



Corporate & Works Committee

Agenda: *Corporate & Works Committee*

Date: *Monday 17 July 2006*

Time: *6.00pm*

Outline Of Meeting Protocol & Procedure:

The Chairperson will call the Meeting to order and ask the Committee/Staff to present apologies or late correspondence.

The Chairperson will commence the Order of Business as shown in the Index to the Agenda.

At the beginning of each item the Chairperson will ask whether a member(s) of the public wish to address the Committee.

If person(s) wish to address the Committee, they are allowed four (4) minutes in which to do so. Please direct comments to the issues at hand.

If there are persons representing both sides of a matter (eg applicant/objector), the person(s) against the recommendation speak first.

At the conclusion of the allotted four (4) minutes, the speaker resumes his/her seat and takes no further part in the debate unless specifically called to do so by the Chairperson.

If there is more than one (1) person wishing to address the Committee from the same side of the debate, the Chairperson will request that where possible a spokesperson be nominated to represent the parties.

The Chairperson has the discretion whether to continue to accept speakers from the floor.

After considering any submissions the Committee will debate the matter (if necessary), and arrive at a recommendation (R items which proceed to Full Council) or a resolution (D items for which the Committee has delegated authority).

Delegated Authority (“D” Items):

General financial and corporate management of the Council, except those specifically excluded by statute, by Council direction or delegated specifically to another Committee.

Note: This not to limit the discretions of nominated staff members exercising Delegated Authorities granted by the Council.

Quarterly review of Council's Management Plan.

Finance Regulations, including:-

- Authorisation of expenditures within budgetary provisions where not delegated;
- Quarterly review of Budget Review Statements;
- Quarterly and other reports on Works and Services provision; and
- Writing off of rates, fees and charges because of non-rateability, bad debts, and impracticality of collection.

Auditing.

Property Management.

Asset Management.

Traffic Management - Works Implementation.

Works and Services - Monitoring and Implementations.

Legal Matters and Legal Register.

Parks and Reserves Management.

Infrastructure Management, Design and Investigation.

To require such investigations, reports or actions as considered necessary in respect of matters contained within the Business Agenda (and as may be limited by specific Council resolution).

Confirmation of Minutes of its Meeting.

Any other matter falling within the responsibility of the Corporate and Works Committee and not restricted by the Local Government Act or required to be a Recommendation to Full Council as listed below.

Recommendation only to the Full Council (“R” Items):

Such matters as are specified in Section 377 and within the ambit of the Committee considerations.

The voting of money for expenditure on works, services and operations.

Rates, Fees and Charges.

Donations

Matters which involve broad strategic or policy initiatives within responsibilities of the Committee.

Matters not within the specified functions of the Committee.

Asset Rationalisation.

Corporate Operations:-

- Statutory Reporting; - Delegations.
- Adoption of Council's Management Plans; - Policies.
- Quality Service/Communications; - Tenders.
- Leases.
- Matters reserved by individual Councillors in accordance with any Council policy on "safeguards" and substantive changes

Committee Membership:

7 Councillors

Quorum:

The quorum for a Committee meeting is 4 Councillors.

WOOLLAHRA MUNICIPAL COUNCIL

Notice of Meeting

13 July 2006

To: His Worship the Mayor, Councillor Petrie, ex-officio
Councillors John Walker (Chair)
 Keri Huxley (Deputy Chair)
 Claudia Cullen
 Marcus Ehrlich
 Tanya Excell
 Wilhelmina Gardner
 Fiona Sinclair King

Dear Councillors

Corporate & Works Committee Meeting – 17 July 2006

In accordance with the provisions of the Local Government Act 1993, I request your attendance at a Meeting of the Council's **Corporate and Works Committee** to be held in the **Council Chambers, 536 New South Head Road, Double Bay, on Monday 17 July 2006 at 6.00pm.**

Gary James
General Manager

Meeting Agenda

Item	Subject	Pages
1	Leave of Absence and Apologies	
2	Late Correspondence	
3	Declarations of Interest	

Items to be Decided by this Committee using its Delegated Authority

D1	Confirmation of Minutes of Meeting held on 3 July 2006	1
D2	Rose Bay Promenade Cycleway – 663.G	2
D3	Monthly Financial Report – June 2006	10

Items to be Submitted to the Council for Decision with Recommendations from this Committee

R1	Proposal Received for the Upgrading & Landscaping of Bayview Hill Lane, Rose Bay – 545. Part 3	13
R2	Graffiti Management Policy – 1041.G Graf	22

Item No: D1 Delegated to Committee
Subject: **Confirmation of minutes of meeting held on 3 July 2006**
Author: Les Windle, Manager – Governance
File No: See Council Minutes
Reason for Report: The Minutes of the Meeting of Monday 3 July 2006 were previously circulated. In accordance with the guidelines for Committees' operations it is now necessary that those Minutes be formally taken as read and confirmed.

Recommendation:

That the Minutes of the Corporate and Works Committee Meeting of 3 July 2006 be taken as read and confirmed.

Les Windle
Manager - Governance

Item No: D2 Delegated to Committee
Subject: **Rose Bay Promenade Cycleway**
Author: Lorna Oliver - Traffic & Transport Planner
File No: 663.G
Reason for Report: Resolution considering options for the cycleway to reduce loss of existing parking

Recommendation:

- A. That the current DA for the Rose Bay Promenade be amended to incorporate an amended cycleway and the retention of existing parking bays, as detailed in the report.
- B. That further grant funding be sought for the project.
-

Background:

The current Rose Bay Promenade concept has been subject to design development since 2003. In preparing the current DA design, a Community Reference Group meeting was facilitated by the then Mayor, Clr Comino, on 9 October 2003. As a result of this meeting and subsequent meetings with a Councillor Steering Group, an agreed DA design was finalised and lodged 1 March 2004. The plan was publicly exhibited and the submissions received have been addressed in the consultant planner's report prepared by Jim Colman. This report was tabled at the Development Control Committee on 25 July 2005, recommending approval with conditions.

In considering this report, Council resolved to defer consideration of the DA pending a Councillor Workshop to consider a number of design issues.

Following this resolution, a Councillor Workshop was conducted on 26 September 2005. At this time, the major issue was the treatment of the masonry balustrade. Some Councillors considered that the masonry balustrade should be removed entirely and be replaced with an open railing treatment to maximise views. Others were of the view that the original balustrade should be retained, wholly or substantially, for heritage reasons.

It was agreed that a public forum should be arranged and that the alternative designs be presented for community comment. Subsequently, on 31 October 2005 Council made the following recommendation:

- "A. That four design options for the Rose Bay Promenade balustrade be presented to a public forum to be held at 6 pm (date TBA) in the Committee Room, being:*
- the DA proposal;*
 - the DA proposal with small balconies deleted;*
 - an open balustrade;*
 - restore and upgrade the wall as originally constructed.*
- B. That the Mayor nominate a chairperson for the forum.*
- C. That the proposed cycle way, together with funding options for the same, also be considered at the public forum"*

The public forum was held on Thursday 23 February 2006. It was estimated that fifty people attended the forum and that at least twenty of these addressed the forum either directly or by asking questions.

