

Item 12

Questions on Notice with Answers

1. NSW Government Kerbside Charging Grant Program – Round 1 Outcome

By Councillor Jarrett

In 2023, the NSW Government announced an investment of \$10 million, with \$3 million to a Kerbside Charging Grant program to support local governments and Charge Point Operators (CPOs) to install electric vehicle (EV) kerbside chargers across metropolitan NSW.

The grant process encouraged Charging Point Operators (CPOs) to apply, but only proposals with support from the relevant Council were eligible.

The City received and assessed several proposals and determined to support eight proposed pole-based chargers.

Question

1. How many proposals from Charging Point Operators did the City receive and assess?
2. Why were Councillors not given a breakdown of the assessment criteria, how the proposal did/did not meet the criteria and the outcome of each proposal?
3. Can Councillors be given the above-mentioned breakdown of each proposal?
4. According to the Daily Telegraph article 'Hundreds of new kerbside chargers coming. Here's where you will be able to power up your EV', the Inner West Council is receiving 136 new chargers, with Randwick and Waverley receiving 83 and 70 respectively. Given the City's position as the leading Council in Australia, why are we only proceeding with eight proposals when other, smaller Councils, are supporting hundreds of proposals?
5. Has the City considered the impacts only approving such a small number of new EV chargers will have on our sustainability targets?
6. If so, can Councillors receive this information?
7. If not, why not?

X086666

Answer by the Chief Executive Officer

1. There are 200+ existing public chargers including nine existing on-street locations in the City of Sydney local government area. The CEO Update of 19 April 2024 outlined this information.

The Council approved Electrification of Transport Strategy and Action Plan contains the following action:

Action 20: Work with private sector providers to trial paid on-street charging in residential areas with constrained private charging opportunities. This should be cost neutral to the City and avoid negative impacts on the public domain including footpaths and planting.

The City subsequently received five proposals from Charge Point Operators, and one late proposal.

2. The City conducted the consideration in the context of the recently adopted Electrification of Transport Strategy and Action Plan, which was designed to provide the framework for the City to take action. Action 20 was used as the basis of the City's assessment criteria, namely "trial paid on-street charging in residential areas with constrained private charging opportunities. This should be cost neutral to the City and avoid negative impacts on the public domain including footpaths and planting".

It is important to cater for the local demand for residents with constrained private charging opportunities, but not to induce additional vehicle movements into the Local Government Area and increasing parking demand.

Charging Point Operators were aware that, for any proposal that the NSW Government eventually supported, any proposed changes to kerbside controls would require subsequent resident consultation and proceed via the Local Pedestrian, Cycling and Local Traffic Calming Committee.

3. Proposals that the City considered and chose not to support generally related to proposals with:
 - public domain impacts;
 - the location;
 - the rationale for the type of charging proposed;
 - issues relating to technical feasibility;
 - off-street car parks, some of which the City does not own; and
 - the impact on other types of parking in the area.
4. The City supported proposals that were consistent with the Electrification of Transport Strategy and Action Plan. The NSW Government made the final decisions on which proposals it would approve and fund.

The eight new chargers/16 spaces proceeding from the grants, as part of the City's trial with Ausgrid and EVX, add to the 200+ existing public chargers in the City of Sydney. The CEO Update of 19 April 2024 outlined this information.

Subject to community consultation on the eight new on street charging sites, EVX charges will be located in the following streets:

Proposed eight new locations/chargers – pending community consultation

Across the road from 36 Napier Street, Paddington
In front of 228-320 Moore Park Road, Paddington
Across the road from 112A Burton Street, Darlinghurst
In front of 15 Boundary Street, Darlinghurst
In front of 9-11 Layton Street, Camperdown
Across the road from 166 Wyndam Street, Alexandria
In front of 726 Bourke Street Redfern
In front of 322 Bourke Street, Surry Hills

Existing nine locations in trial:

16 Kent Street, Millers Point
8 Brown Street, Newtown
2 Huntley Street, Alexandria
12 Trinity Avenue, Dawes Point
15 Carillion Avenue, Camperdown
27 Morley Avenue, Rosebery
55 Pymont Street, Pymont
3-19 Yurong Street, Darlinghurst
75 St Johns Road, Glebe

- There are 200+ existing public chargers in the City of Sydney local government area. The additional eight chargers/16 spaces under the grant specifically is consistent with the Electrification of Transport Strategy and Action Plan and target existing gaps in areas with constrained private charging opportunities. The trial of on-street charging facilities responds to one action in the City's Strategy and Action Plan, which has 21 actions. There are six specific actions that work together to address the issue of public charging opportunities that have limited impact on the public domain.

