council. Council is conducting a short resident survey about some important local issues, and you have been chosen at random to participate. The survey will only take around 12 minutes, and all answers are confidential. Would you be willing to assist Council by taking part in a quick survey today?

If NO, try to arrange callback, or speak to another adult member of the household.

S2. (If yes) Thanks so much. Before we commence, can I just confirm you live in the Hornsby Shire?

Yes 1

No 2 THANK AND TERMINATE

S3. And what suburb do you live in?

Arcadia	1	Dural	15	Normanhurst	29
Asquith	2	Fiddletown	16	North Epping	30
Beecroft	3	Forest Glen	17	Pennant Hills	31
Berowra	4	Galston	18	Singletons Mill	32
Berowra Creek	5	Glenhaven	19	Thornleigh	33
Berowra Heights	6	Glenorie	20	Wahroonga	34
Berrilee	7	Hornsby	21	Waitara	35
Brooklyn	8	Hornsby Heights	22	West Pennant Hills	36
Canoelands	9	Laughtondale	23	Westleigh	37
Castle Hill	10	Maroota	24	Wisemans Ferry	38
Cheltenham	11	Middle Dural	25	z-None of these	99
Cherrybrook	12	Milsons Passage	26		TERMINATE
Cowan	13	Mt Colah	27		
Dangar Island	14	Mt Kuring-gai	28		

S4. And are you a Hornsby Councillor or permanent Council employee?

YES 1 THANK AND TERMINATE

NO 2

D1. Could I just get your age range please? Would it be...

18-25	1
26-35	2
36-45	3
46-55	4
56-65	5
66-75	6
76+	7

D2. Record gender (don't ask)

Male	1
Female	2

D3. And could I just get your first name for the survey please?

(Record name)

Q1. To kick things off (name), how satisfied are you with the performance of Council – not just across one or two issues, but across all responsibility areas? Are you: (Prompted)

Very satisfied	1
Satisfied	2
Somewhat satisfied	3
Not very satisfied	4
Not at all satisfied	5

Q5. For the next part of the survey we would like your views on the Hornsby Shire as a place to live. I am going to read out a list of statements about the Hornsby Shire and would like you to rate your agreement or disagreement with each of these statements.

We'll use a scale of 1-5, where 1 is strongly disagree, 3 is neutral or unsure, and 5 is strongly agree. So to kick things off, to what extent do you disagree or agree that:

- A. You have access to bushland areas, parks and green spaces.
- B. Youth services and facilities within the Hornsby Shire are adequate.
- C. A range of community events and activities take place that help bring people together
- D. You feel able to afford a reasonable standard of housing in the area
- E. You are able to access a range of community facilities and services to meet your needs, such as libraries, community services and support services
- F. Sporting facilities in the area meet your needs
- G. Aged care and disability services and facilities within the Hornsby Shire are adequate
- H. There is a good range of opportunities for cultural and artistic activities and expression
- I. There is a good range of leisure and recreation opportunities
- J. During the day you feel safe walking around your local area
- K. During the day you feel safe using public transport in your local area
- L. At night you feel safe walking around your local area
- M. At night you feel safe using public transport in your local area

Q6. And likewise, on a scale of 1-5, to what extent would you disagree or agree that:

- A. The natural environment within the Hornsby Shire is well cared for and protected
- B. The Hornsby Shire community is generally supportive of recycling and sustainability
- C. There are adequate parking facilities in public areas, such as schools, shopping centres and hospitals
- D. Public transport is adequate for your needs
- E. Travel time to and from work is acceptable
- F. The road network provides for efficient traffic flows
- G. The road network is well maintained

Q7. And again on a scale of 1-5, to what extent would you disagree or agree that

- A. The community is encouraged to participate in Council's decision-making
- B. Information about Council and its decisions are clear and accessible via a variety of channels
- C. Council plans well to help secure the community's long-term future

Q8. And (D3) how would you rate the quality of life you have living in the Hornsby Shire? Would it be excellent, very good, good, fair, poor or very poor?

Excellent	1
Very good	2
Good	3
Fair	4
Poor	5
Very poor	6

Q9. Now (D3), Council provides and services many assets – leisure and open space facilities (such as parks, playgrounds, sportsgrounds, bushland, aquatic centres, skate parks), town centres, libraries, community centres, stormwater drainage, roads and footpaths. Can you tell me which Hornsby Council asset or location you are most proud of, and why? (open-ended)

Q10. Can you think of any Council assets that need to be improved?

Yes	1	
No	2	SKIP TO Q12
Unsure	3	SKIP TO Q12

Q11. (If Q10=1) Can you tell me which ones, and why? (Open-ended)

Q12. Council is always balancing the need for new infrastructure against improving the existing assets, particularly given current and projected population increases. If you were in charge, what would be your greatest priority among the following? (Read out and choose one of the first 4. Don't read out "unsure".)

Building more infrastructure	1
Improving existing Council assets	2
Making Council assets more environmentally friendly	3
Spending less money on assets	4
Unsure	5

D4. Thanks (D3), we're almost done. Before we finish, how long have you lived in the Hornsby Shire?

Less than 2 years	1
2-5 years	2
6-10 years	3
11-20 years	4
More than 20 years	5

D5. Which of the following best describes the dwelling you are currently living in?

Own/buying this property	1
Rent this property	2
Other (please specify)	3

D6. And do you have children under 18 living in your household?

Yes	1
No	2
Prefer not to answer	3

F1. Finally (D3), Hornsby Shire Council will shortly be running some community workshops to discuss some of these issues in greater detail. The groups would last about 2 hours, be held in a convenient location, and those attending would be paid for their time. If the timing was convenient, is this something that might interest you?

Yes 1 Ask for email address and best contact number
No 2

Thanks so much (D3), that's the end of the survey. Hornsby Shire Council greatly appreciates your time and feedback today. Did you have any questions about the survey?

ISO requirements, thank and finish.



Appendix 2: Weighting calculation

It is common in random surveys such as this to weight results by age and gender. This avoids the need to sample by quota (which is far more expensive than purely random sampling), and ensures the data from under- and over-represented groups is adjusted to meet the demographic profile of the survey population.

Population weighting can only occur where the true survey population is known. In this case the population, defined as “adults 18-plus living in the Hornsby Shire”, can be accurately measured through the 2016 ABS Census⁴. We can hence weight the survey data by the known population.

To do this we divide the survey sample by gender (male/female) and across three age groups (16-39, 40-59 and 60-plus.) This divides respondents into one of six age and gender categories, as shown below:

Randomly selected survey respondents by age and gender		
Age	Male	Female
18-45	11.5%	15.2%
46-65	18.5%	22.0%
66+	15.5%	17.3%

Meanwhile ABS data for the adult (18+) population of the Northern Beaches LGA postcodes (as per 2011 ABS census, Usual Resident profile), is shown in the following table:

Hornsby LGA adult population by age and gender (ABS 2016 Census)		
Age	Male	Female
18-45	22.5%	23.4%
46-65	16.5%	17.7%
66+	8.9%	11.0%
TOTAL	47.95%	52.05%

Dividing the “true” population by the sample population for each age and gender category provides the following weighting factors:

Weighting factor		
Age	Male	Female
18-45	1.96	1.54
46-65	0.89	0.80
66+	0.58	0.63

These weightings are then assigned to each data record based on each respondent’s age/gender profile, and the raw data for each question is adjusted accordingly.

⁴ ABS Census for Hornsby Shire, Usual Resident profile.