Discussion at the public forum centred on the balustrade options with a variety of views being presented. The public forum did not resolve the divergent views on this topic and, subsequently, at its 27 March 2006 meeting, Council decided to retain the existing masonry balustrade.

In accordance with Part C of the above recommendation, the cycleway was also considered at the forum.

Below is the section from the report on the Public Forum, which referred to the cycleway:

“Speakers in favour of the cycleway saw it as a valuable alternative transport facility. Those opposed to the cycleway raised the perception that it might not be safe, and expressed objections to the loss of car parking spaces. In this regard, the DA assessment has investigated the safety issue and found the design to be acceptable. The parking issue is one of balance between competing transport demands. As the cycleway is not included in current funding there may be merit in investigating alternatives to the current design solution and reporting further on this matter.”

It can be seen from this summary, and from the notes taken at the forum, that most comments on the cycleway were supportive on the proviso that it is safe. The majority (all speakers except one who saw the parking as having little value) did not wish to lose parking at this location.

Objectors to the cycleway component in the DA Report mainly cite parking with some also citing safety. These aspects were addressed as follows in the DA Report:

“Pedestrian access to the promenade, to water views, and to remnant beach areas is greatly improved. The existing supply of public parking spaces on the northern side of New South Head Road is reduced from 63 to 21. Some local residents, visitors and business houses have expressed concern over this loss of parking. A dedicated cycleway, part of a planned regional bikeway will make for improved conditions for cyclists. Objectors to the cycleway fall into two categories; those who oppose it totally because of the consequential loss of parking, and those who support it but seek a different alignment within the overall promenade reservation. In the former category are the marina and restaurant interests supported by numerous petitioners. Other grounds of opposition included safety risks to children, the elderly and motorists.

The proposed dedicated cycleway has evoked considerable local opposition, as has the loss of parking on which the cycleway proposal depends. With regard to the loss of parking, Council has received expert advice from both its own officers and outside consultants to the effect that the overall benefits to the community arising from the construction of the dedicated cycleway would outweigh the loss of some local parking capacity. This advice is strongly supported in the wider public interest.

*The immediate proximity of the dedicated cycleway to the eastbound lane of New South Head Road brings with it the possibility of safety risks for cyclists, pedestrians and motorists. However, careful examination of the available design documents and RTA bicycle design guidelines, together with field observation and consultation with BIKEeast, indicates that the proposal is soundly based and capable of implementation as a generally risk-free facility. Nevertheless, it is recommended that before engineering design is commenced, further detailed advice is obtained from an expert in cycleway design as to the most appropriate means of ensuring compliance with performance standards relating to signage, pavement width and detailing, speed control, and the like (see **Condition No 3**).”*

Subsequently, at its meeting of 27 March 2006, Council resolved the following:

- A. *“That Council maintain the balustrade in its entirety as originally constructed and restore and upgrade it where necessary and include an interpretative plaque regarding the history of the promenade.*

- B. *That there be a further report to the Corporate and Works Committee detailing the specific actions to be taken to implement the Council's preferred option as adopted in (A), including estimated timeframe, costs and, where necessary, proposed funding sources and including one marine deck for dinghy storage, suitable additional lighting, landscaping and street furniture.*
- C. *That there be a further report to the Corporate and Works Committee reviewing the DA proposal for the cycleway and considering possible options and proposed funding source for the cycleway, to reduce the loss of existing parking."*

This report deals with Part C above.

The cycleway is a part of Route 2 in Council's adopted Bike Plan. This was identified as a priority route (to be constructed in 1 – 3 years) when the Plan was adopted in 2000. Route 2 has been the most difficult route to implement as the majority of Route 2 is located on New South Head Road, which is a very busy road, controlled by the RTA. If the cycleway is not included in the plans for the Rose Bay Promenade upgrade, it will be extremely difficult to include at a later date and would probably result in cyclists cycling on the promenade, as is currently seen on occasion at this location. Additionally, a safe cycleway along the Rose Bay foreshore would be an asset to Woollahra now and for future generations. It should also be noted that overseas studies have shown that scenic bicycle routes attract tourists and visitors and increase economic activity in the area. For these reasons, it is recommended that the cycleway remain an incorporated part of the Rose Bay Promenade upgrade project.

Following Resolution C above, Council staff investigated a number of alternative options to determine the best solution for safe provision of a cycleway whilst retaining parking. Options included various modifications of the DA proposal of a 2.5m wide cycleway with traffic in both directions and the provision of a 1.4m wide cycleway on each side of the road.

It was concluded that the best location for the cycleway is on the northern side of New South Head Road as separating the cycleway into two one-way cycleways requires an additional 0.3m of road width. This road width is not available for the full length of the route.

It was then decided to investigate methods which would retain the kerbside parking bays with the installation of the two-way cycleway. A treatment has been developed for the parking bays which facilitates this and additionally reclaims 1.4m of the width of each parking bay for green space adjacent to the Promenade. This provides further separation between pedestrians and cyclists and, additionally, means that all parking bays would be retained under this arrangement with the exception of those at the proposed bus bay locations.

Currently, the design proposes three bus bays, however, discussions are underway with the STA with the aim of reducing the number of bus bays to two, one near each of the two signalized intersections. Three bus bays means a loss of six legal parking spaces, two bus bays would be a loss of four legal parking spaces. These spaces should be assessed as offset by the provision of a further seven legal parking spaces on the southern side of New South Head Road, on the western side of the intersection with O'Sullivan Road. This means that, depending on the outcome of the discussions with the STA, a net parking gain of either one or three legal parking spaces will be the result of the preferred option for the cycleway outlined in this report.

Proposal:

The option presented in this report is for a 2.5m cycleway, with bicycle traffic in both directions, on the northern side of New South Head Road. The cycleway is separated from the promenade by greenspace incorporating street trees, plantings and seating areas. This provides separation between pedestrians and cyclists while retaining all street trees along the promenade.

The cycleway runs parallel to the promenade, and at the same grade, except at the bus and parking bays.

There are presently three bus bays within the scope of works. At each of the bus bays, the cycleway deviates towards the promenade to allow sufficient room for the bus to pull in and collect passengers. Physical separation is maintained between the pedestrians and cyclists at these points, combined with a pedestrian crossing at each bus bay to allow pedestrians to access the bus waiting area safely. This ensures that pedestrians cross the cycleway at the same place and alerts cyclists to the potential presence of pedestrians at this point.

The design of a typical bus bay is attached as Annexure 1.