6. The City's approach is guided by the adopted Electrification Strategy and Action Plan.
7. Refer to response to part 6 above.

2. Harry Noble Reserve Update

By Councillor Jarrett

The City's website details that 'the City is preparing a detailed design for the upgrade of this park and playground. Works are expected to start in mid-2024 and take approximately 6 months to complete.'

Question

1. It is now mid-2024, has the City prepared the necessary design for the upgrade of the Harry Noble Reserve?
2. If not, why not?
3. If so, when is the City going to put the design and recommendation to Council?
4. What is the new expected timeframe for the starting time of the works?

X086666

Answer by the Chief Executive Officer

1. The Detailed Design for Harry Noble Reserve is currently progressing to 95 per cent documentation. The design and implementation is complicated by a Sydney Water drainage culvert underneath part of the park and negotiations with Housing NSW who own part of the park.
2. Refer to response to 1 above.
3. The City is in ongoing co-ordination with Sydney Water for approval to build over a drainage culvert located beneath the park. Once this approval has been completed, a new licence agreement will then be finalised with Housing NSW.
4. The ongoing coordination with Sydney Water will add approximately three to six months to the delivery program with current forecast for tender in early 2025.

3. Asbestos in the City of Sydney

By Councillor Scott

Question

1. According to the City's website (14 June 2024) the following parks still have asbestos clean-up underway: Belmore Park (west side), Blackwattle Bay Park, Cook + Phillip Park, Harold Park, Observatory Hill Park, Wentworth Park, and Victoria Park. What is the estimated time frame for the complete removal of asbestos in each of these parks?
2. According to the City's website (14 June 2024) the following parks have asbestos removal plan finalised or in development: Giba Park, John Street Reserve, Minogue Reserve, Munn Reserve and Stewart Street Reserve. What is the estimated time frame for the complete removal of asbestos in each of these parks?
3. How much contract work time has it taken for contractors to clear asbestos in affected parks since February 2024? What is the number of contractors that have been assigned to help with the removal of asbestos since February 2024? Broken down by month, what is the total cost of the City funded asbestos removal?
4. Will the Council provide more frequent asbestos testing considering the scale of the recent asbestos crisis?
5. What is the current provision we have made for the removal process of asbestos found in City of Sydney parks and garden beds?
6. What financial year/s has this provision been made in the City's budget?
7. As of 18 June 2024, how much money has the City spent in the remediation process of asbestos removal in parks?
8. As of 18 June 2024, how much money has the City spent in the remediation process of asbestos removal in garden beds?
9. As of 18 June 2024, what has been the most expensive park for asbestos removal? How much was spent on this park?
10. What is the total provision for the cost of asbestos clean up, from recycled mulch? Over how many years?
11. What is the date that all asbestos laid by City contractors in our parks and garden beds will be removed in the City?
12. What is the City of Sydney's current risk from the extended exposure period, considering the first confirmed exposure was on 12 February 2024?
13. What is the public risk from the extended exposure period, considering the first confirmed exposure was on 12 February 2024?
14. Has the City considered these risks, and how have they been mitigated? Has the City sought external and independent advice on these risks, and how to mitigate them? If so, who, when and at what cost?
15. How will the City continue to consider and mitigate these risks post asbestos clean up?

16. Are there any penalties for the Council that has been imposed, or threatened to be imposed, by regulators?
17. We understand the City has established the Asbestos Incident Management Team. How many members of staff are in this team? What is the cost of the staff time dedicated to this?
18. Has the City been offered any assistance by any Government or other organisations to assist in the clean up of the asbestos found in the City of Sydney parks and garden beds? If yes, have these offers been accepted? If no, why have these offers been declined?
19. Does the City have an asbestos exposure register? If no, why not?
20. If the City does not have an asbestos exposure register, will it create one for members of the community who have been exposed to asbestos for a long period of time?

