

**Sydney:**

Suite 108 272 Victoria Avenue Chatswood NSW 2067  
Mail: PO Box 1675 Chatswood NSW 2057  
Phone: +61 (0)2 9413 1233  
Fax: +61 (0)2 9413 1303  
Mobile: +61 (0)414 504 832  
Email: leswinton@bigpond.com  
Internet: artcraft.com.au

**Canberra:**

Suite 17 Level 1 Manuka Arcade  
20 Franklin St Manuka ACT 2603  
Phone: +61 (0)2 6232 6264



Artcraft Research is a  
division of Artcraft Studios  
of Australia Pty Limited  
ABN 47 002 306 381

**ARTCRAFT  
RESEARCH**



**COMMUNICATIONS  
MARKETING AND  
SOCIAL RESEARCH  
CONSULTANTS**

**Final Report**

on a

**Community Survey**

**Presented to**

**Palerang Council**

**By Les Winton**

**31 May 2005**

# Table of Contents

## Page

<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1 Background	5
1.2 Study Objectives	5
<b>2. Research Methodology</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3. Summary of the Main Survey Findings</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1 The Local Environment Plan	8
3.2 Waste Management	11
3.3 Rate Increase to Cover Revenue Shortfall	12
3.4 Council's Vision	13
3.5 Braidwood Draft Heritage Development Control Plan	14
3.6 The Bungendore Options Paper	14
3.7 Council's Management Plan	16
<b>4. Detailed Tabular Results</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Appendix: The Survey Questionnaire</b>	<b>77</b>

# Executive Summary

This report covers a community survey undertaken by Artcraft Research for Palerang Council during April 2005 as a first stage in a major community consultation process that Council is embarking upon. The study involved administration by telephone of a structured questionnaire of around 15 minutes duration to a stratified random sample of 1,100 people (aged 18 years and over) drawn from throughout the Palerang Council area in early to mid-April 2005.

## **The Local Environment Plan**

At the beginning of the survey, people were asked to describe what they felt to be the good things, and not so good things, about living where they do. In response, around one-half mentioned being quiet and peaceful and wide open spaces as the things they liked, followed by the friendliness of the people and community, the fresh, unpolluted air and being close to Canberra and other places. Only a few people were unable to think of any good things about the area where they live.

On the not-so-good side of the equation, poor upkeep of roads and poor public transport were the only matters to be mentioned unaided by more than one in ten people. Some one-quarter of the population were unable to think of any not so good aspects of where they live.

Once prompted, almost everyone is at least quite satisfied overall with their town or village or area as a place to live, with three in four being at least very satisfied. People living in Braidwood, Bungendore and rural residential areas show a greater strength of satisfaction (all show around eight in ten at least very satisfied), than those living in Captains Flat, the villages or on farms (all show around two-thirds at least very satisfied).

Vast majorities are also at least quite satisfied with 'the sense of community in the area' and the 'look or appearance of the place', and some seven in ten are at least very satisfied in both cases. However, while majorities are also at least quite satisfied with a further seven factors, the proportions who are at least very satisfied fall below majority levels. Close to nine in ten people are at least quite satisfied with 'the range of services available to the community', but less than half are at least very satisfied. Around three in four people are at least quite satisfied with 'the garbage tip facilities in the area', 'the household water supply in the area' (asked only in the three towns), 'the local roads in the area', 'the way in which you area is developing' and 'the connecting roads through the area.

Of the seven specific matters examined in this set of question, people are least satisfied with 'the nature and speed of housing development in the area', with some two-thirds being at least quite satisfied. However, only some three in ten are at least very satisfied and a higher one-third are not satisfied.

In terms of the three towns, considerably more Braidwood people than Bungendore people tend to be at least quite satisfied with the nature and speed of housing development in the area, the ways in which their area is developing and the household water supply in the area.

People living in Captains Flat are generally less likely than people living in either Braidwood or Bungendore to be at least quite satisfied with the look or appearance of the area, the connecting roads through the area, the local roads in the area, the garbage tip facilities in the area and the range of services available in the area.

Just over half of the people would like to see the population of the area stay the same size or even decrease over the next 20 years, with only four in ten opting for an increase in the population.

Whereas nearly three-quarters of those living in Braidwood would like to see an increase in population, this support for any increase falls to around half of those living in villages, roughly four in ten of those living in Captains Flat and on farms, and roughly three in ten among those living in Bungendore and in rural residential areas.

A vast majority would like to see the character of their area stay the same in the future, with only around one in eight wishing for a change.

## **Waste Management**

In order to assist in development of Council's waste management strategy, the survey canvassed community suggestions as to possible alternative tip sites or garbage disposal methods to replace the current tips when they are full? In Captains Flat, where the tip is already at capacity and needs to be closed urgently, the question to people in that town reflected this greater urgency.

In the Captains Flat case, the main suggestions revolved around cutting down on the waste going to the tip, either by various recycling and other waste separating initiatives and/or by restricting use of the tip to locals. Many others suggested finding another site in the area (some suggest the local abandoned mine, others suggest acquiring land nearby) or outside the area (with some mention of Woodlawn and Tarago). A not insignificant minority (around one in ten) disagrees with Council's conclusion that the tip needs to close, claiming that its size can be extended on-site and/or that the waste can be further compacted thereby extending its life.

A similar pattern of response emerges in the rest of the Council area (ie, all except Captains Flat), but with increased emphasis on cutting down on the waste going to the tips, either by recycling, composting, incineration and other waste separating or eliminating initiatives.

The demand for roadside household garbage collection and household recycling collection were examined everywhere in the Council area except among those living on farms. Close to half the people claim already to have a roadside household garbage collection service, including most of those living in the three towns, plus about one in ten in villages and one in twelve in rural residential areas. When probed most of these latter two groups claimed to have arrangements with private contractors.

Among those not currently having a roadside household garbage collection service, around two-thirds maintain that they would use one if it were to be provided, and the preference is predominantly for a weekly frequency of service.

In terms of roadside household recycling collection only around one in six people claimed already to use one, mainly restricted to Braidwood where close to nine in ten people claimed to use one.

Among those not currently having a roadside household recycling collection service, around eight in ten people maintain that they would use one if it were to be provided, with those in Braidwood favouring a weekly service, whereas those in the other towns, villages and those in rural residential tending to favour a fortnightly (or monthly) service over a weekly one.

## Rate Increase to Cover Revenue Shortfall

When the new Council was created, it inherited a million dollar revenue shortfall and is therefore currently operating with an unsustainable deficit. In the survey, people were asked to choose between two contrasted options to overcome this, namely: an increase in your rates of around 25% (or one-quarter) to fully cover the shortfall without reducing any Council services or maintenance levels, or no rates increase but a reduction in Councils service and maintenance levels. In response, only some one in seven people chose the 25% rate increase option and only around one in four chose the reduced services option.

Of the balance, some one in four want a middle option of a smaller rate increase with a slight reduction in Council services and maintenance levels, with a further one in twenty pushing for a more substantial increase in rates to improve on current services and maintenance levels. A further one-third of people were either undecided as to the best option or stated a preference for Council to decide for them.

In summary, only some four in ten people opted for any level of rate rise in response to this question.

When the proposition is put that some rate rise is needed to minimise any reduction in Council services and maintenance levels, the proportion of people who say that they would personally support some level of rate increase rises to almost seven in ten. However, most of these people say that they would personally support a rate rise of no more than 15%.

## Council's Vision

A vast majority of people believes that the Council's draft vision statement, 'Working with our community to provide the best in village and rural living' matches their own vision for the area of whom close to half believe that it matches their vision a lot.

## Braidwood Draft Heritage Development Control Plan

A vast majority of people in Braidwood claims to have already heard of the Draft Heritage Development Control Plan. The kinds of issues that people would like to see raised in public discussion of the Draft Heritage Development Control Plan include:

- The kinds of buildings that should be included, eg, only older buildings; only old buildings that are not dilapidated; only those in the main street, and so on,
- The need to restrict or guide new development, and the nature of future development,
- The need to consider economic, employment and environmental implications,
- The need to explain what can and cannot be done with heritage-listed buildings, and
- The need for more information, consultation and possibly a referendum on key issues.

## The Bungendore Options Paper

Palerang Council is required to review its Local Environmental Plans and Development Control Plans. A number of development options and priorities were examined among Bungendore residents in the current study.

Of the four development options examined, rural residential development (ie, by rezoning land close to the existing village boundaries with large block sizes) emerged most positively, with close to half agreeing with this option, although over one-third disagree and a further one in seven are ambivalent about it. It is also the only option of the four in which more people agree than disagree. More than one-third of people in Bungendore agree with the greenfield development option (ie, by rezoning and developing land just outside the existing village boundaries for suburban block-sized residential purposes), but more than half disagree and one in eleven are ambivalent. Only around one-quarter

agree with the option of infill development (ie, developing the significant areas of vacant land still available within the existing village boundaries, and encouraging the re-subdivision of existing large residential lots), but six in ten disagree (most of whom disagree strongly) and one in six is ambivalent. A small minority of around one in six people agrees with the option of doing nothing (ie, no change to planning controls so that the village continues to develop pretty much as it has been in recent years), with around seven in ten people disagreeing, of whom most disagree strongly) and around one in nine is ambivalent.

Of the four priorities outlined in the Plans, substantial majorities maintain that each of them is at least quite important. Everyone in the Bungendore sub-sample believes that establishing the viability of the water supply is at least quite important, with some nine in ten believing that it is at least very important. Almost all believe that restricting development on floodplains and upgrading of the sewerage treatment works are at least quite important, with some seven in ten believing that they are at least very important. On the other hand, a lesser three-quarters believe that bypassing traffic to the east of Bungendore is at least quite important, but only some one-third believes that it is at least very important.

### **Council's Management Plan**

To assist Council in developing its management plan, the survey measured community perceptions of Council's performance overall, and in terms of six specific aspects. Overall, the Council emerges on the positive side of the ledger, with close to six in ten people scoring its overall performance positively (ie, scoring it 6 or above on a 1 to 10 scale where 10 is excellent and 1 is terrible). On the six specific aspects of performance, some three-quarters ( of those living in the three towns) score the Council positively in terms of the household garbage collection, some two-thirds score it positively on the courtesy and helpfulness of council staff, and around half score it positively on the knowledge and accuracy of council staff, the maintenance of roads in towns and villages and the maintenance of connecting roads in Council's care. Only in terms of the management of residential development within the area in recent years is the Council's performance perceived positively by substantially less than a majority of people. On the other hand, only a bare majority claims to be well-informed about the overall activities and initiatives of the Council.

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Background

With the changing of boundaries and staff, the Palerang Council is looking to engage with the community through effective community consultation processes. There are many matters that need to be dealt with, and ‘bottlenecks’ have already occurred. The Council’s community consultation working party has therefore met and recommended that the initial consultation process to address these issues be two-pronged, namely:

1. This telephone survey; and
2. A series of information days around the villages of the Shire.

The matters to be dealt with in this initial consultation process include:

- a. Local environment plan (LEP),
- b. Waste management strategy,
- c. Possible special rate/rate increase,
- d. Vision,
- e. Braidwood Draft Heritage Development Control Plan (DCP),
- f. The Bungendore Options paper,
- g. Logo, and
- h. Management plan.

Subsequently a number of these matters (eg, the LEP, management plan and any strategy such as the waste strategy) will need to go through a formal consultation process and submission period, and formal documents will need to be prepared.

This initial consultation process will therefore take the form of an information gathering phase enabling Council to obtain community guidance as it drafts the various documents.

## 1.2 Study Objectives

The objective of the telephone survey was to collect information on the following matters within an interview not exceeding 15 minutes average duration:

### **a. The local environment plan:**

- Questions covered such topics as:
  - What’s good about the locality;
  - What’s not so good about it – opportunities for improvement;
  - Vision of the locality;
  - Attitudes and preferences regarding the level of development.

### **b. Waste management**

- This will assist the development of the waste management strategy, and covered issues of:
  - Scoping of issues and suggestions regarding future rubbish tips
  - Demand for roadside collection in rural residential areas;
  - Demand for recycling;

**c. Rate increase**

- Level of support for a rate rise to address the current revenue shortfall.

**d. Vision**

- Attitudes to Council's draft vision.

**e. Braidwood heritage DCP**

- Scoping of issues. (Asked only in the Braidwood area.)

**f. The Bungendore options paper**

- Attitudes to various options. (Asked only in the Bungendore area.)

**g. Demographics**

- The phone survey also collected basic demographic information so that the similarities and differences in views could be examined across the community, including:
  - Age,
  - Gender,
  - Household size/structure,
  - How long lived in area,
  - Housing tenure – eg, own or rent,
  - Location.



## 2. Research Methodology

The study involved administration by telephone of a structured questionnaire of maximum 15 minutes duration to a stratified random sample of people drawn from throughout the Palerang Council area in early to mid-April 2005.

To ensure that the results in each of the regions could stand up to statistical scrutiny, a total sample size of 1,100 people (aged 18 years and over) was chosen, with the number of people interviewed in each region being calculated so that the statistical tolerance in each region is equal at around  $\pm 6.6\%$  on 50/50% results at the 95% level of confidence. The sampling tolerance on total results is around  $\pm 2.8\%$ . Results were then weighted at the computer analysis stage to realign the total results to population proportions.

Region	Estimated population	Stratified sample used in survey	Sampling tolerance
Braidwood	1,100	180	$\pm 6.6\%$
Bungendore	2,000	195	$\pm 6.6\%$
Captains Flat	400	140	$\pm 6.6\%$
Rural residential	4,000	200	$\pm 6.6\%$
Farms	2,000	195	$\pm 6.6\%$
Villages	1,500	190	$\pm 6.6\%$
Total	11,000	1,100	$\pm 2.8\%$



Region	A. Population proportions	B. Stratified sample used in survey	Weights used during analysis to realign sample with population proportions (A/B)
Braidwood	110	180	0.611
Bungendore	200	195	1.026
Captains Flat	40	140	0.286
Rural residential	400	200	2.000
Farms	200	195	1.026
Villages	150	190	0.789
Total	1,100	1,100	na

In terms of sampling, we first used an electronic telephone book to develop lists of all households living in the postcodes covering the Palerang Council area. Where postcodes extended beyond the Council boundaries, we eliminated listings (by address) which were clearly outside the boundaries, and used filter questions at the beginning of the survey to eliminate any others. Filter questions were also used to ensure that only households living in or close to the towns and villages were included in those sub-samples, with the rest being classified into rural residential dwellings and farms.

We employed a three call approach in the interviewing process, that is, making one initial call and then up to 2 call-backs to not-at-homes on different days at different times before sample replacement. This approach provides a more representative sample than simply interviewing the first 1,100 people who answer the phone and agree to take part in the survey. By definition, the telephone approach leaves out all households where no phone contact is possible, but this generally comprises only a relatively small proportion of households in regional and rural areas.

A structured questionnaire suitable for telephone administration was drawn up in consultation with Council, and pilot-tested with a small sub-sample of the population (via test interviews with some 20 people from different regions) to test for question flow and to eliminate any question wording ambiguities. The interviews were then conducted by our experienced team of IQCA-accredited interviewers, who were briefed and supervised on the study.

## 3. Summary of the Main Survey Findings

This section of the report provides a summary of the main findings emerging from the study. For a more detailed analysis by population sub-groups, please refer to Section 4.

### 3.1 The Local Environment Plan

- At the beginning of the survey, people were asked to describe what they felt to be the good things, and not so good things, about living where they do.
- In response, around one-half mentioned being quiet and peaceful (54.5%) and wide open spaces (46.3%) as the things they liked, followed by the friendliness of the people and community (28.9%), the fresh, unpolluted air (23.6%) and being close to Canberra (16.8%) and other places. Only a few people (3%) were unable to think of any good things about the area where they live. (See Table 3.1 below, and Tables 4.1 and 4.2 in Section 4).
- On the not-so-good side of the equation, poor upkeep of roads (18.7%) and poor public transport (10.5%) were the only matters to be mentioned unaided by more than one in ten people. Some one-quarter of the population were unable to think of any not so good aspects of where they live.

**Table 3.1:**

<b>What people feel are the <u>good things</u> about living in the area: (Unaided mentions)</b>	<b>All %</b>	<b>What people feel are the <u>not so good things</u> about living in the area: (Unaided mentions)</b>	<b>All %</b>
Quiet/peaceful	54.5	Roads/poor upkeep/potholed	18.7
Wide open spaces/fields/countryside	46.3	Poor public transport	10.5
Sense of community/ friendly people	28.9	Growing too fast/too many new homes	8.0
Fresh air/unpolluted	23.6	Extremes of seasons	7.8
Close to Canberra	16.8	Lack of variety of shopping	6.3
Close to other places (Sydney, Coast, Melbourne, etc)	8.3	High prices	3.8
Good climate/ four seasons	6.9	Not enough to do/too quiet	2.8
Safe for children	4.9	Inadequate garbage collection	2.5
Close to Queanbeyan	4.4	Inadequate household recycling service	1.8
Less traffic congestion	3.0	Inadequate schools	1.6
Less crime	1.9	Dangerous drivers/road rage	1.6
Good schools/ educational opportunities	1.8	Drugs/lack of policing	0.9
Good shopping opportunities	1.1	Over-regulated/too many rules	0.7
Well planned/well laid out	1.1	People not friendly (anymore)	0.2
All other minor mentions	3.9	All other minor mentions	44.9
TOTAL mentions of good things	207.4	TOTAL mentions of not so good things	112.1
NET people mentioning any good things	97.0	NET people mentioning any not so good things	75.5
No good things mentioned	3.0	No not so good things mentioned	24.5

- Once prompted, almost everyone (96.7%) is at least quite satisfied overall with their town or village or area as a place to live, with three in four being at least very satisfied (75.2%). People living in Braidwood, Bungendore and rural residential areas show a greater strength of satisfaction (all show around eight in ten at least very satisfied), than those living in Captains Flat, the villages or on farms (all show around two-thirds at least very satisfied). (See Tables 3.2, 4.3 and 4.4a-i).
- Vast majorities are also at least quite satisfied with ‘the sense of community in the area’ (95.0%) and the ‘look or appearance of the place’ (92.1%), and some seven in ten are at least very satisfied in both cases (70.1% and 70.9% respectively).. However, while majorities are also at least quite satisfied with a further seven factors (see Table 3.2), the proportions who are at least very satisfied fall below majority levels.
- Close to nine in ten people (86.8%) are at least quite satisfied with ‘the range of services available to the community’, but less than half are at least very satisfied (44.5%).
- Around three in four people are at least quite satisfied with ‘the garbage tip facilities in the area’ (76.6%), ‘the household water supply in the area’ (75.0%, asked only in the three towns), ‘the local roads in the area’ (72.3%), ‘the way in which you area is developing’ (72.2%) and ‘the connecting roads through the area’ (71.0%).
- Of the seven specific matters examined in this set of question, people are least satisfied with ‘the nature and speed of housing development in the area’, with some two-thirds being at least quite satisfied (65.4). However, only some three in ten are at least very satisfied (29.2%) and a higher one-third (34.6%) are not satisfied.
- In terms of the three towns, considerably more Braidwood people than Bungendore people tend to be at least quite satisfied with the nature and speed of housing development in the area (73.4% vs 42.5% respectively), the ways in which their area is developing (84.4% vs 60.4%) and the household water supply in the area (87.2% vs 68.9%).
- People living in Captains Flat are generally less likely than people living in either Braidwood or Bungendore to be at least quite satisfied with the look or appearance of the area, the connecting roads through the area, the local roads in the area, the garbage tip facilities in the area and the range of services available in the area.

**Table 3.2:**

	<b>Overall %</b>	<b>7 %</b>	<b>2 %</b>	<b>8 %</b>	<b>6 %</b>	<b>9 %</b>	<b>5 %</b>	<b>1 %</b>	<b>4 %</b>	<b>3 %</b>
Completely satisfied	36.4	32.2	30.0	12.7	12.4	22.0	9.9	10.3	15.8	12.9
Very satisfied	38.8	37.9	40.9	31.8	32.1	23.3	29.7	25.6	30.5	16.3
<b>Total C+V satisfied</b>	<b>75.2</b>	<b>70.1</b>	<b>70.9</b>	<b>44.5</b>	<b>44.5</b>	<b>45.3</b>	<b>39.6</b>	<b>35.9</b>	<b>46.3</b>	<b>29.2</b>
Quite satisfied	21.5	24.9	21.2	42.3	32.1	29.7	32.7	36.3	24.7	36.2
<b>Total C+V+Q satisfied</b>	<b>96.7</b>	<b>95.0</b>	<b>92.1</b>	<b>86.8</b>	<b>76.6</b>	<b>75.0</b>	<b>72.3</b>	<b>72.2</b>	<b>71.0</b>	<b>65.4</b>
Not very satisfied*	1.6	4.1	6.3	9.7	10.6	12.3	19.0	15.7	18.2	20.6
Not satisfied at all*	1.7	1.0	1.7	3.5	12.9	12.8	8.7	12.0	10.7	14.0
<b>Total not satisfied</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>5.1</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>13.2</b>	<b>23.5</b>	<b>25.1</b>	<b>27.7</b>	<b>27.7</b>	<b>28.9</b>	<b>34.6</b>
Mean	4.1	4.0	3.9	3.4	3.2	3.3	3.1	3.1	3.2	2.9
S.D.	0.9	0.9	1.0	0.9	1.2	1.3	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.2
Overall: Overall satisfaction with this town/village/area as a place to live? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7. The sense of community in the area.</li> <li>2. The 'look' (or appearance) of the place.</li> <li>8. The range of services available to the community</li> <li>6. The garbage tip facilities in the area.</li> <li>9. The household water supply in the area. (Asked only in the three towns)</li> <li>5. The local roads in the area.</li> <li>1. The ways in which your area is developing.</li> <li>4. The connecting roads through the area.</li> <li>3. The nature and speed of housing development in the area.</li> </ol>										

- Just over half of the people would like to see the population of the area stay the same size (51.1%) or even decrease (1.4%) over the next 20 years, with only four in ten opting for an increase in the population (40.5%). (See Tables 3.3 and 4.5).
- Whereas nearly three-quarters of those living in Braidwood would like to see an increase in population (72.8%), this support for any increase falls to around half of those living in villages (49.9%), roughly four in ten of those living in Captains Flat and on farms (44.2% and 39.3% respectively), and roughly three in ten among those living in Bungendore and in rural residential areas (30.2 and 33.3% respectively).