Additionally, there are eleven parking bays (22 parking spaces) retained within the current scope of works on the current design (three bus bays). Appropriate treatment has been developed in accordance with the RTA NSW Bicycle Guidelines (2003). This allows safe passage for the cyclists and retains the existing parking. It is proposed to raise the parking bays to half the height of the footpath (75-100mm) to allow easier access to the promenade for the mobility-impaired. At each of the parking bays, it is proposed that the cycleway will ramp down to match the level of the parking bays. Green pavement paint will be provided along the cycleway from the commencement of this transition and within the parking bay area, until the cycleway has ramped back to full-pavement height, thus completing the transition. Green pavement paint is the RTA's standard colour and treatment for any area with the potential for conflicts between vehicle and cyclist movements. Additionally, the parking bays will be reduced to 2.8m in width with a C4 line at 2.3m to encourage parking close to the kerb (away from the cyclists). This provides a measure of protection for cyclists from car doors. A PS-2 bicycle logo will be positioned in the centre of the bay to alert drivers to the cycle track. The cycleway will have additional PS-3 bicycle logos with arrows indicating direction of travel at the ramp-up and ramp-down transitions. This will provide additional awareness of the presence of a cycleway as well as indicating to any cyclist, who may have the intention to join the cycleway at this point, the direction of travel for each lane.

The design of a typical parking bay is attached as Annexure 2.

Consultation:

Consultation with BIKEast and the consultants engaged for this project has resulted in agreement on this option.

BIKEast states that this proposal will satisfy cyclists' expectations as well as the NSW Bicycle Guidelines. It provides a safe facility which is expected to attract new cyclists in the area as it links up the new facilities currently being installed in O'Sullivan Road and the existing facilities in Birriga Road.

Additionally, the Rose Bay Promenade Cycleway can be accessed from the bicycle route in Victoria Road via Rose Bay.

Options:

The cycleway is not presently included in the budget allocation for the Rose Bay Promenade. This will be reviewed in future year's budgets.

Funding options for the upgrade of the Rose Bay Promenade and the cycleway include making applications for dollar for dollar funding from the:

RTA - under the Bicycle Grants Program

(closing date for 2007/8 financial year is September 2006)

NSW Department of Planning's Sharing Sydney Harbour Access Program

(funding of \$65,000 has been allocated to date. A further application can be made for the round closing in April 2007).

NSW Department of Planning's Metropolitan Greenspace Program

(funding applications can be made for the next round which closes in April 2007).

The Sharing Sydney Harbour Access Program is, potentially, the best source of further funding for this project as it identifies recreational opportunities for Sydney residents along the harbour as a priority.

It, specifically, prioritises funding for bicycle routes within 2.5km of the harbour foreshore as is proposed by this project.

DA:

Development Application No. 122/2004, which has been deferred by Council now requires to be amended to delete proposed amendments to the balustrade, which is now to be retained, and to amend the proposed lighting, landscaping and marine deck. It is proposed that the amended DA include the amended cycleway and retained parking bays as detailed in this report.

Identification of Income & Expenditure:

The cost of this design is expected to be comparable to the estimated cost of the DA proposal. Detailed costings have not been carried out for either proposal.

Conclusion:

The upgrade of the Rose Bay seawall is a great opportunity to provide a pedestrian promenade and the associated cycleway. This will provide new and improved recreational opportunities for Woollahra residents as well as visitors and tourists to the area. Studies overseas have shown that scenic bicycle routes attract tourists and visitors and increase the income of relevant businesses in the area. A combined pedestrian and cycleway along the Rose Bay foreshore would be an asset to the Municipality now and for future generations. The amended design allows for the cycleway to be incorporated whilst retaining most of the parking in the historic parking bays.

Therefore, it is recommended that Council amend the DA for the upgrade of the Rose Bay seawall to incorporate an amended cycleway, with retained parking bays.

Lorna Oliver
Traffic and Transport Planner

Warwick Hatton
Director Technical Services

Annexures:

1. Design of a typical bus bay
2. Design of a typical parking bay

Item No: D3 Delegated to Committee
Subject: **Monthly Financial Report - JUNE 2006**
Author: Don Johnston, Manager Finance
File No: 987G
Reason for Report: To present the monthly financial report for June 2006

Recommendation:

THAT the monthly financial report for June 2006 be received and noted.

Background:

The monthly financial report for June 2006 is submitted to the Committee for consideration.

The monthly report includes the following:-

Summary of Investments.

Summary of Receipts and Payments and statement of bank balance

Don Johnston
Manager Finance

Annexures:

Nil

INVESTMENTS AS AT 30/06/06

<u>CATEGORY</u>	<u>PURCHASED</u>	<u>MATURING</u>	<u>DAYS</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>B/B</u>	<u>MARGIN</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u> \$	<u>TOTALS</u> \$	<u>% of TOTAL</u>
BANKWEST (S&P) RATING, A1)									
11AM CALL				5.70			959,763.72		
TERM DEPOSIT	12-Apr-06	12-Jul-06	91	5.78	5.69	0.09	1,000,000.00		
TERM DEPOSIT	19-Apr-06	19-Jul-06	91	5.79	5.69	0.10	1,000,000.00		
TERM DEPOSIT	28-Jun-06	04-Oct-06	98	6.16	6.04	0.12	<u>1,500,000.00</u>	4,459,763.72	18.77%
LOCAL GOVT FINANCIAL SERVICE P/L (S&P RATING, A1)									
TERM DEPOSIT	18-Apr-06	26-Jul-06	99	5.70	5.68	0.02	1,000,000.00		
C.R.I.	23-May-06	21-Aug-06	90	6.01	5.89	0.12	<u>1,000,000.00</u>	2,000,000.00	8.42%
CREDIT UNION AUSTRALIA Limited									
TERM DEPOSIT	07-Jun-06	09-Aug-06	63	6.11	5.87	0.24	1,500,000.00		
TERM DEPOSIT	10-May-06	06-Sep-06	119	6.16	5.93	0.23	2,000,000.00		
TERM DEPOSIT	14-Jun-06	13-Sep-06	91	6.20	5.95	0.25	<u>1,500,000.00</u>	5,000,000.00	21.04%
CPS CREDIT UNION (SA) Limited									
TERM DEPOSIT	05-Apr-06	05-Jul-06	91	5.87	5.62	0.25	<u>1,500,000.00</u>	1,500,000.00	6.31%
GREATER BUILDING SOCIETY Limited									
TERM DEPOSIT	23-Jun-06	25-Oct-06	124	6.30	6.03	0.27	<u>2,000,000.00</u>	2,000,000.00	8.42%
HERITAGE BUILDING SOCIETY									
TERM DEPOSIT	22-Jun-06	20-Sep-06	90	6.16	5.99	0.17	1,000,000.00		
TERM DEPOSIT	30-May-06	30-Nov-06	184	6.21	6.02	0.19	<u>2,000,391.05</u>	3,000,391.05	12.63%
SAVINGS & LOANS CU (SA) Limited									
TERM DEPOSIT	30-May-06	02-Aug-06	64	6.06	5.86	0.20	1,000,000.00		
TERM DEPOSIT	24-May-06	23-Aug-06	91	6.08	5.89	0.19	800,000.00		
TERM DEPOSIT	24-May-06	20-Sep-06	119	6.11	5.92	0.19	1,000,000.00		
TERM DEPOSIT	31-May-06	27-Sep-06	119	6.13	5.94	0.19	1,000,000.00		
TERM DEPOSIT	28-Jun-06	18-Oct-06	112	6.29	6.07	0.22	<u>2,000,000.00</u>	5,800,000.00	24.41%
GRAND TOTAL							-	23,760,154.77	100.00%

I hereby certify that the above investments have been made in accordance with Section 625 of the Local Government Act 1993, Clause 212 of the Local Government (General) Regulation 2005 and Council's investment policy.