X086668

Answer by the Chief Executive Officer

1. The City is continuing to work with its contractor to ensure parks are cleaned and reopened as quickly as possible. Clean up is dependent on approvals outside of our control and is weather dependent. Stages within parks are being progressively reopened to the public once mulch has been cleared and clearance is received.
2. Clean up of all parks is occurring as quickly as possible, dependent on approvals outside of our control and is weather dependent. Clean up has been significantly impacted by heavy rain during this period.
3. To expedite remediation seven different licensed asbestos removalist companies have been engaged by the contractor to work concurrently so that remediation of multiple parks can occur and areas be returned to the community as quickly as possible. Companies are using multiple teams with a total of approximately 150 people currently working across all sites each day. The City has not funded contaminated mulch removal.
4. No further testing is proposed. Working with the NSW Environmental Protection Authority (EPA), locations with contaminated mulch have been identified through supply chain investigations and testing. Clean up and clearance is underway. There is no known contamination of mulch beyond the identified sites with negligible ongoing risk. The City will continue to manage sites in line with its Incident Management Process for Asbestos and Other Hazardous Materials.
5. Nil.
6. Not applicable.
7. The City's parks and open space maintenance contractor is currently meeting remediation costs in accordance with the contract. The EPA is continuing to investigate the source of the contaminated mulch and the allocation of costs of mitigation and remediation is likely to be impacted by the outcome of that investigation. There may be additional financial implications in relation to remediation costs, insurance and other matters. Councillors will be updated as part of the quarterly review or in other budget updates.

8. Refer to response to part 7 above.
9. Refer to response to part 7 above. Costs are a matter for the contractor.
10. Refer to response to part 7 above.
11. Refer to response to part 2 above.
12. The City's current risk exposure to claims arising from asbestos contaminated mulch is considered to be negligible in line with NSW Health advice on the public health risk arising from the contaminated mulch. This risk is not expected to change during the clean up period.
13. The risk is considered to be negligible. The City is guided by the advice of NSW Health in making this assessment and advice from the licensed asbestos assessor. On sites yet to be cleaned, where bonded asbestos has been found, controls such as barriers and signage have been installed to restrict access. All removal of contaminated mulch is in line with work health and safety regulations, SafeWork NSW guidelines and NSW Environment Protection Authority (EPA) guidance.
14. The City has taken an informed risk based approach to the management of asbestos related mulch in the public domain based on NSW Health and EPA advice. The City has also relied on advice and risk assessments from licensed asbestos assessors. Risk assessments were covered through internal staff costs and costs for the licensed asbestos assessor to undertake testing and reporting. Total costs for testing and reporting by the licensed asbestos assessor were approximately \$320,000 excluding GST.
15. The clean-up addresses the known public health risks of the contaminated mulch. Following clearance there should be negligible risk to the community. The City will continue to manage sites in line with its Incident Management Process for Asbestos and Other Hazardous Materials. The following additional controls have also been implemented to reduce risks from a contamination incident of this nature recurring:
 - virgin mulch materials are currently being used (non-recycled product);
 - compliance certificates for mulch submitted quarterly for all major supply and service contracts;
 - contractual obligations in relation to mulch supply and compliance with legislative requirements (POEA, mulch orders, mulch exemptions) and standards is being discussed in contract meetings;
 - contractor and City standard operating procedures for installing mulch is being reviewed and updated; and
 - pre-start check to be undertaken by operational staff including a visual inspection for foreign material/unexpected finds on site.
16. No.

17. The Asbestos Incident Management Team (IMT) has 13 members and is chaired by the Director City Services and consists of representatives from City Greening and Leisure, Security and Emergency Management, Media and Communications, Work, Health and Safety, Risk and Governance, Infrastructure Delivery, Legal, Customer Service and City Life. The full IMT last met in March 2024 with a small team continuing beyond this to manage operations associated with the clean up. Costs have been met from within existing resources.
18. The EPA had offered assistance in February 2024 with testing at five of our parks. However, as they could not start this testing straight away and could not confirm a time frame for completing the testing, the City commenced our own testing so that we could start this process immediately. There has been no further assistance offered from Government or other agencies to physically assist with the clean up.