**Table 3.3:**

<b>Over the next 20 years, the population should:</b>	<b>All %</b>
More than triple in size	2.3
Triple in size	2.3
Double in size	9.4
Increase by half	26.5
<b>TOTAL in favour of an increase in population</b>	<b>40.5</b>
Stay the same size	51.1
Decrease in size	1.4
Unsure	7.0

- A vast majority (87.3%) would like to see the character of their area stay the same in the future, with only around one in eight (12.7%) wishing for a change. (See Tables 3.4 and 4.6).

**Table 3.4:**

The future character of the area should:	All %
Remain about the same	87.3
Change	12.7

## 3.2 Waste Management

- In order to assist in development of Council's waste management strategy, the survey canvassed community suggestions as to possible alternative tip sites or garbage disposal methods to replace the current tips when they are full? In Captains Flat, where the tip is already at capacity and needs to be closed urgently, the question to people in that town reflected this greater urgency.
- In the Captains Flat case, the main suggestions revolved around cutting down on the waste going to the tip, either by various recycling and other waste separating initiatives and/or by restricting use of the tip to locals. Many others suggested finding another site in the area (some suggest the local abandoned mine, others suggest acquiring land nearby) or outside the area (with some mention of Woodlawn and Tarago). A not insignificant minority (around one in ten) disagrees with Council's conclusion that the tip needs to close, claiming that its size can be extended on-site and/or that the waste can be further compacted thereby extending its life. (See Table 4.18).
- A similar pattern of response emerges in the rest of the Council area (ie, all except Captains Flat), but with increased emphasis on cutting down on the waste going to the tips, either by recycling, composting, incineration and other waste separating or eliminating initiatives. (See Table 4.19).
- The demand for roadside household garbage collection and household recycling collection were examined everywhere in the Council area except among those living on farms. Close to half the people (44.6%) claim already to have a roadside household garbage collection service, including most of those living in the three towns, plus about one in ten in villages and one in twelve in rural residential areas. When probed most of these latter two groups claimed to have arrangements with private contractors. (See Tables 3.5 and 4.20a-c).
- Among those not currently having a roadside household garbage collection service, around two-thirds (65.4%) maintain that they would use one if it were to be provided, and the preference is predominantly for a weekly frequency of service.

**Table 3.5:**

<b>Currently serviced? Among all people except those on farms:</b>	<b>All except farm dwellers %</b>
Yes	44.6
No	55.4
Unsure	0.0
<b>Would use one, among those who don't have one:</b>	<b>All %</b>
Yes	65.4
No	30.3
Unsure	4.3
<b>Desired frequency of household garbage collection service:</b>	<b>All %</b>
Weekly	70.7
Fortnightly	21.6
Other (mostly twice a week)	5.3
Unsure	2.4

- In terms of roadside household recycling collection only around one in six people (15.8%) claimed already to use one, mainly restricted to Braidwood where close to nine in ten people claimed to use one (86.4%). (See Tables 3.6 and 4.21a-c).
- Among those not currently having a roadside household recycling collection service, around eight in ten people (81.3%) maintain that they would use one if it were to be provided, with those in Braidwood favouring a weekly service, whereas those in the other towns, villages and those in rural residential tending to favour a fortnightly (or monthly) service over a weekly one.

**Table 3.6:**

<b>Currently serviced? Among all people except those on farms:</b>	<b>All except farm dwellers %</b>
Yes	15.8
No	83.2
Unsure	1.0
<b>Would use one, among those who don't have one:</b>	<b>All %</b>
Yes	81.3
No	15.8
Unsure	2.8
<b>Desired frequency of household recycling collection service:</b>	<b>All %</b>
Weekly	37.0
Fortnightly	48.0
Other (Mostly monthly)	10.5
Unsure	4.6

### **3.3 Rate Increase to Cover Revenue Shortfall**

- When the new Council was created, it inherited a million dollar revenue shortfall and is therefore currently operating with an unsustainable deficit. In the survey, people were asked to choose between two contrasted options to overcome this, namely: an increase in your rates of around 25% (or one-quarter) to fully cover the shortfall without reducing any Council

services or maintenance levels, or no rates increase but a reduction in Councils service and maintenance levels. In response, only some one in seven people (13.4%) chose the 25% rate increase option and only around one in four (24.5%) chose the reduced services option. (See Tables 3.7, 4.12 and 4.13).

- Of the balance, some one in four (23.3%) want a middle option of a smaller rate increase with a slight reduction in Council services and maintenance levels, with a further one in twenty (4.8%) pushing for a more substantial increase in rates to improve on current services and maintenance levels. A further one-third of people (34.1%) were either undecided as to the best option or stated a preference for Council to decide for them.
- In summary, only some four in ten people (41.5%) opted for any level of rate rise in response to this question.

**Table 3.7:**

<b>Preferred solution to Council's inherited revenue shortfall:</b>	<b>All %</b>
A substantial increase in rates to also improve on current services and maintenance levels	4.8
Increase rates by around 25% so that there is no reduction in Council services and maintenance levels	13.4
A smaller rate increase and a slight reduction in Council services and maintenance levels	23.3
<b>TOTAL would prefer some increase in rates</b>	<b>41.5</b>
No rate increase but a reduction in Council services and maintenance levels	24.5
Other (mainly preferring Council to decide for them)	15.4
Unsure	18.7

- When the proposition is put that some rate rise is needed to minimise any reduction in Council services and maintenance levels, the proportion of people who say that they would personally support some level of rate increase rises to almost seven in ten (68.3). However, most of these people say that they would personally support a rate rise of no more than 15% (57.1%). (See Tables 3.8 and 4.14).

**Table 3.8:**

<b>People would personally support a rate rise of:</b>	<b>All %</b>
More than 35%	0.0
A rise of 35%	0.0
A rise of 30%	0.1
A rise of 25%	4.5
A rise of 20%	6.6
A rise of 15%	9.5
A rise of 10%	47.6
<b>TOTAL would support any increase</b>	<b>68.3</b>
Would not support any increase	25.7
Unsure	5.9

### 3.4 Council's Vision

- A vast majority of people believes that the Council's draft vision statement, 'Working with our community to provide the best in village and rural living' matches their own vision for

the area (84.8%) of whom close to half (47.7%) believe that it matches their vision a lot. (See Tables 3.9, 4.10 and 4.11).

**Table 3.9:**

<b>The Council's draft vision statement 'Working with our community to provide the best in village and rural living':</b>	<b>All %</b>
Matches my vision a lot	47.7
Matches my vision a little	37.1
<b>TOTAL matches a lot or a little</b>	<b>84.8</b>
Does not match my vision at all	7.8
Unsure	7.4

### 3.5 Braidwood Draft Heritage Development Control Plan

- A vast majority of people in Braidwood claims to have already heard of the Draft Heritage Development Control Plan (82.2%). (See Tables 3.10 and 4.15a-b).

**Table 3.10:**

<b>Aware of the Braidwood Draft Heritage Development Control Plan:</b>	<b>Braidwood %</b>
Yes	82.2
No	14.4
Unsure	3.3

- The kinds of issues that people would like to see raised in public discussion of the Draft Heritage Development Control Plan include:
  - The kinds of buildings that should be included, eg, only older buildings; only old buildings that are not dilapidated; only those in the main street, and so on,
  - The need to restrict or guide new development, and the nature of future development,
  - The need to consider economic, employment and environmental implications,
  - The need to explain what can and cannot be done with heritage-listed buildings, and
  - The need for more information, consultation and possibly a referendum on key issues.

### 3.6 The Bungendore Options Paper

- Palerang Council is required to review its Local Environmental Plans and Development Control Plans. A number of development options and priorities were examined among Bungendore residents in the current study.
- Of the four development options examined, rural residential development (ie, by rezoning land close to the existing village boundaries with large block sizes) emerged most positively, with close to half agreeing with this option (48.7%), although over one-third disagree (36.9%) and a further one in seven are ambivalent about it (14.4%). It is also the only option of the four in which more people agree than disagree. (See Tables 3.11 and 4.16a-d).
- More than one-third of people in Bungendore (36.9%) agree with the greenfield development option (ie, by rezoning and developing land just outside the existing village boundaries for suburban block-sized residential purposes), but more than half disagree (53.9%, most of whom disagree a lot) and one in eleven are ambivalent (9.2%) .



- Only around one-quarter (23.6%) agree with the option of infill development (ie, developing the significant areas of vacant land still available within the existing village boundaries, and encouraging the re-subdivision of existing large residential lots), but six in ten disagree (60.0%, most of whom disagree strongly) and one in six is ambivalent (16.4%).
- A small minority of around one in six people (16.4%) agrees with the option of doing nothing (ie, no change to planning controls so that the village continues to develop pretty much as it has been in recent years), with around seven in ten people disagreeing (71.8%, of whom most disagree strongly) and around one in nine is ambivalent (11.8%).

**Table 3.11: Development Options:**

Agreement with various options:	D. Rural Residential Development %	C. Greenfield Development %	B. Infill Development %	A. Do Nothing %
Agree a lot	32.3	11.3	7.2	4.1
Agree a little	16.4	25.6	16.4	12.3
Neither/nor	14.4	9.2	16.4	11.8
Disagree a little	17.4	7.7	9.2	21.5
Disagree a lot	19.5	46.2	50.8	50.3
Total agree	48.7	36.9	23.6	16.4
Total disagree	36.9	53.9	60.0	71.8
Mean	3.2	2.5	2.2	2.0
S.D.	1.5	1.5	1.4	1.2

D. **Rural Residential Development:** ie, by rezoning land close to the existing village boundaries with large block sizes.

C. **Greenfield Development:** ie, by rezoning and developing land just outside the existing village boundaries for suburban block-sized residential purposes.

B. **Infill Development:** ie, developing the significant areas of vacant land still available within the existing village boundaries, and encouraging the re-subdivision of existing large residential lots.

A. **Do Nothing:** ie, no change to planning controls so that the village continues to develop pretty much as it has been in recent years.

- Of the four priorities outlined in the Plans, substantial majorities maintain that each of them is at least quite important. (See Tables 3.12 and 4.17a-d).
- Everyone in the Bungendore sub-sample believes that establishing the viability of the water supply is at least quite important (100.0%), with some nine in ten believing that it is at least very important (89.8%).
- Almost all believe that restricting development on floodplains (95.9%) and upgrading of the sewerage treatment works (95.4%) are at least quite important, with some seven in ten believing that they are at least very important (69.7% and 69.8% respectively).
- On the other hand, a lesser three-quarters (76.9%) believe that bypassing traffic to the east of Bungendore is at least quite important, but only some one-third believes that it is at least very important (33.8%).

**Table 3.12: Priorities:**

Perceived importance of various priorities:	A. Establishing the viability of the water supply. %	B. Restricting development on floodplains. %	D. Upgrading of the sewerage treatment works %	C. Bypassing traffic to the East of Bungendore. %
Extremely important	27.7	21.5	14.4	9.2
Very important	62.1	48.2	55.4	24.6
Quite important	10.3	26.2	25.6	43.1
Not very important	0.0	2.1	2.1	13.3
Not important at all	0.0	2.1	2.6	9.7
Total E+V imp't	89.8	69.7	69.8	33.8
Total E+V+Q imp't	100.0	95.9	95.4	76.9
Mean	4.2	3.9	3.8	3.1
S.D.	0.6	0.9	0.8	1.1

### 3.7 Council's Management Plan

- To assist Council in developing its management plan, the survey measured community perceptions of Council's performance overall, and in terms of six specific aspects. (See Tables 3.13, 4.7a-f and 4.8).
- Overall, the Council emerges on the positive side of the ledger, with close to six in ten people scoring its overall performance positively (ie, scoring it 6 or above on a 1 to 10 scale where 10 is excellent and 1 is terrible).
- On the six specific aspects of performance, some three-quarters ( of those living in the three towns) score the Council positively in terms of the household garbage collection (74.7%), some two-thirds score it positively on the courtesy and helpfulness of council staff (66.7%), and around half score it positively on the knowledge and accuracy of council staff (51.3%), the maintenance of roads in towns and villages (49.1%) and the maintenance of connecting roads in Council's care (46.7%). Only in terms of the management of residential development within the area in recent years is the Council's performance perceived positively by substantially less than a majority of people (30.1%).

**Table 3.13:**

	<b>Overall %</b>	<b>4 %</b>	<b>6 %</b>	<b>5 %</b>	<b>1 %</b>	<b>2 %</b>	<b>3 %</b>
10 – Excellent performance	1.7	27.0	7.9	3.6	1.9	1.7	2.0
9	0.8	9.6	5.5	2.1	2.7	1.4	0.2
8	16.7	20.7	24.3	14.8	13.9	14.5	7.0
7	25.9	11.4	17.6	16.8	17.9	15.4	9.4
6	13.3	6.0	11.4	14.0	12.7	13.7	11.5
Total scoring 6 and above	58.4	74.7	66.7	51.3	49.1	46.7	30.1
5	31.8	11.8	25.4	31.4	25.3	25.1	32.1
4	2.3	3.8	2.2	8.9	10.0	11.6	13.5
3	4.5	5.4	1.1	3.0	5.1	9.0	9.7
2	1.5	2.9	1.2	1.9	5.1	4.5	6.4
1 - Terrible performance	1.6	1.4	3.3	3.5	5.3	3.2	8.2
Mean	6.0	7.3	6.6	5.8	5.5	5.5	4.8
S.D.	1.6	2.3	2.0	1.9	2.1	2.0	2.0
Overall: Council's performance overall							
4. The household garbage collection in some areas (among the three towns only).							
6. The courtesy and helpfulness of council staff.							
5. The knowledge and accuracy of council staff.							
1. The maintenance of roads in towns and villages.							
2. The maintenance of connecting roads in Council's care.							
3. The management of residential development within the area in recent years.							

- On the other hand, only a bare majority (53.1%) claims to be well-informed about the overall activities and initiatives of the Council. (See Tables 3.14 and 4.9).

**Table 3.14:**

<b>How well informed about the overall activities and initiatives of the council:</b>	<b>All %</b>
10 - Totally well-informed	1.1
9	4.5
8	12.5
7	19.3
6	15.7
Total scoring 6 and above	53.1
5	24.4
4	9.4
3	6.7
2	2.2
1 - Not informed at all	4.3
Mean	5.7
S.D.	2.0

## 4. Detailed Tabular Results

Table 4.1a:

**Q.1 [ASK ALL] What do you feel are all the GOOD things about living in this area? ...**

**What do you most like about living here? [PROBE FULLY]**

	All %	Location					
		Braidwood %	Bungendore %	Captains Flat %	Villages %	Rural Resid'l %	Farms %
Quiet/ peaceful	54.5	33.3	43.1	80.7	66.3	60.5	51.5
Wide open spaces	46.3	36.7	31.3	50.0	42.1	58.5	44.9
Sense of community/ friendly people	28.9	47.2	49.2	40.7	21.1	21.5	16.8
Fresh air/unpolluted	23.6	0.0	11.8	38.6	35.8	23.0	37.2
Close to Canberra	16.8	11.1	24.6	5.7	10.5	18.0	16.8
Close to other places (Sydney, Coast, Melbourne, etc)	8.3	12.8	6.7	0.0	10.5	5.0	14.3
Good climate/ four seasons	6.9	5.6	0.0	8.6	6.3	8.0	12.2
Safe for children	4.9	4.4	7.2	7.1	6.3	2.0	7.1
Close to Queanbeyan	4.4	0.0	7.2	2.9	4.2	4.0	5.1
Less traffic congestion	3.0	0.0	2.6	7.9	1.6	5.5	0.0
Less crime	1.9	0.0	2.6	10.7	2.1	2.0	0.0
Good schools/ educational opportunities	1.8	4.4	2.6	0.0	0.0	2.5	0.0
Good shopping opportunities	1.1	2.2	2.6	2.1	2.1	0.0	0.0
Well planned/ well laid out	1.1	3.9	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.0	2.6
Lower cost of living	0.4	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Tidy/neat/clean	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0
Easy to move around	0.2	0.0	0.0	5.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	3.0	2.1	5.5	1.0	1.4	3.7	2.1
<b>TOTAL mentions of good things</b>	<b>207.4</b>	<b>163.7</b>	<b>199.1</b>	<b>261.7</b>	<b>214.5</b>	<b>214.2</b>	<b>210.6</b>
NET people mentioning any good things	97.0	95.6	97.9	100.0	95.8	98.0	94.9
No good things mentioned	3.0	4.4	2.1	0.0	4.2	2.0	5.1

Table 4.1b:

	All %	Gender		Age		
		Men	Women	18 - 39 yrs	40-54 yrs	55+ years
Quiet/peaceful	54.5	53.0	55.5	52.2	52.3	56.9
Wide open spaces	46.3	42.7	48.7	40.0	49.4	46.9
Sense of community/friendly people	28.9	23.5	32.4	26.6	32.8	27.3
Fresh air/unpolluted	23.6	25.5	22.3	20.5	21.2	26.3
Close to Canberra	16.8	16.7	16.9	12.9	21.8	15.2
Close to other places (Sydney, Coast, Melbourne, etc)	8.3	8.8	8.1	6.9	5.4	10.8
Good climate/four seasons	6.9	9.6	5.1	6.1	3.4	9.4
Safe for children	4.9	5.5	4.5	5.6	6.2	3.8
Close to Queanbeyan	4.4	2.1	5.8	6.8	3.5	4.0
Less traffic congestion	3.0	1.7	3.8	4.7	4.1	1.6
Less crime	1.9	0.5	2.7	0.5	4.0	1.0
Good schools/educational opportunities	1.8	0.0	3.0	8.2	0.0	0.5
Good shopping opportunities	1.1	0.0	1.7	3.9	0.0	0.6
Well planned/well laid out	1.1	0.4	1.6	3.8	0.7	0.3
Lower cost of living	0.4	0.9	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0
Tidy/neat/clean	0.3	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.9	0.0
Easy to move around	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.4
Other	3.0	3.3	2.9	2.8	3.6	2.7
<b>TOTAL mentions of good things</b>	<b>207.4</b>	<b>194.5</b>	<b>215.7</b>	<b>201.5</b>	<b>210.5</b>	<b>207.7</b>
NET people mentioning any good things	97.0	96.6	97.2	96.9	98.9	95.7
No good things mentioned	3.0	3.4	2.8	3.1	1.1	4.3

Table 4.2a:

**Q.2 [ASK ALL] And what if anything do you feel are the NOT SO GOOD things about living in this area? ... What needs to be improved about living here? [PROBE FULLY]**

	All %	Location					
		Braidwood %	Bungendore %	Captains Flat %	Villages %	Rural Resid <sup>1</sup> %	Farms %
Roads/poor upkeep/potholed	18.7	2.2	6.7	40.0	23.2	21.5	26.5
Poor public transport	10.5	11.1	14.4	15.0	4.2	13.0	5.1
Growing too fast/too many new homes	8.0	0.0	23.1	0.0	8.4	4.0	6.6
Extremes of seasons	7.8	18.3	6.7	0.0	7.9	4.0	12.2
Lack of variety of shopping	6.3	6.7	4.6	13.6	7.9	5.5	6.6
High prices	3.8	6.7	4.6	6.4	0.0	3.0	5.1
Not enough to do/too quiet	2.8	2.2	4.1	13.6	4.2	2.0	0.0
Inadequate garbage collection	2.5	0.0	0.0	10.0	2.1	5.0	0.0
Inadequate household recycling service	1.8	0.0	2.6	7.1	0.0	3.0	0.0
Inadequate schools	1.6	0.0	4.6	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0
Dangerous drivers/road rage	1.6	2.2	2.6	2.9	0.0	1.0	2.6
Drugs/lack of policing	0.9	0.0	4.6	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Over-regulated/too many rules	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.0	2.0
People not friendly (anymore)	0.2	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Untidy/graffiti/rubbish everywhere	0.1	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	44.8	37.8	53.8	47.9	50.5	41.0	42.3
TOTAL mentions of not so good things	112.1	89.4	132.4	162.3	110.5	105.0	109.0
NET people mentioning any not so good things	75.5	76.1	75.9	86.4	78.9	71.5	78.1
No not so good things mentioned	24.5	23.9	24.1	13.6	21.1	28.5	21.9

**Table 4.2b:**

	All %	Gender		Age		
		Men	Women	18 - 39 yrs	40-54 yrs	55+ years
Roads/poor upkeep/potholed	18.7	19.6	18.1	17.4	22.7	16.5
Poor public transport	10.5	4.2	14.6	15.5	12.5	7.2
Growing too fast/too many new homes	8.0	7.6	8.3	13.3	11.5	3.6
Extremes of seasons	7.8	12.7	4.6	3.8	1.5	13.5
Lack of variety of shopping	6.3	4.7	7.3	5.9	8.3	5.1
High prices	3.8	4.8	3.1	0.4	6.8	3.1
Not enough to do/too quiet	2.8	2.8	2.7	2.3	5.1	1.4
Inadequate garbage collection	2.5	0.2	3.9	4.3	2.9	1.5
Inadequate household recycling service	1.8	0.2	2.9	2.8	1.1	1.9
Inadequate schools	1.6	0.9	2.0	8.0	0.0	0.0
Dangerous drivers/road rage	1.6	1.2	1.9	0.0	2.5	1.7
Drugs/lack of policing	0.9	1.2	0.8	1.9	0.3	1.0
Over-regulated/too many rules	0.7	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3
People not friendly (anymore)	0.2	0.0	0.4	1.1	0.0	0.0
Untidy/graffiti/rubbish everywhere	0.1	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0
Other	44.8	35.0	51.2	53.9	48.8	38.5
<b>TOTAL mentions of not so good things</b>	<b>112.1</b>	<b>97.1</b>	<b>121.8</b>	<b>130.6</b>	<b>124.3</b>	<b>96.3</b>
<b>NET people mentioning any not so good things</b>	<b>75.5</b>	<b>67.8</b>	<b>80.5</b>	<b>82.1</b>	<b>82.0</b>	<b>68.6</b>
<b>No not so good things mentioned</b>	<b>24.5</b>	<b>32.2</b>	<b>19.5</b>	<b>17.9</b>	<b>18.0</b>	<b>31.4</b>