J.C. Blake
FINANCE OFFICER

D. Johnston
FINANCE MANAGER

Summary of Receipts, Payments and Bank Balance

Cash Book Balance as at 31 May 2006	(420,614.64)
Receipts	
Rates	1,761,032.60
Investments - Called In	1,581,970.03
Loan Drawdown	3,070,000.00
Miscellaneous	3,038,487.18
Total Receipts	9,451,489.81
Payments - Cheque	
Cheque Payments	(2,279,978.41)
Cancelled Cheques	8,127.07
Total Cheque Payments for period	(2,271,851.34)
Payments - EFT	
EFT Payments	(5,259,819.05)
Returned EFT Payments	37.46
Total EFT Payments for period	(5,259,781.59)
Payments - Direct Debits From Bank A/c	
Payroll	(1,540,576.88)
Councillor Fees	(25,893.62)
Bank Charges	(20,723.50)
Credit Card Payments	(1,380.18)
Total Direct Debits for period	(1,588,574.18)
Total Payments	(9,120,207.11)
Cash Book Balance as at 30 June 2006	(89,331.94)
Unpresented Cheques	344,348.13
No. of Cheques: 252	
Outstanding Deposits & Miscellaneous Items	21,460.11
Reconciled Cash Book Balance as at 30 June 2006	276,476.30
Bank A/c Balance as at 30 June 2006	276,476.30

Outstanding Cheques > \$30,000.00

Cheque No.	Cheque Date	Amount
190585	28/06/2006	57,195.00

Item No: R1 Recommendation to Council
Subject: **Proposal received for the Upgrading and Landscaping of Bayview Hill Lane, Rose Bay**
Author: Greg Stewart - Manager Public Infrastructure
File No: 545. Part 3
Reason for Report: To submit the proposal to Council for consideration

Recommendation:

That the proposal received from the owner of the property No. 19 Bayview Hill Lane, Rose Bay, for the upgrading and landscaping of the bend and last 20 metres of Bayview Hill Lane, leading to the Hermitage Foreshore Reserve, be approved subject to the following conditions:

- i. Written confirmation being received by Council from the owner of the property No.
- ii. 8 Bayview Hill Lane and the National Parks and Wildlife Service that they support the proposed upgrading and landscape works
- iii. The detailed design of the works being to Council's specification and being approved by Council's Director Technical Services
- iv. The works being carried out at no cost to Council and under Council's control

Background:

NOTE: A site inspection by Councillors has been scheduled for 5.00pm on 17 July 2006 (immediately prior to the Corporate and Works Committee meeting) at the end of Bayview Hill Lane.

Bayview Hill Lane is a public laneway that runs off Bayview Hill Road at its western or harbour end. The laneway, which is approximately 60 metres long and 6.1 metres wide, contains a blind 90 degree bend and terminates in a dead end at the pedestrian entrance to the Hermitage Foreshore Reserve. The laneway is the main pedestrian access to the southern end of the Hermitage Foreshore Reserve.

The final 20 metres of Bayview Hill Lane, being between the 90 degree bend and the dead end, provides pedestrian access to the Hermitage Foreshore Reserve and vehicular access to one property only, this being the property No. 19 Bayview Hill Lane, which is currently being developed. There is no vehicular access to the Hermitage Foreshore Reserve off Bayview Hill Lane.

The present deficiencies in this section of the laneway are as follows:

Poor pedestrian access to the Hermitage Foreshore Reserve as there is no dedicated footpath in this section of the laneway and pedestrians have to walk on the roadway.

There is no clear visual clue to motorists from Bayview Hill Road that the laneway leads to a dead end.

Conflict between pedestrian traffic and vehicles reversing uphill along the length of the laneway to exit the laneway.

Damage is being caused to the property No. 8 Bayview Hill Lane by vehicles attempting to turn around at the bend in the laneway.

Illegal parking at the end of the laneway obstructing pedestrian access to the Hermitage Foreshore Reserve and vehicular access to No. 19 Bayview Hill Lane.

The poor condition of the laneway and appearance as an entrance to the Hermitage Foreshore Reserve.

Proposal:

The owner of the property No. 19 Bayview Hill Lane has submitted to Council, for approval, a proposal for the upgrading and landscaping of the bend and last 20 metres of the laneway providing pedestrian access to the Hermitage Foreshore Reserve. Details of the proposed upgrading and landscaping works, together with details of the public benefit that would accrue as a result of these works, are explained in detail in their submission, a copy of which is attached as an Annexure.

Generally, the works proposed to be carried out comprise the following:

The narrowing of the road pavement and the installation of three bollards, the centre bollard being retractable, just prior to the bend in the laneway. The purpose of the bollards is to restrict vehicular access to the dead end section of the laneway to the adjoining owners, authorised Council vehicles, the National Parks and Wildlife vehicles and emergency vehicles only. It will also prevent vehicles from illegally parking in the dead end of the laneway and make it obvious to motorists turning into the laneway from Bayview Hill Road that the laneway is a dead end.

The provision of a new footpath, kerb and gutter and drainage in the section of the laneway between the bend and the dead end, where none currently exists.

The provision of landscaping on both sides of the laneway.

The resurfacing of the laneway between the proposed bollards and the entrance to the Hermitage Foreshore Reserve

It is proposed that all works be carried out at no cost to Council, to Council agreed design and specifications and that the works be carried out under Council's control.

The owner of the property No. 19 Bayview Hill Lane has also agreed to a Positive Covenant being placed on the title of his property to ensure the future maintenance of the bollard system.

It is understood that the National Parks and Wildlife Service supports the proposal.

Consideration:

It is considered that the proposal, as submitted, has merit. It will not only enhance the frontage to the property No. 19 Bayview Hill Lane, which is currently under construction, but also addresses the deficiencies listed earlier in this report. The proposal will:

improve the appearance of the end of the Bayview Hill Lane and the entrance to the Hermitage Foreshore Reserve,

improve and enhance pedestrian access to the Hermitage Foreshore Reserve through the provision of a new footpath opposite No. 19 Bayview Hill Lane, linking the existing footpath, that currently finishes at the bend in the laneway, with the entrance to the Hermitage Foreshore Reserve,

resolve the issue of motor vehicles gaining access to the end of the laneway and having to reverse along the length of the narrow laneway to exit the laneway,

prevent illegal parking at the end of the laneway; and the obstruction of the pedestrian access to the Hermitage Foreshore Reserve and vehicular access to No. 19 Bayview Hill Lane,

reduce pedestrian and vehicle conflict within the laneway,

reinforce that the laneway is a dead end for vehicles,

eliminate damage being caused to the garage of No. 8 Bayview Hill Lane by vehicles trying to turn around at the bend in the laneway, and
improve the drainage and overall physical condition of the dead end of the laneway at no cost to Council.

