

SPENDING ALLOCATION MAP

It would be great idea to clearly show ratepayers how much is being spent where across Stonnington, particularly in relation to buildings and facilities.

REVISIT RATE INCREASE

Council has some of the lowest rates in Victoria, is it time to consider a rate increase?

COUNCIL BUILDINGS

Council-owned buildings could be thoroughly reviewed and rationalised so that they meet the community's needs and remain financially viable and/or profitable.

SPENDING TO MATCH PRIORITIES

The priorities indicated by the community do not appear to be reflected in the budget - e.g. digital transformation, sporting grounds, aquatic centres. Spending on legacy issues (e.g. Percy Treyvaud Park) is draining capital and causing newer priorities to be missed. There needs to be more transparency and explanation around how the community priorities were (or were not) reflected in the budget.



BUDGET

REVENUE SOURCES

Could Council reconsider rebalancing its revenue sources, asking the following questions. Is there too much reliance on non-rates income (fines, car parking)? Could any of these non-rates income sources be increased at this time? Could new bylaws or compliance measures be introduced into any other areas? Is it a concern that Council is doubling its borrowing in the current rate climate, how will this affect future generations of Stonnington?

SPENDING ON OPEN SPACE

The spend on open space seems small compared to how it rated in community priorities. There should be more emphasis on this, including the development of cycling and walking greenspace. Also noted was respondent disapproval of the Stonnington Golf Course.

INCREASED SPENDING NEEDED

Spending on roads, footpaths, cycleways and drains needs to increase to match community priorities and align with the Transport Strategy which recommends greater spending on this type of infrastructure.



FOCUS GROUP PARTICIPANTS SPENT TIME EXPLORING THE OUTPUTS FROM THE BUDGET SIMULATOR AND HOW THESE HAD BEEN REFLECTED IN THE DRAFT BUDGET. THE GROUPS THEN PROVIDED INSIGHTS ON HOW WELL COUNCIL HAD REFLECTED COMMUNITY PRIORITIES IN THE DRAFT BUDGET. THESE ARE SUMMARIES OF THOSE INSIGHTS CAPTURED.

Budget simulator responses require further breakdown and analysis in order to better understand respondent demographics and perspectives.

PROCESS



The engagement process has been positive, and it is great that council is trying to listen to the community. However, there should be more than one method of communication so that all groups have an equal opportunity to have their voices heard. The risk of digital-only communications is low representation from people in the 60+ age group, for example.



Discouraging people roaming around and burning carbon, maybe they could park elsewhere and move about by alternative means

Prahran Town Hall should be ditched UNTIL it is a high priority - and if not we walk away from it

Traffic calming on Chapel Street would be great, make it more usable

Colours of bin and confusion around this for people. Any advertising should take into consideration the user's perspective

Phoenix Park Community Centre is very well used

Prahran Square - money could have been spent on a streetscape and made an iconic street

OTHER