**Table 4.3:****Q.3a Overall, how satisfied are you with this town/village/area as a place to live?**

	All %	Location					
		Braidwood %	Bungendore %	Captains Flat %	Villages %	Rural Resid'l %	Farms %
Completely satisfied	36.4	42.2	42.1	17.1	27.4	41.0	29.1
Very satisfied	38.8	36.1	36.9	50.0	39.5	40.0	37.2
Quite satisfied	21.5	17.2	21.0	32.9	24.7	18.0	26.5
Not very satisfied*	1.6	4.4	0.0	0.0	2.1	1.0	2.6
Not satisfied at all*	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	0.0	4.6
Total C+V satisfied	75.2	78.3	79.0	67.1	66.9	81.0	66.3
Total C+V+Q satisfied	96.7	95.5	100.0	100.0	91.6	99.0	92.8
Mean	4.1	4.2	4.2	3.8	3.8	4.2	3.9
S.D.	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.7	1.1	0.8	1.0
	All %	Gender		Age			
		Men	Women	18 - 39 yrs	40-54 yrs	55+ years	
Completely satisfied	36.4	37.1	36.0	28.1	31.1	43.2	
Very satisfied	38.8	32.2	43.1	46.1	35.5	38.1	
Quite satisfied	21.5	28.7	16.8	20.7	27.1	18.1	
Not very satisfied*	1.6	1.9	1.3	1.1	4.2	0.0	
Not satisfied at all*	1.7	0.0	2.8	3.8	2.1	0.6	
Total C+V satisfied	75.2	69.3	79.1	74.2	66.6	81.3	
Total C+V+Q satisfied	96.7	98.0	95.9	94.9	93.7	99.4	
Mean	4.1	4.0	4.1	3.9	3.9	4.2	
S.D.	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	1.0	0.8	
	All %	Have live in Area					
		Up to 3 years %	3 to 10 year %	Over 10 years %			
Completely satisfied	36.4	52.8	31.9	36.5			
Very satisfied	38.8	29.7	43.4	37.6			
Quite satisfied	21.5	17.5	20.5	22.6			
Not very satisfied*	1.6	0.0	1.3	1.9			
Not satisfied at all*	1.7	0.0	2.8	1.3			
Total C+V satisfied	75.2	82.5	75.3	74.1			
Total C+V+Q satisfied	96.7	100	95.8	96.7			
Mean	1.9	1.6	2.0	1.9			
S.D.	0.9	0.8	0.9	0.9			

\* These people were asked the following question:

**In what ways could the situation be improved?**The main verbatim responses:

- *Bring industrial areas in*
- *Environmental planning is poor*
- *Less people coming into town.*
- *Let the town grow*
- *Need a Woolworths store here.*
- *Need development in the city centre*
- *No more development.*
- *Not enough work for young people.*
- *Should be less logging of the forests.*
- *Should be using timber in sustainable way*
- *Should not just woodchipping timber.*
- *Too many large blocks*
- *Too much development*
- *Want less suburban sprawl.*



Table 4.4a:

**Q.4 [ASK ALL] In general, how satisfied are you with the following aspects of this town/village/area..... firstly (READ OUT FIRST ASPECT)..... Would you say you are completely satisfied (CS), very satisfied (VS), quite satisfied (QS), not very satisfied (NV) or not at all satisfied (NA) with that aspect?**

**1. THE WAYS IN WHICH YOUR AREA IS DEVELOPING.**

	All %	Location					
		Braidwood %	Bungendore %	Captains Flat %	Villages %	Rural Resid'l %	Farms %
Completely satisfied	10.3	17.2	9.7	17.1	12.6	5.0	14.8
Very satisfied	25.6	25.0	13.8	26.4	26.8	30.0	28.1
Quite satisfied	36.3	42.2	36.9	50.7	29.5	40.5	26.0
Not very satisfied*	15.7	8.9	28.7	2.9	10.5	15.0	14.3
Not satisfied at all*	12.0	6.7	10.8	2.9	20.5	9.5	16.8
Total C+V satisfied	35.9	42.2	23.5	43.5	39.4	35	42.9
Total C+V+Q satisfied	72.2	84.4	60.4	94.2	68.9	75.5	68.9
Mean	3.1	3.4	2.8	3.5	3.0	3.1	3.1
S.D.	1.1	1.1	1.1	0.9	1.3	1.0	1.3
	All %	Gender		Age			
		Men	Women	18 - 39 yrs	40-54 yrs	55+ years	
Completely satisfied	10.3	11.2	9.8	8.1	9.0	12.1	
Very satisfied	25.6	28.2	24.0	20.9	20.9	30.7	
Quite satisfied	36.3	32.8	38.5	37.3	42.8	31.6	
Not very satisfied*	15.7	15.0	16.2	22.3	13.9	14.2	
Not at all satisfied*	12.0	12.9	11.5	11.4	13.4	11.4	
Total C+V satisfied	35.9	39.4	33.8	29	29.9	42.8	
Total C+V+Q satisfied	72.2	72.2	72.3	66.3	72.7	74.4	
Mean	3.1	3.1	3.0	2.9	3.0	3.2	
S.D.	1.1	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.2	
	All %	Have live in Area					
		Up to 3 years %	3 to 10 year %	Over 10 years %			
Completely satisfied	10.3	12.6	7.1	11.9			
Very satisfied	25.6	32.7	29.2	22.5			
Quite satisfied	36.3	28.8	35.5	37.9			
Not very satisfied*	15.7	9.3	21.7	13.2			
Not satisfied at all*	12.0	16.6	6.6	14.5			
Total C+V satisfied	35.9	45.3	36.3	34.4			
Total C+V+Q satisfied	72.2	74.1	71.8	72.3			
Mean	3.1	3.2	3.1	3.0			
S.D.	1.1	1.3	1.0	1.2			

\* These people were asked the following question:

**What needs to be done to improve the situation? Anything else?**

The main verbatim responses:

- Better planning for town & roads
- Better town planning
- Bureaucratic interference with way of life eg. limiting bores & redoing septic to reduce contamination , at the same time approving more development.
- Concerned about good grazing country being subdivided.
- Concerned about subdivision re water supplies.
- Consider environment when developing, eg, effect on air, soil etc.
- Council needs fewer staff members to balance their books.
- Council should consider size, scope and aesthetic feel of town before considering large development.
- Developing too fast.
- Don't let money influence decisions.
- Forget the subdivision
- Give town people a say, rather than the developers.
- Have smaller development.
- Help developments go ahead with light industrial
- Increase size of acreage of properties & cut down on future population.

- *Less development.*
- *Less houses.*
- *Let development happen, let town grow.*
- *Losing the small village atmosphere.*
- *More standardized development – should have the same rules for everyone.*
- *Need more community consultation*
- *Need more consultation with the people living here / not happy with developments.*
- *No more development*
- *Restrict subdivision & re-subdivision.*
- *Should educate people about what can & can't be done with developments.*
- *Should take a more central view of planning.*
- *Slow down development, and develop with rural landscape in mind.*
- *Slow down development.*
- *Speed limit too high on forest roads.*
- *Stop chopping up of land into small acreages.*
- *Stop developing, we don't want the surrounds of the town trashed.*

Table 4.4b:

**Q.4 [ASK ALL] In general, how satisfied are you with the following aspects of this town/village/area..... firstly (READ OUT FIRST ASPECT)..... Would you say you are completely satisfied (CS), very satisfied (VS), quite satisfied (QS), not very satisfied (NV) or not at all satisfied (NA) with that aspect?**

**2. THE 'LOOK' (OR APPEARANCE) OF THE PLACE.**

	All %	Location					
		Braidwood %	Bungendore %	Captains Flat %	Villages %	Rural Resid'l %	Farms %
Completely satisfied	30.0	41.7	24.6	20.0	33.7	31.0	26.0
Very satisfied	40.9	40.6	44.1	30.0	41.6	41.0	39.3
Quite satisfied	21.2	13.3	22.6	26.4	18.4	21.5	24.5
Not very satisfied*	6.3	4.4	4.1	23.6	6.3	5.5	7.7
Not satisfied at all*	1.7	0.0	4.6	0.0	0.0	1.0	2.6
Total C+V satisfied	70.9	82.3	68.7	50	75.3	72	65.3
Total C+V+Q satisfied	92.1	95.6	91.3	76.4	93.7	93.5	89.8
Mean	3.9	4.2	3.8	3.5	4.0	4.0	3.8
S.D.	1.0	0.8	1.0	1.1	0.9	0.9	1.0
	All %	Gender		Age			
		Men	Women	18 - 39 yrs	40-54 yrs	55+ years	
Completely satisfied	30.0	26.6	32.2	23.2	19.8	39.3	
Very satisfied	40.9	42.7	39.7	35.9	50.2	36.8	
Quite satisfied	21.2	21.3	21.1	27.9	23.1	17.3	
Not very satisfied*	6.3	8.5	4.9	13.0	5.4	4.2	
Not satisfied at all*	1.7	0.9	2.1	0.0	1.5	2.5	
Total C+V satisfied	70.9	69.3	71.9	59.1	70	76.1	
Total C+V+Q satisfied	92.1	90.6	93	87	93.1	93.4	
Mean	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.7	3.8	4.1	
S.D.	1.0	0.9	1.0	1.0	0.9	1.0	
	All %	Have live in Area					
		Up to 3 years %	3 to 10 year %	Over 10 years %			
Completely satisfied	30.0	30.9	26.4	31.9			
Very satisfied	40.9	30.8	49.1	37.7			
Quite satisfied	21.2	29.0	17.4	22.2			
Not very satisfied*	6.3	9.3	7.1	5.4			
Not satisfied at all*	1.7	0.0	0.0	2.9			
Total C+V satisfied	70.9	61.7	75.5	69.6			
Total C+V+Q satisfied	92.1	90.7	92.9	91.8			
Mean	3.9	3.8	3.9	3.9			
S.D.	1.0	1.0	0.8	1.0			

\* These people were asked the following question:

**What needs to be done to improve the situation? Anything else?**

The main verbatim responses:

- Commercial pub is a disgrace / has been under renovation for 15 years.
- Could be greener / need more greenery in the main street / Wallace Street.
- Could use a bit of a 'tart up'! It may help if heritage listed.
- Just general maintenance on houses they look pretty shabby.
- Less development
- Less houses and less subdivisions.
- More commercial places in township.
- More communal areas, eg swimming pool open more, more recreational facilities.
- More work on road in looks messy.
- Stop estate development.
- The houses could be upgraded, looks a bit shabby.

Table 4.4c:

**Q.4 [ASK ALL] In general, how satisfied are you with the following aspects of this town/village/area..... firstly (READ OUT FIRST ASPECT)..... Would you say you are completely satisfied (CS), very satisfied (VS), quite satisfied (QS), not very satisfied (NV) or not at all satisfied (NA) with that aspect?**

**3. THE NATURE AND SPEED OF HOUSING DEVELOPMENT IN THE AREA.**

	All %	Location					
		Braidwood %	Bungendore %	Captains Flat %	Villages %	Rural Resid'l %	Farms %
Completely satisfied	12.9	21.7	21.5	12.1	10.5	6.5	14.3
Very satisfied	16.3	16.7	9.7	24.3	16.8	17.5	18.4
Quite satisfied	36.2	35.0	11.3	58.6	33.2	46.5	38.8
Not very satisfied*	20.6	20.0	24.1	2.9	25.3	18.5	21.4
Not satisfied at all*	14.0	6.7	33.3	2.1	14.2	11.0	7.1
Total C+V satisfied	29.2	38.4	31.2	36.4	27.3	24.0	32.7
Total C+V+Q satisfied	65.4	73.4	42.5	95	60.5	70.5	71.5
Mean	2.9	3.3	2.6	3.4	2.8	2.9	3.1
S.D.	1.2	1.2	1.5	0.8	1.2	1.0	1.1
	All %	Gender		Age			
		Men	Women	18 - 39 yrs	40-54 yrs	55+ years	
Completely satisfied	12.9	11.8	13.6	14.0	9.0	15.0	
Very satisfied	16.3	22.4	12.4	20.4	13.5	16.5	
Quite satisfied	36.2	34.3	37.4	22.1	40.1	39.2	
Not very satisfied*	20.6	17.8	22.3	30.9	19.2	17.3	
Not satisfied at all*	14.0	13.6	14.3	12.6	18.1	12.0	
Total C+V satisfied	29.2	34.2	26.0	34.4	22.5	31.5	
Total C+V+Q satisfied	65.4	68.5	63.4	56.5	62.6	70.7	
Mean	2.9	3.0	2.9	2.9	2.8	3.1	
S.D.	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.2	1.2	
	All %	Have live in Area					
		Up to 3 years %	3 to 10 year %	Over 10 years %			
Completely satisfied	12.9	19.8	11.9	12.5			
Very satisfied	16.3	0.9	17.6	17.9			
Quite satisfied	36.2	53.3	33.4	35.1			
Not very satisfied*	20.6	20.8	21.2	20.1			
Not satisfied at all*	14.0	5.2	15.9	14.3			
Total C+V satisfied	29.2	20.7	29.5	30.4			
Total C+V+Q satisfied	65.4	74	62.9	65.5			
Mean	2.9	3.1	2.9	2.9			
S.D.	1.2	1.1	1.2	1.2			

\* These people were asked the following question:

**What needs to be done to improve the situation? Anything else?**

The main verbatim responses:

- Concerned about residential development proposed nearby.
- Consider environment when developing/ be sure of consequences of building / effect on air, soil etc.
- Decent planning/ no 40 block subdivisions.
- Developments should be done by individuals not by developers.
- Everyone seems to be opposing anyone that wants to put up new houses.
- Fearful of subdivisions – lack of water.
- Increase facilities with development & roads/ more ovals/ infrastructure of town can't handle the growth.
- Lack of water, road systems can't handle.
- Less houses / less subdivisions.
- Less saturation / go to smaller areas like Captains Flat.
- Look of houses being built, should be bigger blocks more in keeping with rural area.
- More creative approach to development in terms of a rural setting.
- More development
- More development & bring more people in/ smaller blocks.
- More planning/ more consultation with public.
- Need to have less council delegation and less red tape about developments.
- Needs to stay in style of town. Must be consultation with community.

- *No more building/ don't want town to get too big.*
- *No more development.*
- *Not a lot of housing developing in the actual town.*
- *Not enough students / need more students for a better school.*
- *Planning needs to be looked at/ development control/ town planning.*
- *Preserve integrity of village/ more sensitive development/ larger blocks, wider roads/ better landscaping, not suburban style.*
- *Reduce amount of development as infrastructure can't support it.*
- *Should be happening a little slower*
- *Should only be sensible development/ the odd house coming up here or there.*
- *Slow down development.*
- *Stop development around here.*
- *Stop estate development.*
- *Stop greenies fighting against development.*
- *Strong restrictions for development.*
- *Subdivision managed better – lack of water – how will it be managed?*
- *Too many houses.*
- *Use environmental technology + ecological, protect view of hills*
- *We should have consultations about developments / people are divided between having development with out spoiling the Heritage look.*

Table 4.4d:

**Q.4 [ASK ALL] In general, how satisfied are you with the following aspects of this town/village/area..... firstly (READ OUT FIRST ASPECT)..... Would you say you are completely satisfied (CS), very satisfied (VS), quite satisfied (QS), not very satisfied (NV) or not at all satisfied (NA) with that aspect?**

**4. THE CONNECTING ROADS THROUGH THE AREA.**

	All %	Location					
		Braidwood %	Bungendore %	Captains Flat %	Villages %	Rural Resid'l %	Farms %
Completely satisfied	15.8	23.3	22.1	4.3	14.2	14.5	11.7
Very satisfied	30.5	27.2	34.4	7.9	25.3	30.0	37.8
Quite satisfied	24.7	31.7	15.9	36.4	26.8	29.0	17.3
Not very satisfied*	18.2	13.3	21.5	19.3	18.9	16.0	21.4
Not satisfied at all*	10.7	4.4	6.2	32.1	14.7	10.5	11.7
Total C+V satisfied	46.3	50.5	56.5	12.2	39.5	44.5	49.5
Total C+V+Q satisfied	71	82.2	72.4	48.6	66.3	73.5	66.8
Mean	3.2	3.5	3.4	2.3	3.1	3.2	3.2
S.D.	1.2	1.1	1.2	1.1	1.3	1.2	1.2
	All %	Gender		Age			
		Men	Women	18 - 39 yrs	40-54 yrs	55+ years	
Completely satisfied	15.8	11.3	18.8	19.8	11.9	16.8	
Very satisfied	30.5	34.4	27.9	24.5	27.5	34.8	
Quite satisfied	24.7	26.0	23.9	27.9	24.7	23.5	
Not very satisfied*	18.2	16.9	19.1	23.0	22.1	13.9	
Not satisfied at all*	10.7	11.3	10.3	4.8	13.8	11.0	
Total C+V satisfied	46.3	45.7	46.7	44.3	39.4	51.6	
Total C+V+Q satisfied	71	71.7	70.6	72.2	64.1	75.1	
Mean	3.2	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.0	3.3	
S.D.	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.2	
	All %	Have live in Area					
		Up to 3 years %	3 to 10 year %	Over 10 years %			
Completely satisfied	15.8	14.6	12.9	17.7			
Very satisfied	30.5	17.1	31.4	32.0			
Quite satisfied	24.7	26.1	19.5	27.6			
Not very satisfied*	18.2	35.9	23.0	12.8			
Not satisfied at all*	10.7	6.4	13.2	9.9			
Total C+V satisfied	46.3	31.7	44.3	49.7			
Total C+V+Q satisfied	71	57.8	63.8	77.3			
Mean	3.2	3.0	3.1	3.3			
S.D.	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.2			

\* These people were asked the following question:

**What needs to be done to improve the situation? Anything else?**

The main verbatim responses:

- *Alternative road to the Clyde.*
- *Better roads needed/ they are unsafe & need to be filled in.*
- *Bitumize the roads.*
- *Bungendore Road/ repairs needed/ widen road.*
- *Bypass Bungendore completely.*
- *Dirt road to Araluen – Marooya*
- *Improve quality of road surface.*
- *Limit heavy vehicles – upgrade the main roads – review maintenance practices.*
- *Main arterial roads widened / bus stops & shelter put in.*
- *Make them safe/ make them freeways, highways.*
- *Make them wider.*
- *More bitumen, upgrade dirt roads.*
- *Need a bypass to the coast or improve highway by making dual lanes / Kings Highway.*
- *Need a zebra crossing / southern end of Wallace Street traffic controls on Kings Highway in & out of town.*
- *Need double overtaking lanes on the Kings Highway.*
- *Need regular maintenance.*
- *Need to be dual carriage ways.*

- *Needs to be double laned / Kings Highway.*
- *Nerriga Road needs sealing.*
- *Nerriga to Braidwood - more maintenance.*
- *Regular maintenance*
- *Re-surfacing, widening, better markings.*
- *Road needs to be rebuilt to a modern standard.*
- *Roads widened, tar & bitumize the gravel roads.*
- *Rough road, many accidents, road-works desperately needed.*
- *Sealing of roads is needed / Nerriga Road.*
- *Sealing roads.*
- *Sections on Captains Flat Road that need to be replaced.*
- *Speed limit needs to be reduced on Lascelles Street to 50kph/ it's a suburban area.*
- *Spend money on roads.*
- *Spend more money on them / esp. Kings Highway.*
- *They are not very safe, esp. the gravel roads, could tar the roads*
- *Upgrading is needed / too many potholes.*
- *Widen roads to cope with increasing traffic.*
- *Wider, tarred roads, bridges need fixing.*

Table 4.4e:

**Q.4 [ASK ALL] In general, how satisfied are you with the following aspects of this town/village/area..... firstly (READ OUT FIRST ASPECT)..... Would you say you are completely satisfied (CS), very satisfied (VS), quite satisfied (QS), not very satisfied (NV) or not at all satisfied (NA) with that aspect?**

**5. THE LOCAL ROADS IN THE AREA.**

	All %	Location					
		Braidwood %	Bungendore %	Captains Flat %	Villages %	Rural Resid'l %	Farms %
Completely satisfied	9.9	8.9	16.4	6.4	6.3	11.0	5.1
Very satisfied	29.7	23.9	40.0	10.0	25.3	31.5	26.0
Quite satisfied	32.7	44.4	27.2	51.4	26.8	35.5	27.0
Not very satisfied*	19.0	15.0	13.8	13.6	31.1	13.5	29.6
Not satisfied at all*	8.7	7.8	2.6	18.6	10.5	8.5	12.2
Total C+V satisfied	39.6	32.8	56.4	16.4	31.6	42.5	31.1
Total C+V+Q satisfied	72.3	77.2	83.6	67.8	58.4	78	58.1
Mean	3.1	3.1	3.5	2.7	2.9	3.2	2.8
S.D.	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1
	All %	Gender		Age			
		Men	Women	18 - 39 yrs	40-54 yrs	55+ years	
Completely satisfied	9.9	6.6	12.0	8.9	10.7	9.8	
Very satisfied	29.7	31.8	28.3	31.0	27.1	30.8	
Quite satisfied	32.7	29.0	35.2	35.0	34.5	30.7	
Not very satisfied*	19.0	21.9	17.1	17.5	20.4	18.8	
Not satisfied at all*	8.7	10.7	7.4	7.6	7.3	10.0	
Total C+V satisfied	39.6	38.4	40.3	39.9	37.8	40.6	
Total C+V+Q satisfied	72.3	67.4	75.5	74.9	72.3	71.3	
Mean	3.1	3.0	3.2	3.2	3.1	3.1	
S.D.	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	
	All %	Have live in Area					
		Up to 3 years %	3 to 10 year %	Over 10 years %			
Completely satisfied	9.9	15.5	6.0	11.3			
Very satisfied	29.7	29.7	32.1	28.2			
Quite satisfied	32.7	23.9	26.3	37.8			
Not very satisfied*	19.0	9.1	23.9	17.8			
Not satisfied at all*	8.7	21.9	11.6	4.9			
Total C+V satisfied	39.6	45.2	38.1	39.5			
Total C+V+Q satisfied	72.3	69.1	64.4	77.3			
Mean	3.1	3.1	3.0	3.2			
S.D.	1.1	1.4	1.1	1.0			

\* These people were asked the following question:

**What needs to be done to improve the situation? Anything else?**

The main verbatim responses:

- *A regular maintenance program.*
- *Align road, shouldn't drive through properties, needs maintenance.*
- *Bituminized as more people and dust blows into houses.*
- *Corang River Road needs fixing – has for 3 years.*
- *Dirt roads could be sealed or higher maintenance level required.*
- *Don't want all the green areas filled in/ carving up the paddocks with ticky tacky houses would be a great shame.*
- *Filling in holes/ maintenance*
- *Fixed up only some of potholes, road not safe for extra traffic eg when other roads are closed.*
- *Footpaths everywhere.*
- *Grade more often.*
- *Grade more than once a year/ Butmaroo Rd.*
- *Graded more regularly / 3 times a year.*
- *Maintenance*
- *Maintenance of all the potholes would be good.*
- *Make them safer through road-works.*
- *Make them wider/ make sure they are all tarred.*
- *More bitumen need to be sealed, needs kerbs & gutters.*