In the proposal submitted to Council, it is proposed that a Positive Covenant be placed on the title of the property No. 19 Bayview Hill Lane to ensure the future maintenance of the bollard system.

As the primary purpose of the proposed bollard system is to restrict vehicular access to the dead end section of the laneway, and as there will be two property owners and the National Parks and Wildlife Service who will directly benefit from the system, not just the property No. 19 Bayview Hill Lane, it is considered that it would be more appropriate for Council to maintain the bollard system and charge a service fee for the maintenance of the system. Such a proposal would also provide Council with greater flexibility should it propose to alter or remove the system in the future. Accordingly, it is recommended that Council not pursue the placement of a Positive Covenant on the title of the property No. 19 Bayview Hill Lane.

Due to the public benefit that would be obtained as a result of the proposed upgrading works, it is recommended:

That the proposal received from the owner of the property No. 19 Bayview Hill Lane, Rose Bay, for the upgrading and landscaping of the bend and last 20 metres of Bayview Hill Lane leading to the Hermitage Foreshore Reserve, be approved subject to the following conditions:

- i. Written confirmation being received by Council from the owner of the property No.
- ii. 8 Bayview Hill Lane and the National Parks and Wildlife Service that they support the proposed upgrading and landscape works.
- iii. The detailed design of the works being to Council's specification and being approved by Council's Director Technical Services.
- iv. The works being carried out at no cost to Council and under Council's control.

Identification of Income & Expenditure:

The works are proposed to be carried out at no cost to Council.

Greg Stewart
Manager Public Infrastructure

Warwick Hatton
Director Technical Services

ANNEXURES:

Copy of proposal received from the owner of the property No. 19 Bayview Hill Lane, Rose Bay.

Item No: R2 Recommendation to Council
Subject: **Graffiti Management Policy**
Author: Wayne Coggins, Property Services Coordinator
File No: 1041.G Graf
Reason for Report: To review Council's existing graffiti management policy in response to a notice of motion.

Recommendation:

- A. That Council adopt the attached revised policy for the removal of graffiti.
- B. That competitive quotations be sought for a trial to be conducted for twelve months with respect to the removal of graffiti from private property.
- C. That a further report be provided on funding options for the trial.

Background:

The following Notice of Motion was adopted by Council on 1 May 2006:

"That a report be brought to the appropriate committee reviewing Council's existing Graffiti Management Policy with the objective of strengthening the policy, and introducing new guidelines so as to more effectively deal with the growing problem of graffiti in the Woollahra area.

The report to address the following:

The report to address the following:

how to deal with graffiti on private property (in accordance with S67A, B & C of the Local Government Act)
how to deal with graffiti on state owned assets
the feasibility of an in-house accredited graffiti removal team and the possibility of combining resources with neighbouring Councils
an education program for schools and the general public
include reference to successful programs introduced by other Councils
consideration be given to Council keeping a register of tags and their location so if common identification marks are present then Council is able to assist the Police with more examples of the person's bad behavior(sic)."

At their meeting on the 14 June 2006, the Community Safety Committee resolved:

"that the Committee notes and views with alarm a significant upward trend in graffiti in the Woollahra area and requests that the increase in graffiti be noted and action be taken."

This report addresses the Notice of Motion and the resolution of the Community Safety Committee relating to graffiti.

Current Policy and Procedures

The Community and Environment Committee, 7 October 2003, resolved:

- “A. That Council continue with its current procedures, with respect to removing graffiti from Council property and requesting private owners and public authorities to remove graffiti but with the following amendments as set out in parts B and C.*
- B. That Council remove graffiti from private property in the following circumstances:*
- 1. A request is received from the property owner to carry out work*
 - 2. The service is provided on a fee for service basis, provided that fees may be discounted in the case of pensioners and fees may be waived in the case of demonstrated hardship.*
 - 3. The private property owner has agreed to Council’s terms and conditions.*
- C. That Council will remove graffiti from public infrastructure and utilities, subject to a service agreement with the public authority owner, which includes:*
- 1. a written request from the public authority owner to carry out work,*
 - 2. the service is provided on a fee for service basis (include in Fees & Charges Document, once adopted), and*
 - 3. the public authorities have agreed to Council’s terms and conditions.*
- D. That offensive graffiti be removed within 24 hours (1 working day) of notification being received.*
- E. That agreements reached with public authorities, including fees for graffiti removal services, be the subject of further reports.*
- F. That this policy be reviewed in 6 months to assess the success of the policy.”*

Our current procedures for the treatment of graffiti are in accordance with the above policy, however, it has not proved practicable, to date, to enter into service agreements with any public authorities.

Council has engaged a contractor who inspects approximately ninety Council sites per day every Monday, Wednesday and Friday and undertakes removal as required. A report is forwarded at the end of each day to the Property Services Coordinator (PSC) outlining the area in square metres removed from each site and supported by photographic evidence. Council is charged only for the actual graffiti removed on any given day, ie if the contractor finds only 2 sq m on a given day, that is all we are charged for and there is no additional inspection fee. The Council is currently charged \$6 per square metre plus cost of paint for paint-out of graffiti and \$14 per square metre for removal service. The daily inspection time is approximately three and a half hours and removal takes approximately ten minutes per square metre.

Expenditure for removal of graffiti from Council-owned assets only, which includes buildings, bus shelters, playground equipment, street furniture and signage, has amounted to \$70,200 in 2005-06. Expenditure on graffiti removal in the first six months of the financial year was \$29,300 but due to the sharp increase in the incidence of graffiti attacks in the last six months, this has risen to \$40,900. This exceeds the provisions made in the budget, based on 2004-05 experience, by about \$40,000

1.1 Procedure for removal of graffiti on Council property

When a report is received of graffiti on Council property, it is forwarded to the PSC through the CRMS action request system. The PSC arranges removal by in-house staff or the contractor. The service level target in the CRMS is four days. All sites are inspected within this time. In the case of obscene or racist graffiti, removal is given highest priority and targeted to be carried out within one to two working days. In other cases, the response time to complete graffiti removal is currently three to six days.

1.2 Procedure for removal of graffiti on private property

When a report is received of graffiti on private residential or commercial property, it is forwarded to the PSC through the CRMS action request system. The PSC writes to the private owner requesting they arrange removal of the graffiti and suggesting they contact Council if they require advice in relation to this, and advising of Council's service for payment of a fee. The service time for this action is seven days.

If there is no response from the owner, or they decline to remove the graffiti or to pursue Council's offer of service, no further action is taken. Section 67B of the local Government Act does empower Council to carry out removal without the owner's agreement providing the graffiti is visible and accessible from a public place. However, the Council must bear the cost of this removal and may also be liable to pay compensation for any damage caused in carrying out this service.

1.3 Procedure for removal of graffiti on assets owned by Public Authorities

The same procedure as for private property is applied to property owned by State authorities and public corporations such as the Department of Education, Energy Australia, Australia Post, Roads and Traffic Authority and Telstra.