Since the contamination was found, the City has been in constant contact with the EPA via multiple emails and phone calls across the various management levels of the organisation, including the Chief Executive Officer, senior staff, and our media team. The City has continuously sought and welcomed technical advice from the EPA and Local Government NSW (LGNSW). We have worked closely and collaboratively with the EPA, LGNSW, as well as SafeWork NSW and NSW Public Works. The City of Sydney has not declined any assistance from government or other agencies.

19. No. For the reasons outlined in the confidential legal advice to Councillors dated 1 March 2024.
20. Refer to response to part 19 above.

4. Snap Send Solve Reporting Process

By Councillor Scott

Question

The City of Sydney currently use the Snap Send Solve app, for residents to report issues to Council.

1. How are issues classified as complete when an issue is reported in Snap Send Solve? How is this audited?
2. What are the three main issues reported by City of Sydney residents through the Snap Send Solve app?
3. Broken down by month, what is the average time of resolution? What is the longest outstanding issue?
4. Broken down by month, how many reports have been made for city of Sydney issues via 'Snap Send Solve' over the past 12 months?
5. Broken down by month, of these reports, how many have been completed and incomplete?
6. Broken down by month, how many reports have been made in the past 12 months regarding missed waste collection?

7. Broken down by month, of these reports, how many have been solved?
8. Broken down by month, of these reports, how many have been left unattended?
9. Please detail the process of prioritisation for issues reported in Snap Send Solve?
10. What is the cost for the City of Sydney using Snap Send Solve as a reporting mechanism?
11. Can all forms of rubbish dumping be selected in the Snap Send Solve reporting mechanism? If no, why not?
12. Can all bins (red, yellow and green) be selected as a 'missed collection service' in Snap Send Solve? If no, why not?

X086668

Answer by the Chief Executive Officer

The City of Sydney receives emails from residents who use Snap Send Solve to send service requests. The City of Sydney does not have a commercial license for Snap Send Solve, as the City has developed its own online platform that integrates with our core enterprise systems.

Our new CityConnect platform launched in April 2024, provides more local information to better assist community members at the time of reporting, manages the issue of duplicate reports, provides progress notifications, and provides our maintenance teams with the information to resolve the request without the need to re-enter the information into other databases.

As the City does not hold a commercial license for Snap Send Solve, we are unable to provide much of the information requested. The City records, monitors and acts on information for total service requests regardless of how they are lodged, including Snap Send Solve requests.

The table below shows the number of reports made via Snap Send Solve for the last seven months:

Month	Snap Send Solve Total requests
Nov-23	1,311
Dec-23	1,261
Jan-24	1,690
Feb-24	1,743
Mar-24	1,604
Apr-24	1,723
May-24	1,673

Reported issues regardless of source or contact channel are work flowed through One CRM. We do not prioritise Snap Send Solve over other channels.

There is no cost for the City of Sydney using Snap Send Solve as the City does hold a commercial license.

Snap Send Solve is an independent platform and has a Dumped Rubbish category where people can add a description of the dumped items.

Snap Send Solve is an independent platform and has a Rubbish and Bins category where people can add a description of the issue.

5. Soft Plastic Recycling in the City of Sydney

By Councillor Scott

Question

Following the collapse of Australia's largest soft plastic recycling program in 2022, City of Sydney residents do not have opportunity to recycle soft plastics. The City's website currently outlines soft plastics such as a plastic bags, bread bags, wrappers, chip packets or bubble wrap must go in the red bin.

In early 2024, five Melbourne supermarkets across 12 suburbs returned to recycling soft plastics through a trial with one yellow bin placed outside of their storefront (<https://wastemanagementreview.com.au/soft-plastics-recycling-trial-starts-in-12-melbourne-suburbs/>).

In light of this:

1. What does the process for recycling soft plastics look like in the City of Sydney?
2. Are there any cost-free ways for residents to recycle their soft plastics? If yes, please outline the cost-free ways.
3. Does the City have any plans to bring back soft plastic recycling? If yes, what are these plans and their corresponding timeframes?
4. What is the process of setting up a soft-plastics recycling zone in the City?