- *More grading/ more money spent on roads.*
- *More signs – speed signs through valley, no buses & trucks allowed.*
- *Need better road to Canberra.*
- *Need curbs / guttering / road edging.*
- *Need regular maintenance and upgrading.*
- *Need regular up keep/ grading gravel.*
- *Needs resurfacing.*
- *Not good drainage.*
- *People are not sticking to speed limits/ need police radars.*
- *Potholes, more frequent grading, bitumen roads maintained to a higher standard.*
- *Regular maintenance*
- *Regular maintenance.*
- *Seal local road.*
- *Tarred surfaces would make the roads safer.*
- *The upgrade & maintenance could be more efficient / more road-works.*
- *They need grading.*
- *Upgrade the roads & widen them/ make safer.*
- *Upgrades, better maintenance.*
- *Widen the roads , tar the bad surfaces.*

Table 4.4f:

**Q.4 [ASK ALL] In general, how satisfied are you with the following aspects of this town/village/area..... firstly (READ OUT FIRST ASPECT)..... Would you say you are completely satisfied (CS), very satisfied (VS), quite satisfied (QS), not very satisfied (NV) or not at all satisfied (NA) with that aspect?**

**6. THE GARBAGE TIP FACILITIES IN THE AREA.**

	All %	Location					
		Braidwood %	Bungendore %	Captains Flat %	Villages %	Rural Resid'l %	Farms %
Completely satisfied	12.4	21.7	18.5	10.0	6.3	13.1	4.6
Very satisfied	32.1	44.4	32.8	26.4	37.9	25.8	33.7
Quite satisfied	32.1	18.9	24.6	27.9	33.2	32.3	46.4
Not very satisfied*	10.6	8.3	13.3	23.6	12.1	10.6	5.1
Not satisfied at all*	12.9	6.7	10.8	12.1	10.5	18.2	10.2
Total C+V satisfied	44.5	66.1	51.3	36.4	44.2	38.9	38.3
Total C+V+Q satisfied	76.6	85	75.9	64.3	77.4	71.2	84.7
Mean	3.2	3.7	3.3	3.0	3.2	3.1	3.2
S.D.	1.2	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.1	1.3	1.0
	All %	Gender		Age			
		Men	Women	18 - 39 yrs	40-54 yrs	55+ years	
Completely satisfied	12.4	10.0	13.9	14.4	11.5	12.2	
Very satisfied	32.1	38.6	27.8	27.6	38.4	29.7	
Quite satisfied	32.1	27.3	35.2	41.2	22.0	35.1	
Not very satisfied*	10.6	10.0	10.9	8.7	12.1	10.3	
Not satisfied at all*	12.9	14.1	12.2	8.1	16.1	12.8	
Total C+V satisfied	44.5	48.6	41.7	42	49.9	41.9	
Total C+V+Q satisfied	76.6	75.9	76.9	83.2	71.9	77	
Mean	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.3	3.2	3.2	
S.D.	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.1	1.3	1.2	
	All %	Have live in Area					
		Up to 3 years %	3 to 10 year %	Over 10 years %			
Completely satisfied	12.4	19.5	10.8	12.2			
Very satisfied	32.1	15.3	40.1	30.0			
Quite satisfied	32.1	54.6	27.2	31.4			
Not very satisfied*	10.6	2.3	11.9	11.0			
Not satisfied at all*	12.9	8.2	9.9	15.4			
Total C+V satisfied	44.5	34.8	50.9	42.2			
Total C+V+Q satisfied	76.6	89.4	78.1	73.6			
Mean	3.2	3.4	3.3	3.1			
S.D.	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.2			

\* These people were asked the following question:

**What needs to be done to improve the situation? Anything else?**

The main verbatim responses:

- Access & movement of traffic inside need management plus more staff.
- Arrange own.
- Better recycling program needed to cut down on waste.
- Building recycling area, more community consultation, more education re recycling to residents.
- Cleaned up more frequently better management of dumping rubbish.
- Close current site down.
- Community recycling reinstated please.
- Don't add chlorine
- Don't know
- Find another location as having it in the state that it is in , can't continue
- Garbage to be collected.
- Have to take own.
- Implement a better recycling system.
- Implement recycling facilities & maintain tidiness of the area.
- Keep tip open more often/ 24 hours & 7 days.
- Longer hours/ 7 days a week 8.00am to 5.00pm
- Longer hours/ Macs Reef & Bungendore should stagger opening times so that not closed at same times.

- *More extensive program of waste recycling.*
- *Need a new tip, better facilities to recycle.*
- *Need to be open all day, everyday.*
- *Not enough recycling units*
- *Open all the time for easier access.*
- *Open everyday/ improve facilities to ..... goods that shouldn't be thrown away.*
- *Open more days a week to make it easier to access for everyone.*
- *Open the tip more often or have a kerbside collection.*
- *Recycling to be encouraged.*
- *Regular maintenance to stop rubbish blowing around.*
- *Rural people could be given a couple of free vouchers a year*
- *Stop burning it / more recycling/ paper in particular.,*
- *Stop letting other people use our tip.*
- *Take trash to Tarago*
- *Tip should be open during working hours / not sure of opening hours there should be containers on the fringe of the outlet to Araluen Road so you have somewhere to put your rubbish.*
- *Waste management program – produce sites with skips to put all rubbish & them Council collect to truck to the tip.*
- *We need a better waste disposal system.*

Table 4.4g:

**Q.4 [ASK ALL] In general, how satisfied are you with the following aspects of this town/village/area..... firstly (READ OUT FIRST ASPECT)..... Would you say you are completely satisfied (CS), very satisfied (VS), quite satisfied (QS), not very satisfied (NV) or not at all satisfied (NA) with that aspect?**

**7. THE SENSE OF COMMUNITY IN THE AREA.**

	All %	Location					
		Braidwood %	Bungendore %	Captains Flat %	Villages %	Rural Resid'l %	Farms %
Completely satisfied	32.2	40.0	41.5	18.6	31.6	27.5	31.1
Very satisfied	37.9	36.1	30.8	45.7	35.3	43.5	35.2
Quite satisfied	24.9	21.7	23.1	32.9	23.2	27.0	24.0
Not very satisfied*	4.1	2.2	4.6	2.9	6.3	2.0	7.1
Not satisfied at all*	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.7	0.0	2.6
Total C+V satisfied	70.1	76.1	72.3	64.3	66.9	71	66.3
Total C+V+Q satisfied	95	97.8	95.4	97.2	90.1	98	90.3
Mean	4.0	4.1	4.1	3.8	3.8	4.0	3.9
S.D.	0.9	0.8	0.9	0.8	1.1	0.8	1.0
	All %	Gender		Age			
		Men	Women	18 - 39 yrs	40-54 yrs	55+ years	
Completely satisfied	32.2	28.8	34.4	33.7	29.4	33.4	
Very satisfied	37.9	36.9	38.5	30.6	47.9	34.3	
Quite satisfied	24.9	24.1	25.4	33.9	18.9	25.2	
Not very satisfied*	4.1	8.5	1.1	1.9	2.4	6.0	
Not satisfied at all*	1.0	1.7	0.5	0.0	1.5	1.0	
Total C+V satisfied	70.1	65.7	72.9	64.3	77.3	67.7	
Total C+V+Q satisfied	95	89.8	98.3	98.2	96.2	92.9	
Mean	4.0	3.8	4.1	4.0	4.0	3.9	
S.D.	0.9	1.0	0.8	0.9	0.8	1.0	
	All %	Have live in Area					
		Up to 3 years %	3 to 10 year %	Over 10 years %			
Completely satisfied	32.2	42.7	36.9	27.8			
Very satisfied	37.9	9.2	47.3	36.9			
Quite satisfied	24.9	40.0	14.9	28.3			
Not very satisfied*	4.1	8.2	0.0	5.8			
Not satisfied at all*	1.0	0.0	0.9	1.2			
Total C+V satisfied	70.1	51.9	84.2	64.7			
Total C+V+Q satisfied	95	91.9	99.1	93			
Mean	4.0	3.9	4.2	3.8			
S.D.	0.9	1.1	0.7	0.9			

\* These people were asked the following question:

**What needs to be done to improve the situation? Anything else?**

The main verbatim responses:

- Council needs to be more active in community.
- If more groups formed.
- More effort to build joint community objectives & strategic discussions.
- More groups for younger people.
- People coming in not nice/ rude.
- Up to the people/ not much can be done about it.

Table 4.4h:

**Q.4 [ASK ALL] In general, how satisfied are you with the following aspects of this town/village/area..... firstly (READ OUT FIRST ASPECT)..... Would you say you are completely satisfied (CS), very satisfied (VS), quite satisfied (QS), not very satisfied (NV) or not at all satisfied (NA) with that aspect?**

**8. THE RANGE OF SERVICES AVAILABLE TO THE COMMUNITY**

	All %	Location					
		Braidwood %	Bungendore %	Captains Flat %	Villages %	Rural Resid'l %	Farms %
Completely satisfied	12.7	35.0	21.0	2.9	8.4	5.1	12.2
Very satisfied	31.8	27.2	36.9	19.3	30.5	30.6	35.2
Quite satisfied	42.3	29.4	42.1	34.3	37.9	53.1	33.2
Not very satisfied*	9.7	8.3	0.0	27.9	16.8	8.2	14.3
Not satisfied at all*	3.5	0.0	0.0	15.7	6.3	3.1	5.1
Total C+V satisfied	44.5	62.2	57.9	22.2	38.9	35.7	47.4
Total C+V+Q satisfied	86.8	91.6	100	56.5	76.8	88.8	80.6
Mean	3.4	3.9	3.8	2.7	3.2	3.3	3.4
S.D.	0.9	1.0	0.8	1.1	1.0	0.8	1.0
	All %	Gender		Age			
		Men	Women	18 - 39 yrs	40-54 yrs	55+ years	
Completely satisfied	12.7	10.0	14.5	7.4	8.4	17.6	
Very satisfied	31.8	31.6	32.0	28.4	26.3	36.7	
Quite satisfied	42.3	44.2	41.0	45.6	49.6	36.2	
Not very satisfied*	9.7	10.5	9.2	12.7	12.7	6.7	
Not satisfied at all*	3.5	3.8	3.3	5.8	3.0	2.9	
Total C+V satisfied	44.5	41.6	46.5	35.8	34.7	54.3	
Total C+V+Q satisfied	86.8	85.8	87.5	81.4	84.3	90.5	
Mean	3.4	3.3	3.5	3.2	3.2	3.6	
S.D.	0.9	0.9	1.0	1.0	0.9	0.9	
	All %	Have live in Area					
		Up to 3 years %	3 to 10 year %	Over 10 years %			
Completely satisfied	12.7	12.6	13.2	12.5			
Very satisfied	31.8	22.3	32.6	32.9			
Quite satisfied	42.3	52.5	44.5	39.4			
Not very satisfied*	9.7	4.1	7.2	12.1			
Not satisfied at all*	3.5	8.4	2.6	3.2			
Total C+V satisfied	44.5	34.9	45.8	45.4			
Total C+V+Q satisfied	86.8	87.4	90.3	84.8			
Mean	3.4	3.3	3.5	3.4			
S.D.	0.9	1.0	0.9	1.0			

\* These people were asked the following question:

**What needs to be done to improve the situation? Anything else?**

The main verbatim responses:

- Don't know what is available so obviously not catering to all residents.
- Improve the hospital / need a new doctor at the hospital/ Need a choice of doctors at the hospital, not just one.
- Keeping up with the developing with the community with the services they provide.
- Larger population is needed for more services.
- Library – more funding.
- Library service & swimming pool available more / Health Services – scope of hospital increased.
- Library should be open more often.
- More help from council, road signs road works make road dangerous.
- More medical centres needed, more doctors.
- More medical services needed/ more local GPs.
- More services such as healthcare more doctors that make visits more often than weekly.
- Need dentists/ doctors for the town/ services for the aged/ nursing homes/ hostels/ taxi service.
- Need garbage & water services.
- Need more access to services / health services.
- Need more medical services, better doctors & more facilities for medical work.
- Not sure.
- Provide more things for the children.

- *Sporting facilities for kids.*
- *Surveys, ask the residents what they want & need.*
- *Telecommunications – no mobile unless satellite.*
- *Tip needs improving - we have no other services.*
- *What services?*

Table 4.4i:

**Q.4 [ASK ALL] In general, how satisfied are you with the following aspects of this town/village/area..... firstly (READ OUT FIRST ASPECT)..... Would you say you are completely satisfied (CS), very satisfied (VS), quite satisfied (QS), not very satisfied (NV) or not at all satisfied (NA) with that aspect?**

**9. THE HOUSEHOLD WATER SUPPLY IN THE AREA. (ASKED ONLY IN THE THREE TOWNS)**

	All %	Location					
		Braidwood %	Bungendore %	Captains Flat %	Villages %	Rural Resid'l %	Farms %
Completely satisfied	22.0	28.3	20.5	47.9			
Very satisfied	23.3	32.2	23.7	33.6			
Quite satisfied	29.7	26.7	24.7	10.7			
Not very satisfied*	12.3	8.3	21.6	2.9			
Not satisfied at all*	12.8	4.4	9.5	5.0			
Total C+V satisfied	45.3	60.5	44.2	81.5			
Total C+V+Q satisfied	75	87.2	68.9	92.2			
Mean	3.3	3.7	3.2	4.2			
S.D.	1.3	1.1	1.3	1.1			
	All %	Gender		Age			
		Men	Women	18 - 39 yrs	40-54 yrs	55+ years	
Completely satisfied	22.0	24.9	20.3	24.1	12.8	27.9	
Very satisfied	23.3	24.3	22.6	17.4	21.3	27.9	
Quite satisfied	29.7	23.5	33.3	35.7	27.8	28.0	
Not very satisfied*	12.3	12.3	12.3	13.5	20.7	5.2	
Not satisfied at all*	12.8	15.0	11.5	9.2	17.4	11.1	
Total C+V satisfied	45.3	49.2	42.9	41.5	34.1	55.8	
Total C+V+Q satisfied	75	72.7	76.2	77.2	61.9	83.8	
Mean	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	2.9	3.6	
S.D.	1.3	1.4	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.3	
	All %	Have live in Area					
		Up to 3 years %	3 to 10 year %	Over 10 years %			
Completely satisfied	22.0	2.0	21.9	26.0			
Very satisfied	23.3	30.5	18.2	25.6			
Quite satisfied	29.7	49.0	33.7	22.8			
Not very satisfied*	12.3	0.0	13.3	14.0			
Not satisfied at all*	12.8	18.5	12.9	11.6			
Total C+V satisfied	45.3	32.5	40.1	51.6			
Total C+V+Q satisfied	75	81.5	73.8	74.4			
Mean	3.3	3.0	3.2	3.4			
S.D.	1.3	1.1	1.3	1.3			

\* These people were asked the following question:

**What needs to be done to improve the situation? Anything else?**

The main verbatim responses:

- *Doesn't advantage a larger family to pay a separate water rate/ change the rate of water.*
- *Don't know what the town water is like/ I have rain-water.*
- *Lower water price of water.*
- *Water supply not from .....*

Table 4.5:

**Q.5a [ASK ALL] Now thinking of the size of the population around here, over the next 20 years or so would you like to see it increase or stay at about the same level as now? [IF INCREASE, PROBE:] How much would you like to see the population increase by ... for example, over the next 20 years or so would you like to see it increase by half, or double, or triple, or would you like to see it grow even further than that over the next 20 years?**

	All %	Location					
		Braidwood %	Bungendore %	Captains Flat %	Villages %	Rural Resid'l %	Farms %
More than triple in size*	2.3	3.9	0.0	2.1	4.2	1.0	5.1
Triple in size*	2.3	6.7	0.0	5.0	4.2	1.0	2.6
Double in size*	9.4	12.8	4.6	5.7	12.6	8.6	12.2
Increase by half*	26.5	49.4	25.6	31.4	28.9	22.7	19.4
TOTAL in favour of an increase in population	40.5	72.8	30.2	44.2	49.9	33.3	39.3
Stay the same size*	51.1	23.9	60.0	55.7	42.1	61.1	43.4
Decrease in size*	1.4	0.0	2.6	0.0	1.6	2.0	0.0
Unsure	7.0	3.3	7.2	0.0	6.3	3.5	17.3
	All %	Gender		Age			
		Men	Women	18 - 39 yrs	40-54 yrs	55+ years	
More than triple in size	2.3	2.3	2.3	9.0	0.0	1.2	
Triple in size	2.3	2.6	2.1	4.6	3.3	0.7	
Double in size	9.4	12.7	7.2	9.7	5.7	11.7	
Increase by half	26.5	26.2	26.7	17.4	29.8	28.0	
TOTAL in favour of an increase in population	40.5	43.8	38.3	40.7	38.8	41.6	
Stay the same size	51.1	53.0	49.9	59.3	54.0	46.1	
Decrease in size	1.4	0.5	2.0	0.0	1.1	2.1	
Unsure	7.0	2.6	9.8	0.0	6.1	10.2	

\* These people were asked the following question:

#### Why do you say that?

##### The main verbatim responses:

##### Those in favour of increase:

- *A few more people would build up the community spirit.*
- *A lot of people that like to commute & have rural lifestyle.*
- *Advantages of being close to bigger places good quality land should stay for farming.*
- *Bring more services to the area & generate more business.*
- *Defense facility being built will be bound to increase.*
- *Employment for our future / for our kids.*
- *Everywhere needs to grow – younger people.*
- *For extra growth/ industry/ for the young people we need career opportunities.*
- *Good for businesses.*
- *Good for town / good for business/ good for school/ need numbers to get the teachers.*
- *Half is manageable level/ it's a gut feeling.*
- *If there are more people in the area, it could mean the building of a bakery, butchers & better shopping facilities.*
- *Increase property value.*
- *Inject some new blood into the old town / can't stop progress.*
- *It's going to happen.*
- *It's good for town economically.*
- *Like to see some work here for the young people.*
- *More development helps with the debt.*
- *More facilities will come/ ambulance & police.*
- *More opportunities for children & businesses.*
- *More people means more infrastructure/ medical, educational & services.*
- *More people more money better facilities.*
- *More people to enjoy the land.*
- *More people would generate more business & socially it would strengthen the community.*



- *More people, more infrastructure, more jobs.*
- *More services come with larger population.*
- *Move the population through, generate more economy & jobs for the area.*
- *Need employment for young people.*
- *Need new people in area*
- *Need to keep services here/ create jobs.*
- *Need to keep the shops & schools going.*
- *Needs a few more people/ just would be nice.*
- *Newer buildings/ more structures/ Woolworths or Coles.*
- *Nice to increase the town, add to community aspect.*
- *No problem with increase so long as infrastructure esp. water paid for by users.*
- *Only 500 people / would be nice to meet new people.*
- *Only if facilities & services increase to cope with growing population.*
- *Property value increased.*
- *Secure our services / create jobs have hospitals & schools to encourage our children to stay here.*
- *So we can get extra services in the town/ more rate payers will provide more services.*
- *To keep schools and churches going.*
- *Towns need to grow / more people create more services.*
- *Want to see town grow & prosper.*
- *We have a small rate base & we do need to increase, slowly, sensitively & with community consultation.*
- *We need some growth to keep it viable/ to return young people.*
- *You need more people to keep the place going.*

**Those not in favour of increase:**

- *All be closer together/ like the space*
- *Any increase would mean we are not living in a small town.*
- *Area can't absorb in any great increase in population/ employment would prove difficult.*
- *As long as planning is sensible/ no alteration of land/ prevent larger development..*
- *Came her to get away from small blocks.*
- *Doesn't want anything to change at all / likes the small community.*
- *Don't like the subdivision of rural properties.*
- *Don't think it would be nicer if there were too many more people / I like the small town community.*
- *Don't want Braidwood to lose it's character / good balance between rural, local & townspeople.*
- *Don't want it to be over crowded/ get away from city life.*
- *Don't want subdivisions which will become ghettos for unemployed.*
- *Don't want subdivisions with small blocks.*
- *Don't want to lose the small town community.*
- *Enjoy the small town atmosphere.*
- *Happy with the way things are.*
- *Have a lot of space & good views/ if developed wouldn't like it.*
- *I enjoy living in a rural community.*
- *I just want a quiet life.*
- *I like the community atmosphere already more people could disrupt the atmosphere.*
- *I like the peaceful nature of the area – more people would disrupt it.*
- *I like the quietness of the area.*
- *I like the small community atmosphere – probably be upset if it got too big.*
- *I like the small town atmosphere.*
- *If it increases it will become a suburb of Canberra.*
- *Independence & freedom of movement, no neighbours.*
- *Infrastructure can't support. More people means less facilities more regulation for existing residents.*
- *It will lose its appeal if it grows.*
- *It would influence your quality of life if bigger.*
- *It's a lovely peaceful valley and we don't want to be trendy.*
- *Keep it a village.*
- *Like it as it is.*
- *Like the peace & quiet of a small population.*
- *Likes it the way it is/ don't need to change.*
- *Limited resources/ facilities/ roads not available.*
- *Location of town doesn't lend itself to great development therefore lack of infrastructure.*
- *Mean to be a rural environment.*

- *More people will make it lose its rural feel.*
- *More people would put pressure on the existing water supply/ infrastructure in general.*
- *Moved here for privacy, the facilities would be stretched if new development.*
- *Moved out here to get away from suburbs.*
- *Not enough facilities esp. water to cope with future residential development.*
- *Once more people, demands on local area change it.*
- *Only want a few people there, not much room to expand & develop*
- *Otherwise it could be too big .*
- *Otherwise it will no longer be a rural area.*
- *Reason for living out here is it's rural.*
- *Reason we came to the country.*
- *Roads, school bus run could be more dangerous with a lot more kids, More change, more people, more conflicts.*
- *Services being over pressed.*
- *Stay a village*
- *That's the charm of the area, not a lot of people.*
- *That's why we moved here.*
- *The community is large enough as it is / prefer the small town as it's more peaceful.*
- *The structure in place couldn't probable stand an increase in population.*
- *Too many people / too much like Queanbeyan.*
- *Too much development ruins town & makes facilities difficult to access.*
- *Turn into too big a town, like the small town atmosphere/*
- *Wants to keep it a country town.*
- *Water needs to be managed better/ composting toilets & more tanks.*
- *We chose this lifestyle to get away from the city.*
- *We moved here for the quieter life and open spaces / don't want to see a lot of land cut up for development.*

Table 4.6:

**Q.6a And what about the future character of the area ... would you like to see the character of the area change, or remain about the same?**

	All %	Location					
		Braidwood %	Bungendore %	Captains Flat %	Villages %	Rural Resid'l %	Farms %
Change*	12.7	14.4	17.3	10.7	12.6	9.6	13.8
Remain about the same	87.3	85.6	82.7	89.3	87.4	90.4	86.2
	All %	Gender		Age			
		Men	Women	18 - 39 yrs	40-54 yrs	55+ years	
Change*	12.7	15.5	10.8	15.3	11.5	12.4	
Remain about the same	87.3	84.5	89.2	84.7	88.5	87.6	

\* These people were asked the following question:

**In what ways would you like the character of the area to change, for example what other kinds of development would you like to see happen?**

The main verbatim responses:

- *6 acre lots would be nice to see more of.*
- *Bitumize the road*
- *Bring back the forests.*
- *Control environmental weeds.*
- *Cultural events with council support, eg touring shows, art.*
- *Customer relations, training and development needed for one person in particular.*
- *Enhance landscape with trees from forest development.*
- *Have to have change to get growth.*
- *Improve tourist areas.*
- *It would be good to be more social, have more people to socialize with.*
- *Less suburban style development/ another school.*
- *Like to see a few more houses around/ not much here available for renting.*
- *More businesses/ dentist.*
- *More commercial than now.*
- *More say in council matters for smaller communities.*
- *Needs to change to grow.*
- *To improve schools.*
- *We need more shops/ Kmart/ Target/ hardware store.*

Table 4.7a:

**Q.7** I'm now going to read out a list of some of the many services provided by Palerang Council. As I read out each one, I'd like you to rate Council's performance on a scale where '10' means excellent, and '1' means terrible? .... Whether you have personal experience of them or not, I'd like you to rate them, based on your impressions and perceptions.