2. Graffiti audit carried out in 2003

In 2003, an audit was carried out of graffiti on Council assets, private property and other public authorities' assets. This audit identified a total of 831.5sqm on private property, 658.5sqm on public utilities and 287.5sqm on Council property. A sample audit of the Double Bay area was subsequently conducted in June 2006 with the following results noted:

Council Properties – the 2003 audit identified 28sqm of graffiti and, when re-audited in June 2006, there was no graffiti remaining.

Private Property – the 2003 audit identified 55sqm of graffiti on private property, including residential and commercial. The re-audit, carried out in June 2006, identified that this had increased to 141sqm.

Public Utilities – the 2003 audit identified 6sqm of graffiti and, when re-audited in June 2006, this had increased to 15sqm.

2.1 New graffiti identified in 2006 audit

During the sample audit of the Double Bay area, new graffiti was recorded with the following results noted:

Council Properties – no new graffiti was observed on Council properties due to regular removal.
Private Property – a total of 350sqm of new graffiti was recorded on residential and commercial properties.

Public Utilities – a total of 181sqm of new graffiti was recorded on public utilities.

3. How to deal with graffiti on private property, in accordance with the Act

The Local Government Amendment (Graffiti) Act was enacted in 2002. The removal of graffiti from private property is covered in Sections 67A, 67B & 67C of the Act.

Section 67A empowers Council, with agreement of the owner or occupier, to carry out graffiti removal work on private property. The definition of private property may exclude property owned by a public authority. The section is silent about whether Council can charge for this service, however, Section 67C requires such a charge be recorded. The inference is that Council can charge for graffiti removal if the removal is agreed to by the owner.

Section 67B empowers Council to remove graffiti on private property without the agreement of the owner or occupier. This must be able to be achieved from a public place and is to be at Council's cost. Section 67B does not empower Council to recover costs.

Section 67B also requires Council to pay compensation for any damage to property caused by the Council. Claims must be dealt with in accordance with Section 730 of the Local Government Act 1993, which provides for referral to arbitration by agreement of both parties or referral to the Land and Environment Court within 28 days of a claim being lodged. There is potential for such claims to run into thousands of dollars in terms of damages, legal costs and lost time of Council staff.

Section 67C states that a graffiti register must be maintained with records of owners' details, nature of work carried out and costs for each incidence of graffiti removal. Maintenance of this register would involve administration costs.

It is accepted that graffiti is unsightly and the best way to reduce it is by cleaning it off as soon as possible. This responsibility has traditionally been placed on private property owners, however, due to the cost and time involved, many owners are inclined not to do any remedial work. This may encourage more graffiti. Smooth, painted walls/surfaces visible from public spaces are usually the main targets.

Currently, Council has no separate budgetary provision for removal of graffiti which is included in the property maintenance budget. Given that we currently spend approximately \$70,000 removing graffiti from Council assets, and based on the previous survey, it is estimated that an additional budget of around \$140,000 would be required for initial removal of existing graffiti by contractor from private and public authority property. In order to establish a more accurate estimate for initial removal, a full audit of the Municipality would need to be carried out at an estimated cost of \$2,000.

Our current procedure is as set out in (1) above. The result, to date, has been very limited removal by private owners and no acceptance of the offer of the Council service. Waverley Council has recently begun providing quotes for removal of graffiti from private and commercial property on an "at cost" basis with no administration costs. To date, they have issued approximately 300 quotations and have received only five acceptances. City of Canada Bay also have been issuing quotes to residents on a cost sharing basis. This council subsidises the quoted price at a rate of 50% but even with the discounted price has had a limited response. The main reason for the lack of response appears to be that residents view graffiti removal as a Council responsibility as in the majority of cases it is applied from a public place, i.e. footpath or roadway.

4. How to deal with graffiti on assets owned by other Public Authorities

Approaches made to other public authorities by Council staff, in relation to a removal service for a fee, have not resulted in a satisfactory response from the various authorities. The general response is that they have their own teams and procedures in place and, if Council notifies them, they will program removal. EnergyAustralia, in particular, do not want anyone not accredited by them carrying out graffiti removal on their assets due to the obvious risk from high voltage. Other Councils have had the same experience. For instance, Waverley Council has recently made the same approach to the authorities, as Woollahra, and received a similar response.

The authorities' actions in response to requests for graffiti removal are usually dependant on when their teams are in the area and, as a rule, response times fall well short of what would be considered as an acceptable standard in order to discourage graffiti. An example of this is the EnergyAustralia Sub-Station at the corner of Epping and Manning Roads, which is constantly hit with a substantial coverage of graffiti. Council notifies EnergyAustralia and they do remove it but it is usually hit again immediately and response time to further removal may quite often be weeks.

5. Feasibility of an in-house graffiti removal team

Council currently employs a contractor 3 days a week, inspecting approximately 90 council sites per day and carrying out removal of graffiti as required. There is no charge for inspections, the only cost is for the actual graffiti removed.

Current Contractor – Permastop Australia Pty Ltd

Three days per week service

Includes inspection and removal

Charges \$6 per square metre for paint-out of graffiti plus paint supplied by Council

Charges \$14 per square metre for graffiti removal

Currently, costs Council \$70,000 to remove graffiti from Council property

If private property is included, it is estimated that the cost will rise by an additional \$140,000 due to the high proportion of graffiti on private property.

The Notice of Motion refers to the feasibility of setting up an accredited in-house graffiti team. This team would need to be equipped with a vehicle, water tank and hot water pressure cleaning equipment and be supplied with materials such as chemical strippers, paint, etc. For graffiti removal from Council property only, this would entail recruiting and training one additional employee, purchasing and operating an additional purpose-equipped vehicle and purchasing materials. The cost would be approximately the same as the present contract arrangement, which includes labour, plant and materials and varies according to the amount of removal required. It is assumed in-house graffiti removal would require about three days per week to maintain the current level of removal.

Costs for start-up and first year		Annual
Twelve months wages and direct overheads (say part-time three days/week, including allowance for leave).	\$40,000	\$40,000
Purchase & fit-out of new vehicle	\$40,000	
Vehicle running costs for twelve months	\$10,000	\$10,000
Purchase & installation of water storage tank, hot water pressure cleaner & computerised paint matching equipment	\$50,000	
Materials including chemicals and paint for twelve months	\$10,000	\$10,000
Total	\$150,000	\$60,000
Contractor (based on current year and a 3 days/week service)		\$70,000

If Council resolved to commence a service of also removing graffiti from accessible private property and wished to do this in-house, it is envisaged that a dedicated team of two full-time employees would be required. This team would need to be equipped with a vehicle, water tank and hot water pressure cleaning equipment and be supplied with materials such as chemical strippers, paint, etc.