X086668

Answer by the Chief Executive Officer

1. The City of Sydney does not currently provide a soft plastics recycling service to residents. We tested the market to find a suitable processor to recycle soft plastics for City of Sydney residents and this included a site visit to a soft plastics recycling facility in Melbourne. Unfortunately, we found there was no processing solution to meet our requirements. The technology to process our soft plastics needs to be reliable, robust and have long-term viability. It must be capable of recycling large volumes of soft plastics into useful products.

Our ongoing investigations have confirmed that the industry is still in the trial phase of testing soft plastics processing technology and the market is not yet ready to process the volumes of soft plastics waste that we would generate through a collection service.

We are across the supermarket trial in Melbourne and have met with the Soft Plastics Taskforce. The article in the Waste Management Review validates our current approach, explaining that a lack of specialised soft plastic recycling capacity was the catalyst to the collapse of REDcycle. The recent opening of the two new facilities in Melbourne has enabled the small-scale trial, which is only collecting soft plastics from a select few Melbourne supermarkets. The spokesperson for the Soft Plastics Taskforce emphasised the importance of shoppers only dropping off small volumes of soft plastics to avoid overwhelming the new recyclers. The City of Sydney will keep a close eye on the progress of the trial in Melbourne.

2. Unfortunately, there is currently no cost-free way available to our residents that results in their soft plastics being recycled.
3. Yes. We will continue to monitor industry developments, liaise with the key stakeholders and re-test the soft plastics market as new information, technology or service providers become available. Unfortunately, there are currently no timeframes on this.
4. When we have a suitable soft plastics recycling solution in place, we will again accept soft plastics recycling at our Recycle It Saturday events, Doorstep Recycling Service and at the Ultimo Recycling Pop-up.

6. City of Sydney Aquatic Centre Funding

By Councillor Scott

Question

1. What are the current entry prices for a City of Sydney resident at City owned aquatic centres?
2. Has this cost increased over the last five years?
3. If yes, by how much? Please provide a breakdown year by year of the increases, if any.
4. Have the City increased fees for senior citizens entering City owned aquatic centres over the past five years?
5. If yes, by how much?
6. Is there a difference in cost for ratepayers and non-ratepayers of the City of Sydney?

X086668

Answer by the Chief Executive Officer

Over the past five years, entry prices at City-owned aquatic centres have been adjusted annually based on the Consumer Price Index (CPI). Our centres provide excellent programs and services in industry leading venues, offering great value benchmarked to the broader industry. We offer a general concession rate of 25 per cent for pensioners, children and students. Since 2006, Commonwealth benefit recipients have been eligible for reduced rates of \$2.00 for casual swim entry and \$5.50 for casual gym entry, with eligibility extended to non-residents in 2022/23. Starting from 1 July, holders of a Senior Card (excluding the Senior Saver Card) will be eligible for concessions for both casual entry and any category with an approved concession fee or charge. There is no price difference between ratepayers and non-ratepayers to access our centres. The table below provides current fees and charges and the previous four years.