**1. THE MAINTENANCE OF ROADS IN TOWNS AND VILLAGES.**

	All %	Location					
		Braidwood %	Bungendore %	Captains Flat %	Villages %	Rural Resid'l %	Farms %
10 – Excellent performance	1.9	0.0	2.1	0.0	2.1	2.0	2.6
9	2.7	8.9	2.1	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0
8	13.9	10.6	21.0	7.9	18.4	9.0	16.3
7	17.9	17.8	15.9	9.3	14.7	19.5	20.9
6	12.7	16.7	16.4	5.0	8.4	15.0	7.1
Total 6 and above	49.1	54	57.5	22.2	43.6	49.5	46.9
5	25.3	33.3	27.2	39.3	23.2	24.5	19.4
4	10.0	6.7	8.7	9.3	14.2	8.0	14.3
3	5.1	3.9	6.7	5.0	10.5	3.0	4.6
2	5.1	2.2	0.0	7.1	2.1	9.5	4.6
1 - Terrible performance	5.3	0.0	0.0	17.1	6.3	5.5	10.2
Mean	5.5	6.0	6.1	4.4	5.4	5.4	5.3
S.D.	2.1	1.7	1.7	2.1	2.1	2.2	2.3
	All %	Gender		Age			
		Men	Women	18 - 39 yrs	40-54 yrs	55+ years	
10 - Excellent performance	1.9	2.9	1.2	0.0	3.5	1.5	
9	2.7	3.0	2.5	1.9	3.0	2.9	
8	13.9	16.6	12.2	9.9	15.2	14.7	
7	17.9	18.2	17.7	23.3	10.1	20.8	
6	12.7	12.5	12.9	11.9	15.4	11.4	
Total 6 and above	49.1	53.2	46.5	47	47.2	51.3	
5	25.3	20.7	28.3	19.1	25.3	27.8	
4	10.0	8.7	10.9	14.3	10.6	8.0	
3	5.1	6.5	4.2	4.3	5.3	5.4	
2	5.1	5.1	5.0	7.5	5.5	3.8	
1 - Terrible performance	5.3	5.9	5.0	8.0	6.1	3.8	
Mean	5.5	5.6	5.5	5.2	5.5	5.7	
S.D.	2.1	2.2	2.0	2.1	2.2	2.0	
	All %	Have live in Area					
		Up to 3 years %	3 to 10 year %	Over 10 years %			
10 - Excellent performance	1.9	4.1	1.1	1.9			
9	2.7	0.0	3.5	2.7			
8	13.9	8.2	11.5	16.2			
7	17.9	17.6	18.7	17.5			
6	12.7	8.0	15.6	11.8			
Total 6 and above	49.1	37.9	50.4	50.1			
5	25.3	25.0	24.6	25.8			
4	10.0	10.2	4.2	13.4			
3	5.1	0.9	7.5	4.4			
2	5.1	16.4	4.7	3.5			
1 - Terrible performance	5.3	9.6	8.5	2.8			
Mean	5.5	4.9	5.4	5.7			
S.D.	2.1	2.4	2.2	1.9			

\* These people were asked the following question:

**Why poor...what improvements are needed?**

The main verbatim responses:

- Bits & pieces of road fixed and not all at once.

- *Bituminized, grading & filling of holes.*
- *Fix the roads.*
- *More maintenance*
- *More maintenance regular & not in emergency only.*
- *More roadwork needed.*
- *Need to be totally reconstructed not just filled in.*
- *Not very safe to drive on because of the potholes/ fill them in.*
- *Redo them/ maintenance.*
- *Regular maintenance needed.*
- *Regular work on dirt roads, & roads sealed where weather makes road dangerous.*
- *The road is too rough. It needs to be resurfaced.*
- *They are unsafe & need to be reconstructed.*
- *Trees need lopping/ stopping visibility/ access roads need to be wider.*
- *Upgrade the roads, dirt roads are a problem.*
- *Upgrades needed.*
- *We need to attract tourism.*
- *Widen & clean up/ esp. main roads.*

Table 4.7b:

**Q.7** I'm now going to read out a list of some of the many services provided by Palerang Council. As I read out each one, I'd like you to rate Council's performance on a scale where '10' means excellent, and '1' means terrible? .... Whether you have personal experience of them or not, I'd like you to rate them, based on your impressions and perceptions.

## 2. THE MAINTENANCE OF CONNECTING ROADS IN THEIR CARE.

	All %	Location					
		Braidwood %	Bungendore %	Captains Flat %	Villages %	Rural Resid'l %	Farms %
10 - Excellent performance	1.7	2.2	2.1	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0
9	1.4	4.4	2.6	2.9	0.0	1.0	0.0
8	14.5	8.3	13.8	10.0	10.5	18.5	14.3
7	15.4	15.6	20.0	7.9	12.6	14.0	17.3
6	13.7	16.7	15.4	2.9	10.5	15.0	12.2
Total 6 and above	46.7	47.2	53.9	23.7	33.6	51.5	43.8
5	25.1	32.2	27.7	28.6	24.7	26.5	15.3
4	11.6	15.0	11.8	12.1	20.5	7.0	11.7
3	9.0	0.0	4.6	14.3	12.6	6.5	19.4
2	4.5	2.2	2.1	12.1	4.2	5.5	5.1
1 - Terrible performance	3.2	3.3	0.0	9.3	4.2	3.0	4.6
Mean	5.5	5.7	5.9	4.5	4.9	5.7	5.1
S.D.	2.0	1.8	1.7	2.2	1.8	2.0	2.1
	All %	Gender		Age			
		Men	Women	18 - 39 yrs	40-54 yrs	55+ years	
10 - Excellent performance	1.7	1.5	1.8	0.0	1.1	2.7	
9	1.4	1.2	1.5	2.4	1.8	0.7	
8	14.5	18.3	12.0	11.3	13.6	16.3	
7	15.4	19.1	13.0	22.6	7.7	17.6	
6	13.7	13.5	13.8	13.7	17.9	10.9	
Total 6 and above	46.7	53.6	42.1	50	42.1	48.2	
5	25.1	15.8	31.1	23.8	26.6	24.6	
4	11.6	12.7	10.8	13.5	9.4	12.2	
3	9.0	6.9	10.3	6.1	12.1	8.1	
2	4.5	5.1	4.1	4.8	7.3	2.6	
1 - Terrible performance	3.2	5.8	1.5	1.9	2.5	4.1	
Mean	5.5	5.5	5.4	5.5	5.2	5.6	
S.D.	2.0	2.2	1.8	1.8	2.0	2.0	
	All %	Have live in Area					
		Up to 3 years %	3 to 10 year %	Over 10 years %			
10 - Excellent performance	1.7	4.1	1.8	1.3			
9	1.4	0.0	1.8	1.4			
8	14.5	5.0	13.5	16.5			
7	15.4	14.4	11.2	18.1			
6	13.7	1.9	18.1	13.0			
Total 6 and above	46.7	25.4	46.4	50.3			
5	25.1	28.0	18.5	28.4			
4	11.6	13.4	9.8	12.3			
3	9.0	23.9	13.9	3.8			
2	4.5	9.3	4.7	3.7			
1 - Terrible performance	3.2	0.0	6.8	1.6			
Mean	5.5	4.8	5.2	5.7			
S.D.	2.0	2.0	2.2	1.8			

\* These people were asked the following question:

**Why poor...what improvements are needed?**

The main verbatim responses:

- *Improve roads.*

- *Make them more like highways.*
- *More maintenance & money needs to be spent on it.*
- *Need grading more than once a year*
- *Need to fill potholes, do more road-work.*
- *Pot holes need filling.*
- *Redo them / maintenance.*
- *Regular maintenance*
- *Regular maintenance esp. major thorough-fares.*
- *Regular maintenance, overall improvement needed.*
- *Regular maintenance, tarring, widening.*
- *Regular maintenance.*
- *Regular work needed.*
- *Remove pot holes.*
- *Roads are shabby.*
- *Roads need to be redone they aren't safe.*
- *Spend more money on them / Kings Highway*
- *Upgrade the roads, look messy and are unsafe.*
- *Upgrade them to take increased traffic overtaking lanes/ widen them.*
- *Upgrade them.*

Table 4.7c:

**Q.7** I'm now going to read out a list of some of the many services provided by Palerang Council. As I read out each one, I'd like you to rate Council's performance on a scale where '10' means excellent, and '1' means terrible? .... Whether you have personal experience of them or not, I'd like you to rate them, based on your impressions and perceptions.

### 3. THE MANAGEMENT OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE AREA IN RECENT YEARS.

	All %	Location					
		Braidwood %	Bungendore %	Captains Flat %	Villages %	Rural Resid'l %	Farms %
10 - Excellent performance	2.0	0.0	2.1	7.9	2.1	2.0	2.0
9	0.2	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
8	7.0	17.2	5.1	2.9	6.3	7.0	4.6
7	9.4	4.4	7.2	12.1	10.5	11.5	8.7
6	11.5	14.4	12.3	14.3	10.0	12.0	8.7
Total 6 and above	30.1	38.2	26.7	37.2	28.9	32.5	24
5	32.1	30.0	20.5	25.7	31.6	35.5	39.8
4	13.5	16.7	7.7	20.7	18.9	11.0	16.8
3	9.7	4.4	8.7	13.6	10.5	12.0	7.7
2	6.4	4.4	22.1	0.0	0.0	4.0	2.6
1 - Terrible performance	8.2	6.1	14.4	2.9	10.0	5.0	9.2
Mean	4.8	5.2	4.0	5.3	4.8	5.0	4.7
S.D.	2.0	2.0	2.3	2.0	2.0	1.9	1.9
	All %	Gender		Age			
		Men	Women	18 - 39 yrs	40-54 yrs	55+ years	
10 - Excellent performance	2.0	4.9	0.2	1.9	1.7	2.3	
9	0.2	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.5	
8	7.0	8.1	6.3	7.1	6.6	7.2	
7	9.4	6.0	11.6	13.1	5.2	10.6	
6	11.5	11.2	11.7	7.4	11.1	13.4	
Total 6 and above	30.1	30.2	30.2	29.5	24.6	34	
5	32.1	27.1	35.4	32.2	28.1	34.7	
4	13.5	12.5	14.1	7.1	17.5	13.3	
3	9.7	12.1	8.2	13.4	12.6	6.3	
2	6.4	5.9	6.7	3.8	8.3	6.1	
1 - Terrible performance	8.2	12.0	5.7	14.1	8.8	5.4	
Mean	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.5	5.0	
S.D.	2.0	2.3	1.8	2.2	2.0	1.9	
	All %	Have live in Area					
		Up to 3 years %	3 to 10 year %	Over 10 years %			
10 - Excellent performance	2.0	0.0	3.3	1.6			
9	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.4			
8	7.0	12.6	7.0	6.2			
7	9.4	24.3	4.1	10.1			
6	11.5	4.1	15.6	10.3			
Total 6 and above	30.1	41	30	28.6			
5	32.1	27.8	23.6	37.7			
4	13.5	13.4	18.4	10.6			
3	9.7	12.5	9.4	9.5			
2	6.4	4.1	6.8	6.5			
1 - Terrible performance	8.2	1.2	11.8	7.1			
Mean	4.8	5.4	4.6	4.8			
S.D.	2.0	1.8	2.2	1.9			

\* These people were asked the following question:

**Why poor...what improvements are needed?**



The main verbatim responses:

- *Better control of what's being built.*
- *Better planning/ larger blocks/ keep village feel.*
- *Better planning/ more communication with community/ not consistent in development approval.*
- *Change of councilors/ change of policies/ communicate more with the public*
- *Council needs to be user friendly / listen to what people want.*
- *Don't like the fact there is no one industrial area.*
- *Elm Street shocking/ blocks don't fit country feel.*
- *Having policies & sticking to them / make the same for everybody/ foster processing of development applications.*
- *Help developers instead of fighting them.*
- *Let the people do what they want/ you can't dictate what is beauty / people have their own responsibility to the place / management should be more in touch with the people*
- *Look at development applications more closely.*
- *Make processing of development application quicker.*
- *More consultation with public.*
- *More information on development plans.*
- *Need to be more environmentally sensitive & future developments should be done slowly & sensitively in keeping with the town.*
- *Need to communicate and be open and honest.*
- *No sewage & water not good enough for large development.*
- *Not all developments should have been passed through / 200 houses built at Braidwood Heights / not in keeping with the town*
- *Not enough planning in town development.*
- *Not in keeping with the character of the area/ stricter guidelines needed.*
- *Overall retaining of heritage.*
- *Prefer bigger blocks for new development to maintain rural aspect.*
- *Regulate development*
- *Sensible consultation with the community.*
- *Slow development down.*
- *Slow down development.*
- *Stronger restrictions for developers.*
- *Things are being passed/ but no-one knows why the are.*
- *Too many small blocks, need larger blocks to keep rural aspect.*
- *Uphold rules they've set.*
- *We need public consultation / a lot worry about the development among people.*

Table 4.7d:

**Q.7** I'm now going to read out a list of some of the many services provided by Palerang Council. As I read out each one, I'd like you to rate Council's performance on a scale where '10' means excellent, and '1' means terrible? .... Whether you have personal experience of them or not, I'd like you to rate them, based on your impressions and perceptions.

#### 4. THE HOUSEHOLD GARBAGE COLLECTION IN SOME AREAS.

When only the three towns are included:	The three towns only %	Location					
		Braidwood %	Bungendore %	Captains Flat %			
10 - Excellent performance	27.0	30.0	21.0	30.0			
9	9.6	15.0	5.1	8.6			
8	20.7	30.6	15.9	15.7			
7	11.4	8.9	14.4	10.7			
6	6.0	4.4	8.7	5.0			
Total 6 and above	74.7	88.9	65.1	70.0			
5	11.8	11.1	12.3	12.1			
4	3.8	0.0	4.1	7.1			
3	5.4	0.0	7.7	8.6			
2	2.9	0.0	6.7	2.1			
1 - Terrible performance	1.4	0.0	4.1	0.0			
Mean	7.3	8.2	6.5	7.3			
S.D.	2.3	1.6	2.7	2.5			
When all people are included:	All %	Location					
		Braidwood %	Bungendore %	Captains Flat %	Villages %	Rural Resid'l %	Farms %
10 - Excellent performance	8.9	30.0	21.0	30.0	1.6	1.0	2.0
9	5.3	15.0	5.1	8.6	6.3	2.5	4.6
8	8.4	30.6	15.9	15.7	2.1	3.0	2.6
7	7.1	8.9	14.4	10.7	8.4	2.0	7.1
6	3.7	4.4	8.7	5.0	0.0	4.0	0.0
Total 6 and above	33.4	88.9	65.1	70.0	18.4	12.5	16.3
5	38.8	11.1	12.3	12.1	43.7	53.0	54.1
4	7.9	0.0	4.1	7.1	16.8	6.0	13.3
3	1.7	0.0	7.7	8.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
2	3.7	0.0	6.7	2.1	4.2	5.0	0.0
1 - Terrible performance	14.6	0.0	4.1	0.0	16.8	23.5	16.3
Mean	5.3	8.2	6.5	7.3	4.6	4.2	4.7
S.D.	2.6	1.6	2.7	2.5	2.2	2.2	2.1
	All %	Gender		Age			
		Men	Women	18 - 39 yrs	40-54 yrs	55+ years	
10 - Excellent performance	8.9	9.0	8.8	6.7	9.3	9.4	
9	5.3	5.4	5.3	8.9	0.9	6.8	
8	8.4	8.4	8.3	6.8	10.1	7.9	
7	7.1	6.1	7.7	11.0	7.7	5.1	
6	3.7	3.7	3.6	4.3	4.2	3.1	
Total 6 and above	33.4	32.6	33.7	37.7	32.2	32.3	
5	38.8	33.4	42.4	36.7	40.8	38.4	
4	7.9	10.6	6.1	9.5	4.5	9.5	
3	1.7	0.0	2.8	2.4	3.6	0.2	
2	3.7	5.7	2.4	4.3	4.6	2.8	
1 - Terrible performance	14.6	17.7	12.5	9.4	14.4	16.7	
Mean	5.3	5.1	5.4	5.5	5.2	5.3	
S.D.	2.6	2.8	2.5	2.5	2.6	2.7	
	All %	Have live in Area					
		Up to 3 years %	3 to 10 year %	Over 10 years %			
10 - Excellent performance	8.9	10.5	6.0	10.3			

9	5.3	8.4	2.4	6.6
8	8.4	2.8	14.2	5.8
7	7.1	9.5	9.2	5.4
6	3.7	0.0	2.4	4.9
Total 6 and above	33.4	31.2	34.2	33
5	38.8	47.6	33.1	40.8
4	7.9	5.0	9.4	7.5
3	1.7	0.0	0.6	2.6
2	3.7	4.1	5.5	2.5
1 - Terrible performance	14.6	12.3	17.0	13.5
Mean	5.3	5.5	5.1	5.4
S.D.	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.6

\* These people were asked the following question:

**Why poor...what improvements are needed?**

The main verbatim responses:

- *Dispose of own garbage.*
- *Don't have a garbage collection.*
- *Need better organization of waste.*
- *No collection*
- *None in this area*
- *None so don't know*
- *Not a large amount of development being done.*
- *Not applicable – we dispose of our own.*
- *Provide bigger bins or more regular visits.*
- *Recycling.*
- *The wheelie bins are too small, better waste disposal systems, such as recycling facilities.*
- *There is none.*
- *There isn't any.*
- *Tip & more times to access – during the week as well as weekends.*
- *Unknown to most rural people.*

Table 4.7e:

**Q.7** I'm now going to read out a list of some of the many services provided by Palerang Council. As I read out each one, I'd like you to rate Council's performance on a scale where '10' means excellent, and '1' means terrible? .... Whether you have personal experience of them or not, I'd like you to rate them, based on your impressions and perceptions.

#### 5. THE KNOWLEDGE AND ACCURACY OF COUNCIL STAFF.

	All %	Location					
		Braidwood %	Bungendore %	Captains Flat %	Villages %	Rural Resid'l %	Farms %
10 - Excellent performance	3.6	8.9	4.6	10.0	0.0	3.0	2.6
9	2.1	4.4	0.0	2.9	3.7	2.0	2.0
8	14.8	25.0	14.4	10.0	10.5	12.0	19.4
7	16.8	18.3	8.7	12.1	23.2	19.0	15.8
6	14.0	11.1	19.0	7.1	14.7	15.0	9.2
Total 6 and above	51.3	67.7	46.7	42.1	52.1	51	49
5	31.4	21.7	44.6	40.0	25.3	31.0	27.0
4	8.9	2.2	4.6	10.0	10.0	11.0	11.7
3	3.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	6.3	4.0	2.6
2	1.9	2.2	2.1	5.0	2.1	1.0	2.6
1 - Terrible performance	3.5	3.9	2.1	2.9	4.2	2.0	7.1
Mean	5.8	6.6	5.8	5.9	5.6	5.8	5.7
S.D.	1.9	2.1	1.7	2.2	1.9	1.8	2.1
	All %	Gender		Age			
		Men	Women	18 - 39 yrs	40-54 yrs	55+ years	
10 - Excellent performance	3.6	3.2	4.0	2.3	0.6	6.2	
9	2.1	1.8	2.4	0.0	2.1	3.1	
8	14.8	17.0	13.4	27.4	10.6	12.5	
7	16.8	19.9	14.8	6.7	26.5	14.5	
6	14.0	13.1	14.5	18.4	16.5	10.5	
Total 6 and above	51.3	55	49.1	54.8	56.3	46.8	
5	31.4	27.9	33.7	37.2	25.4	32.9	
4	8.9	9.0	8.9	7.0	5.3	12.0	
3	3.0	0.0	4.9	0.0	6.5	1.9	
2	1.9	3.1	1.1	0.9	4.2	0.7	
1 - Terrible performance	3.5	5.2	2.4	0.0	2.4	5.5	
Mean	5.8	5.9	5.8	6.2	5.7	5.8	
S.D.	1.9	2.0	1.8	1.5	1.8	2.1	
	All %	Have live in Area					
		Up to 3 years %	3 to 10 year %	Over 10 years %			
10 - Excellent performance	3.6	4.1	2.4	4.3			
9	2.1	0.0	1.8	2.7			
8	14.8	9.3	12.6	16.9			
7	16.8	12.1	19.2	16.1			
6	14.0	21.9	25.1	6.3			
Total 6 and above	51.3	47.4	61.1	46.3			
5	31.4	41.3	24.7	33.7			
4	8.9	11.3	7.4	9.4			
3	3.0	0.0	1.9	4.1			
2	1.9	0.0	2.1	2.1			
1 - Terrible performance	3.5	0.0	2.7	4.4			
Mean	5.8	5.8	5.9	5.8			
S.D.	1.9	1.4	1.7	2.1			

\* These people were asked the following question:

**Why poor...what improvements are needed?**

The main verbatim responses:

- *Better communication with public / never get anywhere when you make a complaint.*

- *Get rid of them all*
- *Haven't seen any.*
- *Hones evaluation of plans made/ open meetings.*
- *More communication between the residents & the council.*
- *More experienced staff, more training & development, attitude to public.*
- *Need more experienced staff, advice not relevant.*
- *Passed around a bit when called in/ don't feel talked to person that deals with that issue.*
- *Rapid resolution of problems.*
- *Return phone calls.*
- *Training would be good.*
- *Utilize knowledge already in the community / no cost.*
- *When we phone in we get passed through to Queanbeyan – it should be linked straight to Braidwood where our Council works from..*

Table 4.7f:

**Q.7** I'm now going to read out a list of some of the many services provided by Palerang Council. As I read out each one, I'd like you to rate Council's performance on a scale where '10' means excellent, and '1' means terrible? .... Whether you have personal experience of them or not, I'd like you to rate them, based on your impressions and perceptions.