Costs for start-up and first year	2 additional staff	Annual
Twelve months wages and direct overheads	\$135,000	\$135,000
Purchase & fit-out of new vehicle	\$40,000	
Vehicle running costs for twelve months	\$10,000	\$10,000
Purchase & installation of water storage tank, hot water pressure cleaner & computerised paint matching equipment	\$50,000	
Materials including chemicals and paint for the first twelve months	\$30,000	\$30,000
Total for first twelve months of operation	\$265,000	\$175,000
Extra over contractor @ \$70,000	\$195,000	\$105,000

Advantage of contractors carrying out graffiti removal work

Contractor	In-house removal
Flexibility of working hours to accommodate early morning starts to service commercial areas at no additional cost.	Early morning starts may require the payment of penalty rates or an increased payment under a workplace agreement.
Not affected by unplanned absences such as sick leave or workers compensation, which would impact on service delivery.	Unplanned absences would greatly impact on the service delivery and would require back-up staff to be trained to fill in.
No cost to Council during extended periods of wet weather as payment is only made for graffiti removed.	Cost of lost time due to wet weather would have to be absorbed.
Provision for annual leave periods included in contract.	Back-up staff would need to be trained in all aspects of operation to account for leave periods.
Training included in contract.	Ongoing training would need to be provided to operator and back-up staff.
No RDO	Staff would attract a RDO every two weeks unless this was removed through a workplace agreement. If position did attract a RDO it would be preferable not to have on Monday or Friday.
No cost for inspections – only charged for actual graffiti removed.	Cost of inspection time would inflate square metre rate or hourly rate for service.
No set-up cost.	High set-up cost in recruitment of new staff member and purchase of plant and equipment.
No depreciation of plant & equipment.	Depreciation and replacement of plant & equipment.
Reduced liability that Council is exposed to as contractor has own insurances.	Public liability claims Property damage claims Workers compensation

Contractor	In-house removal
Performance management – if contractor is not meeting performance standards – services are terminated or payments with-held.	If staff are not meeting performance standards, they may require counselling, additional training or even disciplinary procedures. This would impact on service delivery and cost effectiveness of the service.
No staff employment costs	Council would be liable for payroll tax, superannuation and EBA allowance.
Flexibility – level of contract can be changed or contract can be terminated in response to need.	Staff would need to be permanent or fixed term contracts, with limited flexibility to vary employment conditions.

6. Alternative contract option (fixed price)

We have received a proposal from Graffiti Clean which is outlined in detail below:

ERADICATION PROGRAM (initial 12 month program)

The eradication program is designed to dramatically reduce graffiti from all visible surfaces within a local government area (LGA) within 12-months. It involves a fully equipped vehicle and experienced graffiti removal technician dedicated to Council on a 5 days/week basis.

The program works by strategically identifying, targeting and maintaining graffiti "hot -spots", and then systematically expanding throughout the entire LGA until the following touring program is achieved:

Council Property/Main Roads and Transport Routes Daily
Major Commercial Zones 3 x Per Week
Minor Commercial Zones/Major Residential Zones 2 x Per Week
Minor Residential Zones/Parks/Public Utilities etc. 1 x Per Week

THE PROGRAM

- ..5-day program (Monday to Friday/8 working hours per day)
- ..Covers all property including council controlled property, major and minor commercial sectors, all residential areas, electrical substations (with permission) and transport routes. Excludes RTA controlled property.
- ..Graffiti Hotline: Allows residents and council officers to report graffiti attacks and request repairs.
- ..On-line Offenders Database: Accessible by Council Officers, Police and Residents to log and report graffiti attacks, assist in effective prosecution of offenders, insurance claims and repair requests.
 - * 24-hour On -line Reporting and Management System: Allows council officers to request and track jobs, generate reports and view details and photos of attacks
 - * Guaranteed 24 hour response on council controlled property (post initial clean).
- ..Guaranteed 72 hour response on commercial and private property (post initial clean).
- ..Comprehensive monthly reporting.

All Inclusive Annual Cost: \$126,000

MAINTENANCE PROGRAM (option after initial 12 month period)

Trials have shown that following 12 months of comprehensive graffiti abatement the volume of graffiti attacks may be sufficiently reduced to allow for a reduction in the volume of patrolling and repairs. At this time the implementation of a maintenance program may be suitable with the following touring objectives:

Council Property/Main Roads and Transport Routes 3 x Per Week

Major Commercial Zones 1 x Per Week

Minor Commercial Zones/Major Residential Zones 1 x Per Fortnight

Minor Residential Zones/Parks/Public Utilities etc. 1 x Per Fortnight

Whilst not as immediately effective as the Comprehensive Program this program can ultimately achieve the same objectives as the Eradication Program by reducing visible graffiti throughout a LGA over a period of 18 to 24 months.

THE PROGRAM

- ..3 day program (Monday -Wednesday -Friday/8 working hours per day)
- ..Covers council controlled property, major and minor commercial sectors, and some residential areas, electrical substations and transport routes when possible. Excludes RTA controlled property.
- ..Graffiti Hotline: Allows council officers and local business owners to report graffiti attacks and request repairs.
- ..On-line Offenders Database: Accessible by Council Officers, Police, Business Owners and Residents to log and report graffiti attacks and assist in effective prosecution of offenders and request repairs.
- ..24-hour On -line Reporting and Management System: Allows council officers to request and track jobs, generate reports and view details and photos of attacks
- ..Guaranteed 72 hour response on council controlled and commercial property.
- ..Comprehensive monthly reporting.

All Inclusive Annual Cost: \$86,400

Advantages of program:

1. Fixed price for the twelve month period of the agreement includes all plant, labor and materials.
2. 8 hour a day / 5 days a week continuous graffiti removal service, which should produce a dramatic reduction of graffiti throughout the Municipality in the first twelve months.
3. Option to reduce costs by over 30% after initial twelve month period.
4. Vehicle and technician dedicated solely to Woollahra Council. Vehicle would be a high visibility unit showcasing Woollahra Council's commitment to a cleaner and safer environment. The vehicle can also have signage included with Council's logo (at Council's expense): eg Woollahra Council Graffiti Management Unit or Woollahra Council Graffiti Response Unit followed by service provided by Graffiti Clean.
5. Advanced technology including computerised paint colour matching system on board as well as vacuum collection of waste water and airless spray machine.
6. Exact on-site colour matching of surfaces gives higher quality removal with no shadowing, etc left behind and this will also lessen the chance of property damage claims against Council.
7. Allows accurate budget forecasts.
8. Web site designed for Woollahra Council, which will record all graffiti removal including square metres and digital photographs. The website can also be accessed by police and local residents who can log in and enter graffiti details along with location and digital photo.

Graffiti Clean have stated that 100sqm per day can be achieved but I outline a few different examples below.

Annual Cost (for initial twelve months) is \$126,000. This equates to a weekly cost of \$2,423.

100sqm per day would equate to an equivalent square metre rate of \$4.85sqm

75sqm per day would equate to an equivalent square metre rate of \$6.46sqm

50sqm per day would equate to an equivalent square metre rate of \$ 9.69sqm

This is clearly well under our current rate of \$14sqm and estimates for the annual amount of graffiti that could be removed under this program are:

100sqm per day calculated on 250 working days to allow for public holidays is 25,000sqm.

