

MARRICKVILLE council

**SUPPLEMENTARY
BUSINESS PAPER**

1

for

**COUNCIL
MEETING**

**6.30 PM, TUESDAY,
21 APRIL, 2009**

Distributed 21 April, 2009

SUPPLEMENTARY PRECIS

The following reports appear as late items with Mayoral approval.

GENERAL MANAGER'S REPORT

GM 20	DRAFT ANNUAL MANAGEMENT PLAN AND BUDGET 2009-2013 – SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION ON WASTE SERVICES TO NON-RATEABLE PROPERTIES	1
--------------	---	----------

File Ref: 951-01

This information was omitted from GM 20 Draft Annual Management Plan and Budget and should be considered as part of that report. It should be read as part of the section “**Other Key Budget Assumptions : Domestic Waste Management Charge for 2009/10**” on page 44 of the Business Paper. It is provided further to Council’s resolution of April 2008 meeting to continue to provide waste services to not-for-profit groups and for a further report to be submitted to Council for consideration as part of the 2009/2010 Budget. Council currently funds waste services at no cost to not-for-profit groups including church/religious organisations/benevolent/charity groups and school/educational organisations from the Domestic Waste Management Reserve fund. This is contrary to Section 496 of the Local Government Act 1993 and the supplementary information makes it clear that the Draft 2009/10 Budget proposes a phasing in of charges to such groups commencing with a 50% charge in 2009/2010.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

QS 4	SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION – PETERSHAM CAR PARK	3
-------------	---	----------

Council Meeting - 21 April, 2009

**GM 20 - DRAFT ANNUAL MANAGEMENT PLAN AND BUDGET 2009-2013 -
SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION ON WASTE SERVICES TO
NON-RATEABLE PROPERTIES
For Decision**

File Ref: 951-01

General Manager reports:

Synopsis

This information was omitted from GM 20 Draft Annual Management Plan and Budget and should be considered as part of that report. It should be read as part of the section “**Other Key Budget Assumptions : Domestic Waste Management Charge for 2009/10**” on page 44 of the Business Paper. It is provided further to Council’s resolution of April 2008 meeting to continue to provide waste services to not-for-profit groups and for a further report to be submitted to Council for consideration as part of the 2009/2010 Budget. Council currently funds waste services at no cost to not-for-profit groups including church/religious organisations/benevolent/charity groups and school/educational organisations from the Domestic Waste Management Reserve fund. This is contrary to Section 496 of the Local Government Act 1993 and the supplementary information makes it clear that the Draft 2009/10 Budget proposes a phasing in of charges to such groups commencing with a 50% charge in 2009/2010.

Domestic Waste Management Charge for 2009/10 (Contd)

As previously reported to Council, waste services to not-for-profit groups including church/religious organisations/benevolent/charity groups and school/educational organisations cannot be funded from the Domestic Waste Management Reserve. Section 496 of the Local Government Act 1993 precludes the use of the Domestic Waste Management Reserve for providing waste services to the non-residential component of these types of premises.

Council has provided waste services to these organisations at no cost for many years. Whilst this is in keeping with social equity principles, it is contrary to the provisions of Section 496 of the Local Government Act.

Since Council currently provides these “non residential” services to not-for-profit groups as part of Council’s DWM Service, there is a financial impact on other ratepayers through their DWM Charge. Council has been funding all of the services from the domestic waste management charge. A number of the current services are very significantly larger than normal domestic waste services.

Council can provide domestic waste services to the residential component of non-rateable properties, such as manses, etc, and fund it from the Domestic Waste Management Service but only if a charge is made for the service. Hence Council does need to levy a DWM charge against the residential components of these non-rateable properties. The amount of the charge as shown in the following table, assuming the DWM Charge increases to \$349.50 in 2009/2010 as recommended, is \$22,717.50 if the full charge is applied. The budget proposes that Council provides a 50% subsidy for 2009/10 to support these organisations during the transition phase, with the full charge to be implemented in 2010/11. It is also proposed that Council staff work with these organisations to reduce their bin numbers, improve recycling and therefore reduce their costs.