#### 6. THE COURTESY AND HELPFULNESS OF COUNCIL STAFF.

	All %	Location					
		Braidwood %	Bungendore %	Captains Flat %	Villages %	Rural Resid'l %	Farms %
10 - Excellent performance	7.9	26.1	7.2	15.7	4.2	4.0	7.7
9	5.5	6.1	0.0	6.4	12.1	5.0	6.6
8	24.3	21.7	22.6	11.4	27.4	22.5	31.1
7	17.6	18.9	16.4	17.9	21.1	19.0	12.8
6	11.4	12.8	17.4	5.0	8.4	13.0	5.1
Total 6 and above	66.7	85.6	63.6	56.4	73.2	63.5	63.3
5	25.4	10.0	28.2	32.1	21.1	28.5	27.0
4	2.2	0.0	0.0	2.9	1.6	4.0	2.6
3	1.1	2.2	2.1	2.9	0.0	1.0	0.0
2	1.2	2.2	2.1	2.9	0.0	0.0	2.6
1 - Terrible performance	3.3	0.0	4.1	2.9	4.2	3.0	4.6
Mean	6.6	7.6	6.3	6.5	6.8	6.4	6.6
S.D.	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.3	1.9	1.8	2.2
	All %	Gender		Age			
		Men	Women	18 - 39 yrs	40-54 yrs	55+ years	
10 - Excellent performance	7.9	8.6	7.4	7.7	3.4	10.9	
9	5.5	4.5	6.2	2.7	6.9	5.7	
8	24.3	35.1	17.2	24.2	21.1	26.3	
7	17.6	15.8	18.8	16.6	21.1	15.8	
6	11.4	10.0	12.4	11.9	17.7	7.2	
Total 6 and above	66.7	74	62	63.1	70.2	65.9	
5	25.4	18.5	29.9	32.8	22.3	24.6	
4	2.2	1.5	2.7	2.4	0.0	3.6	
3	1.1	0.9	1.1	1.1	2.7	0.0	
2	1.2	1.2	1.1	0.5	2.2	0.8	
1 - Terrible performance	3.3	3.8	3.0	0.0	2.7	5.1	
Mean	6.6	6.9	6.4	6.6	6.5	6.7	
S.D.	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.7	1.9	2.2	
	All %	Have live in Area					
		Up to 3 years %	3 to 10 year %	Over 10 years %			
10 - Excellent performance	7.9	15.8	6.2	7.7			
9	5.5	0.0	4.1	7.2			
8	24.3	8.2	23.2	27.4			
7	17.6	23.3	27.0	11.3			
6	11.4	22.5	11.2	9.9			
Total 6 and above	66.7	69.8	71.7	63.5			
5	25.4	25.0	23.5	26.7			
4	2.2	1.2	1.1	3.1			
3	1.1	4.1	0.0	1.2			
2	1.2	0.0	0.3	1.8			
1 - Terrible performance	3.3	0.0	3.4	3.9			
Mean	6.6	6.6	6.7	6.6			
S.D.	2.0	1.8	1.8	2.1			

\* These people were asked the following question:

**Why poor...what improvements are needed?**

The main verbatim responses:

- Haven't seen any.

- *Management & staff only get rid of them.*
- *Planning not helpful/ gave dishonest information/ arrogant/ ran things for their own benefit.*
- *Ring back when they say the will / answer the phones / more phone staff.*
- *Still waiting a phone call from before Christmas.*
- *They didn't understand about overflowing gutters/ issue was brushed to the side.*
- *We don't hear from the, they don't seem to do much more input into community & residents.*

Table 4.8:

**Q.8 [ASK ALL] Thinking of Palerang Council as a whole, that is, taking into account all the services they provide and facilities they run, not just the few I've mentioned, how would you rate the Council's performance overall ..... Again, a score of 10 would be excellent performance and 1 would be terrible .... how would you rate the overall performance of Palerang Council as a whole?**

	All %	Location					
		Braidwood %	Bungendore %	Captains Flat %	Villages %	Rural Resid'l %	Farms %
10 - Excellent performance	1.7	2.2	2.1	2.9	2.1	2.0	0.0
9	0.8	6.7	0.0	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
8	16.7	28.3	23.6	12.9	16.3	14.5	8.7
7	25.9	16.7	28.2	10.7	23.2	27.0	31.6
6	13.3	19.4	11.3	30.7	18.9	9.5	11.7
Total 6 and above	58.4	73.3	65.2	60.1	60.5	53	52
5	31.8	22.8	24.1	32.1	29.5	33.5	42.9
4	2.3	1.7	0.0	5.0	2.1	4.5	0.0
3	4.5	2.2	4.6	0.0	7.9	4.0	5.1
2	1.5	0.0	4.1	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0
1 - Terrible performance	1.6	0.0	2.1	2.9	0.0	3.0	0.0
Mean	6.0	6.7	6.2	6.0	6.1	5.9	5.9
S.D.	1.6	1.5	1.8	1.6	1.5	1.8	1.2
	All %	Gender		Age			
		Men	Women	18 - 39 yrs	40-54 yrs	55+ years	
10 - Excellent performance	1.7	2.2	1.4	0.0	1.2	2.7	
9	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.0	0.0	1.6	
8	16.7	12.8	19.2	17.0	14.9	17.7	
7	25.9	28.5	24.2	28.9	26.3	24.5	
6	13.3	9.7	15.6	17.6	14.0	11.1	
Total 6 and above	58.4	54	61.1	63.5	56.4	57.6	
5	31.8	33.5	30.7	30.8	31.3	32.6	
4	2.3	4.1	1.1	0.0	4.3	1.8	
3	4.5	4.3	4.7	3.8	3.0	5.8	
2	1.5	2.8	0.6	1.9	2.3	0.7	
1 - Terrible performance	1.6	1.2	1.8	0.0	2.7	1.5	
Mean	6.0	5.9	6.1	6.1	5.9	6.1	
S.D.	1.6	1.7	1.6	1.4	1.7	1.7	
	All %	Have live in Area					
		Up to 3 years %	3 to 10 year %	Over 10 years %			
10 - Excellent performance	1.7	7.3	1.8	0.8			
9	0.8	0.0	0.7	1.0			
8	16.7	14.3	14.7	18.2			
7	25.9	19.6	29.2	25.0			
6	13.3	20.3	13.3	12.2			
Total 6 and above	58.4	61.5	59.7	57.2			
5	31.8	29.1	29.9	33.4			
4	2.3	1.2	5.1	0.8			
3	4.5	8.2	3.2	4.7			
2	1.5	0.0	2.2	1.3			
1 - Terrible performance	1.6	0.0	0.0	2.7			
Mean	6.0	6.2	6.1	6.0			
S.D.	1.6	1.7	1.5	1.7			

\* These people were asked the following question:

**Why poor...what improvements are needed?**

The main verbatim responses:

- *Changed road, then the number, the location / changed address 3 times but have never moved.*
- *Concentrate more on old community needs of residents.*
- *Council didn't do what it said it would do regarding our State/ not built properly.*



- *Get out & do things / not doing anything.*
- *Get rid of hierarchy.*
- *Lack of honesty & openness with people.*
- *More cohesion as a group needed.*
- *New people, they are naïve, but they are learning, so it's okay.*
- *Not returning calls, not replying, not coming to meetings.*
- *Preferred previous council area. This council set up to fail. Could be more entrepreneurial.*
- *Should follow wishes of residents rather than developers wishes.*
- *They have let the grading of roads go too long.*

Table 4.9:

**Q.9a How well-informed do you feel about the overall activities and initiatives of the Council?**

	All %	Location					
		Braidwood %	Bungendore %	Captains Flat %	Villages %	Rural Resid'l %	Farms %
10 - Totally well-informed	1.1	2.2	2.1	2.9	0.0	1.0	0.0
9	4.5	6.7	2.6	2.9	4.2	5.0	4.6
8	12.5	21.7	14.4	4.3	14.7	13.0	4.6
7	19.3	19.4	20.5	5.7	27.4	14.0	25.5
6	15.7	14.4	13.3	10.0	16.8	18.0	14.3
Total 6 and above	53.1	64.4	52.9	25.8	63.1	51	49
5	24.4	16.7	16.9	32.1	20.0	26.0	34.7
4	9.4	4.4	16.9	12.9	6.3	10.5	4.1
3	6.7	6.1	6.7	12.1	6.3	6.0	7.7
2	2.2	4.4	2.6	9.3	0.0	2.5	0.0
1 - Not informed at all	4.3	3.9	4.1	7.9	4.2	4.0	4.6
Mean	5.7	6.1	5.6	4.6	6.0	5.6	5.6
S.D.	2.0	2.2	2.0	2.1	1.8	1.9	1.7
	All %	Gender		Age			
		Men	Women	18 - 39 yrs	40-54 yrs	55+ years	
10 - Totally well-informed	1.1	1.2	1.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	
9	4.5	3.7	5.0	4.9	4.5	4.3	
8	12.5	15.1	10.8	9.2	13.1	13.5	
7	19.3	20.1	18.8	13.7	20.9	20.5	
6	15.7	19.8	13.0	19.3	13.0	16.0	
Total 6 and above	53.1	59.9	48.6	47.1	51.5	56.5	
5	24.4	18.8	28.1	27.4	17.6	27.6	
4	9.4	8.8	9.8	11.5	8.8	9.0	
3	6.7	4.5	8.1	11.6	8.5	3.6	
2	2.2	1.8	2.4	0.0	5.1	1.1	
1 - Not informed at all	4.3	6.1	3.1	2.4	8.6	2.3	
Mean	5.7	5.8	5.6	5.5	5.4	6.0	
S.D.	2.0	2.0	1.9	1.8	2.2	1.8	
	All %	Have live in Area					
		Up to 3 years %	3 to 10 year %	Over 10 years %			
10 - Totally well-informed	1.1	0.0	1.1	1.2			
9	4.5	8.2	4.0	4.2			
8	12.5	7.3	14.5	12.2			
7	19.3	6.0	23.9	18.8			
6	15.7	11.1	17.8	15.1			
Total 6 and above	53.1	32.6	61.3	51.5			
5	24.4	29.1	17.6	27.6			
4	9.4	22.9	8.7	7.7			
3	6.7	5.0	7.5	6.5			
2	2.2	10.5	2.8	0.5			
1 - Not informed at all	4.3	0.0	2.2	6.2			
Mean	5.7	5.1	5.9	5.6			
S.D.	2.0	1.9	1.9	2.0			

\* These people were asked the following question:

**Why don't you feel informed ... what are your key areas of concern?**

The main verbatim responses:

- *Can't gauge accuracy of what's in papers.*
- *Council could provide more information themselves.*
- *Council newsletter would be better than nothing.*
- *Development in future, rumors are rife and no word from council.*
- *Doesn't attend meetings, no information sent to residents.*
- *Don't hear anything from the council at all.*

- *Don't hear, no local paper.*
- *Don't know*
- *Don't know what activities they have.*
- *Don't seem to get to know very much.*
- *Get information out earlier.*
- *Have nothing to do with them.*
- *Inform us more truthfully.*
- *Local paper, seems to be improving in communication.*
- *More info on getting information/ website/ meetings are intimidating.*
- *More information about development*
- *More information distributed.*
- *More user friendly terminology in publications. More financial information. And environmental policy.*
- *Need more info in the local paper/ council newsletter is needed.*
- *Never send us anything.*
- *No dealings.*
- *Not enough info/ do letter box drops.*
- *Not much activity impinges on my life.*
- *Nothing distributed/ put in papers, TV, Radio.*
- *Only local paper & reports in-fighting.*
- *Possibly my fault.*
- *Release statements about progress/ be more open.*
- *Tell residents what is happening in the area – more publicity needed.*
- *They don't have enough money, have heard about some plans.*
- *They don't send anything out to us, we don't see much of them.*
- *They don't send many letters or briefs to residents.*
- *They don't send out enough information to residents.*
- *They should put regular articles or a column in the local paper.*
- *Things done without consultation with public.*
- *Things just happen. Nobody tells anybody anything/ should have media coverage.*
- *Town planning*
- *Weed control / wanted to get an individual problem solved but nothing done.*
- *Where do you find out apart from community newspapers?*
- *Why don't they send us council newsletters or bulletins?*

Table 4.10:

**Q.10 [ASK ALL] Palerang Council was created in February 2004 as a result of changes in boundaries of several old councils including Yarrowlumla and Tallaganda Councils. Its draft vision statement currently says: “Working with our community to provide the best in village and rural living”. To what extent does this vision match with your vision for the area ... a lot, a little or not at all?**

	All %	Location					
		Braidwood %	Bungendore %	Captains Flat %	Villages %	Rural Resid'l %	Farms %
Matches my vision a lot	47.7	45.1	43.4	51.2	46.2	58.9	32.1
Matches my vision a little	37.1	46.2	45.6	34.6	41.2	27.6	39.6
<b>TOTAL matches a lot or a little</b>	<b>84.8</b>	<b>91.3</b>	<b>89.1</b>	<b>85.8</b>	<b>87.4</b>	<b>86.5</b>	<b>71.7</b>
Does not match my vision at all	7.8	1.7	8.8	8.7	8.8	8.6	7.5
Unsure	7.4	6.9	2.2	5.5	3.8	4.9	20.9
	All %	Gender		Age			
		Men	Women	18 - 39 yrs	40-54 yrs	55+ years	
Matches my vision a lot	47.7	45.5	49.0	51.1	54.3	42.1	
Matches my vision a little	37.1	39.6	35.6	46.9	35.4	34.3	
<b>TOTAL matches a lot or a little</b>	<b>84.8</b>	<b>85.1</b>	<b>84.6</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>89.7</b>	<b>76.4</b>	
Does not match my vision at all	7.8	9.2	6.9	0.0	9.0	10.1	
Unsure	7.4	5.8	8.4	2.0	1.3	13.6	

Table 4.11

**Q.11 [ASK ALL] In what ways could this vision statement be improved?.....How would you write it?**

The main verbatim responses:

- *“working together with.....etc.”*
- *Add communication & Roads.*
- *Add on – for all our residents.*
- *Add to it – maintain the character of rural life and enhance other industries.*
- *As long as they honor that statement, fine as it is.*
- *Be specific about how life is being made better, tell us where the money is going.*
- *Better planning of development/ strategic approach to retain village feel.*
- *Better service to the community/ answer development applications.*
- *Concentrate on preservation of heritage but bring the 21st century into the town.*
- *Consultation about development with the public.*
- *Couldn't have written it better.*
- *Council seems alienated from people improve the relationship.*
- *Create more small villages/ adds to community feel.*
- *Determine what residents want by surveying.*
- *Don't think it could be improved, as long as the statement is realized.*
- *Don't want anything changed/ protect what the town has instead of change.*
- *Don't want to get too big/ more recycling.*
- *Emphasis on keeping the environment untouched unspoiled.*
- *Follow what they “Preach”/ aren't doing this by developing.*
- *Follow what they are saying/ if continue development as is, Bungendore won't be a village anymore it will become a town*
- *Happy as it is.*
- *Have monthly public meetings/ don't know their agenda.*
- *Help people out/ be more understanding of their mistakes (council's)*
- *I like this vision statement, I think there could be more emphasis on moving forward into the future.*
- *I would like to be less obscure/ be more definitive about the boundaries of Palerang council.*
- *I wouldn't rewrite it – just protect small town community.*
- *In communication with community.*
- *It needs to refer to progress & life in the 21st century / it's not forward looking.*
- *It seems that council is behaving differently that what the statement says ie., passed housing developments without consulting people.*
- *Maintain current quality of life. Don't make it bigger.*
- *More specific on what they mean on what rural living means to them.*

- *Needs more emphasis on the working aspect of it/ more energy in putting it in to practice.*
- *No, let's return to previous Council*
- *Preservation of natural environment/ consideration of natural environment issues should be added.*
- *Put more emphasis on the "small Town" aspect of the community.*
- *Sack management of Palerang Council*
- *Survey people & then find out what needs to be done/ do what the people want.*
- *The actions don't match the statement, but I endorse the statement.*
- *They need to appeal to the residents & show them what they are doing.*
- *To involve the children more to make them appreciate what they have.*
- *Too motherhoodish/ not specific enough.*
- *Working at communication with our community.*
- *Would like to hear about specifics of what the council are doing for the area.*

Table 4.12:

**Q.12 [ASK ALL] When the new Council was created, it inherited a million dollar revenue shortfall so it is currently operating with an unsustainable deficit. In order to overcome this, which would you prefer: an increase in your rates of around 25% (or one-quarter) to fully cover the shortfall without reducing any Council services or maintenance levels... or no rates increase but a reduction in Councils service and maintenance levels?**

	All %	Location					
		Braidwood %	Bungendore %	Captains Flat %	Villages %	Rural Resid'l %	Farms %
A substantial increase in rates to also improve on current services and maintenance levels	4.8	0.0	17.8	0.0	2.1	1.0	5.1
Increase rates by around 25% so that there is no reduction in Council services and maintenance levels	13.4	25.0	9.4	22.1	12.6	15.0	6.6
A smaller rate increase and a slight reduction in Council services and maintenance levels	23.3	17.8	29.8	12.1	16.8	26.0	21.4
<b>TOTAL prefer some increase in rates</b>	<b>41.5</b>	<b>42.8</b>	<b>57.0</b>	<b>34.2</b>	<b>31.5</b>	<b>42.0</b>	<b>33.1</b>
No rate increase but a reduction in Council services and maintenance levels	24.5	15.0	18.8	49.3	24.2	31.0	17.3
Other	15.4	2.2	14.1	10.7	23.2	13.5	23.0
Unsure	18.7	40.0	9.9	5.7	21.1	13.5	26.5
	All %	Gender		Age			
		Men	Women	18 - 39 yrs	40-54 yrs	55+ years	
A substantial increase in rates to also improve on current services and maintenance levels	4.8	0.0	7.8	15.3	4.1	1.0	
Increase rates by around 25% so that there is no reduction in Council services and maintenance levels	13.4	9.0	16.3	15.1	13.4	12.8	
A smaller rate increase and a slight reduction in Council services and maintenance levels	23.3	27.3	20.7	21.4	30.2	19.6	
<b>TOTAL prefer some increase in rates</b>	<b>41.5</b>	<b>36.3</b>	<b>44.8</b>	<b>51.8</b>	<b>47.7</b>	<b>33.4</b>	
No rate increase but a reduction in Council services and maintenance levels	24.5	26.5	23.2	23.3	23.8	25.4	
Other	15.4	24.2	9.8	9.3	16.4	17.3	
Unsure	18.7	13.0	22.3	15.5	12.2	24.1	

**Table 4.13:**
**Q.13 [ASK ALL] If any Council services or maintenance levels do need to be reduced to limit a rate rise, which services or maintenance would you accept some reduction in?**
The main verbatim responses:

- *Any except the roads.*
- *Can't comment, they don't do much for us.*
- *Can't reduce what you don't get.*
- *Council indoor staff / have more people doing jobs outside of the office.*
- *Cut tip management from the council / skim their big pay-offs.*
- *Don't get any services anyway / have no water or garbage collection.*
- *Don't get any services now what can they cut back on?*
- *Don't have any services – turn lights off in town apart from main roads.*
- *Don't know about what they provide so don't know where they could cut.*
- *Don't know all the services they provide.*
- *Don't know full list of services to know what we don't need.*
- *Don't know the services they provide so couldn't make a decision.*
- *Don't know the services they provide so couldn't pinpoint an area.*
- *Don't know what services they provide to make an educated decision.*
- *Don't receive services.*
- *Don't see many services/ roads okay.*
- *Electricity.*
- *Few services to start with/ would really need to know what services are available.*
- *Garbage collection*
- *Garbage collection – we do our own.*
- *Garbage collection / maintenance of road.*
- *Garbage pick up.*
- *Get rid of a level of too heavy overpaid workers from the council.*
- *Govt. should provide as they change the areas.*
- *Hard for services to be reduced if there aren't many to begin with.*
- *Haven't got any so what could be reduced.*
- *I don't know the services provided.*
- *I don't know the services provided/ need a list to see what they do.*
- *I was told there was 116 office staff/ get rid of half of them / what do they need all that staff for.*
- *Lengthen work intervals on road maintenance/ higher development rates.*
- *Less council services – road maintenance for a short period of time.*
- *Less service on roads.*
- *Less staff at the council*
- *Management too much*
- *More efficient service.*
- *No absolutely no reductions.*
- *No garbage collection – we don't get it anyway.*
- *No reductions at Araluen as we only have the tip & the road,*
- *No reductions should be made.*
- *No reductions.*
- *None, they don't provide many services, so how could they cut them?.*
- *Not getting any so what other services?*
- *Not informed enough*
- *Not interested in having reductions as there aren't many services to start with.*
- *Number of councilors.*
- *Only service is road maintenance perhaps reduce something in towns. Reinstate recycling service at tip.*
- *Rather have rate rise.*
- *Reduce staff / library.*
- *Road expenditures.*
- *Road maintenance / don't receive other services.*
- *Road maintenance / outer roads / not main roads.*
- *Road maintenance.*
- *Road maintenance.*
- *Road maintenance.*
- *Roads & footpaths.*
- *Rubbish bins / could be collected less often.*
- *Shouldn't have received this deficit in first place.*
- *The Council don't provide very many services to the area.*
- *There are no services to start with so can't reduce.*
- *They don't do a lot in the area, there's not much to cut back on.*
- *Town garden maintenance.*
- *Water / garbage.*

- *Water / garbage.*
- *We already provide our own services so think rate increase is unfair.*
- *We don't have any services.*
- *We don't have services to start with apart from road so wouldn't affect loss of services*
- *We don't know what they provide so don't know what they could reduce.*
- *We had no choice in amalgamation. We were doing all right before.*
- *Would not accept a reduction in service at all, rate is astronomical as it is.*



Table 4.14:

**Q.14 [ASK ALL] If some rate increase is needed, what level of rate increase would you personally be likely to support to minimise any reduction in Council services and maintenance levels... a rise of around 10%, a rise of around 15%, 20%, 25%, 30%, 35% or more than 35%?**

	All %	Location					
		Braidwood %	Bungendore %	Captains Flat %	Villages %	Rural Resid'l %	Farms %
More than 35%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
A rise of 35%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
A rise of 30%	0.1	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
A rise of 25%	4.5	6.7	2.6	0.0	0.0	8.0	2.6
A rise of 20%	6.6	10.6	4.6	2.9	8.4	5.0	9.2
A rise of 15%	9.5	8.3	9.2	15.0	2.1	14.5	5.1
A rise of 10%	47.6	36.7	60.0	37.1	56.8	42.0	47.4
<b>TOTAL would support any increase</b>	<b>68.3</b>	<b>62.3</b>	<b>76.4</b>	<b>57.1</b>	<b>67.3</b>	<b>69.5</b>	<b>64.3</b>
Would not support any rise	25.7	33.9	15.9	42.9	23.2	25.0	31.1
Unsure	5.9	3.9	7.7	0.0	9.5	5.5	4.6
	All %	Gender		Age			
		Men	Women	18 - 39 yrs	40-54 yrs	55+ years	
More than 35%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
A rise of 35%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
A rise of 30%	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	
A rise of 25%	4.5	4.8	4.3	12.1	3.8	1.9	
A rise of 20%	6.6	5.6	7.3	5.8	4.3	8.5	
A rise of 15%	9.5	8.2	10.4	12.9	13.0	6.0	
A rise of 10%	47.6	46.1	48.5	48.9	54.3	42.7	
<b>TOTAL would support any increase</b>	<b>68.3</b>	<b>64.9</b>	<b>70.5</b>	<b>79.7</b>	<b>75.6</b>	<b>59.1</b>	
Would not support any rise	25.7	30.2	22.9	16.4	18.0	34.5	
Unsure	5.9	5.0	6.5	3.9	6.5	6.4	

Table 4.15a:

**Q.15a [ASK ONLY IN THE BRAIDWOOD AREA:] A Draft Heritage Development Control Plan is being prepared for Braidwood and the surrounding area and will be exhibited for public comment prior to being revised and adopted by Palerang Council. The aim of the plan is to manage new development in Braidwood to help ensure that it does not harm the heritage (and/or historical) significance of the town and its setting. Have you heard that this Draft Plan is being prepared**

	Braidwood %
Yes	82.2
No	14.4
Unsure	3.3

Table 4.15b:

**Q.15b [ASK ONLY IN THE BRAIDWOOD AREA:] Briefly, what issues or concerns would you like to see raised in public discussion of this draft heritage development control plan? [PROBE FULLY FOR SENSE]**

The main verbatim responses:

Should include only established buildings:

- All established buildings should be included in heritage.
- Buildings should remain the way that they have been in the past.
- I believe it should be a heritage town.
- Only certain houses should be passed through as heritage/ only the older ones.
- They should have done it 20 years ago, we are now only 1/2 heritage & 1/2 ordinary.