Year	Category	Andrew (Boy) Charlton	Cook + Phillip Park Pool	Gunyama Park Aquatic & Rec Centre	Ian Thorpe Aquatic Centre	Prince Alfred Park Pool	Victoria Park Pool
2019/20	Adult (swim)	\$6.70	\$7.80	\$0.00	\$7.80	\$6.70	\$6.70
	Concession (Swim)	\$5.10	\$5.80	\$0.00	\$5.80	\$5.10	\$5.10
	Access Card (Swim)	\$2.00	\$2.00	\$0.00	\$2.00	\$2.00	\$2.00
	Family (swim)	\$19.10	\$20.70	\$0.00	\$20.70	\$19.10	\$19.10
	Adult (gym)	\$19.20	\$21.60	\$0.00	\$21.60	\$19.20	\$19.20
	Concession (Gym)	\$14.40	\$16.20	\$0.00	\$16.20	\$14.40	\$14.40
	Access Card (Gym)	\$5.50	\$5.50	\$0.00	\$5.50	\$5.50	\$5.50
2020/21	Adult (swim)	\$6.90	\$8.00	\$8.00	\$8.00	\$6.90	\$6.90
	Concession (Swim)	\$5.20	\$5.90	\$5.90	\$5.90	\$5.20	\$5.20
	Access Card (Swim)	\$2.00	\$2.00	\$2.00	\$2.00	\$2.00	\$2.00
	Family (swim)	\$19.50	\$21.10	\$21.10	\$21.10	\$19.50	\$19.50
	Adult (gym)	\$19.60	\$22.00	\$22.00	\$22.00	\$19.60	\$19.60
	Concession (Gym)	\$14.70	\$16.50	\$16.50	\$16.50	\$14.70	\$14.70
	Access Card (Gym)	\$5.50	\$5.50	\$5.50	\$5.50	\$5.50	\$5.50
2021/22	Adult (Swim)	\$7.00	\$8.15	\$8.15	\$8.15	\$7.00	\$7.00
	Concession (Swim)	\$5.00	\$6.00	\$6.00	\$6.00	\$5.00	\$5.00
	Access Card (Swim)	\$2.00	\$2.00	\$2.00	\$2.00	\$2.00	\$2.00
	Family (Swim)	\$20.00	\$21.50	\$21.50	\$21.50	\$20.00	\$20.00
	Adult (Gym)	\$20.00	\$22.50	\$22.50	\$22.50	\$20.00	\$20.00
	Concession (Gym)	\$15.00	\$17.00	\$17.00	\$17.00	\$15.00	\$15.00
	Access Card (Gym)	\$5.50	\$5.50	\$5.50	\$5.50	\$5.50	\$5.50
2022/23	Adult (Swim)	\$7.20	\$8.30	\$8.30	\$8.30	\$7.20	\$7.20
	Concession (Swim)	\$5.20	\$6.20	\$6.20	\$6.20	\$5.20	\$5.20
	Access Card (Swim)	\$2.00	\$2.00	\$2.00	\$2.00	\$2.00	\$2.00
	Family (Swim)	\$20.50	\$22.00	\$22.00	\$22.00	\$20.50	\$20.50
	Adult (Gym)	\$20.50	\$23.00	\$23.00	\$23.00	\$20.50	\$20.50

Year	Category	Andrew (Boy) Charlton	Cook + Phillip Park Pool	Gunyama Park Aquatic & Rec Centre	Ian Thorpe Aquatic Centre	Prince Alfred Park Pool	Victoria Park Pool
	Concession (Gym)	\$15.30	\$17.50	\$17.50	\$17.50	\$15.30	\$15.30
	Access Card (Gym)	\$5.50	\$5.50	\$5.50	\$5.50	\$5.50	\$5.50
2023/24	Adult (Swim)	\$7.50	\$8.50	\$8.50	\$8.50	\$7.50	\$7.50
	Concession (Swim)	\$5.40	\$6.40	\$6.40	\$6.40	\$5.40	\$5.40
	Access Card (Swim)	\$2.00	\$2.00	\$2.00	\$2.00	\$2.00	\$2.00
	Family (Swim)	\$21.30	\$22.50	\$22.50	\$22.50	\$21.30	\$21.30
	Adult (Gym)	\$21.00	\$24.00	\$24.00	\$24.00	\$21.00	\$21.00
	Concession (Gym)	\$15.70	\$18.00	\$18.00	\$18.00	\$15.70	\$15.70
	Access Card (Gym)	\$5.50	\$5.50	\$5.50	\$5.50	\$5.50	\$5.50

*Concession includes child/ student/ health care card holders

7. FOGO Food Recycling in the City of Sydney

By Councillor Scott

Question

1. How many residents currently have FOGO?
2. What is the current cost of the City's FOGO service?
3. What is the cost for the City of Sydney to have FOGO across all residential properties?
4. What is the estimated timeframe for which the food scraps recycling service will be available for all City of Sydney residents?
5. What are the restricted areas for the food scraps recycling service within the City of Sydney?
6. What are the main restrictions to ensuring the FOGO roll out is the same as the Inner West?