Council Meeting - 21 April, 2009

**GM 20 - DRAFT ANNUAL MANAGEMENT PLAN AND BUDGET 2009-2013 -
SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION ON WASTE SERVICES TO
NON-RATEABLE PROPERTIES
For Decision**

Table 1- Price Impact of Residential Component of Non-Rateable Garbage Services Based on Council providing service

Category	No. of Residential Services	Cost Impact 09/10 (\$349.50 per service)	Cost Impact 09/10 (Assume 50% Cost)
*Addison Road Community Centre	0	0.00	0.00
Benevolent/Charity	26	\$9,087.00	\$4,543.50
Nursing Home (sub-category of Benevolent/Charity)	0	0.00	0.00
Church/ religious	39	\$13,630.50	\$6,815.25
School/ Educational Institute	0	0.00	0.00
Total	65	\$22,717.50	\$11,358.75

NOTE: 1 x 240 litre bin equals 2 DWCs.

The non-residential component is set out in the following table and similarly a 50% subsidy and other support is proposed for 2009/10: By 2010/11, it is proposed that these organisations arrange their own waste removal.

Table 2 - Price Impact of Non-Residential Component of Non-Rateable Garbage Services Based on Council providing service

Category	No. Non-Residential Services	Cost Impact 09/10 (\$349.50 per service)	Cost Impact 09/10 (Assume 50% cost))
*Addison Road Community Centre	44	\$15,378.00	\$7,689.00
Benevolent/Charity	34	\$11,883.00	\$5,941.50
Nursing Home (sub-category of Benevolent/Charity)	40	\$13,980.00	\$6,990.00
Church/religious	124	\$43,338.00	\$21,669.00
School/Educational Institute	52	\$18,174.00	\$9,087.00
Total	294	\$102,753.00	\$51,376.50

NOTE: 1 x 240 litre bin equals 2 DWCs.

Providing garbage services at no cost to non-rateable properties and without a cap provides no incentives for the non-rateable property owners to reduce the amount of waste that ultimately ends up in landfill. This is not in accordance with Council's key objective to increase resource recovery and reduce waste to landfill. A major driver of waste diversion is the application of fees for waste generation. The current provision of waste services at no cost does not assist in meeting the State Government's waste diversion targets. If users are required to pay a fee, or to make their own arrangements for a waste service, then they will have an incentive to reduce the number of services to which they avail themselves. They will be supported by Council staff to reduce services during the transition phase.

In summary, the current situation of funding waste services at no cost to not-for-profit groups including church/religious organisations/benevolent/charity groups and school/educational organisations from the Domestic Waste Management Reserve fund cannot continue indefinitely having regard to Section 496 of the Local Government Act 1993. The proposal in the budget supports these organisations through a transition period, with a 50% subsidy for one year and staff support to minimise their bins, maximise their recycling and reduce costs. By 2010/11 organisations would pay the full charge or make other arrangements, particularly for the collection of non-residential waste.

**QS 4 – SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION – PETERSHAM CAR PARK
For Decision**

Note:

The following information is provided as supplementary material to Councillor Phillip's Question on Notice appearing on page 103 of the Business Paper.

This information should be considered in conjunction with QS 4 – Petersham Car Park (page 103).

Supplementary information from Director, Development & Environmental Services:

As indicated in the initial response on page 103 of the Business Paper, there is no readily available information on the heritage significance of the building and further research would be required to fully answer that question.

The Director, Development and Environment Services advises that the research and analysis would need to include at least:

- research into the historical development of the site and context;
- comparative analysis of other (potentially similar) industrial buildings within the state, the findings of which will reveal whether or not the building is a rare or representative example of its type;
- further investigation into the former uses of the building and how it relates to the surrounding commercial and residential context;
- a physical and contextual analysis of the internal and external building fabric and its immediate and expanded curtilage.

Obviously that research would require some time and resources to complete. It would not be undertaken for a Question with Notice. A request from a Councillor requiring that amount of resources to respond to would need to come in the form of a Motion that was adopted by Council rather than simply as a Question from an individual Councillor.

Council's urban design consultants did voice an opinion at the Councillor Briefing that the building was interesting and could be retained and adaptively re-used, however, officers believe this assessment was not necessarily informed by any evidence of heritage significance.

The adjacent bank is not currently a heritage item, but has been identified as a potential item through the review of heritage provisions and whilst the building is within a 111 area, it is not within a proposed conservation area. Nevertheless, Council officers believe the building would need consideration should demolition be proposed. This is why in reply to the question regarding if demolition would be recommended, officers have stated that development consent would be required and any approval for demolition would be required to include supporting information to justify demolition. The supporting information would need to address the issues raised in the dot points at the start of this email.