Happy with Plan as is:

- Am happy with plan as it's put forward.
- Controls to date appear to have worked well, I'm happy with the plan.
- We should be listed on the heritage register.

Need to restrict/guide new development:

- Development should be encouraged but guided in the proper way to keep the town heritage in mind.
- Houses that have a heritage value are not surrounded by inappropriate development.
- I would like it to stay Heritage without new developments.
- Put a cap on residential development, sewerage & town water can't cope now.
- The quantity of development in the area / don't want big suburban developments here.
- Whether the large scale developments will allowed to go ahead/ end of Wallace Street.

Disagree that they are all heritage buildings:

- Doesn't concern me, they are just old buildings and will be judged as such.
- Don't feel should be a heritage town anyway, it's just an old, run-down town..
- Don't want the heritage plan -- I would like to see some old places here pulled down.
- Heritage building should be maintained but ones that are beyond redemption should have a modern building replace them.
- Don't want to see new houses jeopardized/ somebody should be able to build a new home to suit their style.

Need for more information, consultation and a referendum:

- Degree of honesty of what the benefits would be one way or the other.
- Important that people affected have a lot of community consultation.
- Needs a lot more public time on public exhibition for objections.
- Needs to be an investigation into the social & demographic economic impact on the town. Needs a referendum of residents to be affected.
- Secret ballot vote to get an idea of the towns feelings.
- The pro's and con's of it all should be in the newspaper for everyone to see.

Employment and economic issues:

- Must not reduce young people's opportunities to live and work here.
- Not to impede on any businesses that are likely to come/ businesses may be frightened off from restrictions by historical factor.
- Plan is a legal document, therefore, if people break the law what happens? Most people in Braidwood have 2-3 jobs for their income. How can we as residents upkeep heritage buildings when we don't have the income. If Trust would like our town to be heritage, a financial account for the use of the residents is required.
- Resources + infrastructure + employment.
- Rural land shouldn't be classed as heritage, it will drop the value on it & that's our retirement money.

Nature of future development:

- Future development of the town/ of developers coming in/ impact on water supply.
- Future development/ where can it be/ what sent/ how much development can infrastructure sustain current LEP & proposed DCP & how they will overlap & that not a lot will change if we have heritage listing.
- How will it affect the growth of our town/ with the conditions & regulations it puts on the non heritage homes and buildings.
- Would like new developments to fit into what already exists. New houses need to be kept in a rural setting. Need to keep large blocks

Restrict it to the main street:

- *I'd like to leave the main street as it is, but let people build whatever houses they want on the outskirts.*
- *Our main street should stay the same.*
- *Think only the main street should remain heritage – why the whole town?*

Explanation of what can and can't do with heritage buildings:

- *Have it clearly explained regarding restriction about building or renovations.*
- *How much does it affect everybody regarding changes to their homes.*
- *What do they expect everybody to do with their own homes*

Table 4.16a:

**Q.16 [ASK ONLY IN THE BUNGENDORE AREA] Palerang Council is required to review its Local Environmental Plans and Development Control Plans. It will shortly be exhibiting a discussion paper for public comment which is likely to discuss four options for the future (residential) development of Bungendore. As I describe each of these possible options, I'd like you to indicate how much you agree or disagree with it. Firstly... [READ OUT FIRST/LAST, ROTATE]... Do you agree or disagree with that option? [Probe: Do you (dis)agree a lot or a little?**

**A. DO NOTHING, IE, NO CHANGE TO PLANNING CONTROLS SO THAT THE VILLAGE CONTINUES TO DEVELOP PRETTY MUCH AS IT HAS BEEN IN RECENT YEARS.**

	Bungendore %
Agree a lot	4.1
Agree a little	12.3
Neither/nor	11.8
Disagree a little	21.5
Disagree a lot	50.3
Mean	2.0
S.D.	1.2

The main verbatim responses:

- *Can't service current development.*
- *Community concerns that it would become too big too fast.*
- *Doing poor job of development.*
- *Don't want it to become like a city.*
- *Don't want to get too big.*
- *Last environmental plan has allowed sewage systems on the lot/ Public health hazard.*
- *More holistic.*
- *No change. Stay as is no suburb*
- *Not sure what their plans are.*
- *People seem to be happy with the way it is.*
- *Slow development will keep the character of area.*
- *Stop development*
- *There has to be some growth.*
- *To do nothing means don't need the council.*
- *Way now isn't good / not sure what.*

Table 4.16b:

**Q.16 [ASK ONLY IN THE BUNGENDORE AREA] Palerang Council is required to review its Local Environmental Plans and Development Control Plans. It will shortly be exhibiting a discussion paper for public comment which is likely to discuss four options for the future (residential) development of Bungendore. As I describe each of these possible options, I'd like you to indicate how much you agree or disagree with it. Firstly... [READ OUT FIRST/LAST, ROTATE]... Do you agree or disagree with that option? [Probe: Do you (dis)agree a lot or a little?**

Table 4.20: Q.16-B Infill development.

**B. INFILL DEVELOPMENT, IE, DEVELOPING THE SIGNIFICANT AREAS OF VACANT LAND STILL AVAILABLE WITHIN THE EXISTING VILLAGE BOUNDARIES, AND ENCOURAGING THE RE-SUBDIVISION OF EXISTING LARGE RESIDENTIAL LOTS.**

	Bungendore %
Agree a lot	7.2
Agree a little	16.4
Neither/nor	16.4
Disagree a little	9.2
Disagree a lot	50.8
Mean	2.2
S.D.	1.4

The main verbatim responses:

- *Bungendore is nice as it is*
- *Can't stop progress/ accommodate people that want to move to this area*
- *Don't want a suburb. Remain as a little towns.*
- *Don't want to get too big.*
- *Enough development as is now.*
- *Keep the larger blocks so that it looks rural still.*
- *Leave urban area out of here.*
- *Not good the way it is / not sure.*
- *People moved out there to have large lots / removes public open space.*
- *Population will grow/ more commercial than now.*
- *Should be bigger.*
- *Some development crazy/ but don't want to lose village feel.*
- *Under right restrictions this could be done tastefully.*
- *Will change the character.*

## Table 4.16c:

**Q.16 [ASK ONLY IN THE BUNGENDORE AREA] Palerang Council is required to review its Local Environmental Plans and Development Control Plans. It will shortly be exhibiting a discussion paper for public comment which is likely to discuss four options for the future (residential) development of Bungendore. As I describe each of these possible options, I'd like you to indicate how much you agree or disagree with it. Firstly... [READ OUT FIRST/LAST, ROTATE]... Do you agree or disagree with that option? [Probe: Do you (dis)agree a lot or a little?**

## Table 4.21: Q.16-C Greenfield Development

**C. GREENFIELD DEVELOPMENT, IE, BY REZONING AND DEVELOPING LAND JUST OUTSIDE THE EXISTING VILLAGE BOUNDARIES FOR SUBURBAN BLOCK-SIZED RESIDENTIAL PURPOSES.**

	Bungendore %
Agree a lot	11.3
Agree a little	25.6
Neither/nor	9.2
Disagree a little	7.7
Disagree a lot	46.2
Mean	2.5
S.D.	1.5

## The main verbatim responses:

- *4 acres of land is great/ someone wants it, they should have it.*
- *Concerns on how it will change the nature of village.*
- *Don't want a city*
- *Don't want a suburb*
- *Don't want to get too big.*
- *Enough development as is now.*
- *Environment can't take it.*
- *If proper planning it would be beautiful.*
- *Makes patchy development/ not pleasing aesthetically or in regards to community life.*
- *More rate rises & more development to Captains Flat / need development here.*
- *Not good the way it is/ not sure*
- *Population will grow/ more commercial than now.*
- *Spoil rural atmosphere.*

Table 4.16d:

**Q.16 [ASK ONLY IN THE BUNGENDORE AREA] Palerang Council is required to review its Local Environmental Plans and Development Control Plans. It will shortly be exhibiting a discussion paper for public comment which is likely to discuss four options for the future (residential) development of Bungendore. As I describe each of these possible options, I'd like you to indicate how much you agree or disagree with it. Firstly... [READ OUT FIRST/LAST, ROTATE]... Do you agree or disagree with that option? [Probe: Do you (dis)agree a lot or a little?**

**D. RURAL RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, IE, BY REZONING LAND CLOSE TO THE EXISTING VILLAGE BOUNDARIES WITH LARGE BLOCK SIZES.**

	Bungendore %
Agree a lot	32.3
Agree a little	16.4
Neither/nor	14.4
Disagree a little	17.4
Disagree a lot	19.5
Mean	3.2
S.D.	1.5

The main verbatim responses:

- *4 acres of land is great/ if someone wants it they should have it.*
- *Ambience of village would remain*
- *Don't want a suburb*
- *Enough development as is now.*
- *Environment can't take it.*
- *It keeps rural & will have effect on facilities (water & sewage*
- *Keep the rural theme of the area.*
- *Large block sizes is why I like living here.*
- *Leave it alone/ can't service current development.*
- *Not another Murrumbatemen/ small village expanded out into large area of larger holdings ( 2-5 acres) surround village/ little control on development of these blocks like a crowded shanty town.*
- *Not good the way it is / not sure.*
- *Out of control growth/ water supply at risk.*
- *Should be bigger lot sizes.*
- *So that it still looks rural*
- *That's the structure of the town/ fits original plan.*
- *This is why most people moved here / people gave up convenience for lifestyle and space.*

Table 4.17a:

**Q.17 [ASK ONLY IN THE BUNGENDORE AREA]** I'm now going to read out four things that the Plans suggest for Bungendore to assist future development. As I read out each one, could you tell me whether you fell it is extremely important, very important, quite important or not important ... [READ OUT STATEMENTS, ROTATE]

**A. Establishing the viability of the water supply.**

	Bungendore %
Extremely important	27.7
Very important	62.1
Quite important	10.3
Not very important	0.0
Not important at all	0.0
Mean	4.2
S.D.	0.6

Table 4.17b:

**Q.17 [ASK ONLY IN THE BUNGENDORE AREA]** I'm now going to read out four things that the Plans suggest for Bungendore to assist future development. As I read out each one, could you tell me whether you fell it is extremely important, very important, quite important or not important ... [READ OUT STATEMENTS, ROTATE]

**B. Restricting development on floodplains.**

	Bungendore %
Extremely important	21.5
Very important	48.2
Quite important	26.2
Not very important	2.1
Not important at all	2.1
Mean	3.9
S.D.	0.9

Table 4.17c:

**Q.17 [ASK ONLY IN THE BUNGENDORE AREA]** I'm now going to read out four things that the Plans suggest for Bungendore to assist future development. As I read out each one, could you tell me whether you fell it is extremely important, very important, quite important or not important ... [READ OUT STATEMENTS, ROTATE]

**C. Bypassing traffic to the East of Bungendore.**

	Bungendore %
Extremely important	9.2
Very important	24.6
Quite important	43.1
Not very important	13.3
Not important at all	9.7
Mean	3.1
S.D.	1.1



Table 4.17d:

**Q.17 [ASK ONLY IN THE BUNGENDORE AREA] I'm now going to read out four things that the Plans suggest for Bungendore to assist future development. As I read out each one, could you tell me whether you fell it is extremely important, very important, quite important or not important ... [READ OUT STATEMENTS, ROTATE]**

**D. Upgrading of the sewerage treatment works**

	Bungendore %
Extremely important	14.4
Very important	55.4
Quite important	25.6
Not very important	2.1
Not important at all	2.6
Mean	3.8
S.D.	0.8

**Table 4.18:**

**Q.18 [ASK ONLY IN THE CAPTAINS FLAT AREA:] The Captains Flat rubbish tip has already been filled beyond a level acceptable to Council, and needs to be closed urgently. What possible alternative tip sites or garbage disposal methods can you suggest to replace the current tip when it closes?**

The main verbatim responses:

Cut down waste going to tip.

- *A better recycling & waste management system needs to be implemented.*
- *Better collection, normal, bigger bins, recycling & green bin to cut down on the waste in the tip.*
- *Better recycling facilities to cut down on waste.*
- *Contract someone to take the waste to another tip – and implement a recycling system.*
- *Green waste, recycling, hard rubbish removal.*
- *Implement a recycling system.*
- *Introduce recycling & use facilities in Queanbeyan*
- *Make a recycling centre to cut down on waste.*
- *Possibly recycling.*
- *Provide a 3 bin system like they have in Queanbeyan.*
- *Put bigger bins on the kerbside collection/ wheelie bins too small.*
- *Recycling facilities needed.*
- *Recycling for households if not tip will be thrown in bush.*
- *Refuge Transfer Stations – semi trailer size industrial bins that the town can dump into, then it's taken away to an alternate site.*
- *We'd like bigger rubbish bins.*

Find another site in area

- *Any other council land which could be developed as another tip.*
- *Another site found in the area, needs to be local.*
- *Find another place in Captain's Flat to have a new tip.*
- *Find another site nearby that rubbish could be taken to.*
- *Have our rubbish taken to another tip close by.*
- *Have transport to take garbage away to a close location at another community.*
- *If too far away the result is dumping along road*
- *Open another tip in the new area / one that is close by.*
- *Possibly travel to another tip close by in the area.*
- *Take the rubbish to another location nearby.*
- *Take waste to another tip nearby, surely that's obvious.*

Restrict tip to locals

- *Canberra dumps rubbish in it. Stop it. Should be for residents only.*
- *Only Captains Flat should be allowed to use the tip for waste.*
- *Police the tip on the weekends.*
- *Restrict it to residents*
- *Stop Canberra from coming into our tip.*

Disagree that its full/ make it bigger

- *Don't believe it is filled to capacity.*
- *Expand the size of the tip.*
- *Making a mountain out of a molehill – the tip has a longer life than we are being told.*

Find another site outside area

- *Some way to remove the rubbish for us – taken to an external location.*
- *Take it to Tarago not Canberra.*

Table 4.19:

**Q.19 [ASK ALL EXCEPT THOSE IN THE CAPTAINS FLAT AREA:]** The Council rubbish tips are nearly full so a solution needs to be found soon. What possible alternative tip sites or garbage disposal methods can you suggest to replace the current tips when they are full?

The main verbatim responses:

Cut down waste going to tip.

- *Assure everything has been done when current tip closes, eg, that recycling everything possible.*
- *Better management, more recycling.*
- *Better recycling facilities like they have in Canberra – have stations so that people can recycle.*
- *Better recycling to reduce landfill, need to sort rubbish at the tip.*
- *Bio reactors/ appropriate recycling.*
- *Burning of trash.*
- *Car bodies & hard rubbish taken elsewhere.*
- *Composting at home.*
- *Council needs to look more at a controlled recycling system, and more mulching of green waste.*
- *Degradation/ use of less waste such as plastic packaging / purification site/ bio mass.*
- *Develop a re-using facility/ give people access to materials at a reduced rate & not be part of the land fill.*
- *Don't mind paying if graded garbage disposal ie., recycling.*
- *Encourage recycling & compacting rubbish.*
- *Formal recycling service/ new site for garbage.*
- *Have a recycling facility in Bungendore for us to put glass paper & plastics in.*
- *Have bins put in at the tip and have the rubbish taken away to another location.*
- *Have recycling.*
- *Having trucks to take it away to another area to incinerate it.*
- *I'm sure there could be some improvement with new technology, they could look into.*
- *If we had rubbish & recycling collection it would preserve the tips better/*
- *Implement a garbage & recycling service in my area.*
- *Improve recycling, currently have limited facilities – Bio bins – biodegradable disposal of rubbish - alternative disposal technology.*
- *Improve recycling.*
- *Improved recycling facilities at the tip*
- *Increase recycling at tips, fine people for dumping what could be recycled – need to bring paper recycling back in.*
- *Increase recycling facilities.*
- *Introduce recycling systems to cut down on inappropriate waste.*
- *Kerbside recycling.*
- *Local recycling centre/ households should do compost recycling.*
- *Look into transfer refuse/ or organic ways of recycling.*
- *Make recycling easier/ general bins outside to separate waste.*
- *More economically & ecologically friendly sustainable recycling.*
- *More recycling facilities at the tip needed.*
- *More recycling facilities needed in the area.*
- *More recycling, re-using as well, other peoples old stuff.*
- *More recycling/ better management of tip.*
- *More stringent recycling.*
- *Need a transfer station / maybe the one at Tarago/ need a more educated recycling system.*
- *Need to do more recycling.*
- *Packaging needs to be reduced/ recycling/ industry needs to be involved as well instead of just the council.*
- *People who pay for a private contractor should have recycling option as well.*
- *Put a recycling plan in to cut down on unnecessary waste.*
- *Recycling & green-waste.*
- *Recycling at home*
- *Recycling at home & pick up.*
- *Recycling Centres.*
- *Recycling needs to be made available & people need to be informed about it.*
- *Recycling needs to occur.*
- *Recycling stations at the tip site should be put in.*
- *Recycling/ increase bin sizes.*
- *Recycling/ larger bins for recycling & trash.*
- *Redo proper management of tip site. More recycling.*
- *Reduce amounts put in by education/ pay fee for use of tip.*
- *Set out like it is in Canberra, recycling.*
- *Thought everything was going to be recycled so we wouldn't need a tip.*
- *We are not fully using the recycling facilities/ old council use to collect cardboard/ now I'm told to dump the cardboard.*

Find another site outside area

- *Alternative is Tarago tip.*
- *Approach State Government for use of Tarago tip.*

- Build more further out.
- Collection centre to send it somewhere else.
- Containers need to be taken to the old mine near Tarago, some of these containers should be in Braidwood.
- Dig another hole
- Do something with Woodlawn Mine at Tarago.
- Fill up rubbish pits/ Woodlawn Mine out at Captains Flat.
- Freight it to Tarago.
- Go to fill up Woodlawn
- Have it taken to another tip for us.
- Have the garbage taken away to another tip.
- Have the rubbish collected & taken to another site.
- Have to take it to Tarago
- Maybe an old quarry.
- Might have to take it somewhere else/ Tarago.
- Move tip further away from village/ recycling.
- Put further out of town.
- Put rubbish in compactable containers & ship to Tarago Mine.
- Send garbage to Tarago Mine.
- Send it to Woodlawn
- Send the garbage to Tarago if more land can't be purchased.
- Share Queanbeyan tip site.
- Tarago Bio reactor.
- Transfer station so residents can use and council to take rubbish to Tarago.
- Woodlawn, where Sydney puts their rubbish.

#### Find another site in area

- Council needs to look for further land which is of no use for grazing
- Find another location nearby for us to take our garbage to.
- Find other landfill areas that will last 15 – 20 years.
- Go to another nearby site.
- Have to relocate tip with in our shire boundaries.
- Introduce collection or another tip adjacent to the existing on, or combine with Bungendore tip.
- Look for poor land that could be filled without becoming bad for environment. Harness methane gas from tips.
- Make a new tip in light industrial area on the Kings Highway.
- Plenty of poor land around Bungendore which could be used for tip.
- Use wetlands.
- We need another one within 5 km of Braidwood.

#### Restrict tip to locals

- Charge people out side of town to dump/ move it away from settlement.
- Charges so people outside of Palerang won't use the tip.
- Depot manned somewhere where residents only have access
- Stop people who are not in the area from using tip.

#### Disagree that tips are nearly full

- Council tip in Braidwood is perfectly adequate, that's where I go.
- Dig a bigger hole.
- Extend the present tip/ make it bigger/ they have a bit of land.
- Need to find land elsewhere or extend the tip/ make it longer or wider.
- New land next to current tip.
- The block next door to it should be used.

#### Service people who are not currently serviced

- A monthly rubbish truck to cover all residents in the shire.

