

# RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE

## COUNCIL MEETING 19 FEBRUARY 2025



### Public Question Time

---

#### **Question from Trevor White:**

The JWS Community Satisfaction survey was undertaken across Council's in Victoria. The survey shows that the community expectation results have declined year by year over the last four years. The City of Port Phillip services results are below the average of the metropolitan areas in 21 out of the 22 services that were analysed. What date did the City of Port Phillip receive the report from JWS and what date did the Councillors receive the report? Why was the report released as a Christmas present at the end of December? Did anyone make representations to the CEO to delay the distribution of the report? Are the poor survey results a result of Council policy or service delivery and execution? Can the CEO's plan for the improvement of the service delivery be made public?

**Response:** *No representations to the CEO to delay the distribution of the report were received. Officers received the 2024 CSS results report on 6 June 2024. Councillors received a copy of the report on 29 August 2024. The results were then presented at the 4 September Councillor briefing, along with analysis and improvement actions from relevant Departments regarding the results. This was within the target date agreed with Councillors of by 30 September 2024 and was similar to the prior year briefing date.*

*The full report was published on Council's website on 26 November 2024. The delay was due to an operational oversight. After being alerted by a resident, the results on the website the same day. Process improvements have been implemented to ensure there is no delay in publishing the report this year, and in future.*

*There are a mix of factors influencing results such as service delivery, increased demand, resourcing challenges, policy decisions, and divergent councillor and community views on some contentious topics. However, service delivery is clearly an important factor to overall perceptions, and we are committed to improvement. In addition to improvement actions underway, as part of this year's survey (for which data collection has just commenced) we are seeking more detailed insights and benchmarking to better understand performance and better target improvement activities.*

*The Customer Satisfaction Survey Analysis and Action Plan was intended as an internal document. The Community Satisfaction Survey results are an important input, but not the only input, to service delivery improvement initiatives. We also use other sources including ongoing review of request and complaint data; staff, Councillor, and community feedback; and examination of better practices. Combined, this feeds into the review of the Council Plan and Budget each year; departmental priorities; how we prioritise internal customer experience, process, and system improvement resources; and where relevant procurement, contract management, and policy and strategy reviews.*

# RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE

## COUNCIL MEETING 19 FEBRUARY 2025



### Item 8.1 Presentation of CEO Report Issue 114 – Quarter 2, 2024-25

---

**Question from Councillor Halliday:** On page 44 of the CEO report, the percentage of recently purchased library collection there is a big uptake from 55% to 69%. Is that an anomaly, or did a big purchase occur?

**Response:** *This figure was reported incorrectly within the CEO and should have been reported as 55% rather than the 69%. This figure was corrected at the 19 March Council meeting, the updated CEO report issue 114 can be viewed here: [CEO Report – Issue 114 Quarter 2 2024-25 \(web final version\)](#)*

**Question from Councillor Makin:** Given this is a quarterly report and a number of these inputs feed into the community satisfaction survey results. Could we look into what linkages could be made to the CEO report and community satisfaction. By showing within the report that we are meeting these targets, we are potentially improving what that rating might be?

**Response:** *Thank you for the suggestion regarding stronger linkages between the CEO Report and Community Satisfaction Survey (CSS). The 2025 survey is in the field, and Councillors will be briefed within a month of us receiving the results. At that time, Council officers will discuss options to strengthen community understanding of the targets and Council's performance in the relevant service areas, which could include utilising the CEO Report.*

### Item 13.1 Mid-Year 2024-25 Financial Review

---

**Question from Councillor Jay:** In relation to the congestion levy, a 73% increase is massive in anything, I understand that the current charge for congestion is about \$1,100 per property. Can officers advise who is impacted by the levy noting that it is already quite expensive as it is.

**Response:** *A property owner of an off-street parking space located in a public or private carpark, within the Congestion Levy zone, may be liable to pay the levy unless exempted or a concession applies.*

*Where a car space is income generating, then it is likely to be liable for the Congestion Levy. Many exemptions apply, therefore individual property owners will need to contact the State Revenue Office to determine whether the Congestion Levy applies to them.*

*Some key exemptions (where a fee is not charged) include:*

- *A car parking space used exclusively by a resident to park their car while they are at home.*
- *Visitor parking*
- *Exempt organisations (councils, religious bodies, charities, hospitals, libraries).*

*SRO Website includes some information on exemptions: [Congestion levy exemptions and concessions | State Revenue Office](#)*

*Council is required to pay the levy for off street carparks where we charge parking fees. These carparks are located at Port Melbourne Yacht club, Acland Street (Irwell/Belford St carparks), Lower Esplanade (Palais Theatre), Shakespeare Grove and South Melbourne Market, covering approx. 867 places.*

# RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE

## COUNCIL MEETING 19 FEBRUARY 2025



*These carpark are located in the Category 2 levy areas which will see levies increase from \$1,240 to \$2,150 on 1 January 2026.*

*The Budget and Fees proposed for 2025/26 will seek to recover the additional cost to Council, through higher parking fees at those locations and from foreshore permit holders entitled to use those car parks. As the increased levies only apply for half the 2025/26 budget year, a further increase will be required in the 2026/27 budget year to fully offset the increased cost to Council.*

### Item 13.2 MAV State Council Submission

---

**Question from Councillor Thomann:** In relation to build to rent, the only one I know if is the one on the corner of Wellington Street and Brighton Road which is a 28 storey building with 300-400 apartments. Has there been a previous submission to the MAV on this topic?

**Response:** *The City of Port Phillip successfully moved a motion on built-to-rent at the May 2024 State Council which was Seconded by City of Glen Eira. The resolution is as follows:*

- **#53: Challenges with 'Build-to-Rent' (97% FOR / 3% AGAINST):**  
*Resolution: That the MAV seeks a review of existing Build to Rent regulations and provisions and assesses the ongoing challenges identified by local government around these developments for infrastructure and open space investment.*

*In addition, in 2024 the City of Port Phillip moved the following motions:*

- **#37: Supporting residents using in-home care (73% FOR / 27% AGAINST)**  
*Motion: That the MAV advocates to the Victorian State Government for support for Local Governments wanting to be the first point of contact for older people seeking access to in-home care and related services that best meet their needs.*
- **#54: Victorian Precinct Rejuvenation after COVID (75% FOR / 25% AGAINST)**  
*Resolution: That the MAV seeks the collaborative support of the State Government through the Minister for Precincts and the Minister for Tourism to rejuvenate precincts significantly hit from a lack of visitation extending from the COVID pandemic and to open grant opportunities for these precincts to revive their visitor economies.*
- **#55: Maximising the value of our Major Events economy (86% FOR / 14% AGAINST)**  
*Resolution: That the MAV requests the office of Minister for Tourism, Sport and Major Events consider a roundtable to hear from traders and local government on the challenges associated with holding these major events in their municipalities, and the opportunity for flow on impacts to be realised.*