X086668

Answer by the Chief Executive Officer

1. About 22,000 households (16 per cent) across the City have access to the food scraps recycling service. Note that none of our residents have a FOGO service, i.e. a combined Food Organics and Garden Organics bin.
2. The estimated cost of the current food scraps recycling project for the 2023/24 financial year is \$268,220. This includes processing fees, education and communication costs, equipment, grants income (where applicable) and project administration costs). It does not include in-house collection costs, salaries or plant and asset costs.

3. The City is continuing to work on the business case for the implementation of a FO or FOGO service. Costs will be dependent on the service type, processing method and collection arrangements.
4. The service will be available to all residents before the NSW Government mandated deadline of 1 July 2030. It is proposed that the full rollout of the service will be phased over a two-year period. The City is working towards providing the service when there is adequate food organics waste processing capacity to handle the volume generated in the City of Sydney. It is noted that there are a number of challenges (outside the control of the City) including a limited number of suppliers, a lack of processing infrastructure and a shortage of readily accessible waste collection and transfer sites. The NSW Environmental Protection Authority is continuing to develop the NSW Waste Infrastructure Plan to address infrastructure needs across the state.
5. There are no restricted areas for the food scraps recycling service. We intend to make the service available to all residential properties.
6. The City's rollout of a FO or FOGO service will be designed to suit the specific needs of our residents. We aim to learn from the experience of the Inner West Council and consider additional factors that are unique to the City of Sydney, including:
 - Most residential properties in the City do not have a green garden organics bin. Most Inner West properties already had a green bin prior to the FOGO rollout.
 - Around 80 per cent of City residents live in apartment buildings and do not generate much, if any, garden waste.
 - A large proportion of houses in the City are bald-faced terraces and/or semi-detached properties with little or no storage space at the front or back of the property for an additional 120 litre FOGO bin.
 - The City only collects 1,800 tonnes of garden organics waste per year through its optional garden organics service. This suggests that most City households do not want, or need, a garden organics bin.
 - On average, around 40 per cent of the residential red bin contains food waste. A dedicated food organics (FO) bin would suit most City households that generate significant amounts of food waste, though very little garden waste.

The City is working towards providing the service when there is adequate food organics waste processing capacity to handle the volume generated in the City of Sydney. It is noted that there are a number of challenges (outside the control of the City) including a limited number of suppliers, a lack of processing infrastructure and a shortage of readily accessible waste collection and transfer sites. The NSW Environmental Protection Authority is continuing to develop the NSW Waste Infrastructure Plan to address infrastructure needs across the state.

8. City of Sydney Plaque Removal

By Councillor Scott

Question

1. What is the City's annual expenditure or budget for the removal of plaques, broken down by financial year since 2004?
2. Has this cost increased over the last five years?
3. If yes, by how much? Please provide a breakdown year by year of the increases, if any.
4. What is the process of selection for the removal of a plaque. Please detail the selection and removal process.
5. Please list, broken down by year, since 2004 how many City plaques have been removed. Please detail why each was removed, the original wording of the plaque, the location and cost.
6. Has there been an increase in removal over the last five years?
7. If yes, by how much? Please provide a breakdown year by year of the increases, if any.
8. Has the City ever removed an existing plaque for the installation of another?
9. If yes, please detail each instance, outlining why it was replaced, the old and new wording, location, and the cost of re-installation for each instance.

X086668

Answer by the Chief Executive Officer

There is no budget allocated for removal / replacement of plaques and generally speaking we do not remove plaques.

Very infrequently a plaque is damaged beyond repair or stolen and where appropriate these plaques are replaced funded from the general plaques budget. Replacement plaques are copies and the wording is not changed.

A recent example of a damaged plaque that was replaced is the Mum Shirl plaque on Redfern Street, where the City responded to community requests to replace it.

Very infrequently the replacement of a plaque is included in the public art conservation program if the original plaque was damaged or missing. These are typically replaced with a City Art plaque in the new template, and typically funded by the conservation project budget. The wording is the same or, in consultation with the artists if possible, an edited version of the same text is developed to comply with the new template.

A recent example of a missing plaque that was replaced is the plaque for the Wimbo Paddock mural that was reframed as part of the Wimbo Park upgrade. The missing plaque is being replaced by a City Art plaque in the new template.