Table 4.20a:

**Q.20a [ASK ALL EXCEPT THOSE ON FARMS (from code 5 in QB):] Do you currently have a roadside household garbage collection service in your area?**

	All %	Location					
		Braidwood %	Bungendore %	Captains Flat %	Villages %	Rural Resid'l %	Farms %
Yes	44.6	89.4	97.9	95.0	9.6	7.6	
No	55.4	10.6	2.1	5.0	90.4	92.4	
Unsure	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	

Table 4.20b:

**Q.20b [IF 'NO' OR 'UNSURE' to Q. , ASK:] Would you use a roadside household garbage collection service if it was provided?**

	All %	Location					
		Braidwood %	Bungendore %	Captains Flat %	Villages %	Rural Resid'l %	Farms %
Yes	65.4	57.9	100.0	57.1	55.7	68.1	
No	30.3	42.1	0.0	42.9	44.3	26.5	
Unsure	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.4	

Table 4.20c:

**Q.20c [IF 'YES' to Q. , ASK:] How frequently should a roadside household garbage collection service be provided ... weekly or fortnightly?**

	All %	Location					
		Braidwood %	Bungendore %	Captains Flat %	Villages %	Rural Resid'l %	Farms %
Weekly	70.7	93.0	90.8	87.1	46.2	50.7	
Fortnightly	21.6	4.7	4.6	5.7	23.1	42.3	
Other*	5.3	2.3	4.6	5.0	15.4	5.6	
Unsure	2.4	0.0	0.0	2.1	15.4	1.4	

\* Mostly twice a week.

Table 4.21a:

**Q.21a [ASK ALL EXCEPT THOSE ON FARMS (code 5 in QB):] Do you currently have a roadside household recycling collection?**

	All %	Location					
		Braidwood %	Bungendore %	Captains Flat %	Villages %	Rural Resid'l %	Farms %
Yes	15.8	86.4	6.7	0.0	4.8	6.1	
No	83.2	13.6	91.3	100.0	95.2	92.9	
Unsure	1.0	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	1.0	

Table 4.21b:

**Q.21b [IF 'NO' OR 'UNSURE' to Q. , ASK:] Would you use a roadside household recycling collection service if it was provided?**

	All %	Location					
		Braidwood %	Bungendore %	Captains Flat %	Villages %	Rural Resid'l %	Farms %
Yes	81.3	76.5	100.0	95.0	66.3	74.4	
No	15.8	23.5	0.0	5.0	24.1	22.1	
Unsure	2.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.6	3.6	

Table 4.21c:

**Q.21c [IF 'YES' to Q. , ASK:] How frequently should a roadside household recycling collection service be provided ... weekly or fortnightly?**

	All %	Location					
		Braidwood %	Bungendore %	Captains Flat %	Villages %	Rural Resid'l %	Farms %
Weekly	37.0	74.4	33.0	48.0	33.9	27.0	
Fortnightly	48.0	25.6	55.5	33.7	32.2	54.7	
Other*	10.5	0.0	7.3	15.3	27.1	13.5	
Unsure	4.6	0.0	4.2	3.1	6.8	4.7	

\* Mostly monthly.

# Appendix: The Survey Questionnaire

A1958 — Palerang Council Community Survey – Final – 160405 – Les Winton 02 62326264  
0414504832

**Introduction:** Good morning/afternoon/evening, I'm ..... from Artcraft Research, an independent market research organisation, and we are conducting a study for Palerang Council to provide them with a basis for planning a program of community consultation. .... The survey will take around 10 to 15 minutes ..... AND We would appreciate your opinions firstly:

## **SCREENING QUESTION:**

**Q.A** About how long have you lived in this area?

Q.No.     [1-4]

		[5]
Less than 6 months	1	⇒ Thank and terminate
6 months to 11 months	2	⇒ Go on
1 to 2 years	3	⇒ Go on
3 to 5 years	4	⇒ Go on
6 to 10 years	5	⇒ Go on
11 to 20 years	6	⇒ Go on
Over 20 years	7	⇒ Go on

## **ASK ALL**

**Q.B** Now just to confirm, .....Do you live in the Town of Braidwood, Town of Bungendore or Town of Captains Flat or a villages ( code 1-4) or do you live on a rural residential property or Farm outside those towns or a village (Code 5 or 6)

		[6]
In Town of Braidwood	1	
In Town of Bungendore	2	
In Town of Captains Flat	3	
In a village (read villages at C below)	4	
On a rural residential property	5	
On a farm	6	

Those who don't live in Town Braidwood, Bungendore or Captain's Flat but live in a village (code4 above) ask

Do you live in one of the following villages?.....read out villages.

Those not in a village ASK Do you live in the area of Wamboin, Burra, Byong, Hoskinstown, Sutton Carwoola?

**Q.C** [PROBE FOR VILLAGE OR AREA]

		[7]
In the village of Araluen	1	
In village of Majors Creek	2	
In the village of Mongarlowe	3	
In the village of Nerriga	4	
In the area of Wamboin (ASK Is that part of Palerang)	5	
In the area of Burra	6	
In the area of Bywong	7	
In the area of Hoskinstown	8	
In the area of Sutton (ASK Is that part of Palerang)	9	
In the area of Carwoola	0	

**Q.1 [ASK ALL] What do you feel are all the GOOD things about living in this area? ... What do you most like about living here? [PROBE FULLY]**

Write answer in here, then attempt to code in list below:		
DO NOT READ OUT, ACCEPT MULTIPLES		
Good schools/educational opportunities	1	[8]
Close to Canberra	2	[9]
Close to Queanbeyan	3	[10]
Close to other places (eg, Sydney, coastal beaches, Melbourne)	4	[11]
Easy to move around/good roads/great networks of roads	5	[12]
Entertainment/arts/culture/movies	6	[13]
Fresh air/unpolluted atmosphere/healthy air	7	[14]
Good climate/four distinct seasons	8	[15]
Good shopping centre/opportunities	9	[16]
Wide open spaces/rural atmosphere/green/countryside	1	[17]
Less crime/low crime rate	2	[18]
Less traffic congestion/hardly any peak hour	3	[19]
Lower cost of living/cheaper than city living	4	[20]
Quiet/peaceful/not hectic	5	[21]
Safe for children	6	[22]
Sense on community/friendly people/community feeling	7	[23]
Tidy/neat/clean	8	[24]
Well planned/well laid out	9	[25]
Other (Specify)	1	[26]
No good things	2	[27]

**Q.2 [ASK ALL] And what if anything do you feel are the NOT SO GOOD things about living in this area? ... What needs to be improved about living here? [PROBE FULLY]**

Write answer in here, then attempt to code in list below:		
DO NOT READ OUT, ACCEPT MULTIPLES		
Extremes of seasons/summer too hot/winter too cold	1	[28]
High prices (eg, petrol, air fares, tip fees, bus fares, etc)	2	[29]
Growing too fast/too many new houses	3	[30]
Not growing fast enough/stagnating/dying	4	[31]
Lack of variety of shopping	5	[32]
Not enough to do/too quiet/boredom	6	[33]
Over-regulated/too many rules	7	[34]
People not friendly (anymore)/no community feeling	8	[35]
Public transport/none/not often enough/unreliable	9	[36]
Inadequate schools	1	[37]
Roads/poor upkeep/potholed	2	[38]
Too far from Sydney/Melbourne/beaches	3	[39]
Untidy/graffiti/rubbish everywhere	4	[40]
Dangerous drivers/road rage	5	[41]
Drugs/lack of policing	6	[42]
Garbage collection/none/infrequent/unreliable	7	[43]
Household recycling service/none/infrequent/unreliable	8	[44]
Other (Specify)	9	[45]
No not so good things	1	[46]



**Q.3 [ASK ALL] Overall, how satisfied are you with this town/village/area as a place to live?**

	[47]	
Completely satisfied	1	
Very satisfied	2	
Quite satisfied	3	
Not very satisfied	4	⇒ Probe
Not satisfied at all	5	⇒ Probe
Unsure	6	
<i>In what ways could the situation be improved? Write in any additional comments below:</i>		

**Q.4a [ASK ALL] In general, how satisfied are you with the following aspects of this town/village/area..... firstly (READ OUT FIRST ASPECT)..... Would you say you are completely satisfied (CS), very satisfied (VS), quite satisfied (QS), not very satisfied (NV) or not at all satisfied (NA) with that aspect?**

**Q.4b [FOR EACH NV/NA RESPONSE, ASK:] What needs to be done to improve the situation? Anything else?**

<i>Read out, rotate list:</i>		NA	NV	QS	VS	CS	
		↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	
1.	The ways in which your area is developing	1	2	3	4	5	[48]
<i>In what ways could the situation be improved?</i>		↓	↓				
2.	The 'look' (or appearance) of the place	1	2	3	4	5	[49]
<i>In what ways could the situation be improved?</i>		↓	↓				
3.	The nature and speed of housing development in the area	1	2	3	4	5	[50]
<i>In what ways could the situation be improved?</i>		↓	↓				
4.	The connecting roads through the area (main roads)	1	2	3	4	5	[51]
<i>In what ways could the situation be improved?</i>		↓	↓				
5.	The local roads in the area	1	2	3	4	5	[52]
<i>In what ways could the situation be improved?</i>		↓	↓				
6.	The garbage tip facilities in the area	1	2	3	4	5	[53]
<i>In what ways could the situation be improved?</i>		↓	↓				
7.	The sense of community (groups, networks) in the area (community groups/support networks)	1	2	3	4	5	[54]
<i>In what ways could the situation be improved?</i>		↓	↓				
8.	The range of services available to the community	1	2	3	4	5	[55]
<i>In what ways could the situation be improved?</i>		↓	↓				
<b>[ASK ONLY IN BRAIDWOOD, BUNGENDORE &amp; CAPTAINS FLAT:]</b>		1	2	3	4	5	[56]
9.	The household water supply in the area	1	2	3	4	5	[56]
<i>In what ways could the situation be improved?</i>		↓	↓				

- Q.5a [ASK ALL] Now thinking of the size of the population around here, over the next 20 years or so would you like to see it increase or stay at about the same level as now? [IF INCREASE, PROBE:] How much would you like to see the population increase by ... for example, over the next 20 years or so would you like to see it increase by half, or double, or triple, or would you like to see it grow even further than that over the next 20 years?**

	[57]	
More than triple in size	1	Ask Q5b
Triple in size	2	Ask Q5b
Double in size	3	Ask Q5b
Increase by half	4	Ask Q5b
Stay the same	5	Ask Q5b
Grow smaller/decrease in size	6	Ask Q5b
Unsure	7	Go to Q6

- Q.5b [ASK ALL EXCEPT UNSURE:] Why do you say that? [PROBE FULLY]**

Write in below:

- Q.6 [ASK ALL] And what about the future character of the area ... would you like to see the character of the area change, or remain about the same? IF CHANGE, PROBE: In what ways would you like the character of the area to change, for example what other kinds of development would you like to see happen?**

	[58]	
Change	1	⇒ Probe
Remain about the same	2	
<i>In what ways could the situation be improved? Write in any additional comments below:</i>		

- Q.7 I'm now going to read out a list of some of the many services provided by Palerang Council. As I read out each one, I'd like you to rate Council's performance on a scale where '10' means excellent, and '1' means terrible? .... Whether you have personal experience of them or not, I'd like you to rate them, based on your impressions and perceptions.**

	PERFORMANCE										
1. the maintenance of roads in towns and villages	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	[59]
<i>Why poor/what improvements are needed?</i>	←	┘	┘	┘							

2. the maintenance of connecting roads in their care	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	[60]
<i>Why poor/what improvements are needed?</i>	←	┘	┘	┘							

3. the management of residential development within the area in recent years	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	[61]
<i>Why poor/what improvements are needed?</i>	←	┘	┘	┘							

4. the household garbage collection in some areas	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	[62]
<i>Why poor/what improvements are needed?</i>	←	┘	┘	┘							

5. the knowledge and accuracy of council staff	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	[63]
<i>Why poor/what improvements are needed?</i>	←	┘	┘	┘							

6. the courtesy and helpfulness of council staff	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	[64]
<i>Why poor/what improvements are needed?</i>	←	┘	┘	┘							

- Q.8 [ASK ALL] Thinking of Palerang Council as a whole, that is, taking into account all the services they provide and facilities they run, not just the few I've mentioned, how would you rate the Council's performance overall .... Again, a score of 10 would be excellent performance and 1 would be terrible ... how would you rate the overall performance of Palerang Council as a whole?**

The overall performance of Palerang Council as a whole	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	[65]
Why poor/what improvements are needed?	←	↓	↓	↓	↓						

- Q.9 [ASK ALL] How well informed do you feel about the overall activities and initiatives of the Council? On a scale of 1 to 10 where a score of 10 would be totally well informed and 1 would be not informed at all?**

How well informed do you feel about the overall activities and initiatives of the Council?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	[66]
Why don't you feel informed? Key areas of concern.	↓	↓	↓	↓							

- Q.10 [ASK ALL] Palerang Council was created in February 2004 as a result of changes in boundaries of several old councils including Yarrawlumla and Tallaganda Councils. Its draft vision statement currently says: "Working with our community to provide the best in village and rural living". To what extent does this vision match with your vision for the area ... a lot, a little or not at all?**

	[67]
Matches my vision a lot	1
Matches my vision a little	2
Does not match my vision at all	3
Unsure	4

- Q.11 [ASK ALL] In what ways could this vision statement be improved?.....How would you write it?**

*Write in below:*

- Q.12 [ASK ALL] When the new Council was created, it inherited a million dollar revenue shortfall so it is currently operating with an unsustainable deficit. In order to overcome this, which would you prefer: an increase in your rates of around 25% (or one-quarter) to fully cover the shortfall without reducing any Council services or maintenance levels... or no rates increase but a reduction in Councils service and maintenance levels?**

	[68]
Increase rates by around 25% so that there is no reduction in Council services and maintenance levels	1
A smaller rate increase and a slight reduction in Council services and maintenance levels	2
No rate increase but a reduction in Council services and maintenance levels	3
A substantial increase in rates to also improve on current services and maintenance levels	4
Other (Specify)	5
Unsure/don't know	6

- Q.13 [ASK ALL] If any Council services or maintenance levels do need to be reduced to limit a rate rise, which services or maintenance would you accept some reduction in?**

*Write in below:*

- Q.14 [ASK ALL] If some rate increase is needed, what level of rate increase would you personally be likely to support to minimise any reduction in Council services and maintenance levels... a rise of around 10%, a rise of around 15%, 20%, 25%, 30%, 35% or more than 35%?**

	[69]
More than 35%	1
A rise of 35%	2
A rise of 30%	3
A rise of 25%	4
A rise of 20%	5
A rise of 15%	6
A rise of 10%	7
Would not support any rise	8
Unsure	9

- Q.15a [ASK ONLY IN THE BRAIDWOOD AREA:] A Draft Heritage Development Control Plan is being prepared for Braidwood and the surrounding area and will be exhibited for public comment prior to being revised and adopted by Palerang Council. The aim of the plan is to manage new development in Braidwood to help ensure that it does not harm the heritage (and/or historical) significance of the town and its setting. Have you heard that this Draft Plan is being prepared**

	[70]
Yes/thought it had been	1
No	2
Unsure	3

- Q.15b [ASK ONLY IN THE BRAIDWOOD AREA:] Briefly, what issues or concerns would you like to see raised in public discussion of this draft heritage development control plan? [PROBE FULLY FOR SENSE]**

Write answer in here, then attempt to code in list below:	
DO NOT READ OUT, ACCEPT MULTIPLES	
What extensions/renovations will be allowed with existing homes	1 [71]
How can we challenge/appeal against the plan	2 [72]
Who requires the plan to be produced and followed	3 [73]
Other	4 [74]
No good things	5 [75]

- Q.16 [ASK ONLY IN THE BUNGENDORE AREA] Palerang Council is required to review its Local Environmental Plans and Development Control Plans. It will shortly be exhibiting a discussion paper for public comment which is likely to discuss four options for the future (residential) development of Bungendore. As I describe each of these possible options, I'd like you to indicate how much you agree or disagree with it. Firstly... [READ OUT FIRST/LAST, ROTATE]... Do you agree or disagree with that option? [Probe: Do you (dis)agree a lot or a little?**

<i>Read out, rotate list:</i>	Disagree a lot ↓	Disagree a little ↓	Neither nor ↓	Agree a little ↓	Agree a lot ↓	
A <b>Do Nothing</b> , ie, no change to planning controls so that the village continues to develop pretty much as it has been in recent years.	1	2	3	4	5	[76]
<i>Briefly, why do you say that?</i>	↓	↓		↓	↓	
B <b>Infill Development</b> , ie, developing the significant areas of vacant land still available within the existing village boundaries, and encouraging the re-subdivision of existing large residential lots.	1	2	3	4	5	[77]
<i>Briefly, why do you say that?</i>	↓	↓		↓	↓	
C <b>Greenfield Development</b> , ie, by rezoning and developing land just outside the existing village boundaries for suburban block-sized residential purposes.	1	2	3	4	5	[78]
<i>Briefly, why do you say that?</i>	↓	↓		↓	↓	
D <b>Rural Residential Development</b> , ie, by rezoning land close to the existing village boundaries with large block sizes.	1	2	3	4	5	[79]
<i>Briefly, why do you say that?</i>	↓	↓		↓	↓	

- Q.17 [ASK ONLY IN THE BUNGENDORE AREA]** I'm now going to read out four things that the Plans suggest for Bungendore to assist future development. As I read out each one, could you tell me whether you felt it is extremely important, very important, quite important or not important ... [READ OUT STATEMENTS, ROTATE]

<i>Read out, rotate list:</i>	Not imp at all ↓	Not very important ↓	Quite important ↓	Very important ↓	Extremely important ↓	
A Establishing the viability of the water supply	1	2	3	4	5	[80]
B Restricting development on floodplains	1	2	3	4	5	[81]
C Bypassing traffic to the east of Bungendore	1	2	3	4	5	[82]
D Upgrading of the sewerage treatment works	1	2	3	4	5	[83]

- Q.18 [ASK ONLY IN THE CAPTAINS FLAT AREA:]** The Captains Flat rubbish tip has already been filled beyond a level acceptable to Council, and needs to be closed urgently. What possible alternative tip sites or garbage disposal methods can you suggest to replace the current tip when it closes?

*Write in below:*

- Q.19 [ASK ALL EXCEPT THOSE IN THE CAPTAINS FLAT AREA:]** The Council rubbish tips are nearly full so a solution needs to be found soon. What possible alternative tip sites or garbage disposal methods can you suggest to replace the current tips when they are full?

*Write in below:*

- Q.20a [ASK ALL EXCEPT THOSE ON FARMS (from code 5 in QB):]** Do you currently have a kerbside household garbage collection service in your area?

	[84]
Yes	1
No	2
Unsure	3

- Q.20b [IF 'NO' OR 'UNSURE' to Q. , ASK:]** Would you use a kerbside household garbage collection service if it was provided?

	[85]
Yes	1
No	2
Unsure	3

- Q.20c [IF 'YES' to Q. , ASK:]** How frequently should a kerbside household garbage collection service be provided ... weekly or fortnightly?

	[86]
Weekly	1
Fortnightly	2
Other (specify)	3
Unsure	4

- Q.21a [ASK ALL EXCEPT THOSE ON FARMS (code 5 in QB):]** Do you currently have a kerbside household recycling collection?

	[87]
Yes	1
No	2
Unsure	3

- Q.21b [IF 'NO' OR 'UNSURE' to Q. , ASK:]** Would you use a kerbside household recycling collection service if it was provided?

	[88]
Yes	1
No	2
Unsure	3

**Q.21c [IF 'YES' to Q. , ASK:] How frequently should a kerbside household recycling collection service be provided ... weekly or fortnightly?**

	[89]
Weekly	1
Fortnightly	2
Other (specify)	3
Unsure	4

**Q.22 [ASK ALL] Your age?**

	[90]
18 to 20 years	1
20 to 24 years	2
25 to 39 years	3
40 to 54 years	4
55 to 64 years	5
65+ years	6

**Q.23 [ASK ALL] Your gender?**

	[91]
Male	1
Female	2

**Q.24a [ASK ALL] Do you work full-time, part-time or are you not employed at the moment? (IF NOT EMPLOYED, PROBE) What do you do at the moment?**

	[92]
Employed full-time/own or run business	1
Employed part-time or casual	2
Unemployed (ie, and looking for work)	3
Student	4
Home duties/home manager	5
Retired/pensioner/self funded retiree	6
Carer	7
Disability	8

**Q.24b [IF EMPLOYED, ASK] What is your occupation? [PROBE FOR TYPE OF JOB AND LEVEL]**

Managers and administrators	1	[93]
Professionals	2	
Associate professionals	3	
Tradespersons and related workers	4	
Advanced clerical and service workers	5	
Intermediate clerical, sales and service workers	6	
Intermediate production and transport workers	7	
Labourers and related workers	8	
Other (do not use unless uncodable)	9	

**Q.24c [IF EMPLOYED, ASK] In which town or area do you work?**

From home	1	[94]
Travel, eg, salesperson, taxi driver, courier, tradesperson, etc	2	
Bungendore (area)	3	
Braidwood (area)	4	
Captains Flat (area)	5	
Local village (area)	6	
Queanbeyan	7	
Canberra	8	
Other (specify)	9	

**Q.25 [ASK ALL] How many people are there in your household?**

1	1	[95]
2	2	
3	3	
4	4	
5+	5	

**Q.26 [ASK ALL] What is the age of the youngest person or child in your household?**

Under 5	1	[96]
5-12	2	
13-18	3	
Over 18/adult	4	

**Q.27 [ASK ALL] What kind of dwelling do you live in – is it a ... (READ OUT LIST)?**

Detached house in town/village	1	[97]
Detached house on acreage/farm/rural residential	2	
Semi-detached house	3	
Townhouse or terrace	4	
Home unit or flat	5	
Other (specify)	6	

**Q.28 [ASK ALL] And do you own it or are your renting? (IF OWN, ASK) Do you own it outright or are you paying it off?**

Own/paying off (and live in it)	1	[98]
Own/paying off (and don't live in it – from absentee landlord sub-sample)	2	
Renting	3	
Other (specify)	4	

**Q.29 [ASK ALL] Finally, are there any other comments you'd like to make, or issues you'd like to raise?**

Write in:	
<b>Respondent's name:</b>	<b>Phone:</b>

**Thank you for your help !**

I certify that this interview was conducted according to the Code of Practice of the Australia Market and Social Research Society (AMRS), and has been checked for completeness.

<b>Interviewer's name:</b>	<b>Signature:</b>	<b>Date:</b>
----------------------------	-------------------	--------------

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

This document is copyright, Arctcraft Research © 2004. Reproduction in whole or part is prohibited without the written permission of Arctcraft Research. All questionnaires are confidential. Completed and blank questionnaires are to be returned to Arctcraft Research.