75sqm per day calculated on 250 working days to allow for public holidays is 18,750sqm

50sqm per day calculated on 250 working days to allow for public holidays is 12,500sqm

The total amount of graffiti identified in the 2003 audit was 1,777sqm which included Council, private and utilities. The audit showed just under three times the amount of graffiti on private property (831sqm) compared to Council property (287.5sqm).

To date this year, we have removed a total of 5014sqm from Council property alone at an average of 34sqm per day. If the same ratio of graffiti on private property to Council property was applied to the current figures, it would have seen 14,490sqm of graffiti removal on private property this year. Using the current contract rate of \$14sqm, this would have seen additional expenditure of \$202,860 for the year. This figure would have been for removal only and not the repainting of the area affected by removal and would have brought total annual expenditure to over \$270,000.

Using the anticipated removal rate of 75sqm/day (outlined above), the Graffiti Clean proposal would see an approximate clean-up rate of graffiti on Council and private property of nearly 95% during the initial 12 month period.

7. Trial project for removal of graffiti

Graffiti in the Woollahra Municipality and surrounding areas has increased over the past few months and it is considered it could be beneficial to set up a trial program of increased response and monitor its effectiveness in curbing the incidence and reducing the visibility of graffiti.

A fixed price contract, as described in (6), appears to have great advantages to Council to; (a) remove the backlog of graffiti and (b) assess the most effective long-term strategy for the management of graffiti. It is proposed that we invite quotations for such a service and report back with recommendations for funding.

8. Resource sharing with other councils

Some initial discussion has been held with other councils. It will require further research to ascertain the service delivery improvements that could be achieved as well as the cost-benefits to the various councils. One of the issues to be addressed would be the relative priorities of individual councils and the workloads in each area. This could be more realistically assessed after the initial removal program as suggested above.

Waverley Council would be an obvious option with whom we could enter into a resource sharing agreement and this would be a medium to long term proposition. We understand that they are currently recruiting for an in-house service and the option of resource sharing would be better addressed once they have had time to review their initial twelve month trial. It may also be advantageous to consider graffiti removal as part of a more holistic approach to resource sharing in the outdoor works area.

9. Education program for schools and general public

It is envisaged that a public education program, on an effective scale, would require the engagement of a suitably experienced consultant to develop and deliver such a program. There is currently no budget provision for this purpose. An estimated budget for this would be approximately \$15,000

for the production of brochures and \$35,000 to engage someone to pay one visit to each of the schools in the Council area etc.

Information is being sought from other councils on which programs they have successfully run. Jenny Coppock from Auburn Council has suggested that articles in the local press and school visits are appropriate but should wait until initial progress has been made. The Director of Community Services and the Communications Manager have indicated that, with current resources, they could provide only a very limited input to such a program, such as placing items in the local press.

10. Programs currently in place at other councils

Waverley Council presently carries out removal of graffiti from council assets, utilising a contractor for this purpose, but are in the process of establishing a two-person graffiti removal team. They are also auditing the area and issuing quotations to property owners on an “at cost” basis absorbing administration charges. To date, they have issued approximately 300 quotations and received about five acceptances.

City of Canada Bay Council have established a one-person graffiti removal service and remove graffiti from council assets and issue quotations to property owners offering a 50% cost sharing between the council and owner for the service. They have experienced a low rate of acceptances for the pro-active quotes issued but slightly higher when the resident requests the quote.

Auburn Council is seen as a bench mark council in the successful reduction of graffiti in their local government area. This has been the result of a comprehensive program being put in place including the utilisation of corrective services day release personnel and “work for the dole” programs. They also have a program manager, Jenny Coppock, who is well regarded as an expert in the field of graffiti management and who has driven this program from the start when Auburn had a significant problem.

The success at Auburn has been achieved over a number of years with an initial saturation of resources to reduce the instance of graffiti. Over time, the ongoing cost has reduced and overall appearance of the area has improved. However, it is noted that, on daily travel through the Auburn Municipality, there is still readily visible graffiti, demonstrating that even the most comprehensive programs will not eliminate the problem completely.

Rockdale Council remove graffiti from all council and private property under their Safer City Program. After an extensive public consultation process, a special levy was placed on rates, which raises funds for projects such as additional street lighting and graffiti removal. This is a three year trial program which has just entered its second year and proved very successful and it is likely that a recommendation will be put forward to extend beyond the three year period.

11. Graffiti Register

Section 67C of The Act requires Council to maintain a register of all graffiti removed, the location and, in the case of removal for a fee, the actual cost of the removal.

There are a few web-based databases specifically designed for local government to record and track all graffiti related activities. The databases provide detailed information required to plan and coordinate anti-graffiti strategies and track graffiti related costs more effectively. The databases allow users to add, edit, track and archive graffiti records with attached digital photos.

The shared portion of the database allows user groups to share their graffiti data with others, including the police, which enhances the ability to track and prosecute offenders.

The Australian Graffiti Register is one that is popular with a number of councils and the annual cost of the database is \$4,000, which includes three logins to the system. One of these logins would be made available to the Local Police Area Command to assist in the tracking and prosecution of offenders. In addition to the \$4,000 annual cost, there is the initial purchase of the PDAs at a cost of \$959 each. It is considered that two PDAs would be required, one for the use of the graffiti removal team and one for supervisory/administrative staff to enter jobs.

The graffiti removal team would carry a PDA and add individual job details, including square metres. Photographs would be downloaded to the database at the conclusion of each day. Information such as tags can be shared amongst participants to the register but at the same time access to more sensitive information, such as costs and property addresses, is restricted.

It is not recommended that Council determine whether to sign on to the Australian Graffiti Register until we have invited and assessed quotations, as proposed in (7). If we choose to use a package service such as that offered by Green Clean, this would include a web-based register in the fixed price.

12. Proposed Revised Policy (Annexure 1)

A revised draft of the Graffiti Removal Policy and associated procedures is attached as Annexure 1. This summarises current policy and procedures augmented by proposed changes to the policy with regard to removal of graffiti from private property.

Income & Expenditure:

The proposed operational budget for 2006/2007 does not have a provision for graffiti removal which is currently included in the property maintenance budget. Additional funds will be required if Council resolves to remove graffiti from private property. The amount required will depend on how this is carried out. It is recommended that a trial be conducted initially. It is proposed that quotations be obtained for such a trial.

Additional funding would be required for the subscription to the AUSGR database and purchase of the PDAs but would not be required if the fixed price contract option was adopted.

It is proposed there be a further report on funding options once quotations have been received.

Conclusion:

As a result of discussion with a number of Councils on this issue, it is apparent that there is a common perception by property owners that graffiti removal, even on private property, is a Council responsibility. This is evident by the fact that very few property owners are willing to pay for a graffiti removal service even when it is offered at a discounted rate. Should Council wish to provide a free service to private residents, the additional funds noted above will be required.

A trial programme will enable an assessment of the feasibility of establishing an in-house removal team.

Wayne Coggins
Property Services Coordinator

Warwick Hatton
Director Technical Services

Annexures:

1. Graffiti Removal Policy and Procedures: revised draft
2. Australian Graffiti Register Document